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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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|  | ( ) |
| 10 |  |
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| 20 |  |
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| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
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| 1 | LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 2021 Page 628 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 8:41 A.M. |
| 3 | --00- |
| 4 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So Mr. Bidsal, I'm not |
| 5 | going to re-swear you in. You've already begun your |
| 6 | testimony. Do you realize you are still under oath? |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 8 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. |
| 9 | All right, Mr. Shapiro. |
| 10 | MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you. |
| 11 | CONTINUED EXAMINATION |
| 12 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 13 | Q. All right. Shawn, when we left off your |
| 14 | testimony two days ago, we were talking about the Green |
| 15 | Valley Center Owners Association. I'd like to have you |
| 16 | take a quick look at Exhibit 7, and specifically I want |
| 17 | you to go to Page 7 of that document, which is Bates |
| 18 | stamped 1361. |
| 19 | A. Okay. |
| 20 | Q. What rights do these CC\&Rs give each owner in the |
| 21 | common areas of the property? |
| 22 | MR. LEWIN: Objection. The document speaks for |
| 23 | itself. |
| 24 | ARBITRATOR WALL: You're asking for his |
| 25 | understanding? |


| 1 | MR. SHAPIRO: Well, yeah. I'm just asking Page h29 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | testified he's the one -- you know, he was in charge of |
| 3 | preparing and recording these. So yeah. What's his |
| 4 | understanding? What's in the document? |
| 5 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. I'll allow it. |
| 6 | A. So basically the parking lot is considered a |
| 7 | service lot servicing the owners of the buildings. |
| 8 | There are eight of them. And this is used for multiple |
| 9 | purposes: for ingress, egress, underground easements, |
| 10 | signage, and so forth. Basically the current GVC, the |
| 11 | Green Valley Commerce, while the Green Valley is in |
| 12 | charge as a declarant, it manages the parking lot and |
| 13 | charges back the expenses of the parking lot to each |
| 14 | owner. |
| 15 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 16 | Q. Okay. So in Section 3.1 they have a parking |
| 17 | easement. Correct? |
| 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | Q. And then in 3.2 there's an access easement? |
| 20 | A. Yes. |
| 21 | Q. 3.3 is a utility easement? |
| 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | Q. Then there's some additional easements. We'll |
| 24 | skip over. 3.6 there's actually a sign easement? |
| 25 | A. Yes. |

1
Q. And a drainage easement. Correct?

And do the owners of Buildings B, C, and E, do they get the benefits of these rights, these easements?
A. Yes, they do. It's actually spelled out in their grant deed.
Q. Now, we previously looked at Section 2.10 of the deed in lieu agreement. That's been discussed by a number of witnesses. In that -- you can go there if you need, but in that, American Nevada Realty was -- or GVC, Green Valley Commerce, agreed to hire American Nevada Realty to manage the property. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was in charge of the books and records while American Nevada Realty was managing the property in 2011?
A. It was American Nevada.
Q. And there was some discussion about a 2011 general ledger, which is Exhibit 95 if you'd like to turn to that. I don't know which binder book it's in, but do you recall the 2011 general ledger that's been discussed?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you prepare that document?
A. No.
Q. Who prepared that?
A. American Nevada.
Q. And when did you take over the management of the property from American Nevada?
A. Sometimes in 2012. I don't recall exactly. I would say in mid-2012.
Q. Mid? Is that what you said?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'd like for you to turn to Exhibit 52. MR. SHAPIRO: I don't know if you have Exhibit 52. Let me see here. It's probably going to be Binder 2. There's 54, so it's probably this one.

ARBITRATOR WALL: 52?
MR. GERRARD: 52.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Are you at Exhibit 52?
A. Yes.
Q. Exhibit 52 comprises two pages. Can you tell me what those pages are?
A. It's the Clark County treasurer, first page, and the second page is the map of the Green Valley Commerce project site plan.
Q. Looking at the first page, someone has written in A, E, F, G, H -- and I can't even tell what that last one is.

ARBITRATOR WALL: CA, common area.


```
1 building designated on the second page as C?
```

```
ARBITRATOR WALL: It's pretty light, but yeah.
A. Yes.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. And Building B, you know, there's been some testimony that Building \(B\) was sold. Is the Building \(B\) designated on this page the correct building?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, I'd move for the admission of Exhibit 52.
MR. LEWIN: No objection.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. 52. 52 will be admitted.
(Exhibit 52 admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. I'm going to go back to the first exhibit binder and draw your attention to Exhibit 12. This is the 2011 tax return. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you send a copy of this tax return to Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you send the \(K-1 s\) to Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Ben ever inform you that there were any
```

```
    1 inaccuracies in the way that the company income or
    2 revenue was allocated or distributed?
```

```
A. No.
Q. Can you please turn to Bates stamp 2341, which I believe is your K-1?
A. (Complied.)
Q. Did you include and pay taxes on all the income and distributions identified on your K -1 in your personal tax returns for 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you please turn to Exhibit 18?
A. (Complied.)
Q. Now, this is the Cost Segregation Study. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did you commission the Cost Segregation Study?
A. I don't recall exact date, but it should be sometime in 2013, early.
Q. And what was the reason that you commissioned it?
A. It's basically serves two purpose. One is to do cost allocation of each improvement and land for the subdivision, and it also provides a depreciation schedule that basically breaks the surplus of land and then breaks the buildings into building categories of
```

```
    1 depreciation as short-term, midrange and long-term
```

```
depreciation as short-term, midrange and long-term depreciation, like 5-year, 15-year, and 30-year.
Q. Does completing a Cost Segregation Study allow you to take advantage of some tax benefits?
A. Yes. Basically, once you do that, you can accelerate the depreciation under short-term items on a property. So for example, carpet, air-conditioning and if it's a stove, refrigerator. Depending on the type of property, they will have a shorter lifespan so you can depreciate them faster.
Q. So even if the original intent was to keep all of the buildings, was there still a reason to commission a Cost Segregation Study?
A. Of course.
Q. Was Ben aware that this was being commissioned?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he ever disagree or object to it?
A. No.
Q. Can you please turn to the last page -- actually, the second-to-last page of the study which is Exhibit 18 and tell me what that document is?
A. (Complied.)
Q. You're not going to need that binder.
A. This is the tax asset allocation 2011 from the tax return for Green Valley Commerce.
```

    3 cost segregation. It's done with cost segregation.
    4 Q. Okay. So is this where you -- where the
    5 allocation to each individual lot is designated?
    6 A. Yes.
    Q. Now, at some point, clearly, a decision was made
8 to sell some of the buildings. Correct?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. At what point in time was that decision made?
11 A. Sometime in -- before we listed in }2012
12 Q. Okay. And I lied about not needing the other
one. Can you turn to Exhibit 50?
14 A. (Complied.)
Q. Tell me when you're there.
16 A. I'm there.
17 Q. Now, the top Email is not the one I'm focusing
18 on. I draw your attention to the Email header about
19 halfway down the page. Do you see where it says there
20 was an Email from Jeff Chain to https://protect-us.mimecast.com/s/rcZ3CPNJLAc3gE4IzTu6r?domain=yahoo.com
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. And the date of that Email is August 13th, 2012.
23 Correct?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. Is that your Email address?

```
```

A. Yes.
Q. And it appears while there's some documents behind this first page, are these documents, were they attached to that Email?
A. Probably. Yes.
Q. Is this the first -- well, tell me what this Email -- why did Jeff Chain Email this information to you?
A. Jeff Chain did an analysis on valuations, the BOV -- Brokers Opinion of Value -- for Green Valley Commerce. And, you know, I was talking to Ben and discussing eventually selling them, so he made the flyers with the income and expense of each building so that we can go to market and sell.
Q. Now, the date of that Email is August 13th, 2012, which is almost one year after you obtained title to the property. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Had you made any efforts prior to August of 2012 to sell any of the properties?
A. No. I mean, there could be other E-mails in that timeframe, but no.
Q. Was Ben still hesitant at this point to sell any of the buildings or was he on board with the idea?
A. By this time he was on board.

```

```

Q. What did you do with those proceeds?
A. The proceeds went into an IPX 1031 exchange company.
Q. Did all the proceeds go there?
A. Eventually, yeah.
Q. Had you identified any replacement purchase property at that time?
A. No.
Q. When did you ultimately identify a replacement property?
A. I don't recall, but sometime after.
Q. Turn to Exhibit 17.
A. (Complied.)
Q. Now, this is the closing statement on the purchase of the Arizona property. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did that property close?
A. Um, sometime -- I'm looking at the settlement date and the print date. Sometime around 3/8/2013.
Q. After the purchase of the Arizona property, was there money left over from the sale of Building $C$ ?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Did you say March of 2013 is when the Greenway was closed?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.

```

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What was the question?
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. The question is: Was there money left over from the sale of Building \(C\) after your purchased the Arizona property?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you have any conversations with Ben about what to do with the leftover funds?
A. Yes.
Q. What conversations did you have with him?
A. How to break it up and distribute it.
Q. Turn to Exhibit 14. Do you know who prepared Exhibit 14?
A. This was prepared by my office.
Q. Okay. And when you were talking to Ben about how to -- what to do with the excess proceeds, what was decided about how to split those proceeds up?
A. Well, we talked about when we are selling these buildings one at a time, how we going to distribute the proceeds. So basically we had the tax cost allocation, and they would take the -- well, in this case it was exchange, but what --
Q. Let's focus on this other one. We'll talk about the other ones later.
A. Right. Whatever is left over of the cost base we
```

    1 will distribute 30/70 as a return of capital, and
    ```
```

will distribute $30 / 70$ as a return of capital, and whatever was the actual profit on the property, it was rolled up into the new building.
Q. Did you have any understanding with Ben regarding -- at the time you purchased the Arizona property, did you contemplate selling additional properties?
A. By that time, yes, I had discussions with Ben about it and actually prior to the sale of the Building C.
Q. Okay. And did you have any -- I mean, prior to that point, did you have any understanding with Ben about just generally how proceeds would be distributed?
A. Yes. We talked about it.
Q. Okay.
A. So basically each building would be -- because by that time we had the so-called tax allocation, so we would distribute the tax cost allocation $30 / 70$ between the partners, and the balance of it would be -- the profit would be split 50/50.
Q. And that was something that you specifically discussed with Ben?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did Ben agree to it?
A. Yes.

```

1
Q. Did he have any concerns with it?
A. No.
Q. Did he raise any objections to it?
A. No.
Q. All right. Going back to Exhibit 14, you heard Chris Wilcox provide his explanation of what happened or what this page depicts. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he accurately describe what you and your office did in calculating the distributions?
A. Yes, but there was one more explanation that \(I\) need to make. So net gain, that's just a subtraction of the selling of Building \(C\) minus buying the Greenway. So that's how the additions went -- I mean the subtractions went.
Q. Okay. But at the end of the day you split all of the proceeds -- the remaining 95,000 and change 70/30 why?
A. That was based on my discussions with Ben, and that was the right way to do it. That was the fair way to do it. This was the leftover of the base, of the cost base of Building \(C\), because we rolled over all the profit into the new -- from the relinquished property to the replacement property. That's the terminology on 1031. That was the leftover of that money.
Q. And when you were talking to Ben about how to split the proceeds on the 95,000 , did you guys have any discussion about Exhibit \(B\) and the special allocation waterfall language there?
A. Yes, we talked about how to distribute this -well, it was before even the selling we had discussion of how to distribute the proceeds. And we agreed that this doesn't fall into the waterfall allocation -preferred allocation, so we would take these properties distinctly and we treat them like an individual sale, return the capital associated with the property on a \(30 / 70\) basis, and then the balance of it would be distributed 50/50.
Q. Did you send him the breakdown of how you allocated each time that you distributed proceeds from the sale of the properties?
A. Yes. We generate -- this is generated in the office, and we usually -- I think at that time I think it was Alex. So he would send it to Ben, and if he okayed it, then we cut the checks.
Q. So you're saying he would send this breakdown to Ben prior to the time that the checks were cut?
A. Usually we did that. We get a consent.
Q. And then when you send the checks out, did you send a copy of it?
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1 & A. Yes. \\
2 & Q. And why did you send a copy of it? \\
3 & A. So for whoever receives it has an understanding \\
4 & of what the breakdowns are.
\end{tabular}
Q. And why did you send a copy of it?
A. So for whoever receives it has an understanding
Q. All right. So if you turn to the next couple of pages in Exhibit 14, there are some checks in there. Correct? Some check stubs, I should say. Was it you or your office that actually prepared these checks?
A. It's my office, but \(I\) sign them.
Q. You sign the checks. And so when you sent these checks out, a copy of this breakdown was attached to the checks?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I want you to turn to Exhibit 57. You may not have that. Tell me if you have Exhibit 57.
A. I do have it.
Q. You do have it? Okay.

MR. SHAPIRO: Not all the binders lined up the same as far as which binder the exhibits were in. We'll go ahead and wait until Rod gets there.

Are you there, Rod?
MR. LEWIN: I am.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. What is Exhibit 57?
A. That's the grant deed for the sale of Building \(C\).

1
Q. And did this deed convey any right to the new owner with respect to the parking lot, driveways, and common areas?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. Could you point out where that occurred?
A. On Page 1 of the grant deed there is Subject 2. No. 2 it says: Covenants, restrictions --
(Court reporter clarification.)
(Discussion off the record.)
ARBITRATOR WALL: It says: "Covenants, restrictions, conditions, reservations, rights, rights-of-way, and easements now of record, if any, or any that actually exist on the property."
A. In addition to the next sentence that says: "Together with all singular tenements," etc., etc. So...

And then on Page 3 of the grant deed, it says Parcel 3. That's the nonexclusive right to the parking lot. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Just to clarify, you're on the document Bates stamped Bidsal 1457?
A. I'm looking at it, if you give me a minute.
Q. The Bates stamp at the bottom?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then you referenced Parcel 3.

\section*{Correct?}
A. Yes.
Q. And Parcel 3 references a document that was recorded on March 16, 2012 in Book 2012/03/16 as Document 01304. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you look at the CC\&Rs which are Exhibit 7, is that the same recording information as the CC\&Rs? Exhibit 7. You're not in the front of the page. There you go.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait. What did you just compare this to?

MR. GERRARD: The CC\&Rs. The recording stamp. ARBITRATOR WALL: The recording stamp on Exhibit 57?

MR. SHAPIRO: No, on Exhibit 57 I'm looking at the recording information identified in Parcel 3 at the bottom of Parcel 3.

MR. GERRARD: Legal description.
MR. SHAPIRO: It says -- the second-to-last sentence says: Covenants and restrictions recorded March 16th, 2012 in Book --

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. I got you.
MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.

1 BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. If you compare that to the first page of Exhibit 7, so Shawn, is that the same recording information as the CC\&Rs that are already in evidence as Exhibit 7?
A. Yes.
Q. So this deed specifically referenced these CC\&Rs and specifically granted to the owner the rights covered by these CC\&Rs. Correct?
A. And to the parking lot, yes.
Q. Yes. Well, that included the parking lot, the signs, the utilities. Everything. Access. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, I'd move for the admission of Exhibit 57.

