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## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX TO APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

NO.

1. Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment

Exhibit 117: JAMS Final Award dated March 12, 2022

Exhibit 122: Operating Agreement of Green Valley Commerce, LLC
2. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 1 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 101: JAMS
Arbitration Demand Form dated February 7, 2020

Exhibit 102: Commencement of Arbitration dated March
2, 2020
Exhibit 103: Respondent's
Answer and Counter-Claim dated March 3, 2020

Exhibit 104: Report of Preliminary Arbitration Conference and Scheduling
Order dated April 30, 2020
Exhibit 105: Claimant Shawn
Bidsal's Answer to Respondent
CLA Properties, LLC's
Counterclaim dated
May 19, 2020
Exhibit 106: Notice of Hearing
1
191-195

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 2) Exhibit 107: Notice of Hearing for February 17 through
February 19, 2021 dated
October 20, 2020
Exhibit 108: Claimant Shawn
Bidsal's First Amended Demand for Arbitration dated
November 2, 2020
Exhibit 109: Respondent's
Fourth Amended Answer and Counter-Claim to Bidsal's First Amended Demand dated January 19, 2021

Exhibit 110: Claimant Shawn Bidsal's Answer to Respondent
CLA Properties, LLC's Fourth Amended Counterclaim dated
March 5, 2021
Exhibit 111: Notice of Additional
Hearing for June 25, 2021
dated April 29, 2021
Exhibit 112: Notice of Additional
Hearing for September 29
through September 30,
2021 dated August 9, 2021
3. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award
(NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 2 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect] 1
Exhibit 113: Final Award

- Stephen E. Haberfeld,

Arbitrator dated April 5, 2019

2234

235-245
DATE VOL. PAGE NO.
1
196-199

1
200-203

1
204-214

215-220

221-226

227-232

233
6/22/22 1

246-267

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 3) Exhibit 114: Order Granting
Petition for Confirmation of
Arbitration Award and Entry
of Judgment and Denying
Respondent's Opposition and
Counterpetition to Vacate the Arbitrator's Award dated December 5, 2019

Exhibit 115: Notice of Entry of Order Granting Petition for Confirmation of Arbitration Award and Entry of Judgment and Denying Respondent's
Opposition and Counterpetition to Vacate the Arbitration's Award dated December 16, 2019

Exhibit 116: Interim Award dated October 20, 2021

Exhibit 117: Final Award dated March 12, 2022
4. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 3 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 118: Agreement for Sale and Purchase of Loan dated May 19, 2011

Exhibit 119: Assignment
2
435-438
and Assumption of Agreements dated May 31, 2011

Exhibit 120: Final Settlement
Statement - Note Purchase dated June 3, 2011

Exhibit 121: GVC Articles of
2
441-442

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 4) Exhibit 122: GVC Operating
Agreement
Exhibit 123: Emails regarding
Execution of GVC OPAG dated November 29, 2011 to December 12, 2011

Exhibit 124: Declaration of
CC\&Rs for GVC dated
March 16, 2011
Exhibit 125: Deed in Lieu
Agreement dated
September 22, 2011
Exhibit 126: Estimated
Settlement Statement - Deed
in Lieu Agreement dated
September 22, 2011
Exhibit 127: Grant, Bargain,
Sale Deed dated September 22, 2011
5. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 4 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 128: 2011 Federal Tax
6/22/22 3
584
3 579-583

Return dated December 31, 2011
Exhibit 129: Escrow Closing
Statement on Sale of Building
C dated September 10, 2012
Exhibit 130: Distribution
Breakdown from Sale of
Building C dated April 22, 2013
Exhibit 131: 2012 Federal Tax
Return dated September 10, 2013
DATE VOL. PAGE NO.
2 443-471

2
472-476

477-557

558-576
3

577-578
3
,




$$
585
$$

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 5) Exhibit 132: Letter to CLA
Properties with 2012 K-1 dated August 8, 2013

Exhibit 133: Escrow
Settlement Statement for
Purchase of Greenway Property dated March 8, 2013
6. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 5 of 18)

DATE VOL. PAGE NO.
3
639-646

3
647-649

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
3
Index [Incorrect]
3
651

Exhibit 134: Cost Segregation
4
Study dated March 15, 2013
7. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 6 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
4
793
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 135: 2013 Federal Tax
6/22/22 4
792 652-662

663-791
6/22/22 3650

4
794-804

Return dated September 9, 2014
Exhibit 136: Tax Asset Detail
4
805-826

2013 dated September 8, 2014
Exhibit 137: Letter to CLA
4
830-836
Properties with 2014 K-1 dated September 9, 2014

Exhibit 138: Escrow Closing
4
827-829

Statement on Sale of Building
E dated November 13, 2014
Exhibit 139: Distribution
4
839-842
Breakdown from Sale of
Building E dated November 13, 2014

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 7) Exhibit 140: 2014 Federal Tax
Return dated February 27, 2015
Exhibit 141: Escrow Closing
Statement on Sale of Building B dated August 25, 2015

Exhibit 142: Distribution
Breakdown from Sale of
Building B dated August 25, 2015
Exhibit 143: 2015 Federal Tax Return dated April 6, 2016

Exhibit 144: 2016 Federal Tax
Return dated March 14, 2017
Exhibit 145: Letter to CLA
Properties with 2016 K-1 dated March 14, 2017

Exhibit 146: 2017 Federal Tax Return dated April 15, 2017

Exhibit 147: Letter to CLA Properties with 2017 K-1 dated April 15, 2017

Exhibit 148: 2018 Federal Tax Return dated August 2, 2019

Exhibit 149: Letter to CLA
Properties with 2018 K-1 dated April 10, 2018
8. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 7 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 150: 2019 Federal Tax Return (Draft) dated March 20,2020

DATE VOL. PAGE NO.
843-862

4 863-864

4
865-870

871-892
4

5
893-914

915-926

927-966

967-972
5

973-992

993-1003

1004
6/22/22 5
(Cont. 8) Exhibit 151: Letter to CLA
Properties with $2019 \mathrm{~K}-1$ dated March 20, 2020

Exhibit 152: Emails Regarding
CLA's Challenges to Distributions dated January 26 to April 22, 2016

Exhibit 153: Buy-Out
Correspondence - Bidsal Offer dated July 7, 2017

Exhibit 154: Buy-Out
Correspondence - CLA Counter dated August 3, 2017

Exhibit 155: Buy-Out
Correspondence - Bidsal
Invocation dated August 5, 2017
Exhibit 156: Buy-Out
Correspondence - CLA Escrow dated August 28, 2017

Exhibit 157: CLA Responses to First Set of Interrogatories dated June 22, 2020

Exhibit 158: GVC Lease and
6
Sales Advertising dated April 25, 2018

Exhibit 159: Property Information dated August 10, 2020
9. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 8 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index6

Index [Incorrect] 6
Exhibit 160: Deposition
Transcript of David LeGrand dated March 20, 2018 (with Exhibits 1-39)

6/22/22 6

[^0]10. Appendix to Movant CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 9 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 161: Deed - Building C dated September 10, 2012

Exhibit 162: Deed Building E dated November 13, 2014

Exhibit 163: Email from Ben
Golshani to Shawn Bidsal
dated September 22, 2011
Exhibit 164: Deed of Trust
Notes (annotated) dated July 17, 2007

Exhibit 165: Assignment of Lease and Rents dated July 17, 2007

Exhibit 166: CLA Payment of
\$404,250.00 dated May 29, 2011
Exhibit 167: Operating Agreement
For Country Club, LLC dated June 15, 2011

Exhibit 168: Email from David LeGrand to Shawn to Bidsal and Bedn Gloshani dated
September 16, 2011
Exhibit 169: GVC General
Ledger 2011 dated December
31, 2011
Exhibit 170: Green Valley Trial Balance Worksheet, Transaction Listing dated June 7, 2012

6/22/22 $\quad 9$

1865

(Cont. 10) Exhibit 171: Correspondence from Lita to Angelo re Country Blub 2012 Accounting dated January 21, 2016

Exhibit 172: Email from Shawn Bidsal re Letter to WCICO dated January 21, 2016

Exhibit 173: GVC Equity
Balance Computation dated June 30, 2017

Exhibit 174: Email from Ben
Golshani to Jim Main dated July 21, 2017

Exhibit 175: Email
Communication between
Ben Golshani and Jim Main dated July 25, 2017

Exhibit 176: Email
9
Communication from James
Shapiro dated August 16, 2017
Exhibit 177: Email
Communication between
Ben Golshani and Shawn Bidsal dated August 16, 2017
Exhibit 178: Email
Communication between Rodney
T. Lewin and James Shapiro
Exhibit 178: Email
Communication between Rodney
T. Lewin and James Shapiro
Exhibit 178: Email
Communication between Rodney
T. Lewin and James Shapiro dated November 14, 2017

Exhibit 179: Letter from Ben
Golshani to Shawn Bidsal dated December 26, 2017

Exhibit 180: Letter from Shawn Bidsal to Ben Golshani dated December 28, 2017

Exhibit 181: Arbitration Final
Award dated April 5, 2019
Exhibit 182: Email from Ben
Golshani to Shawn Bidsal dated June 30, 2019

9

9

9

9

9

9

9

10
9

10

2014-2017

2018-2019


2020-2021

2022-2025

2026-2031

2032-2033

2038-2039
2036-2037
2034-2035

2062-2063

## NO. DOCUMENT

(Cont. 10) Exhibit 183: Email from Ben Golshani to Shawn Bidsal dated August 20, 2019

Exhibit 184: Email
Communication between CLA and Shawn Bidsal dated June 14, 2020

Exhibit 185: Claimant Shawn Bidsal's First Supplemental Responses to Respondent CLA Properties, LLC's First Set of Interrogatories to Shawn
Bidsal dated October 2, 2020
Exhibit 186: Claimant Shawn Bidsal's Responses to Respondent CLA Properties, LLC's Fifth Set of Requests for Production of Documents Upon Shawn Bidsal dated
February 19, 2021
11. Appendix to Movant CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 10 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 187: Claimant Shawn
Bidsal's Responses to
Respondent CLA Properties,
LLC's Sixth Set of Requests for
Production of Documents Upon
Shane Bidsal dated
February 22, 2021
Exhibit 188: 2019 Notes re
Distributable Cash Building C dated July 11, 2005

10
DATE VOL. PAGE NO.
10 2064-2065

10
2066-2067
$10 \quad$ 2068-2076

10
2077-2081

6/22/22 $10 \quad 2082$

10
10
10
2095-2097
2083
2084-2094

2098-2099

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 11) Exhibit 189: Order Granting
Petition for Confirmation of Arbitration Award and Entry of Judgment and Denying Respondent's Opposition and Counterpetition to Vacate the Arbitrator's Award dated December 6, 2019

Exhibit 190: Plaintiff Shawn
Bidsal's Motion to Vacate
Arbitration Award dated
April 9, 2019
Exhibit 191: Notice of Appeal dated January 9, 2020

Exhibit 192: Case Appeal
Statement dated January 9, 2020
Exhibit 193: Respondent's
Motion for Stay Pending
Appeal dated January 17, 2020
12. Appendix to Movant CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 11 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 194: Notice of Entry of Order Granting Respondent's
Motion for Stay Pending Appeal dated March 10, 2020

Exhibit 195: Notice of Posting
Case in Lieu of Bond dated March 20, 2020

Exhibit 196: (LIMITED)
11
2350-2412

Arbitration \#1 Exhibits 23-42
(Portions of 198 admitted:
Exs. 26 and 40 within 198)

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 12) Exhibit 197: Rebuttal Report Exhibit 1 Annotated (Gerety Schedule) dated July 11, 2005

DATE VOL. PAGE NO.

Schedules dated August 13, 2020
Exhibit 199: Rebuttal Report
Exhibit 3 dated December 31, 2017
Exhibit 200: Distribution
Breakdown dated November 13, 2014 and August 28, 2015

Exhibit 201: Respondent's 11
11
2435-2530
Motion to Resolve Member
Dispute Re Which Manager Should be Day to Day Manager and Memorandum of Points and Authorities and Declarations of Benjamin Golshani and Rodey T. Lewin in Support Thereof dated May 20, 2020
13. Appendix to Movant CLA
Properties, LLC's Motion to Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 12 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
6/22/22 $\quad 12$
2548
2531-2547

Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 202: Claimant Shawn
Bidsal's Opposition Respondent
CLA Properties, LLC's Motion
2549
to Resolve Member Dispute
Re Which Manager Should be
Day to Day Manager dated
June 10, 2020 (with Exhibits 1-62)
Exhibit 203: Request for Oral
14
3156-3158
Arguments: Respondent CLA
Properties, LLC's Motion to
Resolve Member Dispute Re
Which Manager Should be Day
to Day Manager dated
June 17, 2020
(Cont. 13) Exhibit 204: Respondent's Reply Memorandum of Point and Authorities and Declarations Benjamin Golshani and Rodney T. Lewin in Support of Motion to Resolve member Dispute Re Which Manager Should be Day to Day Manager dated June 24, 2020

Exhibit 205: Claimant Shawn
Bidsal's Supplement to
Opposition to Respondent CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Resolve Member Dispute Re Which Manager Should be Day to Day Manager dated July 7, 2020

Exhibit 206: CLA’s Supplement
3194-3213
to Brief re Motion to Resolve Member Dispute Re Which
Manager Should be Day to Day
Manager - Tender Issue and
Declaration of Benjamin
Golshani in Support of Motion dated July 13, 2020

Exhibit 207: Order on Pending
14
Motions dated July 20, 2020
14. Appendix to Movant CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 13 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index 14
Index [Incorrect] 14
Exhibit 208: CLA Properties,
14
15
Answers to First Set of Interrogatories to Shawn Bidsal dated July 16, 2020
(Cont. 14) Exhibit 209: Exhibits to CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Compel Answers to First Set of Interrogatories to Shawn Bidsal dated July 16, 2020

Exhibit 210: Claimant's
Opposition to Respondent's
Motion to Compel Answers to
First Set of Interrogatories to
Shawn Bidsal and Countermotion
to Stay Proceedings dated
July 24, 2020
Exhibit 211: Respondent CLA
15
Properties, LLC Reply to
Opposition by Claimant (Bidsal) to
CLA's Motion to Compel Further
Answers to Interrogatories dated July 27, 2020

Exhibit 212: CLA Properties, LLC's
15
3465-3489
Reply in Support of Motion to
Compel Answers to First Set of Interrogatories and Opposition to Countermotion to Stay
Proceedings dated July 28, 2020
Exhibit 213: Order on
15
3490-3494
Respondent's Motion to
Compel and Amended
Scheduling Order dated
August 3, 2020
Exhibit 214: Claimant's 16
Emergency Motion to Quash
Subpoenas and for Protective Order dated June 25, 2020

Exhibit 215: CLA Properties, 16

3525-3536
LLC's Opposition to Emergency
Motion to Quash Subpoenas and for Protective Order
dated June 29, 2020
Exhibit 216: Claimant's Reply 16

3537-3539

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 14) Exhibit 217: Order on Pending
Motions dated July 20, 2020
15. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to
Vacate Arbitration Award
(NRS 38.241) and for Entry
of Judgment (Volume 14 of 18)

> Note Regarding Incorrect Index

6/22/22 16
3548

Exhibit 218: CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Compel Further Responses to First Set of Interrogatories to Shawn Bidsal and for Production of Documents dated October 7, 2020

Exhibit 219: Rodney Lewin and James Shapiro Email Chain dated October 19, 2020

Exhibit 220: Claimant's
Opposition to Respondent's Motion to Compel Further
Responses to First Set of Interrogatories to Shawn Bidsal
And for Production of Documents dated October 19, 2020

Exhibit 221: CLA Properties, LLC's Reply to Opposition to Motion to Compel Further Responses to First Set of Interrogatories to Shawn Bidsal and for Production of Documents dated October 22, 2020

Exhibit 222: Order on
Respondent's Motion to Compel Further Responses to First Set of Interrogatories to Shawn Bidsal and for Production of Documents dated November 9, 2020

## (Cont. 15) Exhibit 223: CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Continue Proceedings dated November 5, 2020

Exhibit 224: Order on
Respondent's Motion to Continue Proceedings and Second Amended Scheduling Order dated November 17, 2020

Exhibit 225: Letter to Honorable David Wall (Ret.) Requesting Leave to Amend dated January 19, 2021

Exhibit 226: Respondent's 16

3677-3687
Fourth Amended Answer and Counterclaim to Bidsal's First Amended Demand dated January 19, 2021

Exhibit 227: Claimant's 16
Opposition to Respondent / Counterclaimant's Motion for Leave to file Fourth Amended Answer and Counterclaim dated January 29, 2021

Exhibit 228: Respondent /
16
3733-3736
Counterclaimant's Reply in Support of Motion for Leave to File Fourth Amended Answer and Counterclaim dated February 2, 2021

Exhibit 229: Order on Respondent's Pending Motions dated February 4, 2021

Exhibit 230: CLA Properties, LLC's Emergency Motion for Order Compelling the Completion of the Deposition of Jim Main, CPA dated January 26, 2021

16
3658-3663

16
3664-3669
$16 \quad 3670-3676$

3688-3732

[^1]
$\qquad$

(Cont. 15) Exhibit 231: Claimant's
Opposition to Respondent /
Counterclaimant's Emergency
Motion for Order Compelling the Completion of the Deposition of Jim Main, CPA dated January 29, 2021

Exhibit 232: Jim Main's
Opposition and Joinder to Claimant's Opposition to Respondent / Counterclaimant's Emergency Motion for Order Compelling the Completion of the Deposition of Jim Main, CPA dated February 1, 2021

Exhibit 233: CLA Properties, LLC's Reply in Support of Emergency Motion for Order Compelling the Completion of the Deposition of Jim Main, CPA dated February 3, 2021

Exhibit 234: Order on Respondent's Pending Motions dated February 4, 2021

| 16. | Appendix to Movant CLA <br> Properties, LLC's Motion to <br> Vacate Arbitration Award <br> (NRS 38.241) and for Entry <br> of Judgment (Volume 15 of 18) | $6 / 22 / 22$ | 18 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Motion for Orders (1) Compelling
Claimant to Restore/Add CLA to
all Green Valley Bank Accounts;
(2) Provide CLA with Keys to all of Green Valley Properties; and (3) Prohibiting Distributions to the Members until the Sales of the Membership Interest in
Issue in this Arbitration is
Consumated and the Membership
Interest is Conveyed dated
February 5, 2021
(Cont. 16) Exhibit 236: Claimant's
Opposition to Respondent /
Counterclaimant's Motion for Orders (1) Compelling Claimant
To Restore / Add CLA to All
Green Valley Bank Accounts;
(2) Provide CLA with Keys to All Green Valley Properties; and (3) Prohibiting Distributions to The Members until the Sale of The Membership Interest in
Issue in this Arbitration is
Consummated and the
Membership Interest is Conveyed dated February 19, 2021

Exhibit 237: Order on
Respondent's Motion for Various
Orders dated February 22, 2021
Exhibit 238: CLA Motion in
Limine re Bidsal's Evidence re
Taxes dated March 5, 2021
Exhibit 239: Claimant's
Opposition to CLA's Motion in Limine Regarding Bidsal's
Evidence re Taxes dated
March 11, 2021
Exhibit 240: Ruling -
18
4230-4231
Arbitration Day 1 p. 11 dated March 17, 2021

Exhibit 241: CLA Properties,
LLC's Motion in Limine
Re Failure to Tender dated
March 5, 2021
Exhibit 242: Claimant Shawn
19
Bidsal's Opposition to
Respondent CLA Properties, LLC's Motion in Limine Re Failure to Tender dated
March 11, 2021
Exhibit 243: CLA Properties,
19
LLC's Reply to Shawn Bidsal's
Opposition Re Failure to
Tender dated March 12, 2021

18
4102-4208

18 4209-4215

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 16) Exhibit 244: Ruling -
Arbitration Day 1 pp 15-17
dated March 17, 2021
Exhibit 245: CLA's Motion to
Withdrawal Exhibit 188 dated March 26, 2021

Exhibit 246: Claimant's
Opposition to CLA's Motion to Withdraw Exhibit 188 dated March 31, 2021

Exhibit 247: CLA's Reply to
Bidsal's Opposition to the Motion to Withdraw Exhibit 188 dated March 31, 2021

Exhibit 248: Order on Respondent's Motion to Withdraw Exhibit 188 dated April 5, 2021
17. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Appendix to Movant CLA } \\ & \text { Properties, LLC's Motion to } \\ & \text { Vacate Arbitration Award } \\ & \text { (NRS 38.241) and for Entry } \\ & \text { of Judgment (Volume 16 of 18) }\end{aligned}$

Note Regarding Incorrect Index 19
6/22/22 $\quad 19$
4446

Index [Incorrect] 19
Exhibit 249: CLA Properties, LLC's Brief Re: (1) Waiver of the Attorney-Client Privilege; and
(2) Compelling the Testimony of David LeGrand, Esq. dated
May 21, 2021
Exhibit 250: Claimant Shawn Bidsal's Brief Regarding the Testimony of David LeGrand dated June 11, 2021