MR. LEWIN: No objection.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. 57 will be admitted.
(Exhibit 57 was admitted into evidence.) BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Okay. Turning your attention to Exhibit 15, these are the 2012 tax returns. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you or your office send a copy of these tax

\section*{1 returns to Ben?}
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know when would you have sent those? I don't know if you remember exactly, but maybe you do, but when would you have sent those?
A. As soon as they get prepared by the CPA, they send them. Also, the CPA sends them directly to the partners, so partners receive the tax returns and \(K-1 s\) also from the CPA's office.
Q. Ans did Ben ever inform you that there are any inaccuracies in the way that the company income or revenue was allocated or distributed?
A. No.
Q. Can you please turn to document Bates stamped 2550, which should be your K-1? Tell me when you're there.
A. Okay.
Q. Did you include and pay taxes on all income and distributions identified on this \(K\)-1 in your personal tax return for 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could turn to Exhibit 16 , do you know who prepared this document?
A. This is prepared by Jim Main's office. It's a K-1 addressed to CLA Properties and mailed to their Los
```

1 Angeles office address, 2801 South Main Street.

```
Angeles office address, 2801 South Main Street.
Q. So Jim Main would have been the one that sent that, not you?
A. Yes. This is Jim Main's accompanied by a letter and then the \(K-1\).
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 19? This is the 2013 tax returns. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you send these to Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever have any conversations with Ben regarding the 2013 tax returns? Just generally? Did you ever talk to him about it? Do you know if he received them?
A. We mailed it, so I'm assuming he received it.
Q. Did Ben ever inform you that there were any inaccuracies in the way the company income or revenue was allocated or distributed?
MR. LEWIN: Excuse me. The question is vague. ARBITRATOR WALL: How? MR. LEWIN: The issue is did he ever inform you? I think he's talking about the tax return.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. I mean, ever, like, up to today?
MR. SHAPIRO: Right.
```

|  | Page 650 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. LEWIN: Okay. |
| 2 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Not vague. |
| 3 | You can answer. |
| 4 | A. I don't think so. I mean, aside from this |
| 5 | arbitration. |
| 6 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 7 | Q. Generally speaking, did there ever come a point |
| 8 | in time when Ben started raising questions or concerns |
| 9 | about the tax returns? |
| 10 | A. I don't recall about tax returns but he start |
| 11 | sending E-mails in 2016. |
| 12 | Q. Okay. So at any time prior to 2016 did Ben ever |
| 13 | inform you that there were any inaccuracies in the way |
| 14 | that the company income or revenue was allocated or |
| 15 | distributed in the 2013 tax returns? |
| 16 | A. No. |
| 17 | Q. I'll draw your attention to Exhibit 22. What is |
| 18 | Exhibit 22? |
| 19 | A. That's the escrow closing for Building E. |
| 20 | Q. And when did that transaction close? |
| 21 | A. 11/13/2014. I'm reading off the closing |
| 22 | statement. |
| 23 | Q. Does that sound right to you? |
| 24 | A. Yeah. |
| 25 | Q. And what was the sales price? |



1 that you had with him in connection with the sale of

## Building C?

A. We had conversations on this transaction too.
Q. And he confirmed that agreement with you?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if you could turn to Exhibit 23, does this show how you calculated the distributions on the sale of Building E?
A. Yes.
Q. And you heard Chris Wilcox's testimony yesterday where he explained all the numbers in here. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Was his explanation accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Was this breakdown prepared in accordance with your agreement with Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. And was Ben aware of how you were going to distribute these funds prior -- well, was he aware of how you were going to distribute these funds?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you know that?
A. I talked to him in advance.
Q. Did you send this first page of Exhibit 23 to Ben prior to cutting the checks?

```
A. Yes. The office did.
Q. And did Ben approve it?
A. He okayed it and then we cut the checks.
Q. If you look at the next couple pages, there are some checks there. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When you sent the checks to Ben, did you send a copy of this summary with the checks?
A. Yes.
Q. Could he have received the checks without seeing the summary?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Did Ben ever comment on or object to the fact that some of the proceeds had been split 50/50 and other part of the proceeds was split 70/30?
A. At that time that we send this?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. When was the first time that he raised any concerns regarding that issue?
A. As an issue or as to this building?
Q. Well, just generally speaking, when was the first time you heard any concerns with Ben about your agreement with him about how to split the proceeds from the sale of the buildings?
```

|  | A Tn some E-mails in 2016 Page 654 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. In some E-mails in 2016. |
| 2 | Q. If you could turn to Exhibit 58, can you tell me |
| 3 | what this document is? |
| 4 | A. That's the grant deed for the sale of Building D. |
| 5 | Q. And this was recorded when? |
| 6 | A. I think 11/13/2014. |
| 7 | Q. All right. |
| 8 | A. So November of 2014. |
| 9 | Q. And in this deed did you convey any rights to the |
| 10 | new owner with respect to the parking lot and common |
| 11 | areas? |
| 12 | A. Yes. The same language that was in the previous |
| 13 | grant deed, subject to No. 2 and also together with the |
| 14 | (inaudible). |
| 15 | Q. And did it have the same description in the legal |
| 16 | description? |
| 17 | A. Yes, it did. |
| 18 | Q. So looking at the document that's been Bates |
| 19 | stamped Bidsal 1473, it identifies a Parcel 3 which |
| 20 | specifically references the CC\&Rs recorded March 16th, |
| 21 | 2012. Correct? |
| 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | MR. SHAPIRO: I'd move for the admission of |
| 24 | Exhibit 58. |
| 25 | ARBITRATOR WALL: It's the grant bargain and sale |


| 1 | deed. |
| :--- | :---: |
| 2 | MR. LEWIN: No objection. |
| 3 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. 58 will be |
| 4 | admitted. |
| 5 | (Exhibit 58 was admitted into evidence.) |
| 6 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 7 | Q. I ask you to keep that open because we're going |
| 8 | to be looking at Exhibit 56 in a minute. But for now |
| 9 | let's turn to Exhibit 24. This is the 2014 tax returns. |

A. Yes.
Q. Did you send a copy of these tax returns to Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. Did the copy that you sent include the $K-1$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Ben ever inform you prior to the time that you just previously testified in 2016 -- prior to that point did Ben ever inform you that there were any inaccuracies in the way that the company income or revenue was allocated or distributed?

MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry. The question is vague as to time. I don't understand if you're talking about after the tax return or some other time.

MR. SHAPIRO: It's not vague. I said prior to the 2016, did he ever complain.

| 1 | MR. LEWIN: Okay. I'm sorry. I missed that. 656 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. No. |
| 3 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 4 | Q. I'm sorry, what was your answer? |
| 5 | A. No. |
| 6 | Q. And if you could turn to Bates stamp 1820, this |
| 7 | is your K-1. Correct? |
| 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. Did you include and pay taxes on all of the |
| 10 | income and distributions identified on this $\mathrm{K}-1$ in your |
| 11 | personal tax return for 2014? |
| 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | Q. If you turn to Exhibit 25, please, this is the |
| 14 | closing statement for Building B, I believe. Is that |
| 15 | correct? |
| 16 | A. Yes. |
| 17 | Q. And approximately when did you sell Building B? |
| 18 | A. Around August 31st, 2015. |
| 19 | Q. What was the sales price? |
| 20 | A. The gross sales price was 670,760. |
| 21 | Q. And how much did Green Valley Commerce receive at |
| 22 | the closing of that sale? |
| 23 | A. $\$ 584,019$. |
| 24 | Q. How did you -- well, did you have any |
| 25 | conversations with Ben at this time regarding the |

1 distribution of those proceeds?
A. We sent him the distribution breakdown for approval.
Q. So turning to Exhibit 26, is that what you sent to him?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you heard Mr. Wilcox go through all these numbers as well, yesterday. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he accurately explain how you arrived at the numbers on this -- that are depicted on this Exhibit 26 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Was this calculation prepared in accordance with your agreement with Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. And you sent this to Ben prior to cutting the checks?
A. Yes. The office did.
Q. And did Ben approve those numbers?
A. Yes. And then we cut the checks.
Q. And did you send a copy of this to Ben when you sent him his checks?
A. Yes.
Q. And prior to the time in 2016 that you previously testified to, did Ben ever comment on or object to

1 anything -- any of the breakdown of the distributions?
A. No.
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 56? What is this document?
A. That's the grant bargain sale deed for Building B.
Q. And does this document convey to the new owner the same rights to use the parking lots, common areas, and easements as the prior deeds?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could turn to the legal description on Bates No. 1483, are the CC\&Rs referenced there as well?
A. Yes.

MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, I'd move for the admission of Exhibit 56.

MR. LEWIN: No objection.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. 56 will be admitted.
(Exhibit 56 was admitted into evidence.)
MR. LEWIN: You know, 56 -- my books are a little bit different. I have 56 as the LeGrand transcript. MR. SHAPIRO: Oh, yeah. ARBITRATOR WALL: I have that as 55. MR. LEWIN: 55 I had some other document. CFR -ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm using the list that was

```
    1 submitted with Mr. Bidsal's final Rule 20B hearing
    2 disclosures.
```

submitted with Mr. Bidsal's final Rule 20B hearing disclosures.

MR. LEWIN: Then maybe I have it here. I'll figure it out.

THE ARBITRATOR: Okay.
MR. SHAPIRO: Rod, just to be clear, though, 56 was the deed to Building B. 57 was the deed to Building C. 58 was the deed to Building E.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Alphabetical order but --
MR. SHAPIRO: Not chronological.
ARBITRATOR WALL: -- not chronological?
MR. SHAPIRO: Correct.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Can you please turn to Exhibit 27? And I think I really mean it when I say we should be done with that binder, so you can close that. The other one, yeah. I think we're done with that. If you move that so you can see it better, that would be fine.

Exhibit 27 are the 2015 tax returns. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you send these to Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you send Ben a copy of the $K-1 s$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, prior to the conversations that you've

1
spoken to previously that occurred in 2016 , did Ben ever inform you that there were any inaccuracies in the way that the company income or revenues were allocated or distributed?

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, let me stop you there because the testimony so far has been that returns weren't sent until the fall of the following year, which would be 2016.

MR. GERRARD: There was actually testimony with a letter showing that he got the return in March.

ARBITRATOR WALL: In March of 2016?
MR. GERRARD: He got this tax return in March of 2016. We showed you the actual letter.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So I'm just -- I mean, the question was at some point in 2016.

MR. SHAPIRO: Which would have been -- fair point. Fair point. Because certainly the taxes would not have been prepared in 2015.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Correct.
MR. SHAPIRO: Had to have been sometime in 2016. ARBITRATOR WALL: Maybe clarify that one. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Do you know when the 2015 tax returns were prepared?
A. In 2016. Early 2016.
Q. Okay. So -- if you can turn to Bates stamp 2323, that's not what I thought it was going to be.

ARBITRATOR WALL: There's a date on the top of 2323.

MR. SHAPIRO: That's -- somewhere it's wrong. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. I'm trying to find your $\mathrm{K}-1$, Shawn. It's not in here.

ARBITRATOR WALL: It's 2313.
MR. SHAPIRO: That's what I want. 2313. Thank
you.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. If you can turn to Bates stamp 2313.

MR. LEWIN: You're referring to Exhibit...
MR. SHAPIRO: Exhibit 27.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Are you at 2323?
A. I am. But it's a $K-1$ schedule, actually.
Q. And is that your $\mathrm{K}-1$ ?
A. It's not the $K-1$. It's basically statements.
Q. I'm sorry. What page are you on?

ARBITRATOR WALL: You want 2313.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Are you at 2323? Let me just ask you a quick question.


``` MR. LEWIN: His understanding is irrelevant. ARBITRATOR WALL: Why?
MR. LEWIN: Well, because he can't testify when
it was submitted to the IRS.
ARBITRATOR WALL: He can testify to his
understanding of when it was submitted.
MR. LEWIN: Is that probative?
ARBITRATOR WALL: I think it's relevant.
Overruled.
A. What was the question?
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Is it your understanding that this return was submitted April 6, 2016?
A. Yes. As soon as the Jim Main prepares and signs it, we file it.
Q. If you turn to 2313 --
A. Okay.
Q. -- is that your \(\mathrm{K}-1\) ?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you include and pay taxes on all of the income and distributions identified on this K-1 in your personal tax return for 2015?
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to Exhibit 28, this is the 2016 tax returns. Correct?
```

```
A. Yes.
Q. And what's the date next to the preparer's signature?
A. March 14, 2017.
Q. Do you know if these tax returns were sent to Ben?
A. Yes. Actually, from CPA's office.
MR. LEWIN: Objection, Your Honor. He has no personal knowledge if they're sent from the CPA's office.
ARBITRATOR WALL: What did you just say?
THE WITNESS: I said it was sent from the CPA's office to CLA, as well as we sent it.
ARBITRATOR WALL: As well as you sent it?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. That's what I thought he said, but \(I\) wasn't sure.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Can you turn to Bates stamp 1552?
MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry, what was that exhibit again?
MR. SHAPIRO: 28.
ARBITRATOR WALL: What number?
MR. SHAPIRO: 1552.
A. Okay.
```

```
1 BY MR. SHAPIRO:
    Q. And this is your K-1. Correct?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Did you include and pay taxes on all of the
    income and distributions identified on this K-1 in your
    personal tax return for 2016?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 30, please? I believe
    Exhibit 30 is the 2017 tax return. Correct?
        Is that correct or are you still looking?
    A. Yes. It's for 2017.
    Q. Can you turn to Bates stamp 535?
    A. Okay.
    Q. This is your K-1. Correct?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Did you include and pay taxes on all of the
        income and distributions identified on this K-1 in your
        personal tax return for 2017?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Please turn to Exhibit 32.
        ARBITRATOR WALL: Before you do that, was that
        return filed? I'm looking at Bates 514.
        BY MR. SHAPIRO:
    Q. Do you know if this tax return -- well, did Green
        Valley Commerce file a tax return for 2017?
```

|  | A. Yes. It was actually E-filed, so when you do 666 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | electronic E-file, the Jim Main doesn't sign. We file |
| 3 | it. |
| 4 | Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 32. Is this the 2018 tax |
| 5 | return for Green Valley Commerce? |
| 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | Q. And if you turn to the last page of Exhibit 32, |
| 8 | is that your $\mathrm{K}-1$ ? |
| 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | Q. Did you include and pay taxes on all of the |
| 11 | income and distributions identified in this $\mathrm{K}-1$ on your |
| 12 | personal tax return for 2018? |
| 13 | A. Yes. |
| 14 | Q. If you turn to Exhibit 34, now, this appears to |
| 15 | be a draft 2019 return. Correct? This isn't the one |
| 16 | that was actually filed? |
| 17 | A. That is correct. |
| 18 | Q. Do you know if there are any material changes to |
| 19 | the 2019 tax return that was actually filed with the |
| 20 | IRS? |
| 21 | MR. LEWIN: Objection. There's no foundation. |
| 22 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Let's lay a little bit of |
| 23 | foundation. |
| 24 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 25 | Q. Are you familiar with the 2019 tax return that |

1 was filed by Green Valley Commerce?
A. Somewhat, yes.
Q. Okay. Well, let's just get to the heart of the matter. Can you turn to -- actually, turn to Exhibit 35. This is a -- says draft. It was a draft K-1 that was sent to CLA Properties, and I'm going to direct your attention to Bates stamp 889, which is CLA Properties' K-1.
A. Okay.
Q. Did you receive a K-1 from Green Valley Commerce for the tax year 2019?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And for whatever reason we don't have a copy of that here, but would your numbers have been similar to the numbers on CLA's $\mathrm{K}-1$ ?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Best evidence and also the date was similar.
A. I need to look at --

ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on. Hold on. There's an objection pending so $I$ got to weigh in on it.

Where's the '19?
MR. SHAPIRO: It's not included. We can go get that if we need to. I think I can get to it a different way, though, Your Honor.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. All right. Let's do

| 1 | that. $\quad$ Page 668 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 3 | Q. In 2019, do you know if there were any special |
| 4 | allocations of interest or income or any other special |
| 5 | allocations in the tax year 2019 for Green Valley |
| 6 | Commerce? |
| 7 | A. No. |
| 8 | Q. So were all of the allocations of income, |
| 9 | interest, anything to do with taxes, were those split |
| 10 | 50/50 in 2019? |
| 11 | A. Yes. |
| 12 | Q. And did you include and pay taxes on all of the |
| 13 | income and distributions that were allocated to you in |
| 14 | your personal tax returns for the tax year 2019? |
| 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | Q. Is it safe to say that since Green Valley |
| 17 | Commerce was formed, through the current year, you have |
| 18 | included and paid taxes on all income and distributions |
| 19 | associated with your membership interest in Green Valley |
| 20 | Commerce on your personal tax returns? |
| 21 | A. Yes. |
| 22 | Q. If CLA had paid you for your membership interest |
| 23 | in Green Valley Commerce back in September of 2017 such |
| 24 | that you no longer owned any interest in Green Valley |
| 25 | Commerce as of September 2017, would you still have paid |


|  | the same amount of taxes in 2017, '18, and '19? Page 669 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. I wouldn't, no. |
| 3 | Q. And how would it be different? |
| 4 | A. Whatever income shows for those years would not |
| 5 | be included in my personal taxes. |
| 6 | Q. And so your personal tax returns would have been |
| 7 | less in those years. Correct? |
| 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. Direct your attention to Exhibit 36. |
| 10 | A. Okay. |
| 11 | Q. These are some E-mails -- actually, I want to go |
| 12 | to -- |
| 13 | ARBITRATOR WALL: While you're doing that, while |
| 14 | you're looking for it, it's hard enough for her when you |
| 15 | guys are talking amongst yourselves. And I get it, you |
| 16 | want to communicate. You just got to be -- it's got to |
| 17 | be a whisper because when you guys are talking, it's |
| 18 | hard for me to hear him. It's difficult enough I think |
| 19 | just with masks and soft voices and accents a little bit |
| 20 | for her to get it, for me to get it. If you want us to |
| 21 | get it, it's got to be kind of a lower volume. |
| 22 | MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry. I was trying to whisper. |
| 23 | ARBITRATOR WALL: I know. I know, but |
| 24 | All right. Mr. Shapiro. |
| 25 | MR. GERRARD: What exhibit are you on, Jim? |


| 1 | MR. SHAPIRO: Well, I was going to go to 36 Page but |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | I don't know that I want to. |
| 3 | MR. GERRARD: Okay. |
| 4 | BY MR. SHAPIRO: |
| 5 | Q. You heard Ben's testimony given two days ago that |
| 6 | he first started complaining to you about the |
| 7 | distribution and the manner in which the distributions |
| 8 | were made sometime in late 2015. Do you recall that |
| 9 | testimony? |
| 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | Q. To your recollection -- to your knowledge, is |
| 12 | that when he started complaining? |
| 13 | A. No. |
| 14 | Q. When did he first raise the issue of how the |
| 15 | money was being distributed between the members? |
| 16 | A. 2016 . |
| 17 | Q. And in what manner? What was the first time you |
| 18 | learned that he had any concerns at all regarding that |
| 19 | issue? |
| 20 | A. He sent an Email in I think it was sometime in |
| 21 | 2016. |
| 22 | Q. Going back to your original conversation with |
| 23 | Ben, around the time that Building $C$ was sold back in |
| 24 | 2012 -- is that when that was sold? |
| 25 | A. Yes. |

1
Q. Okay. Did you specifically talk about Exhibit Bage to the operating agreement and the waterfall provisions at that time?
A. We did talk about how to distribute Building C's money, and yes, we did speak about it.
Q. And did either of you ever feel that that waterfall provision had been triggered?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Calls for speculation. ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, based on your conversations.
A. It was not, no. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Did you ever make distributions from the sale of any of the buildings without first talking to Ben about how those distributions would be split?
A. No.
Q. Did there come a point in time when your relationship with Ben became strained or started to deteriorate?
A. Yes.
Q. When did that happen?
A. I had issues with not getting reimbursements for the expenses that I spent for Green Valley Commerce, and we had conversations in 2016 and early 2017 where Ben came to my office and $I$ was raising my complaints about

1 not for 2 labor services, and that's where I guess the 3 relationship started deteriorating.
Q. Okay. And at some point did you make a decision to make an offer to buy Ben's interest?
A. Yes.
Q. Direct your attention to Exhibit 37. Is this the offer that you made to Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. What terms did you include -- well, first of all, was this an offer for you to sell your interest to Ben or for you to buy Ben's interest?
A. It was to buy Ben's interest.
Q. And what terms did you include in your initial offer?

MR. LEWIN: Objection that the document speaks for itself.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, he can testify about what he did and why, so I'm going to overrule that objection.
A. I offered to buy CLA's membership interest of 50 percent based on estimated fair market value of the company at 5 million.

BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Using only the terms identified in your initial offer, could you determine a purchase price that you

1 would ultimately pay for CLA's membership interest?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Because it's not specified. It needs to go through a calculation.
Q. When you made this offer, did you anticipate that you would be buying Ben's interest in the company, including any cash in the bank at the time?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Unexpressed anticipation is not relevant.

MR. SHAPIRO: It absolutely is relevant, Your Honor. They're making arguments about whether or not cash in the bank is included in the offer. And Shawn's the one that made the first offer, and his offer was to purchase Ben's interest. It goes to the heart of their argument.

MR. LEWIN: Well, the issue is whether it's evidentially admissible. I don't think the unexpressed intention of a party to a contract is admissible.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, I don't know if it's expressed or not in the letter or whether buying interest in GVC necessarily includes everything.

MR. LEWIN: He's selling his membership interest. He's valuing it as a date certain, and, therefore, whatever those assets were that constituted the company.

```
    7 Page 674
    1 Because he just said he was estimating the company's
    2 value. That would intrinsically include all of the
    3 assets.
```

```
MR. SHAPIRO: That's their argument and that's exactly why it's relevant.
MR. LEWIN: But --
MR. SHAPIRO: Well, hold on, Rod. Let me finish.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Let him finish.
MR. SHAPIRO: So not only is it directly relevant to their argument, but it's very relevant to create the proper foundation and background of what exactly happened. Their whole argument is premised upon the fact that Shawn is selling his membership interest to CLA Properties. But the reality is, the first offer was the opposite. The first offer was for Ben to purchase CLA Properties' membership interest in the company. And so --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait. The first offer was for Ben to purchase --
MR. SHAPIRO: Shawn to purchase. Thank you. Sorry. I misspoke.
It was for Shawn to purchase CLA's membership interest in the company. And what -- how he came to that amount, we're not arguing the amount. The amount's been set. We get that. But how he came to that amount
```

1
and what his intent and understanding about what would happen is directly relevant to what they're trying to flip around and force down his throat.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well --
MR. LEWIN: Isn't that the issue, Your Honor? If he doesn't tell -- if he doesn't express that intent, how would anyone know what he thinks he's including?

ARBITRATOR WALL: I think that's a fair argument, but I don't think it renders it inadmissible for that purpose. So I'll allow it.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Thank you. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. The question is: When you made this offer, did you anticipate that prior to buying Ben's interest you would make a cash distribution of all of the cash in the bank so that Ben would receive the benefit of all of the income up to the date he purchased his interest or were you offering to buy it without any further distributions?
A. We were making periodic distributions of profits, but the way I -- my intent was the way I came to the fair market value was just the properties that was owned at that time in 2017, July 2017. So basically the real estate.
Q. Okay. So you weren't considering that as part of

```
1 the offer you were making, that Ben would relinquishe 676
2 rights to distributions?
```

```
the offer you were making, that Ben would relinquish any rights to distributions?
A. No.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Up to a certain date?
MR. SHAPIRO: Yeah, up to the time of the transfer of membership interest.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
Is that right?
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Is that right that -ARBITRATOR WALL: It doesn't matter if you and I -BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. At what point in time --
THE WITNESS: You're asking at least two different questions, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: The question that you were asked was whether it was contemplated that Mr. Golshani would receive -- CLA would receive -- would continue to receive distributions, and my question was: You mean up to a certain point? Mr. Shapiro responded up to the point of sale.
MR. SHAPIRO: I'm not the witness.
ARBITRATOR WALL: He's not sworn in. You are.
THE WITNESS: I got your point.
```

```
A. Up to the point that the transaction has been consummated. It's finished.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. That's it. All right. MR. LEWIN: Thank you. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Now, how did CLA Properties respond to your offer?
A. CLA made a counteroffer.
Q. And if you can turn to Exhibit A, what were the terms of CLA's counteroffer?
ARBITRATOR WALL: You said A38?
MR. SHAPIRO: Sorry. 38.
A. Basically, Ben turned down my offer and said that the same number I came up with he's going to buy me out as a counteroffer for the membership interest.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. And did you ever object to Ben buying your membership interest out?
A. No. Why would I mind? If he wants to buy it, he could buy it.
Q. Okay. What was your objection?
A. That we need to get an appraisal.
Q. And if you turn to Exhibit 39, is this your response?
A. Yes.
```

Q. And in here you identify, actually, four different appraisers. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you identify four appraisers?
A. Because I responded to CLA that they need to have an appraisal to determine his new offer price, and based on the Section 4 of the operating agreement, parties need to identify appraisers.
Q. Is there anything in this response where you tell Ben that you're not going to selling your membership interest to him?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever tell Ben that you're not going to sell your membership interest to him?
A. No.
Q. Going back to Exhibit 38, does Ben identify a purchase price anywhere in his counteroffer to you?
A. For the membership interest?
Q. Correct.
A. No.
Q. Now, in here Ben indicates -- I'm looking right about the middle of the paragraph where he identifies your 5 million valuation of the company. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

1
Q. And then it says: "The purchase will be all cash with escrow to close within 30 days of the date hereof. We will contact you regarding setting up escrow. I trust that there have not been any distributions of cash on hand that I have not approved of either before or after July 7, 2017."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What was your understanding of that sentence?
A. We were making distributions before and after, so --
Q. Did he agree with those?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Compound.
ARBITRATOR WALL: In the letter?
MR. SHAPIRO: No, not in the letter. Just he said we were making them, so I asked about the ones being made.
A. Yeah. We were making distributions before and even after, so -BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Was an escrow ever opened?
A. -- whatever distributions were made before he cashed it and even after 2017, he also cashed the checks.

But I'm sorry. What was the question?

1
Q. The question was: Was an escrow ever opened?
A. No.
Q. Did Ben ever identify a purchase price -- well, let me -- let me narrow it to time. At any point in 2017, calendar year of 2017, did Ben ever identify an amount that he was willing to pay you for your membership interest?

MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, this line of questioning in terms of this is not relevant for the reasons that we talked about before. It's assumed in the arbitration and the judgment. If it goes to a -- if the purpose of this is to go to a tender issue, it's just not relevant. They've identified some new tender issue.

ARBITRATOR WALL: And that was the subject of the motion in limine, and $I$ sort of stated my feelings on it but said it was more of a dispositive motion than a motion in limine, so I denied it. I understand what's happening, but $I$ also stated my -- what's a good word? My --

MR. SHAPIRO: Initial thoughts?
MR. LEWIN: That's two words, but that's fine. ARBITRATOR WALL: -- current state of mind as it relates to that issue. So $I$ see it as a continuing objection to this line of questioning. So all right.

MR. LEWIN: That's fine.

MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you.
BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. At any point in 2017, calendar year 2017, did Ben ever offer or identify the amount that he was willing to pay you for your membership interest?
A. No, he didn't.
Q. At any point in 2017 did Ben ever offer to pay you any specific sum of money?
A. No.
Q. And let me be clear: Did he offer to pay you any specific sum of money for your membership interest in Green Valley Commerce?
A. No, he did not.
Q. And again, to be clear: At any point on or after July of 2017, did you tell Ben you were not going to sell your membership interest in Green Valley Commerce?
A. No. I just demanded an appraisal.
Q. If Ben had delivered cash, a check, a wire transfer in any form -- if Ben had delivered money to you for the purpose of purchasing your membership interest in Green Valley Commerce, what would you have done?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Calls for speculation. I'll withdraw.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Thanks.