Exhibit 251: CLA's Properties,

20 20

4447
4448-4458
4459-4474
19

4475-4569

4570-4577

LLC Supplemental Brief Re:
(1) Waiver of the Attorney-Client Privilege; and (2) Compelling the
Testimony of David LeGrand, Esq. dated July 9, 2021
(Cont. 17) Exhibit 252: Claimant Shawn Bidsal's Supplemental Brief Regarding the Testimony of David LeGrand dated July 23, 2021

Exhibit 253: Order Regarding
Testimony of David LeGrand dated September 10, 2021

Exhibit 254: Claimant Shawn
Bidsal's Application for Award of Attorney's Fees and Costs dated November 12, 2021

Exhibit 255: Respondent /
Counterclaimant CLA Properties, LLC's Opposition to Claimant Bidsal's Application for Attorney's Fees and Costs dated December 3, 2021

Exhibit 256: Claimant's Reply in Support of Claimant Shawn Bidsal's Application for Attorney's Fees and Costs dated December 17, 2021

Exhibit 257: Respondent /
21
Counterclaimant CLA Properties, LCC's Supplemental Opposition to Claimant's Application for Attorney's Fees and Costs dated December 23, 2021

Exhibit 258: Response to CLA 21
Properties' Rogue Supplemental Opposition dated
December 29, 2021
Exhibit 259: Claimant Shawn 21 4847-4930
Bidsal's Supplemental
22

4578-4595
20

4596-4604

4605-4687
20

4688-4757

4758-4806

4807-4838

Application for Award of
Attorney's Fees and Costs
dated January 12, 2022

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 17) Exhibit 260: Respondent's Second Supplemental Opposition to Application for Attorney's Fees and Costs dated January 26, 2022

Exhibit 261: Claimant's Second
Supplemental Reply in Support of Claimant Shawn Bidsal's Application for Award of Attorney Fees and Costs dated February 15, 2022
18. Appendix to Movant CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to
Vacate Arbitration Award
(NRS 38.241) and for Entry
of Judgment (Volume 17 of 18)

| Note Regarding Incorrect Index | 22 | 5054 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Index [Incorrect] | 22 | $5055-5065$ |
| Exhibit 262: Transcript of | 23 | $5066-5287$ |
| Proceedings - Honorable |  |  |
| Stephen E. Haberfeld <br> Volume 1 dated May 8, 2018 |  |  |
| Exhibit 263: Transcript of | 23 | $5288-5313$ |
| Proceedings - Honorable | 24 | $5314-5549$ |
| Stephen E. Haberfeld <br> Volume 2 dated May 9, 2018 |  |  |
| Exhibit 264: Arbitration | 25 | $5550-5797$ |
| Hearing Transcript Day 1 | 26 | $5798-5953$ |
| dated March 17, 2021 |  |  |
| Exhibit 265: Arbitration | 26 | $5954-6046$ |
| Hearing Transcript Day 2 | 27 | $6047-6260$ |
| dated March 18, 2021 | 28 | $6261-6341$ |
| Exhibit 266: Arbitration | 28 | $6342-6505$ |
| Hearing Transcript Day 3 | 29 | $6506-6705$ |
| dated March 19, 2021 | 30 | $6706-6798$ |
| Exhibit 267: Arbitration | 30 | $6799-6954$ |
| Hearing Transcript Day 4 | 31 | $6955-7117$ |

NO. DOCUMENT
19. Appendix to Movant CLA Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award (NRS 38.241) and for Entry of Judgment (Volume 18 of 18)

Note Regarding Incorrect Index
Index [Incorrect]
Exhibit 268: Arbitration
Hearing Transcript Day 5 dated April 27, 2021

Exhibit 269: Reporter's
Transcript dated June 25, 2021
Exhibit 270: Remote Transcript of Proceedings dated August 5, 2021

Exhibit 271: Transcript of
Proceedings Arbitration dated September 29, 2021

Exhibit 272: Transcript of Hearing Proceedings dated January 5, 2022

Exhibit 273: Transcript of
34
Telephonic Hearing
Proceedings dated
February 28, 2022
Exhibit 274: Appellant Shawn
35
Bidsal's Opening Brief
(Supreme Court of Nevada, Appear from Case No. A-19-795188-P, District
Court, Clark County, NV dated November 24, 2020

Exhibit 275: Respondent's 35

7119
7120-7130
7131-7202
7203-7358

7359-7410

7411-7531

7532-7657
7658-7783

7784-7814

7815-7859

7860-7934

7935-7975

Opposition to CLA's Petition for Confirmation of Arbitration Award and Entry of Judgment and Counterpetition to Vacate Arbitration Award (Case No. A-19-795188-P, District Court, Clark County, NV) dated
July 15, 2019
(Cont. 19) Exhibit 276: Order of
Affirmance (In Re: Petition of
CLA Properties, LLC C/W 80831
Nos. 80427; 80831, Order of Affirmance, unpublished
Deposition) dated March 17, 2022
Exhibit 277: 2011-2019 Green $\quad 35 \quad$ 7982-7984
Valley Commerce Distribution
20. Bidsal's Opposition to CLA

Properties, LLC's Motion to Vacate Arbitration Award
(NRS 38.241) and for Entry
of Judgment and Bidsal's
Countermotion to Confirm
Arbitration Award
Exhibit 1: Declaration of
35
Shawn Bidsal in Support of
Claimant Shawn Bidsal's
Opposition to Respondent
CLA Properties, LLC Motion
to Resolve Member Dispute
Re Which Manage Should
be Day to Day Manager
dated June 10, 2020
Exhibit 2: Affidavit of

Benjamin Golshani in
Opposition to Respondent's
Motion for Stay Pending
Appeal dated January 31, 2020
Exhibit 3: Articles of
Organization for Green Valley
Commerce, LLC dated
May 26, 2011
Exhibit 4: Final Settlement
Statement for Green Valley
Commerce, LLC dated
September 3, 2011
Exhibit 5: Grant, Bargain and
35
8028-8041
8017-8027
7985-8016
35
7976-7981

9/1/22 35

Sale Deed dated September 22, 2011

Exhibit 6: Estimated Settlement 35

NO. DOCUMENT
(Cont. 20) Exhibit 7: Declaration of
Covenants, Conditions and
Restrictions and Reservation of
Comments for Green Valley
Commerce Center dated
March 16, 2012
Exhibit 8: Seller's Closing 8134-8136
Statement - Final dated
September 10, 2012

$$
\text { Exhibit 9: Operating Agreement } 36
$$ for Green Valley Commerce, LLC

Exhibit 10: Schedule with
8166-8169
Check of Distributions sent from Shawn Bidsal to Benjamin Golshani

## Exhibit 11: Seller's Closing

8170-8171
Statement - Final dated
November 14, 2014

$$
\text { Exhibit 12: Schedule of } 36
$$

8172-8175
Distributions
Exhibit 13: Seller's
36
8176-8177
Settlement Statement dated
August 31, 2015
Exhibit 14: CLA Properties, LLC's Election to Purchase Membership Interest dated August 3, 2017

Exhibit 15: Correspondence
8180-8184 from Rodney T. Lewin to James E. Shapiro Re Proof of Funds to Purchase
Membership Interest
Exhibit 16: Demand for
36
8185-8190
Arbitration Form dated
September 26, 2017
Exhibit 17: JAMS Arbitration

## NO. DOCUMENT

(Cont. 20) Exhibit 18: Demand for
Arbitration Form dated
February 7, 2020
Exhibit 19: Respondent's
Answer and Counter-Claim dated March 4, 2020

Exhibit 20: JAMS Final Award dated March 12, 2022
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| 1 | Q. Okay. ${ }^{\text {Q }}$ Page 247 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. And do correction in a trial balance. |
| 3 | Q. When you referred to the interest income that you |
| 4 | raised some questions about -- |
| 5 | A. Interest income -- |
| 6 | Q. -- is it shown on this general ledger? |
| 7 | A. Yes. |
| 8 | Q. Where is it shown? |
| 9 | A. On the second page, account No. 70200. It shows |
| 10 | 311,265.12, and it says interest from March 6, 2011, to |
| 11 | 9-22-2011. March 6, 2011, we had not bought the |
| 12 | property at that time. |
| 13 | Q. Okay. But just answer the question. |
| 14 | A. Yeah. |
| 15 | Q. Mr. Gerrard asked you questions about the |
| 16 | operating agreement and he talked about Exhibit A to |
| 17 | the -- it's actually Exhibit 5, which is the tax -- tax |
| 18 | part of the document. |
| 19 | Are you an accountant? |
| 20 | A. No. |
| 21 | Q. Did you -- when you signed this operating |
| 22 | agreement, did you read every word in this Exhibit A? |
| 23 | A. Not every word but, you know, those that |
| 24 | interested me. |
| 25 | Q. Okay. Did you have -- did you -- are you capable |

1 Page 248
1 of understanding all of the tax information on this

## Exhibit A?

A. Some of them, I'm not.
Q. Just one last -- one last here before we leave. We talked about in Exhibit 6 -- you know what? I'm going to hold off on that.

Has Mr. Bidsal ever provided you with the escrow instructions relating to the deed in lieu agreement?
A. No. I don't think so.

THE ARBITRATOR: Are you withdrawing that
question? Are you withdrawing that questions?
MR. LEWIN: Oh. I think he said -- I think he answered "no."

THE ARBITRATOR: Did you answer that question?
THE WITNESS: Did you ask me a question?
MR. LEWIN: I asked him if he ever provided him with the escrow instructions.

THE ARBITRATOR: For the deed in lieu?
MR. LEWIN: For the deed in lieu.
THE ARBITRATOR: And you said --
MR. GERRARD: Escrow instructions?
MR. LEWIN: Right.
MR. GERRARD: Objection. Lack of foundation.
THE ARBITRATOR: Yeah, I don't know if there are escrow instructions for the deed in lieu.

| 1 | MR. LEWIN: Okay. Let me rephrase it. Page 249 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 3 | Q. Has Mr. Bidsal ever provided you with any escrow |
| 4 | instructions relating to the deed in lieu agreement or |
| 5 | the escrow? |
| 6 | A. No, they haven't. I don't think so. |
| 7 | MR. LEWIN: I have nothing. I'll reserve the |
| 8 | rest. |
| 9 | THE ARBITRATOR: All right. Mr. Gerrard, do you |
| 10 | have more questions at this time? |
| 11 | MR. GERRARD: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 12 | FURTHER EXAMINATION |
| 13 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 14 | Q. Mr. Golshani, who managed the property right |
| 15 | after the deed in lieu of foreclosure agreement? |
| 16 | A. Myself and Mr. Bidsal managed. |
| 17 | Q. Isn't it true, sir, that all the way through 2011 |
| 18 | and into early 2008 that American Nevada Holdings, LLC, |
| 19 | who had been the property manager for the former owner, |
| 20 | continued to be property manager through the entirety of |
| 21 | 2011 and into 2012? |
| 22 | A. Correct. They did manage the day-to-day, managed |
| 23 | property, collected rent, and things like that. |
| 24 | Q. Okay. And, sir, you have just provided testimony |
| 25 | about Exhibit 95, which is -- you stated is a general |

```
1 ledger of Green Valley Commerce, LLC?
```

```
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How do you know that this is a ledger that was created by anyone at Green Valley Commerce, LLC?
A. Because all the accounting is done in-house.
Q. Sir, that's -- that's not --
A. That's what he -- what Mr. Bidsal disclosed to me.
Q. Okay. This is for the year of 2011; correct? All the entries on Exhibit 95 were entered in the year 2011; correct?
A. All the what?
Q. All of the entries on this general ledger that you have as Exhibit 95 were entered in the year 2011? MR. LEWIN: Objection. Calls for speculation.
A. I'm not sure.
MR. LEWIN: Wait. Wait, please. Objection.
THE ARBITRATOR: They are all dated; right?
MR. GERRARD: Right.
THE ARBITRATOR: All the entries are dated 2011. MR. LEWIN: That doesn't mean when they were -that doesn't mean that they -- that's the time that they were placed -- they were entered.
THE ARBITRATOR: Well, the ledger is as of December 31, 2011.
```

| 1 | MR. LEWIN: But it's printed in 2012, Your Page 251 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. Printed 2000 -- there's a |
| 3 | June 4, 2012, date on top. So, I mean, I'll allow him |
| 4 | to ask the questions if Mr. Golshani knows. |
| 5 | MR. GERRARD: Right. |
| 6 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 7 | Q. So, Mr. Golshani, if you look at Exhibit 95, you |
| 8 | can see that the dates where -- all the entries are in |
| 9 | the year 2011; correct? |
| 10 | A. Should be, yes. |
| 11 | Q. And that's at the time when American Nevada |
| 12 | Corporation was acting as the property manager for Green |
| 13 | Valley Commerce, LLC; correct? |
| 14 | A. Correct, but manager -- |
| 15 | Q. Sir, it's just yes or no. |
| 16 | A. Okay. |
| 17 | Q. Do you have any knowledge, yes or no, about who |
| 18 | actually prepared this general ledger? |
| 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | Q. Okay. Did you see any of the entries input into |
| 21 | this ledger by anyone at Mr. Bidsal's direction or by |
| 22 | Mr. Bidsal? |
| 23 | A. With my own eyes, no. |
| 24 | Q. No. And you never saw who actually created any |
| 25 | of the entries on this general ledger, did you? |

A. No.
Q. All right.
A. I haven't seen somebody entering it.
Q. Okay. You just received a copy of it from the company's accountants; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know if this general ledger and all the entries that are on it were prepared by American Nevada Corporation, who was the manager of the property in 2011? Do you know? Yes or no.
A. I don't know if they produced it, no.
Q. Let's go back to Exhibit 108 again. Exhibit 108 is this email that you say was sent in January of 2016, making reference to prior communications that you'd had with Mr. Bidsal about how distributions were to be made of money from the sale of properties; correct?
A. Whatever it says.
Q. Well, sir, I'm asking you a question. Didn't you testify that Exhibit 108 was a communication that followed up on oral conversations that you testified you'd had with Mr. Bidsal about how distributions were supposed to be made? Isn't that your testimony you just gave?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And let's take a look at what the email

1 Page 253
1 actually says, the response from Mr. Bidsal that's on page CLAARB22087. So it says -- the second paragraph, which is the one we care about, says, "In regard to your question on the sale of the property, our distribution is in accordance with the operating agreement. On each sale, we first pay the capital back to the partners, and then we distribute the profit on a 50-50 basis. That is why we cut four checks for the sale of each property, two for the return of capital to each partner, and two for the profits to each partner."

Do you see where I'm reading?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And that statement accurately describes exactly what Mr . Bidsal did from the sale of every one of the three properties that were sold by the company; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

THE ARBITRATOR: I don't know if there were two checks each on Building C.

MR. GERRARD: There were. We just don't have copies of them.

MR. SHAPIRO: No, Building C. There weren't four checks, there were only two on $C$. That's correct.

MR. GERRARD: Because there was -- okay.

1 BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So on Building $C$, there were no -- there was not two checks because there was only a return of capital on Building $C$; correct?
A. No. On Building C --
Q. It's yes or no, sir.
A. No.
Q. Okay. So on Building $C$-- we talked about this when we looked at the distribution -- the amount that was distributed was approximately $\$ 95,000$; correct?
A. About, yes.
Q. Yeah. And that $\$ 95,000$ was split 70-30 because $\$ 95,000$ was less than the capital -- I'm sorry, the basis attributed to Building C; correct?
A. Because less?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. There was no amount of proceeds from the sale of Building C after the 1031 exchange that exceeded the basis -- the company's basis in Building $C$; correct?
A. I'm not sure. THE ARBITRATOR: I opened this up. I shouldn't have. We went through this all. 95,000 is less than 399,000. Remember that whole line of questioning? I opened this up just by making a correction that wasn't

```
    1 even really relevant, so. All right. Next question. even really relevant, so. All right. Next question. THE WITNESS: All I am saying -BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Sir, there is no question pending. THE ARBITRATOR: My fault. My fault. Next question comes from Mr. Gerrard.
MR. GERRARD: Okay. Thanks.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Now, sir, let's look at exhibit -- let me find it
``` here. Let's turn to Exhibit Number 19.
A. 9 or 19?
Q. 19.

MR. SHAPIRO: 1-9. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Do you have that in front of you, sir?
A. I'm there, yes.
Q. Open up to page No. 1644. Bates No. 1644. So a few moments ago you testified that you made some objection because you saw the 2013 tax return that your distributions -- I'm sorry, that your capital percentages were not 70-30 anymore. Do you remember that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. So let's take a look at this page. You see on your Schedule \(\mathrm{K}-1\), at page 1644, that it shows that your

1 ending capital account percentage was 71.95 percent. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So your capital account had gone up; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we look at the next document, which is Bates No. 1645, Mr. Bidsal's ending capital account balance for year 2013 was at 28.047 percent, and so his had gone down below 30 percent; correct?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Okay. When you said that there was -- you were objecting because the distribution -- the percentages of the capital accounts weren't still \(70-30\), what you were objecting to was something that happened in your favor; correct?
A. No.
Q. Your capital account went up?
A. No.
Q. Okay. You don't see that your capital account --
A. My capital.
Q. -- has gone up from 70 percent to 71.95 percent? MR. LEWIN: Objection. Argumentative.
A. No.

MR. LEWIN: Wait a second. If I start to talk, please wait a second. The court reporter can't take us

1 both down and there's just a small chance it might be 2 relevant.

He's arguing with the witness now. It's argumentative.

THE ARBITRATOR: Overruled. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. You can see what it says there; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And were you also present for the
deposition of Jim Main, the accountant?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you hear him explain in his deposition that this is normal for capital account percentages to be off slightly from where they start?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Hearsay.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Do you remember that testimony?

THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. There was an objection to hearsay.