```
A. Probably would put it in a accommodative escrow account and consider the -- well, if the amount was right -- I would calculate, and if it was correct, then I would accept it. If not, it would be a partial payment. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. You never told Ben that you would not sell your membership interest. Correct?
MR. LEWIN: Again, how many times are we going to ask the same question?
ARBITRATOR WALL: That's asked and answered. Sustained. BY MR. SHAPIRO:
Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 40? What is this document?
A. It's a letter from Rod to you showing -- stating that the CLA has the funds.
Q. Is there any amount identified anywhere in Exhibit 40 that -- is there anything in Exhibit 40 that identifies the amount Ben is willing to pay you for your membership interest?
A. No.
Q. Is there anything in Exhibit 40 that identifies an escrow account that was opened or to be opened?
A. No.
```

Q. Is there anything in Exhibit 40 that identifies that these funds have been placed into an escrow account for the purpose of purchasing your membership interest?
A. No.
Q. Have you always been willing to sell your interest at a fair price?
A. Yes.
Q. According to your understanding of what was in dispute in the first arbitration, was the issue of how much the purchase price should be part of the initial arbitration process?
A. No.

MR. SHAPIRO: I'll pass the witness.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Do you want to take a break now?

MR. LEWIN: I would, yeah.
ARBITRATOR WALL: We'll take ten minutes. I have 10 o'clock on the button so we'll return in 10 minutes.
(RECESS TAKEN FROM 10:00 TO 10:18) ***

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Mr. Bidsal, you realize you're still under oath?

THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Mr. Lewin?

| 1 | MR. LEWIN: Thank you, Your Honor. We have -- I |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | think we have an extra copy of Mr. Bidsal's deposition |
| 3 | for you. |
| 4 | MR. SHAPIRO: Going straight into his depo? |
| 5 | MR. LEWIN: Well, I just want it so we don't have |
| 6 | to stop in the middle. |
| 7 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Thank you. No objection to |
| 8 | this being published. Is that right? |
| 9 | MR. GERRARD: No objection. |
| 10 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. |
| 11 | (Unknown exhibit number was admitted into |
| 12 | evidence.) |
| 13 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 14 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 15 | Q. Good morning, Mr. Bidsal. |
| 16 | A. Morning. |
| 17 | Q. Do you recall that I took your deposition in this |
| 18 | case? |
| 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | Q. And you were sworn to tell the truth. Do you |
| 21 | remember that? |
| 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | Q. Did you tell the truth? |
| 24 | A. Yes. |
| 25 | Q. And you also testified in the arbitration that |

```
1 took place before Judge Haberfeld?
```

```
A. Yes.
Q. And you swore to tell the truth --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute.
MR. SHAPIRO: This is Wilcox. Maybe I don't have Shawn.
(Discussion off the record.)
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Bidsal, you testified that Ben approached you to work on deals to buy properties together. Is that correct?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Lewin, if you're facing that way, you're going to need to keep your voice up. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. You testified that Ben approached you to buy properties together. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, at the time -- I think you also said that you had identified the Green Valley properties?
A. Yes.
Q. And that you were -- had already qualified to bid. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When you say you qualified to bid, what do you
```

```
1 mean?
A. I provided proof of funds to be able to qualify to bid. Of course, in addition to the business bid under LSC, I also had to provide the operating agreement and the article to show the auction.com that \(I\) have the right -- I'm the right party to authorize under the LSC to bid.
Q. Isn't it true that you asked Ben to be able to use his credit card to put up the initial money to be able to bid for the Green Valley properties? That's a yes or no.
A. No.
Q. Did you use your own credit card?
A. On the purchase of the note I had my credit card on file with auction.com.
```

Q. And who put up the deposit for the winning bid, for the 10 percent deposit?
A. After the purchase and sale agreement was signed, that (inaudible) was the winner, I assigned it to the Green Valley Commerce and then Ben put the deposit.
Q. And how much was that deposit?
A. 400,000 .
Q. Now, you actually -- so had Ben participated at all in buying the Green Valley note?
A. He -- I don't think he looked at any of the loan

|  | documents, but he -- we drove together to Las Vegas to 687 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | view the property. |
| 3 | Q. As a matter of fact, you and Ben drove together |
| 4 | from Los Angeles and spent at least a whole day driving |
| 5 | around Las Vegas looking at properties. Right? |
| 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | Q. And one of those properties was the Green Valley |
| 8 | properties. Right? |
| 9 | A. Green Valley Commerce. |
| 10 | Q. Green Valley Center? |
| 11 | A. Yes. |
| 12 | Q. And was Jeff Chain with you at the time? |
| 13 | A. No. |
| 14 | Q. And didn't you tell Jeff Chain that Ben was |
| 15 | putting up the credit -- using -- strike that. |
| 16 | Didn't you tell Jeff Chain that Ben put his |
| 17 | credit card up to be able to bid on the Green Valley |
| 18 | note? |
| 19 | A. I don't remember that. |
| 20 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on. |
| 21 | MR. GERRARD: Thank you. |
| 22 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Thank you. |
| 23 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 24 | Q. So you and Mr. Golshani went and visited the |
| 25 | Green Valley Center before you put a bid on it. Right? |

A. Yes.
Q. And it was a promissory note that you were bidding on?
A. Yes.
Q. And he testified that those were risky purchases. Right?
A. Well, it's not a risky purchase. It has risk elements in them.
Q. What are those risk elements?
A. Um, the borrower can file bankruptcy and delay the proceedings or it can basically -- I think that's one element of it, but it could pay off if -- the loan or sell the property, the underlying collateral.
Q. There are multiple defenses they might raise.

## Right?

A. They could raise defenses, but this loan was a little bit different. It was a CMBS loan. It was securitized. So it's very different than a balance sheet loan that a regular bank use. So there's much stronger language. Bigger language is built into it.
Q. But in converting the note to fee simple, it could either be adversarial or friendly. Right?
A. I suppose so, yes.
Q. And the plan was to buy the note and then try to convert it into fee simple. Right?

| 1 | A. Yes. Page 689 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. And the note was in default at the time you were |
| 3 | bidding on it? |
| 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | Q. And how much was it in default for? |
| 6 | A. In what sense? |
| 7 | Q. How much was overdue? |
| 8 | A. Time-wise, I think -- I have to just guess, but I |
| 9 | think it was from 2010. |
| 10 | Q. And the payments on that note were roughly |
| 11 | \$49,000 a month? |
| 12 | A. Something like that. |
| 13 | Q. So if you -- if you win, there are two |
| 14 | procedures. You've got a short time period to sign the |
| 15 | purchase and sale contract? |
| 16 | A. The sale -- purchase and sale was pretty much |
| 17 | right away, which I did. And same day that the bid is |
| 18 | won, you need to sign the PSA. |
| 19 | Q. And in the event that you decided to pull out of |
| 20 | the deal or the buyer caused too many problems -- |
| 21 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, he's the buyer. |
| 22 | MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry. |
| 23 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 24 | Q. In the event the borrower causes too many |
| 25 | problems and you decide not to go forward, is the down |

payment, the 10 percent down payment nonrefundable?
A. Are you referring to the auction.com transaction or the --
Q. Yeah. The auction.com transaction. You then put up $\$ 404,000$. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Does it refresh your recollection that you wrote Ben an Email sometime in 2011 -- did I get that straight? Excuse me.

Ben wrote you an Email asking if you could reduce the balance on his credit card because he wanted to use it. He was going to travel. Do you remember that?
A. That was in 2011. That was 2010 , '12 or '13.
Q. So you were using Ben's credit card to bid on auction.com properties. Right?
A. At what point in time?
Q. From June 2011 to whenever Ben wrote you the

## Email?

A. So you're referring after the purchase of Green Valley Commerce?
Q. After the purchase of Green Valley Commerce, isn't it true that Ben asked you to release his credit card because he wanted to take a trip?

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Relevance.
MR. LEWIN: This has to do with what credit card

```
1 was used to put up the initial }5\mathrm{ percent.
```

```
ARBITRATOR WALL: Except the question goes to after it was --
MR. LEWIN: Right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: He's already said which credit card was used.
MR. LEWIN: I know what he said. I'm trying to refresh his recollection that what he said might be incorrect.
ARBITRATOR WALL: You just said the relevance is which credit card was used for the purchase. He's confirmed that. Are you impeaching him on that?
MR. LEWIN: That's right. There's a two-step process, I think he testified. You have to put a credit card. Let me ask him the question. I'll withdraw the question and see if \(I\) can lay a better foundation. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Okay. In order to bid on the Green Valley note, you had to put up an initial deposit. Right?
A. No. You had to -- you have to show that -- the proof of fund that you have 4 million dollars, which I did of my own money, and you also -- procedurally you have to have a credit card on file like \(\$ 10,000\).
Q. Isn't that a deposit that you have to put up some money in order to bid. Right?
```

| 1 |
| :--- |$\quad$ A. No. You provide corporate document -- Page 692

```
1 I've weighed in. Okay?
```

``` I've weighed in. Okay?
But I'm overruling the objection, so the answer will stand.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. So after you win the bid, you had to put up a 10 percent deposit. So it was \(\$ 404,250\). Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Ben wired that money and that money was put up. Right?
A. After \(I\) won the purchase agreement and transferred the assignment, then yeah.
Q. Well, let's talk about it. Who was present when you were bidding on the note?
A. Ben was present and myself.
Q. You were both jointly deciding how much to bid. Right?
A. Pretty much I knew the process and I knew how much the valuations were, so \(I\) was driving -- I was driving the bidding process.
Q. Can you answer my question? You and Ben were both making joint decisions on what to bid. Isn't that true?
A. I was making the decisions.
Q. You were making the decisions.
And Jeff Chain was present during the bidding.
```

1 Right?
A. I think he was.
Q. And who else was present?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Didn't you ask Ben to put up the $\$ 404,250$ because you told him you were short on cash?
A. No.
Q. The deposit is at risk if you don't close.

Right?
A. The deposit would be at risk, yes.
Q. That means if you don't close for any reason, such as the borrower is going to be too much of a hassle or the borrower may file bankruptcy, whatever reason, that cash is gone. Right?
A. That is not correct, no. That's not true.
Q. In what respect isn't it true?
A. Because the person who buys the note should have done his due diligence prior to bidding, and the purchase and sale agreement are nonnegotiable and final. So once you bid, you are already okay with it. So if the borrower file bankruptcy in the middle or something, there's no recourse. You decided. You're buying it.
Q. If you decided not to put up the remainder of the money, in this case almost 4 million dollars, then you lose the deposit?
A. You would lose the deposit.
Q. And the only person who put up the deposit was Ben. Right?
A. The initial deposit, yes.
Q. The $\$ 404,250$ ?
A. After the assignment of the GVC, yes.
Q. Excuse me. He put up the $\$ 404,000$ as required for the assignment, didn't he?
A. One more question -- one more time.
Q. He put up the assignment -- put up the $\$ 404,000$ before the assignment. Isn't that correct?
A. I don't know the timeline within those few days, but I need to look at it.
Q. And Ben gave you his credit card to put up the deposit for auctions. Didn't he?
A. At a later date, yeah.
Q. So you're saying it wasn't with respect to this auction?
A. Yeah, because the credit card --
Q. Just answer my question, please. You're saying that it wasn't with respect to this auction?
A. I had my credit card on file.
Q. And before Ben put up the $\$ 404,250$ and before you were bidding, did you talk about how you were going to form an LLC to purchase the note?
A. I was buying it on my own, and Ben came --
Q. Excuse me. If you would please answer my question.

ARBITRATOR WALL: If it's a yes/no question, then you can't add an explanation. You could say, "I can't answer it yes or no," but if it's a yes-or-no question, he has that right.

THE WITNESS: I can't answer yes or no.
MR. GERRARD: Judge, I think part of the problem is you can't sometimes tell from Mr. Lewen's question if he's asking it for a yes-or-no answer because he doesn't say, "Could you please answer yes or no." He asks the question, and then after the answer starts, then he says, "Oh, that's answer yes or no."

ARBITRATOR WALL: I think we can tell.
MR. GERRARD: Okay.
(Discussion off the record.)
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Please take a look at Exhibit 87. It's in Book

1. Do you see the date on this document, May 20th?
A. Yes.
Q. You received this?
A. I don't know if I received it or escrow received it, but this is in our file.

MR. LEWIN: I move to admit Exhibit 87, Your


1 May 19th.
A. Yeah, it was signed May 19th electronically by DocuSign.
Q. By the time you signed the document for the purchase of the note, Exhibit No. 1, you had already made your arrangement with Ben for him to put up the deposit. Right?
A. No, he was coming --
Q. It's a yes or no.
A. No.
Q. So you're saying between May 19 and May 20 you made your arrangements with Ben to put up a deposit. Yes or no?
A. He was interested in the -MR. GERRARD: You have to answer yes or no.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Is it true that -- are you saying that between the time you signed this document on May 19 and Ben sent the $\$ 404,250$ on May 20, that you had -- that's when you made your arrangements for Ben to put up the money?
A. Yes.
Q. So you had no discussions before that?
A. We had discussions.
Q. As a matter of fact, you had discussed before you bid on the note that you wanted Ben to put up the money.

```
1 Right? Yes or no?
A. If he wanted to be a partner, yes.
Q. So when Ben was in the room -- do you remember the room you were in? Were you in a hotel or where were you?
A. I think it was in Thomas \& Mack in one of the ballrooms.
ARBITRATOR WALL: In one of the what? THE WITNESS: They have a stadium ballroom. ARBITRATOR WALL: At. MR. SHAPIRO: B-A-R room? ARBITRATOR WALL: At the Thomas and Mack? THE WITNESS: I think it was one of the convention center or sports center of some sort that they had a large room that they were conducting the auction, but the auction was online.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. So before you were actually bidding on the project, you and Ben had talked about becoming partners through an LLC and buying the note. Right?
A. If he wanted to, I would have accepted.
Q. Had you made an agreement with him before then and told him that he would have to put up the money?
A. He could have changed his mind.
Q. Had you made an agreement with him and told him
```

```
    1 he had to put up the money before you went to the
    2 bidding? Yes or no?
```

```
A. We had conversations but no agreement.
Q. No agreement?
A. No.
Q. And how long after the bidding did you sign the purchase and sale contract?
A. I'm sorry? One more time.
Q. How long after you won the bid did you sign the purchase and sale contract?
A. Same hour, same day.
Q. So in between May 19 and May 20, that's when you formalized that Ben was going to put up the money. Yes or no?
A. If he wanted to be a partner, yes.
Q. And -- but had you talked about -- you talked about forming an LLC. Right?
A. If we would get into a joint project --
Q. You --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Give him some time reference. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Before you bid on the note with Ben present in the ballroom, wherever you were, did you talk with Ben about how the -- what entity you would buy the note in if you won the bid?
```

A. We would form an LLC.
Q. Did you talk about who would be the manager?
A. I would be the manager.
Q. You and Ben talked about just you being the manager? Is that what you're saying?
A. I would be the managing member to run it, yes.
Q. Did Ben agree that you would be the managing member?
A. At that time he was okay with it.
Q. Did he say that it was okay for you to be the sole managing member?
A. I don't think that conversation ever took place.
Q. Isn't it true that Ben told you -- strike that. Had you talked about how much of the -- how much of the purchase price that you and he would pay? MR. SHAPIRO: At what point in time?

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Before you bid?
A. How much of the -- no. I understand the question. No.
Q. So you're talking about being partners. Was the conversation that you would each put up an equal amount of money? And I'm talking about before you bid.
A. I don't recall that detail.
Q. You don't recall how much money you said that you
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1 would put up and how much money you would expect him to put up?
A. I was buying it under my own --
Q. Can you just answer my question, sir? Is it your testimony that you do not recall how much money -- the discussion between you and Ben about how much money you would each put up if you won the bid?
A. Prior to bidding?
Q. Prior to bidding.
A. I don't recall having that detailed of a discussion.
Q. Okay. Now let's talk about after you won the bid and between the time you signed the purchase contract and Ben put up $\$ 404,250$. Did you then have a conversation how much each of you were going to put up?
A. It's not having a conversation that if I'm -- if he wants me to assign it and he become a partner, then he needs to put more money and --
Q. Isn't it true that you told Ben that you didn't have enough money to pay for 50 percent of the -available cash to pay 50 percent of the note and you wanted him to put up more?
A. No.
Q. Did you originally tell him that you wanted him to put up 60 percent of the money and you would put up

140 percent because you felt that you were going to be 2 doing more work than him?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever have any discussions about him putting up 60 percent and you putting up 40 percent?
A. After we were in escrow or after we bought the property -- I mean, the note?
Q. Okay. Let's break down the time period.

Before Ben put up the $\$ 404,250$, did you have that
discussion?
MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Which discussion?
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. The discussion about you putting up 40 percent and him putting up 60 percent?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever have that discussion?
A. We had negotiations after we bought the note. I mean, we were putting the money in escrow to buy it.
Q. Isn't it true that before Ben put up the deposit, the 404,000 -- I'm going to round it out to 404,000. Isn't it true that before he put up that money, you had told him that you would put up 40 percent of the purchase price?
A. At what point in time?
Q. Before he put up the 404,000 .

| 1 | A. No. Page 704 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. Before escrow closed did you tell him that you |
| 3 | would put up 40 percent of the money? |
| 4 | A. We were negotiating at that time how much -- if |
| 5 | he wants to be a partner, what amounts of money we each |
| 6 | will put. |
| 7 | Q. But you didn't have those negotiations finalized |
| 8 | before you put up the 404,000. Is that your testimony? |
| 9 | A. I don't recall having that discussion. |
| 10 | Q. All right. But you did talk about forming an |
| 11 | LLC, and didn't Ben tell you before he put up the |
| 12 | 404,000 he'd want to be a co-manager? |
| 13 | A. I don't remember that discussion, no. |
| 14 | Q. Do you deny it took place or you just don't |
| 15 | remember one way or another? |
| 16 | A. I don't think there was a discussion about -- |
| 17 | Q. It's a yes or no, sir. |
| 18 | A. No. |
| 19 | Q. Do you deny it or you just don't remember? |
| 20 | MR. SHAPIRO: Wait a second. He said, Do you |
| 21 | deny or you just don't know and then he says it's a yes |
| 22 | or no. |
| 23 | MR. LEWIN: My apologies. You're right. |
| 24 | ARBITRATOR WALL: He can answer that question. |
| 25 | / / / |

1 BY MR. LEWIN:

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Do you deny the conversation took place before you put up the money or you just don't remember one way or another?
A. I don't think we had such a conversation, no.
Q. All right. But when was the first time that Ben told you that he wanted to be a manager?
A. It was sometime after we purchased the note.
Q. Was it -- but it was after -- you say it was after he put up the $\$ 404,250$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. So the only person who had any money at risk while you were negotiating the deal was Ben. Right?
A. I wouldn't characterize it --
Q. It's a yes or no, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And the escrow closed about a month later. Is that correct?
A. No. It closed about -- 10-day escrow.
Q. Okay. So you said that you were negotiating how much money each of you were putting up. Is it true that Ben wanted you to put up 50 percent of the money?
A. You're referring to from the time we were --
Q. Before you closed escrow.
A. Before we had negotiations, yeah.

1
Q. And you said you didn't think that was right because you were going to be managing the property. Is that correct?
A. That, plus I already bought it under my own name.
Q. You bought it under your own name with his money?
A. No. I could have closed escrow on my own.
Q. Have you ever produced any documents that show that you could be able to put up your own money?
A. The PSA is in my name, and auction.com wouldn't even allow me to bid if $I$ wouldn't have shown the complete proof of funds prior to even bidding.
Q. Didn't Ben provide the proof of funds?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever ask Ben to provide proof of funds?
A. I was already shown the proof of fund to auction.com and $I$ was qualified to bid.
Q. Did you ever ask Ben to provide the proof of funds?
A. No. I just answered. I said I wasn't --
Q. It's a yes or no. The question is: Did you ask?
A. No.
Q. Isn't it true that you asked him in front of Jeff Chain to put up the proof of funds?

ARBITRATOR WALL: You're talking about the proof of funds for auction.com before he bid on the note?

```
1 Before Real Equities bid on the note?
    MR. LEWIN: That's right.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
    A. I don't recall.
    BY MR. LEWIN:
    Q. All right. In any case, would you take a look at
    Exhibit No. 2? This is the assignment that you talked
    about. I'm sorry. Let's go to Exhibit No. 4. These
    are the articles of organization for Green Valley
    Commerce, LLC which you signed on May 25 -- pardon me.
    You filed on it May 26, 2011. Right?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And you signed this on May 25, 2011?
    A. Doesn't have a date of signature but it was filed
on May 26th.
Q. Okay. And I see you named yourself as the sole manager. Right?
A. Sole member.
Q. Sole manager.
A. I see a sole member. Can you point me to where you see that?
ARBITRATOR WALL: No. 5 lists name and address of each manager or managing member.
THE WITNESS: Yes. No. 4 shows as a managing member.
```

```
1 BY MR. LEWIN:
```

```
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you tell Ben when you filed these articles of organization that you were naming yourself as the sole manager?
MR. GERRARD: I'm sorry.
A. I'm sorry. What was the question?
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you tell Ben -- so let me step back.
Ben had already put up the \(\$ 404,000\) on May 20th.
This document -- this organization of Green Valley took place on May 26th. Between -- did you tell Ben that you had filed to set up Green Valley; that you named yourself as the sole manager or managing member?
A. Yes. He knew about filing the GVC --
Q. The question is: Did you tell him?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you tell him? Did you tell him verbally or in writing?
A. I don't recall the method.
Q. And then going back now to Exhibit No. 3, because you said you went over -- I'm sorry -- Exhibit No. 2. That is the -- when you -- that is when you assigned -you actually assigned the purchase contract to Green Valley on May 31st, 2011?
A. Yes.
```

| 1 | Q. Did you provide a copy of the articles of Page 709 |
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| 2 | organization or the assignment to Ben at or about the |
| 3 | time these were executed? |
| 4 | A. Probably, yes. |
| 5 | Q. When you say "probably, yes," do you remember |
| 6 | whether you did it? |
| 7 | A. I don't. It's too many years ago. I don't |
| 8 | remember. |

Q. Okay. That's fair. In any case, as of May 31st, 2011 was there any document whatsoever that identified Ben as an owner of Green Valley LLC?
A. In the LLC or in the -- within the escrow document to purchase the note?
Q. Was there any document that -- was there any document before the LLC operating agreement was signed that showed that Ben was an owner?
A. How can it be? Because you say before the operating agreement or the article?
Q. The operating agreement. I'll withdraw that. The escrow closed on June 3rd for purchase of the note?
A. Yes.
Q. Ben put up 2.8 and some change. You put up a million-2 and some change. Right?
A. Yes.

|  | Q. Was there any document that existed as of the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | date that Ben contributed the 2.8 million dollars that |
| 3 | showed that he was an owner of Green Valley? |
| 4 | ARBITRATOR WALL: When you say "he," you're |
| 5 | including CLA? |
| 6 | MR. LEWIN: Correct. That CLA was an owner. |
| 7 | MR. SHAPIRO: Again, the point of time is when? |
| 8 | ARBITRATOR WALL: As of June 3rd, 2011. |
| 9 | MR. LEWIN: Right. |
| 10 | A. I don't know. I don't know if there was a |
| 11 | document. |
| 12 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 13 | Q. Now, what were the terms of -- what did |
| 14 | you under- -- strike that. |
| 15 | What did you and Mr. Golshani agree what you |
| 16 | would be doing for Green Valley before he put up his |
| 17 | money? I'll rephrase that. |
| 18 | Before you both put up your money to close the |
| 19 | escrow, did you have an agreement with Ben about what |
| 20 | you would be doing? |
| 21 | A. For Green Valley Commerce? |
| 22 | Q. Yeah. |
| 23 | A. First, management. Managing the operation. |
| 24 | Q. As a matter of fact, you know, you've read |
| 25 | Mr. Wilcox's report. Right? |


| 1 | A. Yeah. Page 711 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. And he quoted an affidavit that you had filed in |
| 3 | this case. Right? |
| 4 | A. Okay. |
| 5 | MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Double hearsay. |
| 6 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, it's a yes-or-no |
| 7 | question. |
| 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 10 | Q. Do you remember how you described what you would |
| 11 | be doing in that affidavit? |
| 12 | MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Lacks foundation. |
| 13 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. So the foundation |
| 14 | you're looking for is when and how the affidavit was |
| 15 | generated? |
| 16 | MR. SHAPIRO: No. The foundation is he's asking |
| 17 | a question about Chris Wilcox's report where Chris |
| 18 | Wilcox references a declaration that Shawn allegedly |
| 19 | signed, and he's asking Shawn about questions about a |
| 20 | declaration that Chris Wilcox references in Chris |
| 21 | Wilcox's report. |
| 22 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So foundation is your |
| 23 | objection. |
| 24 | MR. SHAPIRO: There we go. Foundation. |
| 25 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, that's what your |

1 objection was.

MR. SHAPIRO: What's that? Well, it lacks
foundation because he hasn't identified the declaration. It's best evidence. If he's going to talk about the declaration, why are we talking about Chris Wilcox's report?

MR. LEWIN: All right. I'll rephrase it.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you ever say in any -- either orally or in writing that your deal with Ben was that you were going to be using your knowledge and expertise in finding deals, plural, on property, purchasing property and converting those into fee simple properties if needed, subdividing the properties and managing the properties, and that is why you got a disparate interest?
A. At different points in time, yes.
Q. Was that your agreement with Mr. -- that you had with Mr. Golshani before he put up the 2.8 million?
A. At that time, no. I just said at different times there were different levels of expertise. But at that time was to buy the note, try to convert it to a fee simple and manage it.
Q. Well, if you recall, you told Mr. Wilcox -- or at least your affidavit -- that the reason why you put up a

1 million-2 as opposed to 50 percent of the purchase price
2 but got a 50 percent membership interest was because you

3 were going to do those things $I$ just recited.

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. All right. We're about 45 minutes in and I'm just not seeing how any of this so far has been relevant to the decisions I have to make.

MR. LEWIN: I was going to tie that in. I'm really moving off of this right now. The issue has to do with how the -- the basis for how Mr. Golshani was expecting to get his money back.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I mean, there's -- okay. Well, that, we haven't even gotten to that.

MR. LEWIN: This is sort of how that came about.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm going to overrule the objection. We have Mr. Gerety coming at 1 , and $I$ want to make sure we get through exactly what you need and what -- more importantly what I need.

MR. LEWIN: Okay.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Would you please take a look at Exhibit 3?
A. Okay.
Q. Is this the closing statement for the purchase of the note?
A. Yes.

1
Q. Okay. And the note shows that the -- how mage was the total cost of Green Valley to purchase the note?
A. The note was $3,850,000$ plus some closing costs.
Q. Well, the total cost of Green Valley was \$4,048,959. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And this note was subsequently converted into the purchase of getting fee simple title. Right?
A. It was negotiated into a DIL form, deed in lieu, which later on --
Q. That's a yes or no, sir.
A. I'm sorry. What was the question?
Q. The note was subsequently converted by exchanging it for a fee simple title for property. Right?
A. Through a process, yes.
Q. And the cost of the -- so the cost of the purchase of the three -- of the three Sunset Winds properties, that's the Henderson properties, was \$4,048,959. Right?
A. The investment cost.
Q. Excuse me. It's a yes or no.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, almost immediately after you purchased the note, you began to negotiate with the borrowers to try to get a fee simple note?

```
A. Yes.
Q. You hired Mr. LeGrand to arrange for it. Right?
A. Actually, I started that process.
Q. But you then hired David LeGrand. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you hired David LeGrand before you even met Mr. Golshani. Right?
MR. SHAPIRO: I'm sorry. What was the question?
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. You hired Mr. LeGrand -MR. LEWIN: -- before he met Mr. Golshani. ARBITRATOR WALL: Before who met?
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Before LeGrand met Golshani.
A. Yes.
Q. So but you were in charge of negotiating the terms and conditions of the deed in lieu?
A. You might say that.
Q. And Ben was not involved with that. Is that correct?
A. Ben was informed of what we were doing and he was cc'd on the E-mails and the process, yes.
Q. He was cc'd on the E-mails?
A. Yes.
Q. But in terms of negotiating the actual deed in
```

1 lieu agreement, you heard Ben say he never received it until a couple of years ago. Do you remember that?
A. Yes. That's not correct.
Q. Do you have any document that shows that you provided Ben with a copy of the deed in lieu agreement before you signed it?
A. He was cc'd on the back-and-forth, yes. And also with a letter, opening letter to open a negotiation with the borrower.
Q. My question was: Do you have any document in your possession that you produced in this lawsuit or you can produce later -- do you have any document that shows that Ben was given the -- was provided with a copy of the deed in lieu agreement before you signed it?
A. I think there is, yes.
Q. You haven't produced it in this lawsuit. Right?
A. I don't know.
Q. Did you actually begin foreclosure proceedings on the security documents for the Green Valley property -Henderson property? I'm going to call it the Henderson property, the Nevada property -- the Henderson property before you got the deed in lieu?
A. No.
Q. All the money that was used to purchase the note was generated from you and Ben. Right?
A. Was what?
Q. All the money that was used to purchase the note was from you and Ben? There was no mortgage?
A. Correct.
Q. And is it true at the time Green Valley acquired title of the property, the cost of purchase of that property would have included the cost of the note, the payment to auction.com, and all other expenses you incurred in connection with acquiring title to the property?
A. At what point in time?
Q. At the time Green Valley acquired title to the property, the cost of purchase of that property included the cost of the note, the payment to auction.com, and all other expenses incurred in connection with acquiring title to the property?
A. Yes.
Q. So that would have been the COP for the Green Valley property.

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.
A. No.

MR. SHAPIRO: You got to let him rule.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled. And the answer was

| 1 | no. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 3 | Q. Well, but you just answered a minute ago, you 718 |
| 4 | said the cost of purchasing the property was all those |
| 5 | costs that I just identified. Isn't that the cost of |
| 6 | the COP? |
| 7 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Is that just a yes or no? |
| 8 | MR. LEWIN: Yes. |
| 9 | A. No. |
| 10 | BY MR. LEWIN: |

1 expenses incurred in connection with acquiring title and you said yes. So my question is --
A. I don't -- I can't answer it the way you're asking.
Q. Okay. Well, let me just read it. I'd like to read the deposition testimony then since there's a question about this.

At Page 155, Line 24 through 156 --
MR. SHAPIRO: So how are you using this?
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Quote, "QUESTION: Okay. So is it" --

MR. SHAPIRO: Mr. Bidsal doesn't have anything in front of him.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Where's the published one?
MR. GERRARD: He didn't bring any copies.
ARBITRATOR WALL: We don't have the original?
MR. LEWIN: No. We don't have the original.
ARBITRATOR WALL: You don't have a copy for him?
MR. LEWIN: I don't. I thought that Jim had an extra copy for him. I thought Mr. Bidsal said he had a copy. So shall we print another copy?

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. LEWIN: I apologize, Your Honor. I thought I had my certified copy.

ARBITRATOR WALL: 155 and 6?
MR. LEWIN: We are talking about Page 155, Line 24 through Line 6.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Quote, "QUESTION" --
A. I'm sorry. Which? 155?
Q. Line 24 through 156, Line 6 -- Line 5.
A. Let me, if you don't mind.

MR. SHAPIRO: So he's going to read the question and then...

THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Quote, "QUESTION: Okay. Is it -- so is it -- is it true that at the time Green Valley acquired title to the property, the cost of purchase of that property would have included the cost of the note, the payment to auction.com, and all other expenses you incurred in connection with acquiring title to the property" --

MR. SHAPIRO: I'm going to object, Your Honor. He's attempting to impeach Mr. Bidsal with a different question. The question that he asked immediately before he introduced the deposition transcript dealt specifically with COP as defined in the operating agreement. This does not deal with that and you can't use a deposition transcript to impeach a different

1 question.
Page 721

ARBITRATOR WALL: But the one he asked did that, and then we went to the transcript, and he asked this essential question. And then Mr. Bidsal --

MR. SHAPIRO: Which is different than COP. I didn't understand that.

ARBITRATOR WALL: So he's off the COP in the formula question and he's on this.

MR. GERRARD: You're saying, Judge, there was an intervening question? I think he repeated his question twice, but each time he's using it for cost of purchase.

ARBITRATOR WALL: He went to this question.
MR. SHAPIRO: That's fine. As long as the understanding is that it's not COP as defined by the operating agreement, then I'm okay.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. When you purchased the note, you obtained a package of security instruments. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you please turn to Document 84 ?

ARBITRATOR WALL: 84?
MR. LEWIN: 84.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. We're going to be looking at 174,84 , and 85.


MR. LEWIN: That's right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: And you said 4550 , which would be before this.

MR. GERRARD: 4550?
MR. LEWIN: 4550.
MR. SHAPIRO: I don't have that. It's not identified on your list and it's not part of our exhibit.

ARBITRATOR WALL: 4550.
MR. LEWIN: It's the assignment of the deed of trust. It's identified.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah.
MR. GERRARD: We printed out all the documents that you gave, which he prepared.

MR. SHAPIRO: So he E-mailed us some .pdfs. We printed the .pdfs and put them in. And what we're saying is that the .pdf that you provided to us does not have what you're referencing as part of the exhibit, so it is not in our exhibit binders.

MR. LEWIN: I think we gave -- I think we sent you the exhibits a couple separate from the last time that included this document.

MR. SHAPIRO: It didn't. In fact, my paralegal came and said, "What do I do? The documents are wrong."

And I said, "Print out whatever he sent us and