MR. GERRARD: Oh, I'm sorry.
THE ARBITRATOR: Hearsay.
MR. GERRARD: Oh, I'm asking for a state of mind because this is what he's claiming was the basis for his objecting. I'm asking what he heard from Mr. Main. I can save it if you want. I can --

1
```

THE ARBITRATOR: Ask it on rebuttal. That's fine because it doesn't -- Mr. Main's statement in the deposition doesn't affect his state of mind.
MR. GERRARD: No, but he was there for it.
THE ARBITRATOR: Yeah, but state of mind at the time of deposition is really not --
MR. GERRARD: No, that's fair enough. I can ask it later. I agree with Your Honor. All right.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Sir, would you look at Exhibit 24, please. Remember, you said you made these objections in 2013; correct?
A. Some --
Q. Is that what you said?
A. Yeah, we started at that -- probably at that time, yes.
Q. Okay. So now let's look at Exhibit 24, and let's look again at your K-1, which is CLA Bidsal 1819.
A. 2014 tax return?
Q. Yeah. Exhibit 24. We're looking at page 1819. Let me know when you're there, sir.
A. I'm here.
Q. Okay. And so look at your K-1 for 2014. Your ending capital account percentage is 72.34 percent; correct?

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & A. & Yes. Page 259 \\
\hline 2 & Q. & And Mr. Bidsal's, if you look at his, is \\
\hline 3 & 27.655 & percent; correct? \\
\hline 4 & A. & Yes. \\
\hline 5 & 2. & Okay. And let's look at Exhibit 27, the 2015 tax \\
\hline 6 & return. & And let's look again at your K-1 on page 2312. \\
\hline 7 & Let me & know when you're there, sir. \\
\hline 8 & & Are you there? \\
\hline 9 & A. & Yes. \\
\hline 10 & Q. S & So this K-1 shows that your capital account \\
\hline 11 & balance & at the end of 2015 was 73.07 percent; correct? \\
\hline 12 & A. & Yes. \\
\hline 13 & Q. & And Mr. Bidsal's capital account balance was \\
\hline 14 & 26.92 p & percent; correct? \\
\hline 15 & A. & Correct. \\
\hline 16 & Q. & Okay. So the over-distributions hadn't been made \\
\hline 17 & to Mr. & Bidsal, they'd been made to you; correct? \\
\hline 18 & A. & No. \\
\hline 19 & Q. & Okay. \\
\hline 20 & & MR. GERRARD: I have nothing further. \\
\hline 21 & & MR. LEWIN: Just a couple follow-ups. \\
\hline 22 & & THE ARBITRATOR: Sure. \\
\hline 23 & & FURTHER EXAMINATION \\
\hline 24 & BY MR. & LEWIN: \\
\hline 25 & Q. & Mr. Gerrard just asked you about the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

1 over-distributions. When a person makes a -- when you

```
``` get a distribution on a return -- distribution from the company, it reduces your capital account; right?
A. That's right. That's why I'm saying you're over-distributing. That's why his capital is lower.
Q. So --
A. Nobody -- may I continue?
Q. Sure.
A. Nobody wants to commit to 70 percent and be forced to invest 73,72 , or 74 in a scale of 4 million. It's a lot of money.
Q. Okay. We just talk about -- Mr. Gerrard asked you a question looking at your 2013 tax return, and he said you were complaining about that in 2013. You didn't get -- when did you receive that 2013 tax return?
A. In 2014.
Q. Okay. So were you making -- were you complaining about the 2013 tax return in 2013 or some other year?
A. No. Usually I get it on the following year and I look at it.
Q. Okay.
MR. LEWIN: I have nothing else.
MR. GERRARD: Your Honor, I move to admit Exhibits 4, 5.
THE ARBITRATOR: Give me a second.
```

| 1 | MR. LEWIN: I've agreed to most of these,Page <br> but |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | since we don't have a real formal stipulation, we ought |
| 3 | to go through and admit them. |
| 4 | MR. GERRARD: Yeah, I'm going to do that right |
| 5 | now. |
| 6 | THE ARBITRATOR: Are you done asking questions? |
| 7 | MR. GERRARD: I am. |
| 8 | THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. I had a question just |
| 9 | based on what Mr. Lewin just asked. |
| 10 | EXAMINATION |
| 11 | BY THE ARBITRATOR: |
| 12 | Q. So, Mr. Golshani, your understanding is that if |
| 13 | the K-1, let's say for 2015 in Exhibit 27, shows your |
| 14 | ending capital account at 73 percent instead of 70 , your |
| 15 | understanding is that that means that you haven't been |
| 16 | distributed the right amount so as to reduce your |
| 17 | original capital contribution? |
| 18 | A. Yes, sir. |
| 19 | Q. That's your understanding? |
| 20 | A. Yes. |
| 21 | Q. So is that what signalled to you that there was |
| 22 | an issue? |
| 23 | A. Exactly. |
| 24 | Q. All right. |
| 25 | THE ARBITRATOR: Now I'll allow follow-up. |


| 1 | MR. GERRARD: Sure, I have a follow-up. Page 262 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | FURTHER EXAMINATION |
| 3 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 4 | Q. But, Mr. Golshani, at the time that you made that |
| 5 | objection, you did not object to the manner in which |
| 6 | distributions were being made from the sale of property, |
| 7 | did you? |
| 8 | A. That's a different issue. |
| 9 | Q. Thank you. |
| 10 | THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. All right. So now I'm on |
| 11 | your -- |
| 12 | MR. GERRARD: You got your log there, Judge? I |
| 13 | just want to make sure. |
| 14 | THE ARBITRATOR: Yeah. |
| 15 | MR. GERRARD: So I've got -- I'm moving to admit |
| 16 | Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 -- |
| 17 | MR. LEWIN: Hold on a second. Hold on a second. |
| 18 | THE ARBITRATOR: Everything on that page except |
| 19 | 11? |
| 20 | MR. GERRARD: Oh, I'm not looking at the page. |
| 21 | I'm looking at my notes, Judge. |
| 22 | MR. SHAPIRO: But yes. Yeah, I'm with you. Yes. |
| 23 | MR. GERRARD: 17, then 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, |
| 24 | 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 36, 30, 31, $32--$ |
| 25 | MR. LEWIN: Hold on a second. You're now back at |

$30 ?$
MR. GERRARD: Yep. Okay. So 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, $37,38,43,91--$

THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. Hold on. 91 is the other list. Hold on. 91. Okay.

MR. GERRARD: And 108. And with that objection, I also move to admit Exhibit 20. Exhibit 20 is just the last page of the 2013 tax return, which is already in Exhibit 19. It was just broken up.

THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. All right.
MR. LEWIN: I have an objection to No. 10.
No. 10 is an incomplete document.
MR. GERRARD: That's true. We didn't -- we
didn't include the whole --
MR. LEWIN: I'm fine -- I'm okay with No. 10 --
MR. GERRARD: It's only being offered for the purpose of showing that the deed was recorded on that date.

MR. LEWIN: Well, except that -- the fact that there's multiple parcels is important. I would just request that since you've asked him about No. 10 that you provide a document that has the full legal description.

MR. GERRARD: Okay. We can do that. MR. LEWIN: Then 10 is fine.


| 1 | MR. GERRARD: Okay. Page 265 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | *** |
| 3 | (RECESS TAKEN FROM 3:27 P.M. TO 3:37 P.M.) |
| 4 | *** |
| 5 | Whereupon, |
| 6 | SHAWN BIDSAL, |
| 7 | having first been called as a witness, was duly sworn |
| 8 | and testified as follows: |
| 9 | THE ARBITRATOR: You go by Shawn, S-H-A-W-N, |
| 10 | Bidsal, B-I-D-S-A-L? |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. That's correct. |
| 12 | THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. Make sure you keep your |
| 13 | voice up so that the court reporter can hear you. All |
| 14 | right? |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 16 | THE ARBITRATOR: All right. Mr. Shapiro. |
| 17 | MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you. |
| 18 | EXAMINATION |
| 19 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 20 | Q. Shawn, what is your current occupation? |
| 21 | A. Real estate investment and management. |
| 22 | Q. How long have you been in real investment and |
| 23 | management? |
| 24 | A. Almost 25 years. |
| 25 | Q. Have you ever engaged in the management of |

```
    1 property that you did not Page 266
    2 not own an interest in, either in your individual
    3 capacity or as a member of an LLC?
```

```
property that you did not own, either -- that you did not own an interest in, either in your individual capacity or as a member of an LLC?
A. No.
MR. SHAPIRO: Is he loud enough for you? Are you catching that?
THE REPORTER: Yes, thank you.
MR. SHAPIRO: He's a little soft, so \(I\) want to make sure.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. In your activities as a real estate investment and management, have you had the opportunity to form limited liability companies?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Have you ever formed an LLC in which you were the sole managing member?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you formed LLCs where you had other members?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you formed corporations?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is Ben Golshani?
A. He's my first cousin from my mom's side.
Q. And have you entered into any business transactions with Ben?
```

```
A. Yes, I have.
Q. How many business ventures have you and Ben been involved in together?
A. We have three LLCs.
Q. When was the first time that you engaged in any business venture with Ben?
A. 2011 -- mid-2011.
Q. Was it the transaction at issue in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. To your knowledge, as of the time when you first started the transaction in this case, do you know if Ben had any experience in investing in or managing commercial real property?
A. He was in the textile business. He owns a company called Noveltex, so.
Q. Are you familiar with an entity called CLA Properties?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And who or what is CLA Properties?
A. He is my partner in Green Valley Commerce.
Q. Who owns CLA Properties?
A. Ben does.
Q. Are you familiar with a business or website called auction.com?
A. Very much so.
```

Q. Can you tell me what auction.com is?
A. It's one of the internet website platforms where you can purchase notes and properties.
Q. Do you have experience buying from auction.com?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. When was the first time that you bought anything from auction.com?
A. Late 2000 -- 2007 to 2010, in there.
Q. Prior to the transaction at issue in this case, how many times had you purchased or made a purchase via the auction.com platform?
A. Note and property, few times.
Q. More than five?
A. Probably not. Less than five.
Q. Okay, less than five. Tell me the process of -if I wanted to buy something on auction.com, could I log into today and buy something today?
A. Yes, you can.
Q. Is there any type of a qualification process?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. So if -- would I have to be qualified before I could attempt to purchase anything on that platform?
A. Yes. You need to decide if you're buying it on your own name as a -- as a -- in a personal capacity, or as an entity -- legal entity. So if you're buying it as

1 Page 269
1 a legal entity, you need to provide the articles and
2 offer the agreements and fill out forms online and
3 register, and then you also have to provide proof of
4 funds prior to the -- the ability to be able to bid. So
5 they usually list the properties in the platform online about 45 to 60 days prior to the sale. The sale is a three-day sale, and you need to provide proof of fund in full amount to be able to qualify to bid.
Q. So you're saying if $I$ don't show auction.com that I have the cash available to complete whatever it is I'm bidding on, they won't even allow me to bid?
A. Depends on when, at what point in time.
Q. Oh, it's changed?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's talk about 2011. How was it working

## in 2011?

A. You need to provide full proof of fund up to the amount you are going to bid.

MR. SHAPIRO: And he's sounding soft to me, but you're hearing him?
(Reporter confirmation.)
MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Good. All right. I won't ask again unless you say something.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

1 BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. So as of 2011 -- or 2011, had you or any of your entities gone through the qualification process on auction.com?
A. Yes. I use a couple of LLCs. One LLC in particular, Real Equities, LLC, and also West Coast Investment to bid on auction.com.
Q. And so both of those had been pre-qualified by auction.com?
A. Correct. But on each occasion, you need to -they screen you, make sure you are qualified for that property because you need to register, and for that property you still need to declare up to what amount you're bidding.
Q. Did you have any conversations with Ben about the qualification process required by auction.com?
A. Yes, we talked about it.
Q. Was -- do you have any knowledge as to whether Ben was qualified to make any bidding on auction.com?
A. At that particular time for that property?
Q. In 2011.
A. I was qualified.
Q. That wasn't the question. The question was: Do you know if Ben was qualified on -- to bid on auction. com in 2011?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Now, you've obviously sat through Ben's testimony today. You know what this case is about. At some point in 2011, you purchased a loan off of auction.com; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And what entity did you initially use to bid on that loan?
A. One of my LLC entities, Real Equities.
Q. Real Equities, LLC or Inc.?
A. That one is LLC.
Q. Okay. Can you just describe for me real briefly kind of how that came about?
A. The -- as I said, the property gets -- goes -they call it online. It goes online 45 to 60 days prior to bidding. And when it goes online, it's available on the website. So I check the website periodically, make sure I'll have first chance to look at anything that comes on. And if I like the asset, I contact my local broker in Vegas, Jeff Chang, and I bounce it back to him, "See, I'm looking at these few locations. What do you think?"

And if he says that they are good, then I come down. I ask him about the property, if it's a no, so he does some research. But then $I$ come down and look at it

1 and do some due diligence, see if it's 272 2 to purchase.

3
4
5
6
Q. Okay. Turning your attention to the loan at issue that you ultimately purchased, did that same process -- was that same process followed? In other words, did you contact Jeff Chang and say, "Hey, there's this loan. What do you think?" Or did you make your own independent decision?
A. No, I look -- I -- it's online, so everyone can look at it. So I looked at the -- there were a few of them that I identified. I bounced it back with Jeff and Jeff said, "This is a -- relatively a good thing, good candidate to come and look."

So I drove from L.A. and looked at it -- and Ben was with me, actually. We drove together. And looked at that one and at a few more.
Q. Okay. What happened next in the process of making the decision to purchase that note?
A. I was -- at that time, I was qualified because the auction -- this is a three-day auction. So the PSA was signed -- the auction price submitted on 19 of May. So the bidding process opened on May 17th. So it goes 17, 18, 19.

So I came down. I downloaded all the loan documents from the website, and I start doing the due

1 diligence on the paper portion of it, checking all the 2 documents. And then when I came down, I checked the 3 property. We did a drove by. And -- on a note 4 purchase, we are not allowed to contact the borrower, 5 and also tenants, so most of the due diligence is done

```
A. No. Auction.com, their draft PSAs are basically non-negotiable.
Q. So if -- this is the document that you, in fact, signed; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would have signed it via Docusign?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, I'm going to move for the admission as \(I\) go. I think it's a little easier. So I move for the admission of Exhibit 1. MR. LEWIN: Can we just get a date when he signed it?
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Do you know when you signed this document?
A. May 19th.
MR. LEWIN: Okay. No objection.
THE ARBITRATOR: All right. 1 is admitted.
THE WITNESS: And then Bidsal 4059.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. I'm sorry. Bidsal 4059?
A. Yes.
Q. Oh, it is signed. Okay. There it is. So that's your signature?
A. Yes.
```

Q. Okay. And the date there is the date that you signed it?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. Turning to Bidsal 4035.

MR. LEWIN: Can you give me a page number? MR. SHAPIRO: That's what we just looked at, 4035.

MR. LEWIN: I don't have a Bates-stamped copy. MR. SHAPIRO: I don't see page numbers on here, so no, I can't. Do you have page numbers on yours? MR. LEWIN: Actually, I do.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. It's after -- there's 26 and then there's two pages that don't have page numbers, so it'd technically be 28, I guess.

MR. LEWIN: Okay. The one says -- I see his signature on it.

MR. SHAPIRO: Yeah, that's what we were looking at.

MR. LEWIN: Okay.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Now, looking at this signature page, which is Bates stamp 4035 -- I understand yours isn't -- there's a name of the buyer. Do you see that?
A. Where are we now?
Q. 4035 .

| 1 | A. Yes. I'm there. Page 276 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. Who's the buyer? |
| 3 | A. Real Equities. And I'm their manager. |
| 4 | Q. Okay. So you signed this as the manager of Real |
| 5 | Equities, LLC; correct? |
| 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | Q. And do you own Real Equities, LLC? |
| 8 | A. Yes, I do own it. 100 percent. |
| 9 | Q. Now, going back to the first page, there's a -- |
| 10 | this has a number of different terms. One is the |
| 11 | purchase price. What was the purchase price or the |
| 12 | agreed-upon purchase price? |
| 13 | A. $\$ 3$ million 850-. |
| 14 | Q. And what were you purchasing for that amount? |
| 15 | A. A note with all the loan documents, plus the |
| 16 | security deed of trust -- deed of collateral. |
| 17 | Q. And if you look at "buyer" on the first page, who |
| 18 | does it identify as the buyer? |
| 19 | A. That's Shawn Bidsal. That's me. |
| 20 | Q. Is it Shawn Bidsal? |
| 21 | A. Not as person, but the buyer itself is the Real |
| 22 | Equities, LLC. |
| 23 | Q. Okay. Turning to the next page, which is page 2 |
| 24 | of the document Bates-stamped Bidsal 4005, who is the |
| 25 | escrow agent? |

```
A. Escrow Agent is Yvette Cantu (phonetic).
Q. Well, this identified an escrow agent; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And who does it identify?
A. It's the Commerce Title.
Q. Commerce Title company?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. Now, this was purchased under the name of Real Equities. Did Real Equities end up taking ownership of the note?
A. No.
Q. Turn your attention to Exhibit 2. Do you recognize Exhibit 2?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is Exhibit 2?
A. It's the assignment of the -- the agreement \(I\) have to purchase the note from Real Equities through Green Valley Commerce.
Q. Was Ben aware of this agreement at or about the time it was signed?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. Lack of foundation. Speculation.
THE ARBITRATOR: If he knows.
A. In terms of the assignment to the --
```

```
// /
```

```
// /
```

1 BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Do you know if Ben was aware of this agreement on or about the date you signed it?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you know that?
A. Because we had conversations that I'm buying this note for myself, if he -- he was coming with me -tagging along -- that if he wants, he can be a partner. He could be a 50-50 partner.
Q. Now, he ended up putting the required deposit up; right? That money came from him?
A. After I secured the purchase agreement and I already show the proof of fund and was in a so-called PSA agreement -- signed PSA agreement -- then we had a conversation that we can form an LLC, -- Green Valley Commerce -- and he can be a 50 percent partner, yes.
Q. If you turn to Bidsal 3995, which is the third page of the agreement. Do you recognize the signatures?
A. Yes. Both of them are mine.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Your Honor, I move for the admission of Exhibit 2.

MR. LEWIN: No objection.
THE ARBITRATOR: Exhibit 2 will be admitted. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Now, you indicated that Jeff Chang was involved diligence; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Was he paid any type of a commission on this transaction?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. Do you know how much that commission was?
A. It's about -- it's very low. It's like five -half a percent, so 5,000 of the -- of the sale.
Q. Now, at some point, you formed -- or the entity Green Valley Commerce, LLC, was formed; correct.
A. Yes.
Q. Who formed that entity?
A. I did that.
Q. And I'll direct your attention to Exhibit 4. Do you recognize Exhibit 4?
A. Yes.
Q. What is Exhibit 4?
A. That's the LLC article of organization which I formed.
Q. Okay. And did Ben have anything to do with the formation of the entity?
A. No. I did that.
Q. Were you ultimately successful in purchasing the note?

```
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall what date your note purchase occurred?
A. I think it was -- the escrow time for notes are ten days or about ten days. I think it was either June 1 or June 10.
Q. I'll direct your attention to Exhibit 3. Do you recognize Exhibit 3 ?
A. Yes.
Q. What is Exhibit 3 ?
A. That's the closing statement to purchase the note.
Q. And is there a date on there?
A. There's a settlement date of 6-3-2011.
Q. Is that the date that it closed?
A. I think so. That range.
Q. And there's a signature on this page under "the buyer." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Whose signature appears there?
A. That's mine.
MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, I move for the admission of Exhibit 3.
MR. LEWIN: No objection. THE ARBITRATOR: All right. It will be admitted.
```

MR. LEWIN: What happened to 4?
THE ARBITRATOR: It's already in.
MR. LEWIN: Oh, 4's already in. Okay. I can't find my sheet.

BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Looking at Exhibit 3 -- well -- so once you closed the loan on June 3 -- or closed escrow on June 3, what happened next?
A. Then we had to start a formal negotiation with the borrower. We had the ability now to contact them. And I drafted a -- it's called an opening letter, which I had the form of it. And I fill it up and sometime around mid June, I think, we hired David LeGrand as an attorney. And he looked at it and I think he devised a better letter, and then I sent to the Christopher Childs which was the -- I think it was the attorney for the borrower at that time.
Q. And, I mean, I -- I don't know that the details of those negotiations are real relevant here, so let's try and keep it to a minimum, but did that -- you know, what was the ultimate outcome of your discussions with the borrower?
A. The borrower had two guarantees. One was a lease corporate guarantee and they also had a so-called spring parent guarantee that they were very careful not to
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1 create a breach. And so they were cooperating because 2 the amount of the -- the face value of the note was much

3 higher than what we paid, so.
Q. So I'm familiar with guarantees on what's commonly referred to as "bad boy carve-outs." Is that what you're referring to?
A. To some point, yes.
Q. Okay. So can -- can you briefly describe why they were being so careful not to trigger the guarantees? Just help us understand that real briefly.
A. From what $I$ understand, the loan was a CMBS loan, which was foreclosed by LNR. At that time, LNR was the largest servicer in the country and I purchased a lot of stuff from them. So CMBS loans are very tough loans because the language of the loan is kind of very strict. They had to make sure that what they collect from rent and security deposit, everything is like segregated and kept okay. And also, under a lease guarantee, their -one of their spring partners was managing the property, American Nevada.
Q. So under -- under CMBS loans, is it fair to say that if the borrower fails to comply with the loan agreement, that that can trigger personal liability on behalf of the guarantors?
A. Corporate liability in this case, yes.
Q. Okay. Now, turn to Exhibit 8, please.
A. 8 ?
Q. Yes. What is Exhibit 8?
A. That's a negotiated deed in lieu agreement with the borrower and borrower entities.
Q. Okay. And if you can turn to Bidsal 1442, which is page 13. Actually, 1441, which is page 13.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that your signature?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you turn to the next page, it appears that there's three more signatures; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the borrower or the current owner of the property at that time was Green Valley Commerce Center, LLC; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What was American Nevada Holding, LLC? Why did they sign this?
A. I -- we received the structure, the spring structure. I just don't remember it now, but, like, they were a parent company and they had members. And somewhere down the line of that membership, the -- at the end of that hierarchy, they would own properties -multiple properties -- like a tier structure.

And Green Valley Commerce Center was one of those LLCs which was owned by American Nevada and Silver Springs, Inc. And so in order to make sure that we get the proper conveyance, we have to get not only the -the right owner to sign, but also the parent companies to sign. And other reasons including other --
Q. Look at the first page.
A. -- other entities were also the guarantors. One was a leasing guarantor and one was the corporate guarantor. That is $B(V)$ and --
Q. Okay. So you're looking -MR. LEWIN: Wait. Can we have the witness finish his answer, because...
A. -- and B(VI).

BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Okay. So what page are you looking at?
A. 1429 .
Q. So Bidsal 1429, which is the first page of the deed in lieu agreement; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're referencing section $1 B(V)$ ?
A. And VI.
Q. And VI. So Silver Springs, Inc., was a carve-out guarantee or it signed a carve-out guarantee; correct? A. Yes.
Q. And American Nevada Holdings signed a leasing guarantee?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, what's the date of this agreement?
A. September 22, 2011.
Q. And you bought the property when?
A. The actual property? September 22.
Q. I'm sorry. Thank you for correcting me. You became the owner of the note at what date?
A. I think June 3, 2011.
Q. Okay. So why was there a gap between June and September?
A. Negotiating with the borrower, American Nevada and GVCC, to get a proper -- get the loan negotiated and signed. And also they were managing the property at that time, to be able to get the rents and security deposit back properly.
Q. Okay. Drawing your attention, again, looking at the first page of the deed in lieu agreement, I'm looking at Section 1B(I)?
A. Section 1B --
Q. (I).
A. Okay.
Q. Is that the note that you purchased on June 3 or around June 3?

```
A. That's the original note.
Q. Okay. And (II), is that the deed of trust that secured the note that you purchased?
A. Correct.
Q. (III) is an assignment of leases or rents associated with that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If you could turn to -- well, actually, same page, Section 1C. What was the point of Section 1C?
A. Basically, it's a full release of the lien and the guarantee. So once they convey the property, then basically they want to be done. They don't want to have a lawsuit or any other future claims.
Q. Now, you heard Ben testify earlier today; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And part of Ben's testimony was that he testified that as of June 3 when they bought the note, that he considered that you owned the property. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree with his assessment?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
```

A. Note is a -- purchase is a risky business because it's subject to potential pitfalls before you can actually own a property. The borrower can file bankruptcy, the borrower can sell the property and pay you off, the borrower can come up with the money and make the loan current, and -- I don't even know. Maybe there are more of those potential pitfalls, but -- no. It's not a property.
Q. Looking at Section 2.1, which is on the next page, what was the borrower agreeing to do here?
A. It's an absolute conveyance of the -- of the property.
Q. And is that the triggering event as far as when you become the owner of the actual property?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, looking at Section 2.2, Roman numeral A, what was the purpose of this provision?
A. So basically this is a deed in lieu. It's the so-called predecessor document to the grant deed. So this is an agreement entered -- basically the meeting of the minds -- between the borrower and the lender, that will -- eventually will result in obtaining a grant deed. So basically what it says is that we are doing this document, but later on, the grant deed will be the final document. So until the grant deed is issued, the

1 lien is -- still remain.
Q. Turning your attention to Section 2.10, which is on Bidsal 1432. This talks about a dollar amount of 295,258.93. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What -- tell me why this provision was included?
A. When we bought the note, the note was already in default. And the borrower was acting as a so-called defaulted borrower and was obligated to collect the rent on behalf of the lender. In the loan documents, there's a document called a license that -- actually, it's in the assignment of rent or deed of trust that -- well, let me backtrack.

When we bought the note, we put ourselves in the shoes of the existing lender, so now we are the lender. As soon as we buy the note, we are the lender. So we are entitled to all the obligations of the borrower or all the proceeds that they collect from the property. And under the fact that we are in the shoes of the previous lender and based on the assignment of rent, the borrower who used to have a license to collect the rent, pay the bills, and keep the revenue, that license is revoked. They no longer can reap the benefit of the profits.

So whatever rent is collected, it needs to pay
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1 the expenses from the date of the default, which I think
2 it was sometime in 2010, and keep all that monies for
3 the benefit of the lender. In this case, we are the
4 lender.
Q. Was this a specifically negotiated provision?
A. It's the -- the concept and the language is actually in the loan documents. But the running total and the amount of how much is going to be, that was -yeah. Because they had to provide us with the financials, how much they are making every month, how much is the cost. So we knew the rent collections, we knew the expenses per month. They would provide that. So in terms of the -- the document, that was already in the loan document. But in terms of the amounts, that was reflected here in 2.10 .
Q. Now, at the second part of 2.10 , it talks about a management agreement.
A. Yes. So what happened is -MR. LEWIN: Can we have a question? BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Did -- did American Nevada Realty, LLC, enter into a management agreement to manage the property?
A. They were managing the property, but as a part of the deed in lieu, yes. We did sign a management agreement that became a part of this document -- this

```
    1 deed in lieu document And I'm thinking it was Page 290
    2 the exhibits. And they were managing it from before we
```

```
deed in lieu document. And I'm thinking it was one of the exhibits. And they were managing it from before we buy it all the way through 2011 till September, and then they keep managing it through somewhere in the -- I think middle of 2012.
Q. And at the time that they stopped managing the property, who took over the management of the property?
A. Then I took over the management.
MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry. What was the date that they -- they ended management?
THE WITNESS: Sometime there's a general
ledger --
MR. LEWIN: I just wanted to know the date you said earlier.
THE ARBITRATOR: He said middle of 2012.
MR. LEWIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE ARBITRATOR: Certainly.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Drawing your attention to 2.11, next page. Why was this provision included?
A. Because they had this -- the -- American Nevada, the management company for the borrower, had the -- was collecting and keeping the security deposits -- rent security deposits of the tenants, and based on the --
```

1 this deal, they had it turn over to us.
Q. Direct your attention to Exhibit 10. Can you tell me what Exhibit 10 is?
A. That's the grant bargain, grant deed and deed of sale that basically transfers the property from Green Valley Commerce Center to Green Valley Commerce, LLC.
Q. Okay. And what date did that transfer occur?
A. On September 22, 2011.
Q. All right. Now $I$ want to go back. So this -there's some discussion about the fact that the full legal description was not attached to this document. I want to draw your attention back to Exhibit 8. To Bates No. 1444. So 1444. Tell me when you're there.
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. Is this -- was this the legal description on -- of the property you were obtaining title to on September 22, 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. And this legal description appears to go on pages 15 and 16 or Bates stamp Bidsal 1444 to 1445 ; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. How many parcels are described in this legal description?
A. Two.
Q. Two parcels or three?
A. Two.
Q. Well, let me direct your attention to 1445.
A. Yeah. I'm --
Q. Okay. So what is the third parcel that is conveyed? Is that an actual parcel or is that something else?
A. It's an easement parcel, service parcel.
Q. Okay. So when it comes to actual real property as opposed to easement, how many parcels were there?
A. Two parcels plus an easement, so three.
Q. Okay. Two parcels plus an easement. And on those two parcels, how many buildings were there?
A. All together, eight.
Q. If you had wanted to sell just one of these parcels, would you have been able to -- to sell just one of the parcels?

MR. LEWIN: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

THE ARBITRATOR: If he knows.
A. From what I remember, no, because it was kept as one park -- one industrial park.

BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. And if you had wanted to sell one building, would you have been able to sell one building?
A. No.
Q. Did you consider the property to be one parcel or two parcels? In other words, one property or two property or eight property or nine property? What did you consider it to be?
A. At that time, I was looking at it as one property. One park.
Q. Now, turning to Exhibit 9.

MR. SHAPIRO: And I guess, just as a housekeeping
matter, Rod, do you agree that the legal description
attached to the deed in lieu agreement, it would be the same as the one on the deed?

MR. LEWIN: That's my understanding.
MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Do we need to supplement that exhibit, or can we just have that understanding? Either way, I don't care. If you want --

MR. LEWIN: Whatever His Honor wants.
THE ARBITRATOR: It isn't going to matter to me.
MR. LEWIN: That's fine. It doesn't matter to me, as long as we understand that it's two -- that there are not three parcels listed and --

MR. SHAPIRO: Sure.
MR. LEWIN: That one parcel has been stated in various times.

MR. SHAPIRO: Yep.

```
1 BY MR. SHAPIRO:
```

```
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. All right. Turning to Exhibit 9. On
Exhibit 9 -- this is already in evidence. It's the settlement statement for the transfer of the title to the property; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. There's really only two items under the buyer credit column. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What are those two items?
A. Well, this refers back to the DIL. One is the net rent collected by the borrower/seller, and the other one is a security deposit.
Q. Okay. At the time that you closed on title to the property, which was September 22,2011 , did you have a signed operating agreement for Green Valley Commerce?
A. No.
Q. And when did you ultimately sign the operating agreement for Green Valley Commerce?
A. Sometime in December of 2011.
Q. I'm going to direct your attention to Exhibit 6. Looking at the second page of Exhibit 6 -- this is an email from David LeGrand to you dated December 10, 2011; correct?
A. Yes.
```

Q. Do you know if you had signed the operating agreement at the time you received this email?
A. I think -- I think I did. Sometime in 2011. I don't remember was it -- I think it was maybe before then or about that time frame.
Q. Well, go two more pages. This is an email from you to David LeGrand dated December 12, 2011; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And what do you say?
A. Yeah. So it's signed by 12-12.
Q. Okay. So by December 12, 2011, it was signed. So it would have been early 2000 -- or early December of 2011; correct?
A. Yes.

MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry, Jim. I have four pages in this exhibit. Is there only three?

MR. SHAPIRO: No, there's four. I haven't talked about all four, but yeah. There's four.

MR. LEWIN: Because you said go two pages and the email -- the email you're talking about is three pages. THE ARBITRATOR: Well, yeah. Two pages from where he was before is where he ended up. All right. MR. SHAPIRO: All right.

BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Direct your attention to Exhibit 5. Do you

| 1 | recognize Exhibit 5? Page 296 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | Q. What is Exhibit 5? |
| 4 | A. That's the signed operating agreement for Green |
| 5 | Valley Commerce. |
| 6 | Q. Are your initials anywhere on that first page? |
| 7 | A. Yes. |
| 8 | Q. Which ones are your initials? |
| 9 | A. The bottom right corner. SB, Shawn Bidsal. |
| 10 | Q. Is that the one on the right or is that the |
| 11 | initials on the left? |
| 12 | A. To the right. |
| 13 | Q. Okay. And did you initial each page? |
| 14 | A. Yes. |
| 15 | Q. Now, do you know who the other initials are? |
| 16 | A. It's Ben Golshani. |
| 17 | Q. Were you present when he signed and initialed |
| 18 | this? |
| 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | Q. So you watched him do it? |
| 21 | A. We did it together. |
| 22 | Q. Okay. And then if you can turn to Bidsal 21, |
| 23 | which is page 21. Is that your signature? |
| 24 | A. Page 21 or Exhibit 21? |
| 25 | Q. I'm sorry. Page 21 of Exhibit 5. If I said |


|  | exhibit, I meant Bates stamp. But anyway, page 21. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Is that your signature? |
| 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | Q. Well, all four are not. Are your signatures on |
| 5 | that page? |
| 6 | A. Yeah, two signatures. |
| 7 | Q. Do you recognize Ben's signatures? |
| 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. Is it fair to say that the process of agreeing on |
| 10 | the actual language in this operating agreement was long |
| 11 | and arduous? |
| 12 | A. Somewhat, yes. |
| 13 | Q. When did you first start trying to agree on the |
| 14 | language of the operating agreement. Do you recall? |
| 15 | A. What part of the agreement? |
| 16 | Q. Any part. When did you first decide "we need to |
| 17 | draft an operating agreement"? |
| 18 | A. It was early on in June, July of 2011. |
| 19 | Q. Okay. So between June, July of 2011 and December |
| 20 | when you finally signed it, that's a period of how many |
| 21 | months? |
| 22 | A. Six months. Five, six months. |
| 23 | Q. Five, six months. Okay. Was the language in |
| 24 | this agreement -- well, strike that. |
| 25 | If you look at page 1, under "the business of the |

```
1 company," what does that say?
```

```
company," what does that say?
A. It's basically buying a secured note, converting it to property, and running it. Managing it.
Q. Was that the intended business of the company when you signed the operating agreement on -- in December of 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that an accurate description of what both you and Ben contemplated the business of the company to be?
A. At that time, yes.
Q. Now, draw your attention to Exhibit B, which is the last page. What was your percentage interest in this company?
A. 50 percent.
Q. How much cash capital did you contribute?
A. 1,215,000.
Q. And what was CLA Properties' percentage interest?
A. \(2,834,250\).
Q. What was their percentage interest?
A. Capital.
Q. What was CLA Properties' percentage interest?
A. 50 percent.
Q. And how much cash capital did CLA Properties contribute?
A. \(2,834,250\).
```

Q. Why is it that the percentage interest was equal when the cash capital was not equal?
A. A couple of reasons. I'm the one who found the property, tied it up, got the opportunity on it, and then assigned it to the Green Valley Commerce and brought in Ben to be a partner. And also I did all of the work from beginning to now managing the property.
Q. Did you have any type of an agreement with Ben about the return of cash capital contributions?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Whatever the agreement -is he talking about the agreement in the operating agreement, which isn't the agreement we're talking? Is he talking about something else?

THE ARBITRATOR: It's a yes-or-no question, first of all. So we'll take -- we'll take it if necessary. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Okay. So did you have any type of an agreement with Ben regarding the return of his initial cash capital?

THE ARBITRATOR: Did you have an agreement with him or did you have any conversations with him? MR. SHAPIRO: The question was agreement.

BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Did you have an agreement? THE ARBITRATOR: Okay.
A. Yes.

BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. And what was that agreement?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Calls for conclusion.
THE ARBITRATOR: Are we talking about what's in the operating agreement, or are we talking about something else?

MR. SHAPIRO: I'm talking about generally. Did they have an understanding --

MR. GERRARD: So ask that question. Did they have an understanding.

MR. SHAPIRO: All right.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Did you have an understanding -- did you and Ben have an understanding regarding Ben's return -- the return of Ben's initial cash capital?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. It's subjective to understanding. It's irrelevant to what was said between the parties.

THE ARBITRATOR: Not necessarily. I mean, the intention of the parties as it goes to any potential ambiguities makes it relevant. So I'm going to allow the question. I haven't declared ambiguity, but obviously --

MR. SHAPIRO: That's the whole fight.

```
THE ARBITRATOR: Yeah. It's overruled. The objection is overruled.
A. Yes, I had that understanding. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. And what was your understanding with Ben?
A. So basically, if we are going to return the partners' capital, either we do it through a refinance where there's enough -- refinance all of the -- the cashout financing is generated to pay back both partners. That's one scenario.
The other scenario is if we sell the whole assets of the company and generate enough money to pay back the cash contributions.
Q. Okay. Does Exhibit B to the operating agreement reflect that understanding?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. Calls for his opinion as to what it says.
THE ARBITRATOR: Overruled. I mean, it's not an objection, but yeah, that's the gist of the question.
A. Yes. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. At the time Exhibit \(B\) was drafted, were you and Ben contemplating subdividing and selling the properties?
A. Subdividing --
```

| 1 | MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry. Objection. The $\begin{gathered}\text { Page } 302\end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | took place over a long period of time. Can we pin down |
| 3 | a time? It's vague as to time. |
| 4 | MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. |
| 5 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 6 | Q. There was previously -- during Ben's testimony, |
| 7 | there was evidence introduced that the language of |
| 8 | Exhibit B was primarily finalized at least by |
| 9 | September 22, 2011. Is that your understanding? |
| 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | Q. Okay. So let's just use September 22, 2011. |
| 12 | Excuse me. |
| 13 | Can you turn to Exhibit 91, please? It's going |
| 14 | to be in a different binder. |
| 15 | MR. LEWIN: Shawn, the binders are there and |
| 16 | they're numbered. |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: Which number? |
| 18 | MR. LEWIN: 91. |
| 19 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 20 | Q. Okay. So Exhibit 91 is an email from David |
| 21 | LeGrand to you and Ben; correct? |
| 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | Q. And what's the date of this email? |
| 24 | A. September 16, 2011. |
| 25 | Q. All right. Can you read the first paragraph of |

1 this email?
A. "Shawn and Ben, I made some minor edits on the Schedule B and answered some of Ben's questions."
Q. Okay. Now I want to turn to the very last page of this exhibit. Can you compare that to Exhibit B of the operating agreement that was ultimately signed by you and Ben? Do you see any differences? Ignore the underlining and the balloons along the right-hand side that talk about "delete." If you ignore those, do you see any differences between this Exhibit B in Exhibit 91 and the Exhibit $B$ in Exhibit 5?
A. From the word "preferred allocation" down, they're the same. And the Exhibit B on top, the member percentage interest is still the old number, 30-70. And then also the member capital is blank.
Q. Okay. So if I -- if you focus on "preferred allocation and distribution schedule," from that point down, it's the same. Is that your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So certainly by September 16 , if not before -- because LeGrand says, "I made some minor edits" -- but certainly by September 16, 2011, everything from "preferred allocation and distribution schedule" below was finalized; correct?
A. Yes.

1
Q. Okay. So as of September 16,2011 , what did Green Valley Commerce own?
A. The note. Documents on the Green Valley Commerce property.
Q. And was it contemplated as between you and Ben that you would be subdividing and selling the individual buildings as of September 16, 2011?
A. No. Selling part, no.
Q. Now you're making a distinction. Explain.
A. I've done this before multiple times. I can enhance the value of a property by subdivision. And I've done it in commercial setting and I've done it in residential setting.

So basically, when we -- when we take a property and we do a subdivision, it would enhance the value. So sometime after this date, I think around October, we did a recordation of subdivision.
Q. But as of October, were you planning on selling any of the buildings?
A. At that time, no.
Q. Okay. Ultimately you did, though; correct?
A. Yes. Actually, we couldn't regardless of --
Q. Was -- was Ben receptive to the idea of selling properties, or did he resist that concept?
A. He didn't want to sell it. He -- his idea was to

```
    1 keep it for cash flow.
```

```
Q. How do you know that?
A. We had conversations. And he basically liked to invest, and once invested, wants to just collect the rent.
Q. So going back to Exhibit B of Exhibit 5. And you can put that binder away. I think we're done with it. There's the -- and I'm going to focus your attention to "preferred allocation and distribution schedule."
There's a paragraph below that and then there's first step, second step, third step, fourth step. Do you see that?
THE ARBITRATOR: Or final step.
MR. SHAPIRO: Or final step. Thank you. Yes. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Tell me your understanding about what that language was supposed to accomplish.
A. That's basically a special -- or in this instance they call it a preferred allocation where you're trying to either wind down the company, gradually close it, or you're trying to return the cash capital contributions of members in one shot. So based on that, if you go and do a refinance, you generate enough cash out dollars to pay off the -- both members. You would pay off both members and that would be the return of the --
```

```
    1 }100\mathrm{ percent return of capital. Or the other one is
    2 the -- you basically sell the assets of the company and wind down and liquidate and close.
Q. Was it -- in your opinion, was this provision ever triggered in any of the -- at any point in the history of the company?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. We never complied with this special allocation. It never triggered.
```

Q. Now, going to the next paragraph, which is a short sentence, it says, "Losses shall be allocated according to capital accounts." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then following that, it -- there's a paragraph or there's two more paragraphs. Can you read -- let's just start with the -- the paragraph following it. It starts with "Cash distributions of profits." Can you read that, please?
A. "Cash contributions of profits from operations" --
Q. You said "contributions." Is that what it says?
A. "Distributions" -- I'm sorry -- "of profits from operations shall be allocated and distributed 50 percent to Shawn Bidsal and 50 percent to CLA Properties, LLC."

1 paragraph?
A. "It is the express intent of the parties that cash distributions of profits refers to distributions generated from operations resulting in ordinary income in contrast to cash distributions arising from capital transactions or nonrecurring events such as the sale of all or substantially -- a substantial portion of the company's assets or cash out financing."
Q. Is it fair to say that your understanding with Ben was that in all respects, you'd be treated as 50-50 partners unless the company sold the property -- which, as of September 16, it wasn't even a property; it was a promissory note -- but it sold it's primary asset, or there was a refinance that had enough money to pay off the cash capital contributions?

MR. LEWIN: Objection, Your Honor. His unexpressed understanding is not relevant.

THE ARBITRATOR: Say that again.
MR. LEWIN: His unexpressed understanding is not relevant. What's in his mind is not pertinent to what took place between the members or the partners or the two of them.

MR. SHAPIRO: And, Your Honor, again, it is relevant because it is ambiguous, and that's the whole

```
    1 point that we're here. And so I think it does go to
```

``` what was the understanding of the parties, what was the intent.
MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, the intent is described by --
THE ARBITRATOR: Well, you said "unexpressed."
MR. LEWIN: That's right.
THE ARBITRATOR: "The unexpressed intent." So if there was a thought in someone's mind that was never expressed, I agree with you.
MR. LEWIN: That's what we're talking about.
MR. SHAPIRO: It was expressed. It was expressed in Exhibit B.
THE ARBITRATOR: So I'll sustain an objection as to an unexpressed intent. If you want to rephrase the question.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Based upon your discussions with Ben, was Exhibit B consistent with your agreement with Ben?
MR. LEWIN: Same objections, Your Honor.
THE ARBITRATOR: Overruled.
A. Yes.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. And based upon your conversations with Ben, was your understanding with Ben consistent with what
```

```
1 Exhibit B means?
```

```
Exhibit B means?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So you just testified about what your -yours and Ben's understanding was regarding the return of the cash capital; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is Exhibit B consistent with that understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. Please turn to page 10 of Exhibit 5. Actually, strike that.
Okay. Actually, we're back to page 10. Okay. There's a definition section. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. There's a definition of COP. Is the COP the same as a capital account?
A. What?
Q. When --
A. No.
Q. Did you answer the question, or...
A. I didn't even understand the question.
Q. Okay. When you -- you and Ben as members of Green Valley Commerce had a capital account for accounting purposes; correct?
A. Capital account in the -- with the CPA -- with the outside CPA?
```

Q. Yes.
A. A running capital account, yes. Yes.
Q. Sure. Sure. And that's my question, which is:

Is COP intended to be the same thing as a capital
account or is it different?
A. It's different.
Q. Okay. And the $C O P$ was intended to be what?
A. The -- well, at what point in time, first?
Q. Well, at the time that this was signed, the Exhibit B identified the cash capital contributions of each member, you being 1.215 million and Ben being \$2,834,250; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is that supposed to be the COP as of the time that the operating agreement was signed, or was the COP something different?
A. As to the time of signing the operating agreement, the COP meant the cost of properties at that time. So yes.
Q. So yes what?
A. The cost of purchase would be -- with some adjustments because of certain expenses of purchase, the COP would be what the cash capital of the partners was, minus some adjustments for the conversion of the note into a property because there was some cost involved.