```
1 we'll deal with it."
```

```
MR. LEWIN: Well, all I can tell you is I had my books created from the same .pdf that you did. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. In any case, do you have these documents, sir? MR. GERRARD: So Jim, go over and look. MR. SHAPIRO: Can I look over his shoulder? ARBITRATOR WALL: Absolutely.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. This first part of the document is the assignment of leases and rents. Did you read this before you closed escrow as part of the due diligence?
A. Probably did long time ago.
Q. You are familiar with the concept of assignment of leases and rents. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your general understanding of what an assignment of leases and rents constitutes?
A. Basically the borrower in default is collecting the rents on behalf of the lender. It became a new lender, and then they assigned the assignment of the leases and rents to us.
Q. My point is: When the note goes into default, the borrower is then obligated under the assignment to collect the rents and hold them and turn them over in
```

1 Page 725
1 payment of the principal and interest under the note.
2 Right?

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled. He said he's familiar with that kind of document.

MR. GERRARD: I guess the problem, Judge, is are we talking about what happened in this case or are we just talking in general what can happen? Those are two different things.

ARBITRATOR WALL: The question was generally, as I understood it. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Generally that's your understanding. Right?
A. Can you repeat the question?
Q. When you read this assignment of leases and rents, did you understand that this required the borrower in default to collect the rents and then turn them over to the lender, which would be you in payment of the obligations under the note?

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Foundation. He's asking if Shawn understood what the -- how the lender would apply the rents that were turned over. I think that's inappropriate. Calls for speculation.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't think it calls for

| 1 | speculation. I'll allow it. Page 726 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | You may answer. |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I can only tell you |
| 4 | about my own understanding. |
| 5 | ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm sorry? |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: I can only explain about my own |
| 7 | understanding. |
| 8 | A. So yeah, the borrower is unable to pay the |
| 9 | interest or principal, so ceases to pay that. There's |
| 10 | still a charge because there's a management agreement |
| 11 | between the borrower and the previous lender. Under |
| 12 | that management agreement is collecting the rent and is |
| 13 | obligated to turn it over to the lender. So if you had |
| 14 | a new lender, then turn it over to us. |
| 15 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 16 | Q. But then turning over the amount of rents is in |
| 17 | payment of what, according to your understanding? |
| 18 | A. Just basically because if you haven't paid the |
| 19 | principal and interest and there's still a manager of |
| 20 | the property, they cannot take the money away and pay |
| 21 | themselves. So they have to turn over that money. |
| 22 | Q. In payment of the debt, the principal and |
| 23 | interest. Right? |
| 24 | A. I don't know that. I'm not legally that |
| 25 | sophisticated. | sophisticated.

1 owned?
A. As of June...
Q. 3rd, 2011?
A. Probably about $10,15$.
Q. Is it more like 25 or 30 ?
A. As of today. Not as of 10 years ago.
Q. Turn to the second part of this exhibit, which is Bidsal 4551 through 4556. Do you recognize this as the assignment of the deed of trust to you -- or to Green Valley?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. As part of the security package, you got an assignment with -- you got -- you received an assignment of the -- you received an assignment of the -- assignment of leases and rents. Right?
A. Yes.

MR. LEWIN: I move Exhibits 84 and 85 into evidence, Your Honor.

MR. SHAPIRO: So just so I'm clear, 84 is the
note. Right? I don't have any objection to that.
85 appears to be multiple documents. More than two, from what I can tell, and you're proposing that all of those documents be admitted as one exhibit?

MR. LEWIN: That's correct.

MR. SHAPIRO: I think that's confusing, but beyond that $I$ don't have an objection.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I can sort through that confusion. So 84 and 85 will be admitted. For what it's worth, 84 is identical to 174 so I don't see a need to do that.

MR. LEWIN: I'm not going to go to 174.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
(Exhibits 84 and 85 were admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. So at the time that you signed the deed in lieu agreement, what was -- did you have an understanding of how much was owed by the borrower to Green Valley, who is now the lender?
A. There was rent and there was also security deposit.
Q. Well, the borrower only -- before the deed in lieu agreement, the only obligation the borrower had was to pay principal and interest -- right -- under the note?
A. Yes.
Q. How much was owed then under the note as of the day before the deed in lieu agreement was signed, approximately?
A. About almost 4 million in principal and about, I

1 think, 311,000 for interest. In addition to collected rents and security deposit by the borrower.
Q. Well, the rents belonged to the borrower until Green Valley became the owner of the property. Right?
A. No.
Q. The rents were assigned to Green Valley as security for paying the principal and interest on the note. Right?
A. No. It didn't belong to the borrower.
Q. It was your understanding that the rent that the borrower was collecting under the promissory note and the security documents, that rent actually belonged to the lender. Right?
A. I can only tell you my understanding.
Q. Yes or no?
A. The answer is yes.
Q. Okay. And so the only reason that -- strike that.

And the borrower was willing to turn over whatever it had -- whatever rent it had accumulated and not paid to the lender as part of the deed in lieu process. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the borrower -- did the borrower insist that it pay that money to you as rent or did it -- strike

| 1 | that. Page 730 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Were there any communications between you and the |
| 3 | borrower where the borrower said "I've got to transfer |
| 4 | these as rent as opposed to principal and interest"? |
| 5 | A. Yes. There were conversations. |
| 6 | Q. Was David LeGrand part of those conversations? |
| 7 | A. Communications with lender. |
| 8 | Q. Communications between the borrower and you? |
| 9 | A. Yes, there were communications. |
| 10 | Q. You chose to have the borrower -- it was your |
| 11 | decision to have that money that the borrower was |
| 12 | holding characterized as rent in the deed in lieu |
| 13 | agreement. Right? |
| 14 | A. No. |
| 15 | Q. Whose decision was that? |
| 16 | A. It's not a matter of decision. They're providing |
| 17 | financials on a monthly or every few months about how |
| 18 | much rent they're collecting and how much were the |
| 19 | expenses. And there was a net income per month attached |
| 20 | to that financials, and it was adding up to be, like, |
| 21 | 295,000 plus security deposit. And that document became |
| 22 | an attachment to the deed in lieu as one of the exhibits |
| 23 | of the deed in lieu. |
| 24 | Q. My question is: You chose to characterize in the |
| 25 | deed of lieu agreement those monies as rent? |

A. No. No.
Q. Did it make a difference to you whether the money was paid as rent or paid as principal and interest?
A. It was rent, how much they're collecting rent every month. And once we did the deed in lieu agreement, they had to turn it over. It was just rent.
Q. You had to turn it over in payment of what?
A. Based on the agreement, based on the assignment of leases and rents.
Q. In payment of the borrower's obligation to the lender. Right?
A. In a form of --
Q. Yes or no?
A. -- our obligation.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I didn't hear that as a yes-or-no question, so...

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. I said in payment of the borrower's obligations to the lender. Right?

MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, this misstates what the assignment of rent says.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, it can, but that doesn't mean he can't ask the question. So he's not asking the question about what the assignment of rent said. He's asking about what happened. So --

```
MR. SHAPIRO: Well, if he's asking what happened, how is Shawn going to know how the prior lender applied payments?
MR. LEWIN: The assignment of -- the deed of trust -- the note and the assignment is in evidence. I'm asking him if he under- -- the question is --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Let's re-ask the question. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Isn't it true that the rents that were being accumulated by the borrower were being held by the borrower for payment of the borrower's obligations under the note and deed of trust and the assignment of lease? MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Yes or no?
MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. That calls for -- I mean, that question is covered by the document, and the way that he asked the question misstates what the document says.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm going to sustain the objection. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Is it true that it was your understanding -- was it your understanding that prior to that, the rent -let me rephrase that.
``` Was it your understanding that the borrower was collecting the rents and that before foreclosure or the deed in lieu that the lender owned the rents?
A. The rents belonged to the lender that the borrower had to transfer.
Q. The borrower had to transfer those because it was in payment of the note. Right?

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Is that your understanding?

MR. SHAPIRO: That is governed by the assignment of --

ARBITRATOR WALL: He's talking about before that. MR. SHAPIRO: No, at every point in time that's governed by the assignment of leases and rents.

ARBITRATOR WALL: He's talking about what occurred prior to the execution of the assignment of rents.

MR. SHAPIRO: No, because the assignment transferred in 2007.

MR. LEWIN: No, no, no. He's correct. There's an assignment of rents from 2007.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Oh, oh, oh. All right. So...
MR. LEWIN: I'll re-ask it a different way.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
```

1 BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. The only claim that the lender Green Valley had to any amounts of money that were being collected as rents was pursuant to notes and assignment of leases and rents. Right?
MR. GERRARD: At what point in time?
MR. LEWIN: Before the deed in lieu.
MR. GERRARD: Okay.
A. The new lender had the right to those rents. That's the question, if $I$ got it right.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Now, in any case the decision to -- how the monies that were being accumulated and transferred to Green Valley was controlled by you. Isn't that correct?
A. No.
Q. Okay. You were, in 2011, from the time you purchased the note, you were in charge as the managing member of Green Valley of all the business activities. Right?
A. I was the managing member, yes.
Q. And did you consider -- did you tell Ben before the operating agreement was signed that he was not a managing member?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And as a managing member, you were in

```
```

    1 charge of overseeing all of the accounting for Green Valley. Right?
    A. As a managing manager of company, yes.
Q. And you talked about American -MR. LEWIN: American Native, is it, the name of the property manager?
ARBITRATOR WALL: American Nevada.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. American Nevada, they were the property managers for awhile. Right?
A. They were the property manager before and after, yes.

```
Q. And it's your job as the manager to supervise their activities. Right? I mean, not on a day-to-day basis, but to ensure that they're doing the right job for Green Valley?

MR. GERRARD: Rod, when you ask these questions, can we just have a continuing objection, Judge, that when he says "manager," it's managing member? Because that's what the document says.

MR. LEWIN: Is there a technical difference?
MR. GERRARD: There is a difference, yes.
MR. LEWIN: When I say "manager" I mean managing member. Okay? How's that? / / /

1 BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. As the managing member you did have the obligation to oversee, in a general sense, the activities of American Nevada. Right?
A. They're the manager of the property, property management.
Q. It's a yes or no.
A. To some extent, yes.
Q. To what extent weren't you obligated to sort of super -- make sure they were doing the right job for Green Valley?
A. We just acquired the fee simple to the property, and they were in charge of managing it for almost four years prior to that, so -- from 2007 to 2011, so we needed some time to even get our heads around what we bought.
Q. But as manager, you would agree that it's your job to ensure that Green Valley's accounting records are accurate. Right?

ARBITRATOR WALL: Are you talking about before?
MR. LEWIN: After. No, no -- I'm sorry.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Before he took over from
American Nevada in the middle of 2012 or after?
MR. LEWIN: Before. At all times. At all times. My question goes to all times.
```

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, there was a separate property manager up to the time that West Coast Investments replaced American Nevada, so I think there may be a distinction.
MR. LEWIN: But I'm talking about in his role as the managing member of Green Valley.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. As the managing member at Green Valley, it's your job to review the information that's provided by American Nevada to make sure it's accurate. Right?
A. To the extent it's provided, yes.
Q. And it was your obligation as the managing member to provide accurate accounting records to the company's accountants. Right?
A. Actually --
Q. Yes or no.
A. Um, I wouldn't know.
Q. As a manager was it your job -- isn't it true that it was your job to ensure that Green Valley's accounting records are accurate during all times?
A. If I had the information, I would look at our record.
Q. When tax returns were prepared for Green Valley, it was your policy to review those tax returns before

```
```

1 they were filed with the government. Right?

```
```

A. I would look at --
Q. It's yes or no, sir.
A. I would look at them, yes.
Q. And you'd look at them for the purpose of ensuring that they're accurate. Right?
A. I would look at several things.
Q. It's a yes or no, please.
A. I would look at them.
Q. To ensure that they were accurate. Isn't that correct?
A. To the extent I would understand, yes.
Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit 96. Actually, let's take a look at 95 for a second. I apologize. These are documents that were produced by Jim Main's company. Mr. Main testified -- you heard Mr. Main testify that --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Main hasn't testified.
MR. LEWIN: In his deposition?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Right.
MR. LEWIN: Okay. I'll ask that.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. You heard Mr. Main testify in his deposition where you were present that he received all of the accounting basic data such as the general ledger from

```
```

1 you. Do you remember that?

```
```

you. Do you remember that?
MR. GERRARD: Your Honor, he can't introduce testimony that's not in evidence in the court. He can't do it that way.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Sustained.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you provide Exhibit 95 to Mr . Main?
A. I don't recall. It could have been sent directly from American Nevada.
Q. Was it your process as the managing member of Green Valley to have the property manager send documents directly to Mr. Main?
A. It can be, yes, in cases.
Q. Was that your policy?
A. I don't recall. This was the first year of taking over the note.
Q. Was it your policy? It's yes or no.
A. What was the question again?
Q. Was it your policy to have the American Nevada send documents directly to Mr. Main in 2011?
A. I don't think it constitute a policy in the sense of a repeat, but $I$ think they did that.
Q. We talked about this. How much cash did Green Valley receive from the borrower in connection with the deed in lieu agreement?

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & A. At what point -- oh, deed in lieu? 295,000, \({ }^{\text {Page }} 740\) \\
\hline 2 & think, plus the security deposit. \\
\hline 3 & Q. Did they also receive some additional money? \\
\hline 4 & Total money was -- didn't they receive an additional \\
\hline 5 & 57,000? \\
\hline 6 & A. Correct. \\
\hline 7 & Q. All of that -- was any part of that money \\
\hline 8 & characterized as a reduction in capital? \\
\hline 9 & A. It should not have, no. \\
\hline 10 & Q. I know that your claim is that the \$295,000 -- \\
\hline 11 & strike that. \\
\hline 12 & Of all the money that Green Valley received, it \\
\hline 13 & received 295,000 and another 57,000 that totalled \\
\hline 14 & 345,000 -- roughly 345,000 ? \\
\hline 15 & A. Something like that, yeah. \\
\hline 16 & Q. And the 57,000 was paid for what purpose? \\
\hline 17 & A. It was rent. \\
\hline 18 & Q. Part of that rent was accumulated for periods \\
\hline & before Green Valley obtained the note. Right? \\
\hline 20 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait. For my clarification, \\
\hline 21 & the 295 was rent and the 57 was also rent? \\
\hline 22 & MR. LEWIN: He says it's rent. He says they're \\
\hline 23 & both rent. \\
\hline 24 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. \\
\hline 25 & THE WITNESS: They are both rent, Your Honor. I \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

    1 just don't remember -- actually, there is a different
    ```
```

    exhibit from our binder that differences that 57,000 and
    can clarify for what period of time.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
THE WITNESS: But we did receive 57 and we did receive 295. I just don't know -- I know the 295 was a difference to the deed in lieu, but the 57 I don't remember was it before or after or for what months of rent collection.
ARBITRATOR WALL: But you believe that was additional rent collection?
THE WITNESS: I think there was another rent somewhere.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. But the 57,000 was for periods prior to the deed in lieu agreement. Right?
A. I don't know that.
Q. This exhibit --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait a minute. This is all surrounding money that was transferred at the time of the deed in lieu agreement?
MR. LEWIN: That's right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: So how would it be for a period after the deed in lieu agreement? It couldn't.

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & THE WITNESS: Actually -- Page 742 \\
\hline 2 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Unless they're paid in advance, \\
\hline 3 & I suppose. \\
\hline 4 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 5 & Q. A portion of the money that was transferred, the \\
\hline 6 & \$345,000, was for periods prior to June 3rd, 2011. \\
\hline 7 & Isn't that true? \\
\hline 8 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah, but you said prior - \\
\hline 9 & your other questions were prior to the deed in lieu \\
\hline 10 & agreement. \\
\hline 11 & MR. LEWIN: Now I'm going -- now I'm clarifying \\
\hline 12 & that. \\
\hline 13 & ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. \\
\hline 14 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 15 & Q. We're going to call it the 345,000. You know \\
\hline 16 & what I'm talking about. Right? \\
\hline 17 & A. Okay. \\
\hline 18 & Q. A portion of the \(\$ 345,000\) was for periods prior \\
\hline 19 & to Green Valley acquiring the note on June 3rd. Right? \\
\hline 20 & A. I don't know. I need to look at the document. \\
\hline 21 & Q. Okay. Well, it's in the -- by the way, \\
\hline 22 & Exhibit 96, this is a record of Green Valley Commerce \\
\hline 23 & LLC. Is that correct? I'm talking about 95. It says \\
\hline 24 & on top of it. \\
\hline 25 & A. Yeah, it's done by the American Nevada. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1
Q. But it is a record of your company. Right?
A. It's a -- becomes a record of the company, yes. MR. LEWIN: I move to admit Exhibit 95 into evidence.

MR. SHAPIRO: I thought it was in. Nope, it wasn't. No objection.

ARBITRATOR WALL: 95 is in.
(Exhibit 95 was admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. As the manager of Green Valley, was it your custom and practice in 2011 --
A. One more time.
Q. As the manager of Green Valley, was it your custom and practice to review the financial documents that were provided to Mr. Main before they were sent to him?
A. If it was generated from my office, I look at the PMM.
Q. So if you had records from American Nevada, you wouldn't look at them before transmitting them to Mr. Main?
A. As I said, I'm not sure whether -- this is a transition time, the note purchase on the property. I'm not clear how Mr. Main received them and how he processed them.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & Q. Looking at Exhibit 9-- Page 744 \\
\hline 2 & A. Are we done with this exhibit? \\
\hline 3 & Q. Yes. We're done with that. \\
\hline 4 & A. Okay. \\
\hline 5 & Q. Well, I'm sorry. Let's turn to Exhibit 18 first. \\
\hline 6 & Go to the last page of Exhibit 18, cost allocation \\
\hline 7 & study. \\
\hline 8 & A. Okay. \\
\hline 9 & Q. The original cost of the note, which we \\
\hline 10 & established is 4,048,000-something dollars, was modified \\
\hline 11 & and reduced by this cost allocation study. Right? \\
\hline 12 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 13 & Q. Cost Segregation Study? \\
\hline 14 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 15 & Q. And it says here the new land allocations were \\
\hline 16 & per you. Did you provide this? \\
\hline 17 & A. Yeah. So what happened -- \\
\hline 18 & Q. It's just yes -- \\
\hline 19 & A. I provided the backup documents, the comparisons \\
\hline 20 & for the land prices to the -- for the cost segregation \\
\hline 21 & company. \\
\hline 22 & Q. And so the -- you reduced it. Why did you reduce \\
\hline 23 & the cost of the note in this -- strike that. \\
\hline 24 & Why did you reduce the cost of the Green Valley \\
\hline 25 & properties in this Cost Segregation Study? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. We did not reduce it. If you compare, it was not reduced. You are referring to the land recasting, not the note.
Q. I'm talking about the original cost of -- the original cost, which was \(4,048,000\) is now -- according to this, the total cost is less than that. Right?
A. The total showing here is \(3,000,967\).
Q. So there was a reduction?
A. Okay.
Q. Why did you reduce the cost?
A. I did not reduce it. So what \(I\) did is \(I\) sent the information to the -- Danielle Pina, which is the assistant to Jim Main's office, the CPA, and they did the calculation to come up with the 2011 tax year.
Q. Isn't the reason that they -- the cost was reduced because the note balance had been reduced by cash that was paid to Green Valley when you got fee simple title to the land?
A. One more time, please.
Q. Isn't the reason why the Cost Segregation Study is less is because you made a capital distribution and reduced the cost of the note when you got cash from the borrower?
A. No. ARBITRATOR WALL: And that's Danielle Pina is
```

D-A-N-I-E-L-L-E, last name $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{A}$.
MR. LEWIN: Right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm here for you. I got your back.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Turn to Exhibit 5, please.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Oh. The operating agreement?
MR. LEWIN: The operating agreement.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. We've established that you signed this agreement. Did you sign it on December 11 or 12, 2011?
A. Let me get there. Yeah. In that timeframe.
Q. And before you signed the operating agreement, you looked at -- you and Ben discussed the provisions of Exhibit A very briefly. Right?
A. Exhibit A? Yeah, we discussed.
Q. Did you have any part in drafting Exhibit A?
A. No.
Q. Just take a look at Exhibit B.
A. (Complied.)
Q. Did you draft any part of Exhibit B?
A. No.
Q. Did you discuss Exhibit B with David LeGrand?
A. At what point in time?
Q. Before you signed it.

```
```

A. At the very beginning, yes.
Q. And at the very beginning didn't you discuss with David LeGrand that in the event that there was a sale of any of their properties, that there should be a waterfall preferred allocation and distribution schedule?
A. Not any property.
Q. Yes or no, sir?
A. The answer is no.
Q. Did you discuss what would be a capital transaction with David LeGrand?
A. We discussed it in general terms, yes.
Q. Do you know whether Ben drafted any portions of

``` Exhibit B?
A. Yeah. The drafts were showing it's our membership interest at 30 percent, and the final version that's signed shows 50 percent. And I think there were discussions on the last expressed intent paragraph that Ben commented to David LeGrand and David LeGrand drafted.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 6. You received this on November 29, 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And thereafter didn't you tell Mitchell LeGrand that you wanted to review it and make revisions
```

1 to it?
A. I don't recall, sir, no.
Q. Do you remember Mr. LeGrand contacting you by
Email and asking you if you were finished with your
revisions?
A. He contacted me --
Q. It's a yes or no.
A. I don't recall.
Q. You don't know.
A. I might have. I don't recall.
Q. And when you signed this agreement, your
understanding of the words "cash distributions of
profits" refers to distributions generated from
operations resulting in ordinary income. Your
understanding of the words meant that it was ordinary
income, referring to income from the properties from
operations. Isn't that correct?
MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. We're talking about
Exhibit 6. There's no testimony that he signed anything
in Exhibit 6.
ARBITRATOR WALL: He's asking about Exhibit B to
the operating agreement.
MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. But we're talking about
Exhibit 6, and then he said, "when you signed this
document," and I don't see anything in Exhibit 6.

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & ARBITRATOR WALL: We're back to the operating Page 749 \\
\hline 2 & agreement. \\
\hline 3 & A. What was the question? \\
\hline 4 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 5 & Q. Let's take a look at Exhibit 5. The last -- the \\
\hline 6 & words -- specifically the words on Exhibit B, the \\
\hline 7 & second-to-last paragraph where it says, "Cash \\
\hline 8 & distributions of profits from operations shall be \\
\hline 9 & allocated and distributed 50 percent to Shawn Bidsal and \\
\hline 10 & 50 percent to CLA Properties LLC." \\
\hline 11 & And your understanding of those words were that \\
\hline 12 & ordinary income refers to income from the properties \\
\hline 13 & from operations. Right? \\
\hline 14 & A. All kinds of income. \\
\hline 15 & Q. And your understanding of those words meant -- \\
\hline 16 & your understanding of the word "operation" meant running \\
\hline 17 & the properties like rent income, interest income. \\
\hline 18 & Right? \\
\hline 19 & MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Vague. \\
\hline 20 & A. As a part of -- \\
\hline 21 & ARBITRATOR WALL: You got to wait. When he \\
\hline 22 & objects, he's objecting to protect you. Okay? So let \\
\hline 23 & him protect you and wait for me. \\
\hline 24 & But it's overruled. \\
\hline 25 & So you can answer. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1 BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Yes or no?
A. One more time, your question.
Q. Your understanding of operations meant rent income, interest income? Things like that?
A. As a part of it, but it's much broader and more general term.
Q. I'd like to read from the witness's deposition at Page 102 beginning at Line 10 through 103, Line 13. MR. LEWIN: There was an objection, but I clarified the question, that's why I'll leave out the objections.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Quote, "QUESTION: Do you have an understanding of what the words mean in Exhibit B where it says cash -- 'cash distribution of profits refers to distributions generated from operations resulting in ordinary income'? Do you have an understanding of those words?"

Mr. Shapiro objected, and I continue.
MR. GERRARD: Is there a ruling on the objection?
ARBITRATOR WALL: I thought he said it was to rephrase and then you rephrased.

MR. LEWIN: I rephrased.
MR. SHAPIRO: He didn't rephrase it though.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & ARBITRATOR WALL: What page? I'm sorry. \(\begin{aligned} & \text { Page } \\ & \text { I }\end{aligned}\) \\
\hline 2 & just listening. \\
\hline 3 & MR. LEWIN: Page 102, Line 22. \\
\hline 4 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay, 102. \\
\hline 5 & MR. LEWIN: It starts at 10. So I did ask it. I \\
\hline 6 & changed the question and it went on. \\
\hline 7 & MR. SHAPIRO: No, you didn't change the question. \\
\hline 8 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't -- wait. Are you on \\
\hline 9 & 10 -- \\
\hline 10 & MR. LEWIN: I'm on 102, Line 22. \\
\hline 11 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Hold on. There's not \\
\hline 12 & specifically an objection, but -- and then there's a new \\
\hline 13 & question at Line 22. All right. So there was an \\
\hline 14 & objection to the question on Line 22 and 23, which \\
\hline 15 & refers back to the language read in the question from \\
\hline 16 & Lines 10 through 14, so I don't think there's an \\
\hline 17 & objection to the one that begins on Line 22. \\
\hline 18 & So you can answer. \\
\hline 19 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 20 & Q. Continuing on Line 22, quote: "Mr. Bidsal, do \\
\hline 21 & you have an understanding of those words? \\
\hline 22 & "ANSWER: Ordinary income refers to income from \\
\hline 23 & the properties from operations. \\
\hline 24 & "QUESTION: Did you and Ben discuss what was \\
\hline 25 & meant by the word 'operations' before you signed the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & operating agreement? \(\quad\) Page 752 \\
\hline 2 & ANSWER: "Operations, we had discussions. The \\
\hline 3 & operations means running -- running the -- the \\
\hline 4 & properties. \\
\hline 5 & "QUESTION: So rent income, interest income? \\
\hline 6 & Things like that? \\
\hline 7 & "ANSWER: Yes. \\
\hline 8 & "QUESTION: Is there any other kind of ordinary \\
\hline 9 & income that Green Valley earned since -- since the \\
\hline 10 & properties were acquired other than rent and possibly \\
\hline 11 & interest? \\
\hline 12 & "ANSWER: I would have to go back and look at it, \\
\hline 13 & but, mostly rent and -- mostly rent actually." \\
\hline 14 & Now, that conversation took place before you \\
\hline 15 & signed the operating agreement. Right? \\
\hline 16 & A. Right. \\
\hline 17 & Q. And you've had no discussions with Mr. Golshani \\
\hline 18 & since December of 2011. Isn't that correct? \\
\hline 19 & Let me rephrase it. You've had no conversations \\
\hline 20 & with Mr. Golshani regarding Exhibit B after December of \\
\hline 21 & 2011. Isn't that correct? \\
\hline 22 & A. No. \\
\hline 23 & Q. No, it's not correct? \\
\hline 24 & A. It's not correct. \\
\hline 25 & Q. Okay. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR. LEWIN: I'd like to read from the witness's \({ }^{753}\) \\
\hline 2 & deposition at Page 103, Line 14 through 23. \\
\hline 3 & MR. SHAPIRO: And again, Your Honor, it doesn't \\
\hline 4 & impeach him. \\
\hline 5 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. Because it goes up to \\
\hline 6 & 104 and says, "We might have discussed it. I don't \\
\hline 7 & recall." \\
\hline 8 & So is that what you're impeaching him with? \\
\hline 9 & MR. LEWIN: He told me that he didn't recall any \\
\hline 10 & discussions. \\
\hline 11 & MR. SHAPIRO: Well, he says we had situations \\
\hline 12 & where he sold properties and returned capital, \\
\hline 13 & contributions of profits. And that's what he testified \\
\hline 14 & to earlier today, so it's completely consistent. \\
\hline 15 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I mean, if you want to read it \\
\hline 16 & in, great. I'm telling you, if you want to have it read \\
\hline 17 & in, that's fine. \\
\hline 18 & MR. LEWIN: If it's not probative in your mind, \\
\hline 19 & there's no purpose. \\
\hline 20 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't see it as impeachment \\
\hline 21 & of what he has testified to this morning, but I'm giving \\
\hline 22 & you the option to have it read in if you wish. \\
\hline 23 & MR. LEWIN: That's okay. \\
\hline 24 & ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. \\
\hline 25 & / / / \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

1 BY MR. LEWIN:

```
```

Q. Did you tell Jim Main that the sales proceeds -let me strike that.
Was Mr. Golshani in touch with James Main, as far as you knew?
A. Yes.
Q. You do agree that if there's a capital transaction, the waterfall stepdown allocation applies. Right?
A. No. Not under that characterization.
Q. So under Exhibit B there's a phrase that talks about a sale of substantially all of the company's assets. Do you see that phrase?
A. Yes. At what paragraph do you mean?
Q. In $B$, the last paragraph.
A. Okay.
Q. Did you have a conversation with Ben about what that meant?
A. At what point in time?
Q. At any time before you signed the operating agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you had a conversation with him about what that meant at any time after you signed that agreement?

```
```

A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what was said between you and Ben as to what was meant by substantially all the assets of the company?
ARBITRATOR WALL: At what point?
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Before the operating agreement was signed?
A. You're referring to the waterfall provision?
Q. I'm referring to the last paragraph where it says "substantially all of the assets." What was the discussion between you and Ben?
MR. SHAPIRO: That was his answer.
MR. GERRARD: Let him answer.
THE WITNESS: I can explain, Your Honor, the intent, the concept that was discussed prior to signing the document.
ARBITRATOR WALL: The question is about discussions you had with Mr . Golshani regarding that particular paragraph before the operating agreement was signed.
A. Okay. Like, if you sell -- there's a couple of possibilities. If we are winding down closing the company, we sell all the assets and we go to the waterfall provision and pay everybody off with that. Or if you're paying the cash contributions of the members,

```
```

    1 you go and refinance on a cashout basis and pay the
    2 members off.
    ```
```

ARBITRATOR WALL: Then that would trigger the waterfall?
THE WITNESS: That would trigger waterfall, yes. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Was there a discussion about what would be substantial?
A. Substantial assets to be able to pay back the cash contributions of the members.
Q. It says here, "such as a sale of all or a substantial portion of the company's assets." Did you and Ben discuss what was substantial?
MR. SHAPIRO: Asked and answered.
ARBITRATOR WALL: He just answered if it was sufficient to pay back the entire capital contribution. Is that right?
MR. LEWIN: Well, let me read from his deposition at Page 107, Line 15 -- pardon me. Page 108, Line 15. Hold on a second. Line 10 through line 25.
MR. SHAPIRO: What's your final answer, Rod? You've been jumping around here.
MR. LEWIN: Sorry. Line 10 through Line 25.
MR. SHAPIRO: Of what page?
ARBITRATOR WALL: 108.