1
Q. Turning to the next page, which is page 11 , there's the formula -- well, okay. One more page. That was simply a page to provide additional language that had been cut off on page 10 , which we're not going to talk about. So you can skip that.

Go to page 11, which is Bidsal 11. Here there's two formulas on this page. Do you see the formulas?
A. Yes.
Q. Which one is the applicable formula to this dispute?
A. I think the second formula.
Q. Okay. So again, $I$ guess, in all fairness, that really depends on what the supreme court does, but assuming that the supreme court upholds the arbitration award, then the second formula would be the applicable one?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And who proposed that language, that formula language?
A. That was Ben's.

MR. LEWIN: Objection, Your Honor. Again, we're getting into drafting.

MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, I asked who proposed it. It's not -- it's not an issue of drafting. It's just, is this something he came up with, or is it something Ben come up? It's background and foundation. THE ARBITRATOR: Right. Okay. I'm going to allow.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.
MR. GERRARD: Did you get an answer?
THE WITNESS: I said Ben.
MR. GERRARD: Okay. I didn't hear the answer. I'm sorry.

BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Now, here the formula talks about the COP, and the COP is defined as "the cost of purchase as it specified -- as it's specified" -- that's a spelling error, but -- "as it's specified in the escrow closing statement at the time of purchase of each property owned by the company"; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did GVC purchase a property or a promissory note?
A. Bought a promissory note.
Q. Okay. And at some point, there was a conversion of the promissory note to a property by virtue of the deed in lieu agreement; correct?
A. And the grant bargain.
Q. And the grant bargain as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So at the time that the conversion

1 occurred, that settlement statement was Exhibit 3 . ${ }^{\text {Page }}$ Is ${ }^{313}$ there anything on Exhibit 3 that identifies the cost of purchase?
A. Exhibit 3 is the purchase of the note.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Where's the settlement statement for the -- let's see. Oh, Exhibit 9. Exhibit 9. That's the settlement statement for the escrow by which Green Valley Commerce obtained title to the property; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And is there anything on this settlement statement that identifies the cost of purchase?
A. No, it does not.
Q. Okay. And so almost immediately out of the gate, the facts of what actually happened were not matching what the parties originally anticipated; correct?
A. You can say that, yes.
Q. Now, I want to pause for a second. I want to talk about this conversion. You mentioned that you -you did a subdivision of the property; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Was Ben part of the decision to create -- or to subdivide the property?
A. He was informed. I did the work, but he was cc'd on the emails and --
Q. Well, did he agree that that was a good idea?
A. Yeah, he did agree.
Q. Did he object to any subdivision?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I want to turn your attention to Exhibit 7. Do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. That's the recordation of the CC\&R for the -- for the creation of the parcels for Green Valley Commerce, the eight parcels plus the parking lot.
Q. Okay.
A. And the rights and obligations of the --
Q. Did you have anything to do with the preparation of this document?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me what your involvement was?
A. I worked on the CC\&R. It was -- actually came to me as a boilerplate document, a document which I changed the information to reflect the -- Green Valley Commerce's property. And we finally recorded it in March of 2012.
Q. Okay. Directing your attention to Bidsal 1392. THE ARBITRATOR: Hold on. Before you do that, let's go off the record for a second.

| 1 | (Discussion off the record.) Page 315 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. GERRARD: What page did you say, Jim? |
| 3 | MR. SHAPIRO: 1391, which is page 37 of the |
| 4 | document. |
| 5 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 6 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 7 | Q. Is that your signature? |
| 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. And if you turn to the next page, what is this |
| 10 | page? |
| 11 | A. It's a notary page. |
| 12 | Q. And what date did you have it notarized? |
| 13 | A. March 15, 2012. |
| 14 | Q. And looking at the first page, when was the |
| 15 | document recorded? |
| 16 | A. March 16, 2012. |
| 17 | Q. Why did you prepare and record CC\&Rs against the |
| 18 | property? |
| 19 | A. That basically gets the property to a point that |
| 20 | if you want to sell it each parcel, you can. |
| 21 | Q. Had you and Ben had discussions about selling |
| 22 | part of the property as of March of 2012? |
| 23 | A. Yeah, we were talking about it. |
| 24 | Q. Was Ben in agreement, or was he resisting? |
| 25 | A. Kind of resisting. Not very interested. |

1
Q. At what point did he finally agree to sell any portion of the original property?
A. Later on, we did some marketing -- or actually analysis of the market sometime in -- middle of the year toward August of 2012. And Jeff Chang was the broker. He brought in some good analysis, some numbers showing that we can make lot of money on this. And me and Ben talked about it, and we both agreed to list it at that time.
Q. Okay. So that occurred after March of 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. So by March of 2012 , we are four months after the operating agreement was signed and over six months after you obtained title to the property; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. At that time, it still was not agreed upon that anything would be sold; is that accurate?
A. Agreed upon by partners, you're right.
Q. Okay.

THE ARBITRATOR: Mr. Shapiro, just pick a spot in the next ten minutes or so that makes sense. MR. SHAPIRO: Perfect. Yeah, we're going to hit a nice natural spot here soon, so. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Direct your attention to Bates stamp 1365. Okay.

1 Direct your attention to Section 4.1. There's a defined term in here called "declarant control period." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is the declarant?
A. GVC. Green Valley Commerce, LLC.
Q. And what is the declarant control period?
A. So...

MR. LEWIN: Can the witness answer without just reading what the document says? Does he know one way or another?

MR. SHAPIRO: Is there any reason why he can't look at the document to refresh his recollection?

MR. LEWIN: Because, well, I want to get -- I'd like to -- if he needs to refresh his recollection --

THE ARBITRATOR: Let me ask you this: How big an issue is it in what we have -- what I have to decide whether he knows off the top of his head what the declarant control period is?

MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, you're right. I'm sorry. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Do you recall what declarant control period is? What is the point of the declarant? Just generally speaking, what does the declarant do?
A. I haven't read this section for a long time.

```
Q. That's okay. We'll move on.
A. Basically, declarant means the developer who -or subdivider that -- in this case, is Green Valley Commerce -- and...
Q. That's fine. That's fine.
A. Up to a point, as long as the majority of the buildings or parcels are still owned, declarant is in charge. And once it dispenses with so many of the buildings, then there would a board appointed, on and on.
Q. Was Ben aware that you were preparing and ultimately recording the CC\&Rs?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he ever object to it?
A. No.
Q. There's an owners' association described and provided for in the CC\&Rs; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And who manages that owners' association?
A. I formed it and manage it.
MR. SHAPIRO: Honestly, Your Honor, that's probably a good spot.
THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. We'll take our evening recess.
(The proceedings concluded at 4:55 p.m.)
```
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``` LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 2021
9:00 A.M.
THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. So we're interrupting
Mr. Bidsal's testimony to take this witness now; correct?
MR. GERRARD: Correct.
THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. Would you raise your right hand, please?
Whereupon,
CHRIS WILCOX,
having first been called as a witness, was duly sworn and testified as follows:
THE ARBITRATOR: All right. And is it Chris Wilcox?
THE WITNESS: Chris L. Wilcox.
THE ARBITRATOR: C-H-R-I-S? Common spelling
Wilcox?
THE WITNESS: W-I-L-C-O-X.
THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. All right.
Mr. Gerrard?
MR. GERRARD: Thank you.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Mr. Wilcox, good morning.
```



1 your employment?
A. I accepted a position with the CPA firm Laventhol
\& Horwath. I was with them for three years, and then I moved to Bradshaw, Smith \& Company, a local CPA firm. Laventhol \& Horwath is a national firm; Bradshaw, Smith \& Company is a local CPA firm. And I became a partner in that firm. And after about eight years in that firm, I started my own firm with two other partners. After 19 years we split that up, and --
Q. What was the name firm?
A. Johnson Jacobson Wilcox. And that firm split up after 19 years. And then for just over a year and a half, I practiced with my partner Kirk Jacobson. And then we were acquired by the CPA firm I'm currently with, Eide Bailly.
Q. And are you a certified public accountant?
A. I am.
Q. When did you first become certified?
A. 1986 or 1987, somewhere in there.
Q. Have you been continuously certified as a CPA

## from that time?

A. Yes.
Q. Are you a member of any professional
associations?
A. I'm member of the AICPA. I'm a member of --
Q. What is AICPA?
A. Excuse me. AICPA is associate -- American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. I'm also a member of the Nevada state Society of CPAs. I'm also in the tax -- part of the tax group of the AICPA. I'm also part of the national tax office for Eide Bailly.
Q. And what are the general areas in which you have practiced as an accountant?
A. I practice solely in the area of income taxation. Most of my clients are either partnerships, LLCs, S corporations, and high net worth individuals.
Q. And have your clients focused in specific types of areas? In other words, your core group of clients?
A. Yeah. My biggest group of clients is probably automobile dealerships, construction. Beyond that, manufacturing, wholesale distributing, real estate development.
Q. Have you had a lot of experience with real estate developers?
A. I have.
Q. And approximately -- without divulging names -how many real estate developers have you provided tax services to over the years?
A. Over my career, probably 5 to 10. They're fairly significant developers, large businesses. That would be

1 the real estate side, development, yeah.
Q. Now, as a part of your business, are you routinely required to review partnership agreements, shareholder agreements, operating agreements, those types of documents?
A. Yes. On a regular basis.
Q. And what is the purpose of your reviewing those types of documents as a certified public accountant?
A. Every partnership return that is prepared, it's necessary to look at the partnership agreement -understand the terms of the agreement -- so you can know how the income is to be allocated, distributed, and so forth.
Q. Okay. Is the allocation and distribution of income to a company something that is generally governed by the operative documents, or is that governed by the tax code?
A. No, it's governed by the operative documents.

MR. GERRARD: Judge Wall, I'm not sure. I mean, in the old days, we used to have to certify people as expert.

THE ARBITRATOR: Is this somebody you want to take on voir dire?

MR. LEWIN: No.
THE ARBITRATOR: So you stipulate to his

```
1 qualifications?
```

```
MR. LEWIN: Yeah. Sure. I was thinking about doing that earlier, but.
THE ARBITRATOR: It's a balance between letting me know his qualifications beyond -- I don't even know if his CV is part of --
MR. GERRARD: It is, but we haven't --
THE ARBITRATOR: All right. So to the extent that Nevada law arguably still requires him to be accepted by the court as an expert, at arbitration I certainly would do that, given the fact there's no objection.
MR. GERRARD: Okay.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Sir, have you testified as an expert in the past?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. On approximately how many occasions?
A. Gosh. Maybe ten.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't know off the top of my head.
Q. Do you consider that to be a focus of your practice?
A. It is one of the things I do, yes.
Q. Okay. But in terms of your overall practice, is that a small portion of what you do?
```

A. It is a small portion.
Q. Okay. So let's go back to what we were talking about. Do you understand the term "pass through taxation entity"?
A. Yes.
Q. What is a pass through taxation entity?
A. The terms "pass through" simply means that the entity itself does not pay taxes. The income from that entity is passed through to either the partners, the members, or the shareholders, and then they pay the tax on that income generated by the entity.
Q. And what types of entities generally qualify as pass through taxation entities?
A. Partnerships, LLCs, $S$ corporations, some trusts.
Q. Okay. So when you say "S corporations," are you talking about a corporation that's made a subchapter $S$ election?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, in this case, you were asked to look at an operating agreement for a Nevada limited liability company; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Is a limited liability company a pass through taxation entity?
A. Yes.

1


## Page 330 <br> Q. What importance does that have in terms of a $K-1$ on a limited liability company's corporate or company

 tax return?MR. LEWIN: Objection. That's outside the scope of his report and outside the scope of his assignment as far as I understand it.

MR. GERRARD: I don't agree with that. Obviously, to do what he does, he has to determine -- to determine if things have been properly prepared, you have to look at the $\mathrm{K}-1 \mathrm{~s}$. And that's what he's going to testify about right now.

MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, he gave a report. I asked him if all of his opinions were contained in his report. There's no such opinion.

THE ARBITRATOR: You deposed him?
MR. LEWIN: I did.
THE ARBITRATOR: Okay.
MR. LEWIN: And I asked him if all of his opinions were in his report. He said yes. This opinion that he's soliciting is not in the report and not given in the deposition.

MR. GERRARD: Well, I don't think we're soliciting an opinion right now. We're soliciting the background or how he arrived at his opinions. And how he arrived at his opinions was to look at the tax
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1 returns of the company, as he clearly testified in his
2 deposition and as is clearly set forth in the report.

MR. LEWIN: I have no problem you asking if he looked at the $\mathrm{K}-1 \mathrm{~s}$, but giving an opinion as to how important they are is little bit of a different issue.

THE ARBITRATOR: Well, if you review the tax returns, tax returns include the schedule Ks and $\mathrm{K}-1 \mathrm{~s}$. He certainly has to have an understanding of what a $\mathrm{K}-1$ and what its purpose is and why it's included as part of the return. So in terms of that, which is sort of where I thought the question was going --

MR. GERRARD: That's exactly where we're going. THE ARBITRATOR: I think that it's probably appropriate for him. It's a basis for his opinion. MR. LEWIN: Very well. Thank you.

THE ARBITRATOR: You may answer the question if you recall it.

THE WITNESS: So a $K-1$ is part of the tax return for either a partnership, or in this case -- or an $S$ corporation. In this case, the LLC. And the $K-1$ is what reports to the member that member's share of the net income. It also tells the member what their distributions were. The $\mathrm{K}-1$ also shows what -- well, it shows the capital account as well.

```
/ / /
```

1 BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So from looking at a $K-1$, could you quickly determine how income and gain are being allocated and distributed?
A. From looking at all of the K-1s, you could determine how the income is being allocated and how the gains are being allocated, yes.
Q. So in this case, sir -- there's a binder of exhibits in front of you. If you turn to Exhibit 5.

MR. GERRARD: Is that the right one? I'm not sure.

MR. SHAPIRO: Yeah, 5 is the operating agreement. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. Do you have that in front of you, sir?
A. I do.
Q. Do you recognize that document?
A. It is the operating agreement for Green Valley Commerce, LLC.
Q. Were you asked to review this as a part of your engagement?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you review the entirety of this agreement?
A. I did.
Q. And did you find that it was -- had contained

1 clear language, or did you find that it contained 2 ambiguities?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. That's not his province. THE ARBITRATOR: Well, not in a legal sense, but in a general sense, as least the way I understood the question.

MR. GERRARD: Yeah. I mean, an accountant has to read it and has to be able to understand it to be able to do their job.

THE ARBITRATOR: Ambiguity is a term of art in
the law. I'm not taking this question that way; I'm taking it as someone who --

MR. GERRARD: I can re-ask it, Your Honor.
THE ARBITRATOR: No. That's fine.
MR. GERRARD: Okay.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Go ahead, sir.
A. Yes, I did find some ambiguities in the agreement.
Q. What specific parts of the agreement were you most interested in for purposes of arriving at your testimony and your opinions in this case?
A. Page 10 talks about the formula for the buyout.
Q. Did you find the language of the formula to be easily understood?
A. No. It was not easily understood.
Q. Okay. What other provisions were you most interested in?
A. Exhibit A and Exhibit B.
Q. Okay. And Exhibit A is titled Tax Provisions; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so did you review all those tax provisions?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you find the tax provision portion, Exhibit A, easy to understand?
A. Exhibit A was -- is pretty much boilerplate language that -- it's pretty common language.
Q. Any difficulties as an accountant understanding what the company intended to do in reading Exhibit A? MR. LEWIN: Excuse me one moment. That calls for speculation, "what the company intended to do." MR. GERRARD: I'll rephrase it. THE ARBITRATOR: All right. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Any difficulty in you understanding what appeared to be the company's intentions from reading Exhibit A? MR. LEWIN: Objection. I don't think he's here to speculate about intentions. It's not the subject of an accountant.

MR. GERRARD: Well, I disagree.
MR. LEWIN: The issue of interpreting the contract is Your Honor's province, not his.

MR. GERRARD: Accountants are always required to review an agreement to interpret what they understand the intent is based upon the language of the agreement for purposes of them preparing their tax returns and tax documents.

THE ARBITRATOR: We're dealing with sort of a cross between legal terms of art -- ambiguity, intent of the parties -- and an expert. But in terms of the legal part of it, there's a lay definition to "I look at the operating agreement to see what the parties intended," and that's the way $I$ understood the question. So I'm going to overrule it based on the foundation that's been laid that he has to review documents like these; has experience to try to ascertain what was supposed to happen in terms of capital accounts and tax provisions. So you may answer. BY MR. GERRARD:

## Q. Do you remember the question?

A. I think I answered it.
Q. Yeah, I think you actually did.

THE REPORTER: I did not get an answer.
MR. GERRARD: Okay. Let me ask it again to make

```
1 sure we're clear.
2 BY MR. GERRARD:
sure we're clear.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. In reading the language of Exhibit \(A\) to the operating agreement, did you have any difficulty in determining what appeared to be the intent of the company as it relates to these tax provisions?
A. No.
Q. Attached to that there's another document called Exhibit B. Did you review that document?
A. I did.
Q. Did you have any difficulty understanding what
``` the parties -- or what the company intended to have happen based upon Exhibit B?
A. Yes. There was some unclarity in Exhibit B.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit A. We're looking at page 22 of Exhibit 5. As an accountant reading this operating agreement, did you come to a conclusion about how allocations of gain, loss, deductions, income, depreciation, and distributions were to be made?
A. So the allocations are on page 23? Is that what you're referring to?
Q. Well, before we get to page 23 , let's walk through the first page of Exhibit A, which is Section 4.1. Did you read the capital account provisions in 4.1.1 and 4.1.1.1 and 4.1.1.2?
A. Yes, I did.

THE ARBITRATOR: Setting aside why they're numbered that way.

MR. GERRARD: I know.
THE ARBITRATOR: Go ahead. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. When you look at this first paragraph of 4.1.1, it says "A single capital account is to be maintained for each member," and then it says "in accordance with the capital accounting rules of section 704 (b) of the code."

What is Section \(704(\mathrm{~b})\) of the code?
A. Section \(704(\mathrm{~b})\) deals with partnership capital accounts and how to maintain those accounts. There are transactions that can take place within a partnership where maybe some special adjustments need to be made. It also deals with allocation of income and items of income.
Q. Do you have Binder 2 there in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you open up Exhibit 54 in Binder 2?
A. Okay.

THE ARBITRATOR: 54?
MR. GERRARD: 54.
THE ARBITRATOR: That's in my Binder 3.
``` same.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 54?
A. Looks like it's Internal Revenue Code section -it's the regulations under 704.
Q. Okay. And so we have the Code Section 704 (a) and \(704(\mathrm{~b})\), and then there's regulations associated with it; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, under Internal Revenue Code Section \(704(a)\), how are you to determine how allocations and distributions are supposed to be made in a company?
A. You're to go to the operating agreement.
Q. Okay. Under Section 704 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, how are you to determine how allocations and distributions are to be made by a company?
A. Per the operating agreement, as long as it has substantial economic effect.
Q. Okay. Can you explain that to The Court? I know this is a broad area. Just give him a very brief synopsis of how this works.
A. All substantial economic effect says is you can't give the cash to one person -- sorry -- to one person, and all the income to somebody else. That doesn't have
```
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1 substantial economic effect. Basically, the income and 2 the cash, how those get allocated have to make sense.

3 That's an oversimplification, but that's the basis of 4 it.
Q. Okay. Using an example, if $I$ put a million dollars of -- if $I$ contributed a million dollars to a company, and then -- and there were three members of that limited liability company, and the other two members got all the distributions and $I$ didn't get any, would that satisfy the regulations in Code Section 704 (b)?
A. Probably not. You'd have to look at all of the operating agreement to see what the -- to the end of the wrap up, but that would be -- that would certainly be something you'd want to look at.
Q. Okay. To be clear, when you read Section 704 (a) and $704(\mathrm{~b})$ of the IRS code that's made reference to in this Section 4.1.1 of the agreement -- of the operating agreement, your testimony was that those provisions of the tax code direct you to the operating agreement to determine how distributions and allocations are to be made?
A. It says very clearly that partnership's distributive share of any income item, gain, loss shall be determined by the partnership agreement.
Q. Okay. And you're reading from the regulation; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So when we come back to the operating agreement, Exhibit 5, at page 22, let's start with the capital account provisions here in Section 4.1.1. This says that the capital accounts are supposed to be maintained in accordance with the capital accounting rules of Section 704 (b). And you just testified 704 (b) would require you to look at the operating agreement to determine how allocations and distributions are to be made, but that they would have to have substantial economic effect; right?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you determine that in this case all of the distributions and allocations had substantial economic effect?
A. Yes.
Q. So if I'm understanding your testimony correctly then, we've satisfied Section 704 (b); correct?
A. In my opinion, absolutely yes.
Q. So the only concern we would have about 704 (b) then would be how to determine what the distributions and allocations are, and that directs you to look at the operating agreement -- the Code section directs you to

## 1 look at the operating agreement?

A. Correct.

MR. LEWIN: Again, Your Honor, I don't want to interrupt the witness's testimony, but these are all opinions that are not in his report. And when I asked him if all of his opinions were in his report, he said yes.

THE ARBITRATOR: I haven't reviewed his report.
MR. LEWIN: I know. That's what I'm saying. I understand we're trying to get an idea of how he's looking at it, does it satisfy -- but when he says his opinion is $X, Y$, and $Z$, now $I$ have something we never really addressed before.

THE ARBITRATOR: Do the opinions that he gave in his report or the deposition require on a foundational underpinning that the provisions of Exhibit A don't run afoul of $704(\mathrm{~b})$ ?

MR. LEWIN: Probably, but I don't know because it's not in his report.

MR. GERRARD: Of course they do. His ultimate opinions, as you're going to hear, are whether the distributions were properly made in this company. That was one of his opinions. To do that, you have to run through this analysis, and he's explaining to you how to conduct that analysis.

THE ARBITRATOR: I understood most of this. It's sort of my own remedial tax education. Some of it I already know. I don't know what his opinions are, but I assume his opinions have to do with whether allocations and distributions were made properly and what the appropriate measure of that is. And a part of that, as I understand it, is -- would have to be look, you know, the way it was set up at least in Exhibit A, did it violate the IRS code. So I'm going to allow it. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So if you look at Section 4.1.1, you can see that it talks about maintaining a member's capital account. And in general terms, what is a capital account?
A. A capital account is a record of what the member has invested in the company. And it's a historical record of their investments, their allocation of income, and the distributions. That's very general what -that's what a capital account is.
Q. So if we look at Section 4.1.1, the last sentence says "In general, under such rules, a member's capital account shall be," and then you go to 4.1.1.1, and it says "increased by," and then it gives three things that it can be increased by; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And if you look at 4.1.1.2, it says these are the

1 things that a member's capital account can be decreased
2 by; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is there anything about these two sections that is in any way out of the ordinary?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So this is just explaining that a capital account's going to go up, according to 4.1.1.1, by the amount of money contributed and the value of the property contributed and by allocations to a member of income and gain; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's going to go down by -- in 4.1.1.2, by the amount of money distributed to that member, and the value of property distributed to the member, and the allocations to the member of expenditures, and the allocations to the member of loss and deduction?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Those are just general accounting terms; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now let's turn to Section 5.1 on page 23 of the operating agreement. Of course, we're still on Exhibit A. Section 5.1 starts with the word
"Allocations." Do you see where I'm looking?

```
A. Yes.
Q. Was this paragraph and the paragraph that follow important to your analysis?
A. Well, yeah. It is important to the analysis. It tells us how to allocate the income.
Q. Okay.
A. Or where to go to find out how to allocate the income.
```

Q. All right. So according to Section 5.1 , it says "Each member's distributive share of income, gain, loss, deduction, or credit (or items thereof) of the company as shown on the annual federal income tax return prepared by the company's accountants or as finally determined by the United States Internal Revenue Service or the courts, and as modified by the capital accounting rules of Section 704 (b) of the Code and the Income Tax Regulations thereunder, as implemented by Section 8.5 hereof, as applicable, shall be determined as follows."

So what does that paragraph mean to you as an accountant?
A. It just says take the net income of the company, apply the rules from the Internal Revenue Code to determine what the actual net income is. Maybe -- if the return has been audited, then maybe the courts may have weighed in on some adjustments. But arrive at net
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Q. So looking at 5.1.1.1, how does this operating agreement say that that net income is supposed to be allocated?
A. It says that "items of income, gain, loss, deduction, or credit shall be allocated among the members in proportion to their percentage interests as set forth in Exhibit B."

So it basically refers you to Exhibit $B$ of the operating agreement.
Q. Okay. And do the words income, gain, loss, depreciation -- I'm sorry -- deduction or credit, does that cover everything that you could have in a company for accounting purposes? In other words, is that all -is that everything?
A. Yeah. That's all inclusive.
Q. Does that include depreciation?
A. Yes.
Q. So it says that you have to do this in proportion to the percentage interest in Exhibit $B$, and then the rest of that sentence where you stopped in Exhibit B says "subject to the preferred allocation schedule contained in Exhibit B."
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So let's look at Exhibit B. Do you see the members' percentage interest there?
A. Yes.
Q. And what -- according to those members' percentage interest as used in Section 5.1.1.1 of Exhibit A, how is income, gain, loss, deduction, or credit to be allocated?
A. To be allocated 50-50. 50 percent to Bidsal; 50 percent to CLA Properties.
Q. Now, that appears to be the general rule -correct? -- for this company.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, there is this language that says "subject to the preferred allocation schedule contained in

Exhibit B."
Do you see that language?
A. Yes.
Q. So we see this word "preferred allocation." What is a preferred allocation generally in accounting terms?
A. Preferred allocation means if certain things have happened, then you don't follow the ordinary rules; you would go to this special rule. It would apply only in specifically denominated instances.

| 1 | Q. Okay. So it's clearly an exception to the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | general rule? |
| 3 | A. It is exception to the general rule. |
| 4 | Q. And according to your testimony, it only applies |
| 5 | in special -- in specific circumstances? |
| 6 | A. Correct. |
| 7 | Can we take like a 30 -second break or less? |
| 8 | MR. GERRARD: Yes. |
| 9 | Judge, is that okay? |
| 10 | THE ARBITRATOR: Yeah. |
| 11 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 12 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 13 | Q. So you just testified that the general rule in |
| 14 | this company according to Exhibit $A$ is that everything |
| 15 | gets allocated 50-50 and distributed 50-50 between the |
| 16 | members; correct? |
| 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | Q. But then there was an exception to that for what |
| 19 | we've referred to here as a preferred allocation. Do |
| 20 | you see on Exhibit B the preferred allocation and |
| 21 | distribution schedule? |
| 22 | A. Yes, I do. |
| 23 | Q. Did you review that? |
| 24 | A. I did. |
| 25 | Q. And can you explain to me what the special |
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1 circumstance is that would trigger the use of the 2 special allocation language in Exhibit B?
A. Right underneath the heading that you read, Preferred Allocation and Distribution Schedule, it talks about "Cash distributions from capital transactions shall be distributed per the following method."

And the "following method" it's referring to is the step-down allocation below.
Q. Okay.
A. And then it tells us what those capital transactions are: A refinancing event, the sale of company asset. In the event of those two items under this paragraph, cash is to be distributed in this step-down allocation method.
Q. So in that first paragraph that you just talked about, you identified "refinancing event" as being what would be a capital transaction; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you've identified "sale of company asset," and you used the word "asset" as in singular; correct?
A. That's the way it's written, yes.
Q. So if there was a sale of company asset, in your mind, what did that mean?
A. That would mean that if the company sold -- it

1 appears to refer to the company having a singular asset. So if the company sold that asset, that would trigger this step-down allocation.
Q. Okay. And then -- did you read the entirety of Exhibit B?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. And what other language in Exhibit B did you find to be important to determining how allocations and distributions were to be made in this company?
A. Down towards the bottom of the page, the paragraph that begins with "Cash distribution of profits from operations shall be allocated 50-50."
Q. So that's the general rule?
A. That's the general rule.
Q. Okay. And then is there any other language that was important in your analysis?
A. It goes on the next -- the very final paragraph of the operating agreement reads that "It is the express intent of the parties that 'cash distribution of profits' refers to distributions generated from operating results -- excuse me -- operations resulting in ordinary income in contrast to cash distributions arising from capital transactions or nonrecurring events such as a sale of all or a substantial portion of company's assets or cash out financing."

```
Q. What did you understand that to mean?
A. Basically, it says if you have a cash
distribution of cash that came about because of the operations of the company, that would be 50-50. If you had a capital transaction as defined here, then you would go up and look at the waterfall or the step-down. MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry. Can I have the last part of that answer read, Your Honor?
THE ARBITRATOR: If you have a capital
transaction, then you use the waterfall or step-down allocation.
MR. LEWIN: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. A capital transaction would trigger the waterfall or the step-down.
BY MR. GERRARD:
```

1
Q. Now, is this a capital transaction defined by the tax code, or is this a capital transaction defined by the operating agreement?
A. It seems to be a capital transaction, in my opinion, defined by the operating agreement.
Q. Okay. Now, when you see -- well, let's start with that. Would that be consistent with Section 704 (b) of the tax code in terms of how you determine allocations and distributions?
A. The question is, is Exhibit B consistent with

704 (b) ?
Q. No. My question is would it be consistent with the tax codes 704 (a) and 704 (b) for the operating agreement to define how special allocations are made?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.
Q. So you wouldn't expect to find definitions in the tax code to be used to determine how special allocations in a partnership agreement or an operating agreement were to be made?
A. The operating agreement would control unless for some reason it was inconsistent with the tax code.
Q. Okay. So when you were trying to determine for purposes of your opinion what a capital transaction is, what did you rely upon?
A. I relied upon the definition as provided in Exhibit B.
Q. Okay. And the definition in Exhibit $B$ of a capital transaction, according to what you read, is what?
A. So it describes a capital transaction or a nonrecurring event. And then it gives "events such as a sale of all or a substantial portion of the company's assets or cashout financing."

Those are very clear. That's what constitutes a capital transaction.
Q. Now, you have read the expert report of the plaintiffs in this case -- sorry -- of CLA's expert in this case; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does he take the same position as it relates to what a capital transaction is?
A. Well, his position of a capital transaction includes items which I don't believe should be included as a capital transaction.
Q. Does he try to use a tax definition of a capital transaction to apply that to the operating agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. Instead of using the language that's actually in the operating agreement?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Now, the language that's in the operating agreement makes reference to "events such as a sale of all or a substantial portion of the company's assets or cash out financing."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. If a capital transaction was intended by the parties to this operating agreement to be the sale of

1 any piece of property -- any piece of real property, what would be the purpose of having words "such as a sale of all or a substantial portion of the company's assets or cash out financing"?
A. Well, what you just described would be contradictory to what's written.
Q. Okay. Now, are you aware, sir -- well, first of all, have you reviewed all the tax returns of this company?
A. I do not believe I've seen the 2020 return. Maybe the '19. I don't remember. But up through at least '18, I reviewed them.
Q. Okay. And are you aware that there were three individual sales of real property made by this company?
A. Yes.
Q. Did any of those individual sales trigger this special allocation language in your opinion?
A. Not in my opinion, no.
Q. Did the company's tax returns ever allocate the gain on any of those individual property sales as if the special allocation language had been triggered?
A. No. The gains were always allocated 50-50.
Q. Do you know who prepared the company's tax returns?
A. Jim Main.
Q. And do you know who Jim Main is?
A. I do.
Q. How do you know Jim Main?
A. I've known Jim Main as a fellow CPA for close to 20 years, that neighborhood somewhere.
Q. Have you worked on any things that he was working on as well?
A. I have not.
Q. Okay. Do you know his general reputation?
A. He has a good reputation in town. UNLV graduate. Been in practice for 40 years. He might be retiring this year, I think. He's a good man.
Q. Did Jim Main treat each of these individual sales as if the special allocation language of Exhibit $B$ had never been triggered?
A. That is correct. He did not treat them as if they were capital transactions.
Q. Does this operating agreement, according to your reading of it, contemplate selling off individual pieces of real property one at a time?
A. It doesn't. Nowhere in here does it talk about that. It always talks about substantially all or company asset nonrecurring event.
Q. Now, if there was a sale of an individual piece of real property by this company, and if the special
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triggered, how would the proceeds from the sale of an
individual building be allocated and distributed
according to this operating agreement?
A. If the special allocation provisions were not
triggered, then the sale would be allocated -- the
proceeds from the sale would be allocated $50-50$ under
this agreement because there was no capital transaction
pursuant to the agreement definition.
Q. Okay. Now, how did the sale proceeds from the sale of the three individual buildings that were sold, how did -- how were those proceeds actually distributed by Mr. Bidsal?
A. The distributions from those sale proceeds -- the first part of the distribution was Mr. Bidsal looked at the proceeds and he looked at the cost of -- the original cost of the property that was sold. And he apportioned or basically divided them. And he distributed 70-30 -- 70 percent to CLA, 30 percent to himself -- the portion that was attributable to the original cost of the building or the capital -- the original capital contribution that went to use to purchase or was allocated to the purchase of that building.

The balance of the proceeds was distributed

```
1 50-50. The balance of the proceeds would be
2 attributable to the gain.
Q. So if the special allocation language of Exhibit B was never triggered, did the manner in which Mr. Bidsal distributed the revenue benefit himself or benefit CLA Properties?
A. No, if he -- it benefitted him -- it benefitted CLA Properties. Had he followed this agreement, it would have all been distributed 50-50. But he didn't. So CLA Properties got 70 percent of that first part versus just 50 percent.
Q. How did Mr. Bidsal determine -- well, let me ask it this way: Have you ever seen any purchase agreement for this company to have purchased the real property it ended up owning?
A. The only purchase agreement for the actual property was the acquisition of the Greenway property in Arizona.
```

Q. Okay. So what is your understanding of how this company ended up to own real property?
A. Well, the company purchased a note that was -well, they purchased a note. And that note was secured by the green -- Green Valley Commerce property. And then they eventually got a deed in lieu of foreclosure on that note and thereby acquired the property. So they

Page 357
1 acquired the property through the purchase of a note, got a deed in lieu of foreclosure on that note, and then got fee title to the property.
Q. So have you ever seen any actual purchase documents associated with Green Valley Commerce, this company, purchasing the real property that it currently owns, other than the Greenway property?
A. No. It did not purchase them individually. It purchased the note. It did not purchase the property.
Q. Okay. So in looking at the company's tax records, how was the purchase price of the promissory note allocated amongst the property -- the real property that it ended up ultimately owning?
A. So initially, Mr. Main, the CPA -- I assume Mr. Bidsal was involved -- they initially took the purchase price of the note and allocated it among the nine parcels -- eight buildings and the parking -parking lot.
Q. Let me stop you right there for a second. At the time that the note was acquired, was the real property subdivided into nine parcels?
A. It was not.
Q. Okay. What was actually the collateral for the note?
A. It was two parcels made up of all of the

Page 358
1 buildings. There were eight buildings on one parcel and then a separate parcel which consisted of the parking lot.
Q. And then what happened after that? Because you talked about there being separate ownership.
A. So after the deed in lieu was -- after the fee title was received as a result of the deed in lieu, 14 days later, approximately, the eight buildings were subdivided into eight separate parcels.
Q. Okay. And how was -- does that then tie into the testimony you gave earlier about how Jim Main had attributed the purchase price of the note amongst those individual parcels?
A. Right. He went in and took the purchase price of the note and allocated that amongst the parking and the eight buildings.
Q. Okay. And where did you see that allocation first show up in your review of the tax returns?
A. 2011 tax return.
Q. Okay. Was there a tax asset detail --
A. There's an appreciation schedule.
Q. And then was there ultimately any other steps taken by the company to make sure that those allocations were accurate?
A. In March of 2013, they hired a firm to come and

1 Page 359
1 do what is called a cost segregation study. And the 2 cost segregation study basically went in and reallocated 3 the purchase price to --
Q. The purchase price of what?
A. The note.
Q. Okay.
A. Went in and reallocated that over the eight buildings and the parking lot.
Q. Okay. So now let's take that back to what you explained Mr. Bidsal did on the sale of each of the three buildings. Explain that once again. What did Mr. Bidsal do when each of the three buildings were sold?

MR. LEWIN: Just a second. Okay.
THE ARBITRATOR: Go ahead.
A. So when the buildings were sold, Mr. Bidsal identified the amount of a distribution that could be made. He distributed part of that amount based on how much was allocated to the purchase price or allocated to each of the buildings sold.

So for example, if there were nine buildings and we paid $\$ 900,000$ and we allocated $\$ 100,000$ to each of those eight buildings -- I'm sorry. Eight buildings, we allocated $\$ 100,000$ to each and $\$ 100,000$ to the parking lot. Three of them were sold. So that $\$ 100,000$

```
    1 allocated to the purchase of that building would have
    2 been allocated on a 30 percent to Mr. Bidsal and
    3 70 percent to CLA. The balance of it was attributable
    4 to the gain on the sale, and that was allocated and
    5 distributed 50-50.
    6 BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So in your hypothetical, any amount over the \(\$ 100\) that was paid to purchase the property --
THE ARBITRATOR: 100,000, I think, but -- yeah. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Did you say 100,000 ?
A. 100,000 .
Q. Okay. So any amount over the 100,000 that was
``` derived from the sale would have been distributed 50-50?
A. Would have been, yes, 50-50.
Q. So if you open the binder in front of you to Exhibit 12. Actually, turn to Exhibit 13.

Actually, before we go there -- I'm jumping around. I'm sorry. Let's go to the last few pages of Exhibit 18. Let's start there. Do you recognize Exhibit 18?
A. Yes. It is the cost segregation study.
Q. Okay. If you go towards the very end of that document, on the third to the last page, which on mine has a Bates label of CLA Bidsal 2540.
\begin{tabular}{lll}
1 & A. Yes. & Page 361 \\
\(\mathbf{2}\) & Q. Do you recognize that page? \\
3 & A. Yes. \\
\(\mathbf{4}\) & Q. What is that page? \\
5 & A. This is the allocation of the purchase price to \\
6 & the buildings and to the land. \\
\(\mathbf{7}\) & Q. Okay. Is this the one you testified about Jim \\
\(\mathbf{8}\) & Main preparing? \\
9 & A. This one was prepared by the cost segregation \\
10 & study people.
\end{tabular}

11
Q. The cost segregation study wasn't done until -according to this, it wasn't completed --
A. Well, this is from the cost segregation study.
Q. This is just an exhibit to it.
A. Just one minute.
Q. Just to be clear, so our cost segregation study's dated March 15, 2013.

THE ARBITRATOR: If you go back one page to Bates 2539.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. This is -- yes, this is the detail prepared by Jim Main on which the 2011 tax return was based.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. And that was my question.
A. I'm sorry. That was -- yes.

1
```

Q. So now let's go back to Exhibit 13 where we started. Do you recognize Exhibit 13 as being the escrow statement from the sale of Building $C$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then if you look at Exhibit 14, which is the next one there in order, did you review this document as part of your preparation of your opinion?
A. I did.
Q. And what did you understand this Exhibit 14 to be?
A. This was Mr. Bidsal's calculation of the distribution that would be made to him and to CLA.
Q. Okay. And how did -- did this distribution breakdown follow the pattern that you described earlier about what you saw Mr. Bidsal had done on the sale of each of the three buildings?
A. Yes. This distribution went out on a 70-30 ratio.

```
Q. Why was it done on a 70-30 ratio, to your understanding?
A. My understanding is that Mr. Bidsal determined that it was the right thing to do since this is the -it was a return. He was just returning capital.
Q. Okay. And when you say "he was just returning capital," what do you mean by that?
A. It was a return of capital; therefore, it would be on a 70-30.
Q. So what was the allocable share of -- that had been attributed -- allocable share of the purchase price of the note that had been attributed to Building C? If you want, you can look back again at that last page of Exhibit 18, which is that tax asset detail we saw.
A. Let me look at my report. So the original allocation to Building \(C\) was 371,773 .
Q. Okay. And if we look back at Exhibit 14 again -I'm just going to round that for purposes of our conversation to 371,000 so \(I\) don't have to give all the change numbers. But if we look back at Exhibit 14, it shows at the very top that there was a certain amount of money generated from the sale; correct?
A. Correct. A million -- the sales price looks like it was 1,025,000.
Q. Okay. And you can see in his calculations that he gets to a net proceeds number. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. \(\$ 898,629.23\) ?
A. Correct.
Q. And then he adds in closing costs, and there's a number there of \(\$ 790,000\). Do you know what that number represents?
A. That would have been the purchase price of the Greenway property in Arizona.
Q. Now, why would that be related to this sale of Building C?
A. Because Building \(C\) was -- the sale -- Building C was sold pursuant to a 1031 exchange.
Q. And explain to -THE ARBITRATOR: I know.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. So when you sell something in a 1031 exchange, what happens to the original cost basis that's being carried on the books of the company for the property that's being sold?
A. So the original cost basis of the property sold --
Q. And that's the \(\$ 371,000\) number; right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay.
A. That cost basis becomes the cost basis of the property acquired.
Q. In this case, what was the property that was acquired?
A. It was the Greenway property in Arizona.
Q. Okay. So when the Greenway property in Arizona was acquired -- one second.

1

Look at -- you can keep your thumb on Exhibit 14 where we were looking at, but turn over to Exhibit 17.
A. I'm there.
Q. And is this the escrow closing statement you looked at for the purchase of the Greenway property?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So we can see from this document that there was a price paid to the seller of this property of \$790,000; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But what was the company Green Valley Commerce's cost basis in this new Greenway property?
A. It was the carryover from Building \(C\) of 371,000 .
Q. Now, if they had not done a 1031 exchange, what would have happened to the difference between the \(\$ 898,000\) of net proceeds and the \(\$ 371,000\) of the basis in Building \(C\) ? What would have happened to that money that was the difference?
A. That would have been a gain, and that would have been distributed out.
Q. So what would Mr. Bidsal have been entitled to of that money under the operating agreement?
A. Under the operating agreement, he would have been entitled to 50 percent of that money.
Q. Okay. So that -- Mr. Bidsal's share of that
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & appreciation of that property was rolled over into the \\
\hline 2 & purchase of the Greenway property? \\
\hline 3 & A. That is correct. \\
\hline 4 & Q. And he never received his share of that \\
\hline 5 & appreciation; correct? \\
\hline 6 & A. He did not. \\
\hline 7 & Q. So now let's go back to -- \\
\hline 8 & THE ARBITRATOR: Can I ask a question? \\
\hline 9 & MR. GERRARD: Yes. \\
\hline 10 & THE ARBITRATOR: Does it matter that the cost \\
\hline 11 & segregation report came a year after the 1031 exchange \\
\hline 12 & in the sale of Building C ? \\
\hline 13 & THE WITNESS: Yeah, they actually readjust the \\
\hline 14 & basis of the Greenway property from 371 to 399 -- \\
\hline 15 & THE ARBITRATOR: I saw both those numbers. \\
\hline 16 & THE WITNESS: -- pursuant to that report two \\
\hline 17 & years later. \\
\hline 18 & THE ARBITRATOR: Okay. Go ahead. \\
\hline 19 & BY MR. GERRARD: \\
\hline 20 & Q. So when we go back to Exhibit 14, after taking \\
\hline 21 & out the money that was used to purchase the Greenway \\
\hline 22 & property, according to this, it shows that there was a \\
\hline 23 & leftover amount of \$52,069, and then \$43,203 that had \\
\hline 24 & been paid on a promissory note from the sale of \\
\hline 25 & Building C. So making up 95,000; correct? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

A. Correct.
Q. And then how was that 95,000 distributed?
A. 70-30.
Q. Okay. And why was there no portion of that that was distributed by Mr . Bidsal on a 50-50 basis? What was your understanding of why he did it only on a 70-30 basis?
MR. LEWIN: Objection, Your Honor. Lack of
foundation. This would be pure speculation.
MR. GERRARD: I don't think so, Your Honor. He said right in his report that he spoke with Mr. Bidsal.
THE ARBITRATOR: Do the foundation question first.
MR. GERRARD: Sure. I'll be happy to do that. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Did you speak with Mr. Bidsal to determine how the distributions were calculated on each of the sales of the three buildings?
A. We -- yes. We reviewed this report -- these calculations for that distribution with Mr. Bidsal.
Q. With Mr. Bidsal; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What was your understanding from your communications with Mr . Bidsal as to the reason why everything from -- all the leftover proceeds from the

```
```

    1 sale of Building C were distributed 70-30 instead of
    2 50-50?
    ```
```

A. He took the position that this was a return of the original capital and that it was the fair and equitable thing to do.
Q. Okay. And is that because the amount that was leftover was less than the $\$ 371,000$ of basis?
A. Right.
Q. So if there had been enough leftover money that it exceeded $\$ 371,000$, what is your understanding what Mr. Bidsal would have done according to what he told you?
A. He would have distributed the 371 on a 70-30, and the excess would have gone out 50-50.
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal explain to you why he chose to do this when the special allocation language had never been triggered?
A. Just, he felt like that was the right thing to do.
Q. Now let's go down to Exhibit 22.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 22 as the closing statement from the sale of Building $E$ ?
A. I do.
Q. Turn to Exhibit 23. Do you recognize this

```

1 document?
A. Yes. That is the calculation of the distribution.
Q. And, again, this document you also discussed with Mr. Bidsal; correct?
A. We did.
Q. And what did Mr. Bidsal do in this breakdown?
A. As I explained earlier, he determined what the cost basis of the building was. That's the \(427,624\). That number agrees with the cost segregation schedule. He backed -- he added in the commissions to come up with a total cost -- in his estimation, a total cost basis. That \(\$ 479,000\) was the amount that was distributed 70-30, 70 percent to CLA; 30 percent to himself.
Q. Okay.
A. And then the balance of cash available -- or the balance of the gain, 370,000 -- or the balance of the proceeds -- I'm sorry -- the 370,000 , that was distributed on a 50-50 basis.
Q. And did you look at the tax returns for the year 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. And did the tax returns for the year 2014 -Schedule \(K\) and \(K-1 s\)-- did they reflect how the allocation of the gain from the sale of this building
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & had been allocated -- Page 370 \\
\hline 2 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 3 & Q. -- and how it had been distributed? \\
\hline 4 & A. Yes, it did reflect that. \\
\hline 5 & Q. Did it show there was a 70-30 distribution that \\
\hline 6 & had been made of the basis portion of the sale of \\
\hline 7 & Building E? \\
\hline 8 & A. It's not broken down on the tax return, but you \\
\hline 9 & can tell there was a disproportionate distribution made \\
\hline 10 & because the \(\mathrm{K}-1\) s reflect 646,000 going to CLA and only \\
\hline 11 & 454,000 going to Mr. Bidsal. So it does reflect that. \\
\hline 12 & Q. And if you look at the K-1s for that year on the \\
\hline 13 & 2014 tax return -- if you look at, for instance, page \\
\hline 14 & CLA Bidsal 1819 -- this is the CLA K-1. \\
\hline 15 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 16 & Q. Do you see on line 10? \\
\hline 17 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 18 & Q. What does that reflect? \\
\hline 19 & A. So line 10 is the allocation of the tax gain \\
\hline 20 & between the members. So that was CLA's -- on 1819, that \\
\hline 21 & is CLA's share of the gain. \\
\hline 22 & Q. Okay. And if you look at Schedule \(K\) in that same \\
\hline 23 & tax return. \\
\hline 24 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 25 & Q. On page 1815. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

A. Yes.
Q. Does it reflect what the actual gain was from the sale of Building $E$ ?
A. Yeah. The actual gain was 410,000.
Q. So when you compare that to the two Schedule K-1s, what does that tell you about how the $\$ 410,691$ was allocated?
A. It was allocated equally between the two members.
Q. Is that inconsistent with what you understand CLA's position is in this case, that that allocation should have been 70-30 because the special allocation language should have been triggered?
A. The allocation of the gain -- well, it's inconsistent with the way that Mr. Gerety, their expert, has done the allocation.
Q. Okay. Because the way he's done it, the allocation should have tracked the special allocation language on Exhibit $B$ showing a 70-30 split of all of the gain; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And instead, on the tax return, it clearly shows that all the gain was 50-50; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And did you find that that was consistent on each tax return when there was a sale of a building?

```
```

A. Yes. Yeah, all three of the buildings, any gain was allocated equally between the members.
Q. And that was the same even on the sale of Building C; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. If you looked at the tax return from the -covered the sale of Building $C$, even though the distribution of the money was all 70-30 because it was less than the basis in the property, the allocation on the tax return shows that it was allocated 50-50; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. All right. Then let's also take a look at

``` Exhibit 25. Let me know when you're there.
A. I'm there.
Q. And do you recognize this as the settlement statement from the sale of Building B?
A. Yes. This is the settlement from the Building B sale.
Q. Did you see Exhibit 26 ?
A. Yes.
Q. 26 ?
A. \(2-6\).
Q. Yes. What is Exhibit 26?
A. Exhibit 26 is the calculation of the amounts that would be distributed between Mr. Bidsal and CLA.
Q. And, again, how was -- how were the -- I'm sorry. How were the distributions done of the sales proceeds from the sale of Building \(B\) ?
A. The same as with prior to. The amount of the basis -- the original cost basis -- was determined. That amount was -- that amount plus some sales costs was allocated on a -- allocated on a -- I'm sorry.

In this case, it was the adjusted basis plus the sales cost was allocated 70-30 between Mr. Bidsal and CLA. And the balance of the sales price was allocated on a 50-50 basis.
Q. Okay. And, again, in the tax return for 2015, if you look at Schedule \(K\) and the Schedule K-1s, can you see that all of the sales proceeds -- all of it -- from the sale of Building \(B\) was allocated on a 50-50 basis?
A. That is correct.
Q. And can you see that it was -- that the distributions tracked the schedule that had been prepared by Mr. Bidsal that you just looked at?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is the special allocation language that you saw in this Exhibit \(B\) consistent with the type of special allocation language that you've seen in other operating agreements or other partnership agreements?
A. It's --

MR. LEWIN: Excuse me. Pardon me. That's an area that he did not testify about, nor is it in his report.

MR. GERRARD: He actually did testify. You asked him these specific questions.

MR. LEWIN: No. I asked him a different question. I asked him a different question. Not that one. I know the question that I asked him. I asked him whether the waterfall was common in these type of agreements, not the special allocation language which they're talking about.

MR. GERRARD: Isn't the waterfall the special allocation language?

MR. LEWIN: No. No --
THE ARBITRATOR: Isn't the waterfall just another way of talking about the step-down allocation?

MR. LEWIN: That is the step-down allocation. But -- maybe I misunderstood the question. I thought he's talking about the -- what they call the "triggering language."

THE ARBITRATOR: I thought you were talking about the whole thing. The whole waterfall provision, step-down provision, special allocation, preferred allocation -- to me, those are all the same thing, and
```

1 they all discuss what's in Exhibit B below the

```
``` percentage of members' interest and the statement of the capital contribution.
MR. GERRARD: Let me just ask a different question. Make it easier.
MR. LEWIN: Maybe I thought he was referring to something else.
THE ARBITRATOR: Am I wrong to conflate those four terms?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, no. That's -- that's what -THE ARBITRATOR: All right. Go ahead. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So there's a general concept in many partnership agreements and operating agreements where at some triggering event, there's a return of cash to the original owners that contributed cash?
A. That is correct.
Q. That's fairly common; correct?
A. Every partnership agreement has something like that.
Q. Okay. So the concept that you see in this operating agreement is not inconsistent with what you've seen --
A. No.
Q. -- countless times?
```

```
A. It is not inconsistent.
Q. Okay. And how many times have you seen a partnership agreement or an operating agreement that has provisions like that in it that trigger a special allocation?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. Hearsay.
THE ARBITRATOR: How many times in his experience has he seen that type of --
MR. LEWIN: Yeah, because that would be -- he'd be talking about what he's seen in a document.
MR. GERRARD: He's an expert. He's allowed to rely on hearsay for his opinions.
THE ARBITRATOR: That's --
MR. LEWIN: Okay.
A. Dozens of times.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Now, according to your review of the operating agreement, do you believe that there was -- that there were any distributions that were made to Mr . Bidsal that were inappropriate under the terms of the operating agreement?
A. No.
Q. Do you think that Mr . Bidsal actually made distributions -- more distributions to CLA than he would have been required to make under the operating
```

```
1 agreement?
```

```
A. I'm sorry. A strict interpretation of the operating agreement -- go back and restate my answer to your prior question. Mr. Bidsal would not have made the 70-30 allocations.
So the answer to the next question, yes, under the operating agreement, I think CLA received more than they would have done -- should have done.
Q. But based upon your experience with these types of agreements and what you've testified was some unclear language in the agreement, do you believe that the way that Mr. Bidsal did this was, in your experience, a fair way to treat this?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Did the way that he -- is the manner in which Mr. Bidsal treated this beneficial to him or beneficial to CLA?
A. No, it was more beneficial to CLA.
Q. All right. Now, we talked about the 1031 exchange for a minute earlier. Does CLA's interpretation of how this 1031 exchange should be reflected in the cost of purchase for the formula in the operating agreement, does that deprive Mr. Bidsal of his share of the appreciation realized when Building \(C\) was sold?
```

```
A. It absolutely deprives him of his share of that depreciation -- of that appreciation, with an "A," not with a "D."
THE ARBITRATOR: If you're going to move into a separate area, can I ask a question?
MR. GERRARD: Go ahead.
EXAMINATION
BY THE ARBITRATOR:
Q. I'm going to warn you on the front end, it's not going to be very artful. It's kind of premised on a few things, and if any of my premises are wrong, jump in and correct me.
A. Okay.
Q. It seems to me that the preferred allocation language in Exhibit \(B\) is only necessary because there's a disproportionate capital contribution between the two; right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So the purpose of the preferred allocation language is to ultimately return those disproportionate capital contributions?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So when you state that the sale of Building \(C\) individually or in conjunction with the sales of Buildings \(B\) and \(E\) don't trigger the special
```

1 allocation, when would the special allocation have been triggered if -- for instance, let's assume a hypothetical that each of the eight buildings was sold one per year.
A. Okay.
Q. At some point, you can't sell all eight and distribute all of the sales proceeds 50-50 because then the assets are gone and the member who has the disproportionately higher capital contribution never is able to recoup that. So at what point in that hypothetical would the special allocation have been triggered so that the member with the higher capital contribution would have been able to recoup it? Did that question make sense?
A. Yeah, I understand the question. And that really gets to the heart of why there's -- the operating agreement simply isn't clear. There's ambiguity in it. Because the operating agreement on its face says distribute the assets. If you sell one a year, you never get to -- you never get to substantially all the assets. I mean, when do you get to that? So that's really your question --
Q. Right.
A. -- is when does it get triggered.
Q. You're the accountant for this, and there's a

1 sale of one a year.
A. So under that scenario, at some point in time, you've got to step back and say, Well, this doesn't work. It doesn't work.

What Mr. Bidsal did is he had the foresight to look at that and say, What the operating agreement says really doesn't work, so I'm going to -- rather than wait for this operating agreement which doesn't really get everybody their money back, I'm going to figure out how much my original capital, how much of CLA's original capital went into each building, and as the building is sold, I'm going to give it back. I'm going to distribute it back. So that --
Q. I understand how he did. I'm kind of focused more on your conclusion that it's not triggered by a single sale --
A. Okay. I got you.
Q. -- and it's not triggered by two, and it's not triggered by three. When would it be triggered?
A. When is it triggered?
Q. Yeah.
A. And that's one of the ambiguities of the operating agreement, is if you sell one a year for the next eight years, do you say, Well, now we've sold four of them -- of the eight, so that meets the definition or

```
1 we think that's substantially all, so now we better
2 start doing it pursuant to the waterfall? There really
3 isn't --
Q. You got to do it in a way that makes sure that five through eight are going to sell for --
A. Right.
Q. -- enough to be able to recoup the greater capital contribution.
A. Well -- and then let's take your example a little
``` bit further. There isn't enough paid.
Q. Right. The first four sell for a million each, and last four sell for 50,000 each.
A. Exactly. At that point in time, 704 would require that -- I'm not sure if this agreement has what they call a deficit restoration clause in it, or if there would have to be a special allocation of all the income. But under 704, we would have to make some adjustments to get -- Mr. Bidsal would have to put money back in to make it right so that CLA got their money. That's what 704 tries to protect against, exactly what you're talking about.
Q. So it seems like from a practical standpoint, there would be three ways to do it. Way number one is the way Mr. Bidsal did it. Way number two is somewhere between -- in that scenario, sales five through eight

1 determine that we're close to the -- substantially all

2
3 and allocate them in a way that returns the greater capital contribution. And then the third way would be to begin with the first property and allocate all of it 70-30 to begin to settle the difference between capital contributions. And you might be done by the middle of property three, and now we're equal and everything after that is 50-50. We hope eventually if we actually sold all eight, all three scenarios would get you to the same place?
A. We hope, yes.
Q. Okay. So is one of those more a gap issue than another?
A. The challenge that you run into is what we're talking about now assumes that Bidsal and CLA are going to be partners through the end of the ownership so there would be a chance to reconcile everything. What happens where what we're talking about here where one partner is bought out? And so now you've got to take that into account as well.
Q. Okay.

THE ARBITRATOR: All right. Now, to the extent I opened up additional things.

MR. GERRARD: I'm sure you did. But that's fine. I'm glad to hear that. It shows what you're hearing.
\begin{tabular}{|cc|}
\hline 1 & THE ARBITRATOR: I wanted to do it before you 383 \\
2 & moved on to a completely different area. \\
3 & MR. GERRARD: I appreciate that. \\
4 & FURTHER EXAMINATION \\
5 & BY MR. GERRARD: \\
6 & Q. So in a situation like this where there is a real \\
7 & estate venture like this where you're obtaining real \\
8 & estate and managing it and/or selling it, in your \\
9 & experience in what you've seen in handling these kinds \\
10 & of situations from an accounting side, is there always a \\
11 & risk that the capital doesn't get returned? \\
12 & A. Sure. That's why it's called an investment. \\
13 & Q. So the timing of this is important; correct? \\
14 & A. Yes. \\
24 & talked about, obviously in this situation, if all of the \\
15 & Q. And who gets to decide the timing of when these \\
16 & distributions are going to be done and what will be the \\
17 & triggering events that will result in a return of \\
18 & capital? \\
20 & operating agreement. Ideally, that would be controlled by the
\end{tabular}

1 bill -- if all of the property had ultimately been sold
2 one at a time, and they at least were sold for enough money to cover the original cost basis, CLA would have received a return of all of its capital; correct?
A. That is correct.

THE ARBITRATOR: The way that Mr. Bidsal did it. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. The way that Mr . Bidsal was doing it?
A. Right.
Q. And in your understanding from talking to Mr. Bidsal, is that the reason why Mr . Bidsal did it the way that he did, because he wanted to treat CLA fairly and he didn't want there to be a situation that would arise such as the one that the judge was describing where there would be a situation where they wouldn't get all their money back?
A. That's correct. It also addresses -- it also keeps all parties at risk -- equally at risk.
Q. Because in this agreement, what was the ownership percentage of this agreement?
A. 50-50.
Q. Okay. So although there was more cash that had been put in by CLA than Mr. Bidsal, obviously Mr. Bidsal must have put in something else that made this so that they were equal owners in the company; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And what is your understanding of what Mr. Bidsal put in that gave him the right to be a 50 percent owner?
A. Mr. Bidsal found the property to begin with, so he put the opportunity in. Plus, he brought the expertise on how to manage the property and how to subdivide the property -- enhance value through subdivision. So that was the reason that CLA was going to give him 50 percent ownership even though CLA put 70 percent of the money in.
Q. And who was spending all the time to manage this venture?
A. Mr. Bidsal.
Q. Okay. So the parties had already decided that they had equal risk in this; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And if it didn't turn out the way that they hoped it would turn out, they both stood to lose equally; correct?
A. Right.
Q. Do you think that the judge's assumption that he made a minute ago, that if Mr. -- if the cash wasn't completely returned to CLA, that that meant that CLA bore a disproportionate risk to Mr. Bidsal? Do you think that that is an accurate assumption?
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A. No. Because they would both bear the same -they would both bear risk based on their ownership.
Q. And the risk had already been determined by the parties to be 50-50?
A. Correct.
Q. In this situation, again -- I'll ask the same question \(I\) asked before -- do you believe that the approach that Mr. Bidsal took, especially given the ambiguities in Exhibit B, was an appropriate response and a fair response to take care of all of the members of the LLC?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, what if the opposite approach had been -what if the opposite was the case? What if all of the proceeds from the sale of every building were distributed to CLA until CLA had been paid down to 0 , and in the middle of that, CLA decided to purchase Mr. Bidsal's interest in the company at a fixed fair market value number?

MR. LEWIN: Excuse me. The question as phrased is not relevant.

THE ARBITRATOR: I think we're talking about consequences of potential distribution scenarios.

MR. LEWIN: He's talking about all of the -- he just said if all of the distributions were done -- were
```

1 given to CLA. That's not even the ballpark of what's
2 going on here.
4 all done 70-30; right?
THE ARBITRATOR: No. He's saying if they were
MR. LEWIN: No. That's not --
MR. GERRARD: Let me rephrase the question. I'll be happy to rephrase.
MR. LEWIN: That was the reason I objected.
BY MR. GERRARD:

``` Step 4 of the waterfall.
Q. What if all of the sales proceeds from the sale of each of the buildings was divided 70-30, as CLA has maintained that it should have been, until each of the members' initial cash had been paid down in full, and then in the middle of that, there was an offer by CLA to purchase the property, such as what we have -- not the property. The membership interest. I'm sorry. Purchase the membership interest of Mr. Bidsal. Would that have created a disadvantage for Mr. Bidsal?
A. Mr. Bidsal would not have received his share of the appreciation of the gain on the properties under that scenario until -- he wouldn't start to receive that until we got past Step 3 of the waterfall and we're into
Q. Okay. Let's take a look at the operating agreement again, which is Exhibit 5. And let's
```

    1 specifically look at page 10 -- actually, page 11.
    ```
```

specifically look at page 10 -- actually, page 11.
So you see on page 11 right above Section 4.3, there's a paragraph that starts "The specific intent of this provision."
A. Yes.
Q. And then right above that there's a formula; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's the formula that's at issue in this case; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. This formula -- fair market value of all the properties less the original cost to purchase them times .05 -- isn't that essentially saying each member gets their half of all the appreciation in the property?
MR. LEWIN: Objection, Your Honor. The question misstates the document.
THE ARBITRATOR: How?
MR. LEWIN: Because it's -- just one second.
He said fair market value of all the property. That's not -- that's not the issue -- that's not what fair market value is. Fair market value is the value of the company.
MR. GERRARD: Actually, fair market value is not the value of the company; it's the value of the

```
membership interest by definition.
THE ARBITRATOR: If you want to restate.
MR. GERRARD: Fine.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Is it your understanding of the intent of this language in the formula that each member would get their half of the appreciation of all of what the company owned if there was a purchase by one member of the other member's membership interest?
A. That is exactly the way the formula reads.
Q. So if you utilized this step-down allocation language the way that CLA is asking the court to utilize it, if they had received all the appreciation because they had -- well, they had received a disproportionate share of all the appreciation on the three buildings that were sold because they got 30 percent of all the sales proceeds and Mr. Bidsal only got 30 percent --

THE ARBITRATOR: They got 70. You said they got 30 -- or he got 30 .

MR. GERRARD: I thought I said CLA. Did I --
THE ARBITRATOR: You said CLA. You just said 30 for both.

MR. GERRARD: Okay. Let me rephrase.
THE ARBITRATOR: Sorry.
MR. GERRARD: No, I do appreciate it. It's nice
\[
1 \text { to know that you're listening. }
\]

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So if what had happened is on the sale of each building, all the sales proceeds had been divided 70 percent to CLA and 30 percent to Bidsal, and then right after the three buildings had been sold and that had occurred, there was a purchase by CLA under this formula of Mr. Bidsal's membership interest, wouldn't that disproportionately hurt Mr. Bidsal?
A. It would hurt him because part of that formula is an add back of the capital contribution of the offering members. And assuming that we had paid all of his back and we interpreted this agreement to mean that it's not the original capital but the remaining unrepaid capital, he'd never -- you wouldn't get any add back. So all he would get at that point would be just his 50 percent of the appreciation.
Q. Okay. But also, the purpose of this formula, isn't it to try to make sure that each partner gets their fair share of the appreciation of the property --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the company?
A. Yes.
Q. And let's look at the formula specifically now. First, there's a term that says "FMV." Do you see that?
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline 1 & A. Yes. \\
2 & Q. And let's look back at the previous page to \\
3 & see -- in the Definitions under Section 4.1 to see what \\
4 & that actually means. What does FMV mean? \\
5 & A. "Fair market value." \\
6 & Q. "As specified in Section 4.2"? \\
7 & A. Correct. \\
8 & Q. So let's look at 4.2. 4.2 says "Any member \\
9 & (offering member) may give notice to the remaining \\
10 & members that he or it is ready, willing, and able to \\
11 & purchase the remaining members' interests for a price \\
12 & the offering member thinks is the fair market value." \\
13 & Do you see that? \\
14 & A. Yes. \\
15 & Q. So according to this definition, fair market \\
16 & value means what one member thinks the value of the \\
17 & other member's interest is; correct? \\
18 & A. Correct. \\
19 & Q. Now, let's take a look at the next step in this \\
20 & formula. It says "Cop." Do you see that? \\
21 & A. Yes. \\
22 & Q. So let's look at the defined term cop on \\
23 & Section 4.1. "Cop means 'cost of purchase' as it \\
24 & specified in the escrow closing statement at the time of \\
25 & purchase of each property owned by the company."
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lc}
\hline 1 & Do you see that? \\
2 & A. Yes, I do. \\
3 & Q. So what property is presently owned by the \\
4 & company? \\
5 & A. Property that's presently owned are -- there are \\
6 & six pieces. Five pieces of property -- actually, seven. \\
7 & There's five buildings -- one in Arizona, four at Green \\
8 & Valley Commerce Center -- and then the parking lot at \\
9 & Green Valley Commerce Center. \\
10 & THE ARBITRATOR: Five at Green Valley? \\
11 & THE WITNESS: There are five -- \\
12 & THE ARBITRATOR: At Green Valley, one in Arizona, \\
13 & plus the parking. \\
14 & THE WITNESS: -- at Green Valley, and then the \\
15 & Greenway property in Arizona -- five, six, and then the \\
16 & parking. So that's how we got to seven. \\
17 & BY MR. GERRARD: \\
18 & Q. Okay. So of those properties -- and those are \\
19 & the same properties that were owned by the company at \\
20 & the time of the offers back and forth between Bidsal and \\
21 & CLA to purchase membership interest; correct? \\
22 & A. Correct. \\
23 & Q. Okay. So of those properties, how many of those \\
24 & have you seen an escrow closing statement from, quote, \\
25 & "the time of purchase of each property" that specifies a
\end{tabular}

1 cost of purchase?
A. The only property that has an escrow closing statement is the Greenway property in Arizona.
Q. So if you strictly use the language of this definition, what would be the cost of purchase that would be applied in this formula to CLA's purchase of Mr. Bidsal's interest?
A. Only the Greenway property in Arizona.
Q. That would be \(\$ 790,000\) ?
A. Yeah. 790- plus closing costs.
Q. Okay. Do you think that that is a reasonable interpretation to take, even though that's what the language says?
A. No.
Q. And what do you think is reasonable?
A. The approach which I took, which was the approach that the accountant took -- Jim Main took when he allocated the price -- the purchase price of the note amongst the properties. I mean, that's the only thing that makes sense here.
Q. Okay. Is that also the position that Mr. Bidsal has taken?
A. Yes.
Q. Has Mr. Bidsal tried to take advantage of CLA by saying, Oh, no, the language actually says it's only

1 cost of purchase if there is an escrow closing statement purchase?
A. No. correct?
A. Yeah. from the time of purchase that specifies a cost to
Q. So if we go back to the formula now -- let's continue on. So we've already identified that there are a couple of ambiguities in the definition of fair market value as just -- is just related to the value of a membership interest; correct?
A. Right.
Q. Let's take that one step further. You've been involved in a lot of business sales and purchases;
A. Correct.
Q. Is there a difference between the value of a membership interest generally and the value of the assets of a company?
Q. If you're just selling a membership interest and you value that in the marketplace, what normally

MR. LEWIN: Hold on a second.
Okay. That's fine.
MR. GERRARD: Go ahead, sir.
THE ARBITRATOR: Just for whatever it's worth,
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1 and then I'll let you go. I don't believe I have a whole lot of discretion on the fair market value part of the formula.

MR. GERRARD: That's not the point I'm making here. The point is the agreement is ambiguous and it is difficult to follow, and so you have to adopt a reasonable interpretation.

THE ARBITRATOR: Understood.
A. So the question is how do you value a membership interest in a typical transaction. You would start by looking at the assets of the company, but that's certainly not where it begins.

You look at -- you could look at the net income of the company and apply some kind of a multiple to it, and then in that case you would ignore the assets because the assets are what are used to generate the net income. You would look at some of the assets held in the company that maybe are going to be distributed out prior to the sale or at the time of the sale, and you wouldn't -- so you wouldn't include those if you were doing an asset-based purchase.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. And if you were going to -- and then is there typically a discount applied to a membership interest?
A. And that was where \(I\) was going next. And if
```

1 there's _- because _- because a membership interest has
a limited market, there's a thing called a marketability discount that would probably be applied as well.

```
Q. Okay. So let's now go back to the formula. So we've identified that there's an ambiguity with fair market value because it just deals with the membership interest value, and that there's -- and doesn't say how you take into account that marketability discount.

There's also a problem with COP that we just addressed. So let's take a look at the next part of the formula.

So then it says "Fair market value minus cost of purchase times .05," which you said the reasonable interpretation of that is whatever the appreciation in the property is of the company, each member should get half of that; right?
A. Correct.
Q. Then it says "plus capital contribution of the offering member" -- so in this case, that's Mr. Bidsal; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. "At the time of purchasing the property minus prorated liabilities."

Do you see that?
A. I do.

1
2
Q. So the property of this company, number one, was never purchased -- correct? -- other than the Greenway property.
A. Correct.
Q. It was just acquired in exchange. So if we take the acquisition time of the property -- forget about the word "purchase" for a minute; let's just use "acquisition." When was all this property that we're talking about actually acquired by the company?
A. September of 2011.
Q. Okay. And what do you base that upon?
A. The deed in lieu.
Q. Okay. And that's Exhibit 8 that's in your binder right there. So you're saying that the deed in lieu agreement -- and I'm assuming the deed that came as a result of it -- is what gave title to the property to the company?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. Okay. So if we use that acquisition date of September 22, 2011, what was Mr. Bidsal's capital contribution on that date?
A. \(1,215,000\).
Q. And if we use the time that the original property was purchased, which was the note; correct?
A. Correct.

1
Q. What was Mr. Bidsal's capital contribution on that date?
A. \(1,215,000\).
Q. Okay. So under the strict language of this formula, what would have to be added to fair market value minus COP times . 05?
A. Well, under the strict language of the formula, you'd add 1,215,000.
Q. Okay. Is that the position that you think is reasonable notwithstanding the language of this formula?
A. No. No. And I did not use that position.
Q. And why do you think that that's not reasonable?
A. Well, I mean, the reasonable -- to me, it's reasonable that what they're really trying to say here is, Capital contribution less capital that has been returned.
Q. Okay. So what's left over of the original cash they put in?
A. Yeah. That's not what it says, but I think that's a reasonable man's interpretation.
Q. But that interpretation doesn't benefit Mr. Bidsal, does it?
A. No.
Q. And did Mr. Bidsal take that same interpretation?
A. No.

1
Q. No, I mean did he take the interpretation that you have taken?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So Mr. Bidsal was not trying to take advantage of CLA by saying, Hey, you have to give me back my full 1,215,000 no matter whether I got some of that already returned from the sale of Buildings \(C, B\), and E?
A. I was never -- I never heard him take that position.
Q. Okay. Given what you've just testified is the reasonable interpretation of this formula, do you think that it would be reasonable to use the cost of purchase from the actual purchase price of the Greenway property as part of this formula?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, obviously, that excludes the costs involved in acquiring the other five properties held by the company.
Q. Okay. And does it also exclude the actual cost of Building \(C\) ?
A. Yeah.
Q. And that cost is still on the books of the company?

1 Page 400 property, then the cost of Building \(C\) would be -wouldn't be relevant anymore, because you're using the cost of the actual purchase price of the property.
Q. Do you think that that's reasonable, or do you think that the reasonable way is to use the original price of Building \(C\) since it's been rolled into the Greenway property?
A. It would not be reasonable to use the purchase price of Greenway; it is reasonable to use the carryover basis for the Greenway property.

THE ARBITRATOR: You said price of the -carrying over the price of Building C, but you really mean cost --

MR. GERRARD: Cost. It's the cost basis, yeah. If I said price, I misspoke.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 8. This is the deed in lieu agreement. Let me know when you've got that open.
A. I'm ready.
Q. Now, as a part of this deed in lieu agreement, you understood that there were collected rents that the former owner had that were being transferred to the new owner; correct?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & A. Correct. Page 401 \\
\hline 2 & Q. Let's take a look at Section 2.10 on page 1432. \\
\hline 3 & So this paragraph states "Upon the execution of \\
\hline 4 & this agreement, borrower" -- now, who's the borrower in \\
\hline 5 & this case? \\
\hline 6 & A. The borrower would be the original purchasers of \\
\hline 7 & the Greenway -- I'm sorry -- Green Valley Commerce \\
\hline 8 & Center. \\
\hline 9 & Q. Okay. So we can also refer to them as owner of \\
\hline 10 & the property; correct? \\
\hline 11 & A. Correct. \\
\hline 12 & Q. Says that they "shall transfer to lender" -- and \\
\hline 13 & who's lender in this case? \\
\hline 14 & A. So the lender is -- it would be Green Valley \\
\hline 15 & Commerce. \\
\hline 16 & Q. Okay. Mr. Bidsal and CLA's company? \\
\hline 17 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 18 & Q. Okay. "Shall transfer to the lender the amount \\
\hline & of \$295,258.93, which amount represents the net rents \\
\hline 20 & from the property that have not been -- previously been \\
\hline & paid to lender or lender's predecessors in interest for \\
\hline & the period beginning October 1, 2010, and ending \\
\hline 23 & September 21, 2011." \\
\hline 24 & Do you see that? \\
\hline 25 & A. I do. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1
Q. And then at the very end of that page, there's a sentence that says "Borrower will cause American Nevada Realty, LLC, to transfer the net rents from the property from and after September 21, 2011, to lender in accordance with and pursuant to the provisions of the management agreement."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So right after that in Section 2.11, that talks about also being the former owner transferring to the new owner \(\$ 74,549.01\) in security deposits; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Did you see that CLA is -- in their expert report is trying to treat these rents as interest?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it correct to characterize these rents as interest from an accounting perspective?
A. Well, the document speaks -- says that these are rents that were paid over to the owner of the building -- to the lender, who is CL -- who is Green Valley Commerce. I don't -- I don't agree with that.
Q. All right. These rents, they're being paid over to the new owner of the property as a result of the new owner taking title; correct?
A. Correct.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & Q. These rents weren't paid to Green Valley as a \\
\hline 2 & lender back at the time that it acquired the note, was \\
\hline 3 & it? \\
\hline 4 & A. No. They were paid at the time that the deed -- \\
\hline 5 & the fee simple deed was acquired; this deed in lieu was \\
\hline 6 & executed. \\
\hline 7 & Q. Okay. So if this was money that belonged to the \\
\hline 8 & lender, then our company -- right? -- Green Valley \\
\hline 9 & Commerce would have obtained its right to those rents \\
\hline 10 & and would have received them back when they acquired the \\
\hline 11 & note in June of 2011; correct? \\
\hline 12 & MR. LEWIN: Objection. That for calls \\
\hline 13 & speculation. \\
\hline 14 & THE ARBITRATOR: Overruled. \\
\hline 15 & You may answer. \\
\hline 16 & A. Correct. Which they did not. They did not \\
\hline 17 & receive until they actually took title of the property. \\
\hline 18 & BY MR. GERRARD: \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. Interest is still ordinary income, which the operating agreement specifies will be distributed 50-50.
Q. Okay. Based upon general accounting principles, if there's an agreement to sell a membership interest, does the selling member generally lose its rights to allocations and distributions prior to that sale being completed?
A. No. Quite the opposite. If there's an agreement to sell the membership interest, it's common that the cash would be distributed prior to the closing of the sale.
Q. How was depreciation allocated under this operating agreement?
A. It's part of operating income, so it's allocated 50-50 to each of the members.
Q. So can you explain to me under what circumstances the capital account percentages that started at 70 percent for CLA and 30 percent to Bidsal would change over time based upon depreciation?
A. Sure. So probably an example is the easiest way to look at it. If the capital accounts were using easy numbers -- 700,000; 300,000; 70-30 -- and the operating income from the -- from the rent -- from the rental activity, let's say it was \(\$ 200,000\), but included in that \(\$ 200,000\) is \(\$ 100,000\) of depreciation. So in that
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1 case, it would actually be \(\$ 300,000\) of distributable
2 cash. Okay? That would be the income plus the
3 depreciation because the depreciation is a noncash item.
Q. So if that was distributed, how would that affect the percentages of the capital accounts?
A. So that would cause the capital -- that would cause Bidsal's capital account percentage to go down, and it would cause CLA's to go up. And the reason for that is this: The income is 200,000. So going back to our capital account maintenance rules, if we were at \(\$ 300,000\) of income -- of capital for Bidsal, plus the \(\$ 100,000\) of his share of the net income, now we're at 4-, minus his share --
Q. You said "his share of the net income." You're talking about the depreciation?
A. No. I'm talking about net income. Remember, net income is 200,000.
Q. Okay.
A. But included in that net income is a deduction of \(\$ 100,000\) specific to depreciation. A depreciation deduction. So you got net income, but you've also got depreciation, which is a noncash item. So you would have \(\$ 300,000\) of distributable cash from operations.

So Mr. Bidsal gets \(\$ 100,000\) of income allocated to him. He also gets \(\$ 150,000\) of cash allocated to him.
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1 So now his capital account is 250,000. 300-plus 1002 minus 150-, so it's now 250-.

On the other side, Mr. CLA would get the same 100,000 of income, so now they're at \(800-\). They would get the same \(\$ 150,000\) distribution. So now they are at 650-. So our total capital is now not \(\$ 1\) million, but it's 900,000. 250-, 650-. If you divide 250- by 900,000, you don't get 30 percent. You'll get -- I don't have my phone here. I'd do the numbers for you.

\section*{Q. That's all right.}
A. But you get a number bigger. That's why if you look at just the tax return, his capital account is going to be more than -- I'm sorry -- less than 30 percent. It's because of the way -- just the way the accounting works when you have depreciation involved.

\section*{Q. Thank you.}

THE WITNESS: Did that make sense, Your Honor? THE ARBITRATOR: Fairly, yes. In my mind, I'm doing the math, and it -- I don't know. It's basically 5 divided by 19, which is a little less than -- yeah. I think that works.

THE WITNESS: It's just simple that the capital account is increased by net income and it's decreased by distributions. Distributions, if they exceed net income, in this case will cause his capital account --
```

1 will cause everybody's capital account to get out of
2 that 70-30 ratio.

```
```

will cause everybody's capital account to get out of that 70-30 ratio.
THE ARBITRATOR: It's not an indication of disproportionate distributions or allocations under the operating agreement.
THE WITNESS: No. Not at -- no. And to follow that all through, if and when we sell all of the buildings eventually and we distribute back the capital account as Mr. Bidsal has done, they will come back into a 70-30 ratio eventually.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Now -- so the fact that the capital account balances -- well, let's actually just look at them.
THE ARBITRATOR: As reflected on $K-1$ ?
MR. GERRARD: Yeah.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Let's start by taking a quick look at Exhibit No. 11 -- 12. Let's look at the K-1s in Exhibit 12. It's the 2011 tax return. So that's on pages 2340 and 2341. Do you have those in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. So on this tax return, CLA's ending capital account balance is 70.241966 percent; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And Mr. Bidsal's ending capital account balance

```

\section*{is 29.758034. Do you see that?}
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And you're saying that's caused by depreciation?
A. Yeah. This is a good example. You can see that if you take a look at line 2 and line 5 of the \(K-1\) and if you add those up, that comes to 240,000 . Now, if you go down to Section L, that's how much income was allocated to each partner. That number is the same on both \(\mathrm{K}-1\) s, those two numbers. 84,155 is the same number allocated 50-50. That comes to 240,246.

But then the very next number is 265,000 , which is a distribution. There was no capital transaction here. Nothing was sold this year, so this is a great example. There's no argument on whether there's a capital transaction because according to this \(K-1\), we had income and we had interest and our distribution was 265,000. That results in Mr. Bidsal's capital account going up by two tenths of a percent and CLA's going down by that same two tenths of a percent.
Q. Isn't it just the opposite of that? His going down and CLA's going up?
A. No -- I'm sorry. I had them turned around. Yes, it is just the opposite.
Q. Yeah. Okay.
A. I was looking at them backwards, sorry.

1
Q. Okay. Under this operating agreement, how is depreciation supposed to be allocated?
A. Depreciation is an element of ordinary income, and so it is allocated -- the depreciation expense is allocated equally between Mr. Bidsal and between CLA.
Q. Now, you saw that Mr. Gerety in his report tried to say that depreciation was a capital event and had to be split 70-30. Do you recall that?
A. I do.
Q. And do you agree with that?
A. I do not.
Q. Why not?
A. Number one, I've never seen it in my years of practicing where in this situation depreciation would be treated as a capital event. And it's not a capital event for a couple of reasons. The first would be that it's not within the definition of a capital event under the LLC agreement. And then the second reason is eventually that depreciation will get recaptured, and when it does, it will get allocated -- pursuant to the way these tax returns are being prepared -- equally back to the parties the same way it was taken.
Q. Okay. And so let's take a look now at Exhibit 15. This is the 2012 tax return. Let's look at the \(\mathrm{K}-1 \mathrm{~s}\) again on page 2550 and 2551.
```

A. Okay.
Q. And so here you can see that Mr . -THE ARBITRATOR: You said 2550? MR. GERRARD: 2549, sorry.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So 2549. You can see CLA's ending capital account balance is 71.198; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And Mr. Bidsal's on the next page is 28.801; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And does that mean that there was inappropriate distributions being made to Mr. Bidsal?
A. No. It's the same situation as the prior year. The distributions from operations simply exceeded the -exceeded the ordinary income.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm guess -- you know, I didn't look, but I'm assuming -- well, I could tell you right now.
Yeah, there was 146,000 of depreciation in this year.
Q. Okay. You want to show The Court where that's located?
A. Sorry. That's on page 51. Third number -fourth -- fifth -- the fifth number from the bottom of

```
```
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