```

```

assets? What does it mean?
"ANSWER: Again, we didn't go into detail about that, but our intent was substantially means almost all."
ARBITRATOR WALL: But he said, "Again, we didn't go into that detail about percentages, but our intent was substantially means, like, almost all of it."
MR. LEWIN: Okay. I'd like to read Page 109 to Line 10 to Page 10 -- to Line 17.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. "QUESTION: I'll re-ask the question. Let me ask a different question. When you had nine parcels, what did you believe that selling a substantial portion of the nine parcels would include?
"ANSWER: Actually, we didn't sell the parking lot, so it's eight parcels. Substantially means like selling all of it or maybe even if not selling one, selling, like, 7 out of the 8 but not one of them." End quote.
MR. SHAPIRO: Again, Your Honor --
ARBITRATOR WALL: So it's in. Okay? You're not objecting to that information coming in. Right?
MR. GERRARD: No.
MR. SHAPIRO: No. I'm just saying it's an

```
```

    inappropriate use of deposition testimony, but...
    ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't see that it's
    prejudicial.
    MR. SHAPIRO: No, it's not. It's consistent
    still.
    BY MR. LEWIN:
    Q. When you sold Building $C$, you received boot. Is
that correct?
A. I received --
Q. Yes or no, sir.
MR. GERRARD: Rod, unless you want to define what "boot" is and you assume he knows what it is. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Do you know what boot is?
A. Not in that content of terminology, but...
Q. Okay. You heard what Mr. Wilcox described as boot. That would the amount of money that was not used as part of the exchange process?
A. Okay. I got it now. Correct. I did receive boot.
Q. And you received approximately $\$ 95,000$ of boot. Right?
A. In addition to some other interest, yes.
Q. In addition to a $\$ 75,000$ promissory note?
A. No. In addition to some other interest of the

```
```

    1 money.
    ```
```

ARBITRATOR WALL: 40-some thousand?
THE WITNESS: No, that's the principal of the money. We also received some interest, smaller interest amounts in addition to.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. But whatever it was, you distributed the boot 70/30. Right?
A. Correct. And then we distributed the --
Q. Excuse me. There's no question pending.
Did you distribute the promissory note?
A. No, we distributed the --
Q. Did you distribute the promissory note?
ARBITRATOR WALL: It's a yes-or-no question.
A. I don't -- different question?
MR. SHAPIRO: No, no. The question is: Did you distribute the promissory note? Yes or no or you can't answer.
ARBITRATOR WALL: But you can't distribute a note.
A. You're referring to the promissory note on Building C?
MR. SHAPIRO: That is correct.
THE WITNESS: Oh. The --

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{1 Right? See it says Bidsal 1452?} \\
\hline 2 & A. & Yes. Yes. \\
\hline 3 & Q. & This was in your file. Right? \\
\hline 4 & A. & Yes. \\
\hline 5 & & ARBITRATOR WALL: For the record, who is Alex? \\
\hline 6 & & THE WITNESS: Alex Valerio was an accountant from \\
\hline 7 & 2011 -- & \\
\hline 8 & & ARBITRATOR WALL: Was a what? \\
\hline 9 & & THE WITNESS: Accountant. \\
\hline 10 & & ARBITRATOR WALL: Accountant. \\
\hline 11 & & THE WITNESS: From 2011 until '15, '16. \\
\hline 12 & & ARBITRATOR WALL: And what was the last name? \\
\hline 13 & & THE WITNESS: Valerio, V-A-L-E-R-I-O. \\
\hline 14 & & ARBITRATOR WALL: Thanks. \\
\hline 15 & BY MR. & LEWIN: \\
\hline 16 & Q. & As a matter of fact, you don't know where this \\
\hline 17 & documen & t came from. Isn't that true? \\
\hline 18 & A. & That's not true. \\
\hline 19 & Q. & You don't know whether it came from you or the \\
\hline 20 & account & ant or somewhere else. Isn't that right? Is \\
\hline 21 & that ri & ght? Yes or no? \\
\hline 22 & A. & I was -- \\
\hline 23 & Q. & Yes or no? \\
\hline 24 & A. & What is the question? \\
\hline 25 & Q. & You don't know where this document came from, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

    1 whether it came from a CPA or from your office or
    ```
```

wherever. Isn't that correct?
A. That's not correct.
Q. You don't know whether it was produced by Henry or Alex. Isn't that correct?
ARBITRATOR WALL: In the litigation?
MR. LEWIN: No. Sorry. Let me rephrase.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. You don't know if this handwriting is from Alex or from Henry. Isn't that right?
A. It's not from Henry because this predates Henry.
Q. You don't know that it's from Alex either, do you?
A. Most probably it's from Alex. It was during that time that --
Q. It's a yes or no, sir.
A. I think it's from Alex.
MR. LEWIN: I'd like to read from the witness's deposition.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Page?
MR. LEWIN: Page 139, within the deposition.
This document was marked as Exhibit 11.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
MR. LEWIN: Can I refer to it as -- no, I'll just read the deposition. I'm going to read from 139

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & through 140, Line 6. Page 764 \\
\hline 2 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 3 & Q. By Mr. Lewin: \\
\hline 4 & "QUESTION: Mr. Bidsal, let me see if I can move \\
\hline 5 & this over a little bit. Take a look at Exhibit 11 and \\
\hline 6 & tell me if you recognize it." \\
\hline 7 & I've already got -- I'm just going to skip that. \\
\hline 8 & Then it goes down to -- I'll start at line 10. \\
\hline 9 & "This -- is this document -- is this -- are your \\
\hline 10 & calculations -- are these calculations in your \\
\hline 11 & handwriting? \\
\hline 12 & "ANSWER: No. \\
\hline 13 & "Do you know whose handwriting it is? \\
\hline 14 & "ANSWER: No. \\
\hline 15 & "Do you recognize this handwriting as being \\
\hline 16 & either -- being from either Henry or Alex? \\
\hline 17 & "ANSWER: I don't -- I wouldn't know. \\
\hline 18 & "QUESTION: Well, you produced this document. \\
\hline 19 & Where did you get it? \\
\hline 20 & "ANSWER: It was in our file. It was something \\
\hline 21 & that either the CPA produced or it was in our file that \\
\hline 22 & we produced. \\
\hline 23 & "QUESTION: When you say 'produced it,' either \\
\hline 24 & who? \\
\hline 25 & "ANSWER: Either the CPA or from my office. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & "QUESTION: You can see it was in your file, Page 765 \\
\hline 2 & however. Right? \\
\hline 3 & "ANSWER: Yes. \\
\hline 4 & "QUESTION: Do you have any reason to doubt that \\
\hline 5 & it came from your accountant Henry? \\
\hline 6 & "ANSWER: I can't be certain on that. As I said, \\
\hline 7 & it could be from the CPA's office or from my office." \\
\hline 8 & Now, in connection with this document, you \\
\hline 9 & believe this is an accurate description of how the boot \\
\hline 10 & was calculated. Right? Talking about Exhibit 14. \\
\hline 11 & A. To the best of my knowledge, yes. \\
\hline 12 & Q. And this was distributed on a 70/30 basis? \\
\hline 13 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 14 & Q. By the way, you've testified that you've had \\
\hline 15 & conversations with Ben where he agreed to how to \\
\hline 16 & distribute money or how to distribute funds. Do you \\
\hline 17 & have any document in writing where Ben agreed to a \\
\hline 18 & distribution of funds other than sales of the property? \\
\hline 19 & Talking about B and E. Do you have anything in writing \\
\hline 20 & where it shows that he approved that distribution? \\
\hline 21 & A. In writing? He cashed the checks. He agreed to \\
\hline 22 & it. \\
\hline 23 & Q. You have nothing in writing from him saying "I \\
\hline 24 & agree with this. This is the way the money should be \\
\hline 25 & distributed." Is that correct? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. Not that \(I\) know of.
Q. Thank you.

Well, you've searched all your records for this arbitration. Right?
A. The great extent is literally, I don't know,

20,000 E-mails.
Q. And you said that the first time that you understood that there was a disagreement was when Ben sent you an Email in 2016. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, again, looking at Exhibit 23, do you know who prepared this?
A. 23, it's from our office.
Q. Well, actually, you don't know whether -- it's like the same with respect to the other one. You don't know whether it came from the CPA's office or your office. Right?
A. No. But when I meant the CPA office, I meant who produced the production of documents. But in terms of the actual drafting of it, this came from our office.
Q. So you're saying this was created by -- so again, was this provided to Ben?
A. Yes.
Q. When?
A. When we did the distribution sheet, we provided
```

1 it to Ben.

```
```

Q. And how do you know that?
A. Because I reviewed this and I'm the one who signs the checks.
Q. Did you mail this document to Ben? Yes or no?
A. Personally, I don't remember.
Q. You actually don't know who created the document and you don't know who mailed it to him, if anybody. Isn't that right?
A. That is not true.
Q. Will you take a look at Exhibit 58? I'm sorry. That's wrong. Take a look at Exhibit 108. ARBITRATOR WALL: 108? MR. LEWIN: 108.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. You wrote this. This is an Email dated January 25, 2016. You wrote this?
MR. SHAPIRO: Which page are you referencing?
MR. LEWIN: The first page.
ARBITRATOR WALL: No, second page. 2087? MR. LEWIN: You're right. Second page.
A. Yes.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. And it says -- you say -- and you composed this Email?

```
```

A. Yes.
Q. And what were you -- what were you responding to when you composed this Email? Take a look at Exhibit 107 and see if that refreshes your recollection. It says letter to WCI 1 -- 01 -- January 21st, 2016.
A. Are you looking at Exhibit 107?
Q. Were you responding to Exhibit 107 when you wrote this Email on Exhibit 108?
A. (No verbal response.)
Q. Notice that Exhibit 107 is a letter dated January 21st, 2016. And on your response, the attachment refers to January 21st, 2016?
A. The 107 is regarding the country club. It's a different property.
Q. I understand that. But you were responding to this letter when you wrote -- isn't it true you were responding to Exhibit 107 when you wrote Exhibit 108?
A. I don't know if it's a response to that or response to another Email.
Q. Okay.
MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, we talked about
Exhibit 107. And I realized last night we turned to
Exhibit 36. All these E-mails related to Country Club are in evidence already. Exhibit 36 is a series of E-mails from -- that were offered into evidence by

```

1 Mr. Gerrard. I'd like to revisit 107.
ARBITRATOR WALL: 36 is in. Right? Why don't you use \(36 ?\)

MR. LEWIN: Well --
MR. GERRARD: He doesn't want to use it because 107 is not a part of that.

ARBITRATOR WALL: 107 is part of it.
MR. GERRARD: Is it?
ARBITRATOR WALL: It's Bates 1554.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. So now looking at Exhibit 107, does that refresh your --

MR. LEWIN: I just thought it would be better to have them next to each other.

MR. GERRARD: Hold on for a second.
ARBITRATOR WALL: 108 is 1552.
MR. GERRARD: Oh, I do see it at the end. Yep, I do see it.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. So let's just use Exhibit 36 since they're in evidence.

MR. LEWIN: Very well.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. When you wrote your response --
A. Can I go to 36 now or...

ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & BY MR. LEWIN: Page 770 \\
\hline 2 & Q. When you wrote your response to -- \\
\hline 3 & ARBITRATOR WALL: So you're going to look at -- \\
\hline 4 & his response is Exhibit 36 Page 1552. \\
\hline 5 & THE WITNESS: 1 -- \\
\hline 6 & ARBITRATOR WALL: -- 552. \\
\hline 7 & THE WITNESS: Okay. \\
\hline 8 & MR. SHAPIRO: And then turn to 108. \\
\hline 9 & ARBITRATOR WALL: We don't need 107 and 108. \\
\hline 10 & They're all in 36. \\
\hline 11 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 12 & Q. So when you wrote this response -- \\
\hline 13 & MR. SHAPIRO: In 108. \\
\hline 14 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait. Wait. We're just using \\
\hline 15 & Exhibit 36. \\
\hline 16 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 17 & Q. When you wrote the response to Lida on \\
\hline 18 & January 25, your response to the January 21st letter \\
\hline 19 & where there was a complaint regarding the way you were \\
\hline 20 & distributing money, you were responding to that letter. \\
\hline 21 & Right? You were responding to the January 21st letter? \\
\hline 22 & MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered. He \\
\hline 23 & said he wasn't sure. \\
\hline 24 & ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. \\
\hline 25 & / / / \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Is your answer still you don't know?
A. It looks like the response is to Country Club, which is different property.
Q. The country club, however, has the same operating agreement as Green Valley. Isn't that right?
A. Similar, yes.
Q. It's not similar. It's the same. Right? Except it's a different name?
A. I haven't looked at it for quite a while.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 88.

MR. SHAPIRO: What's the relevance of the similarities between the operating agreements?

MR. LEWIN: Because the relevance is the issue in the way that Mr. Bidsal was managing both properties with identical operating agreements, and Ben was beginning to object to the way he was distributing money under both of them.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So it's not a circumstance where in the Country Club scenario that sales of property were distributed differently than they were in the Green Valley? MR. LEWIN: He was distributing in Country Club --

ARBITRATOR WALL: The same way?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR. LEWIN: The same way and Ben was objecting. 772 \\
\hline 2 & ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Were there sales \\
\hline 3 & in -- I don't want to ask -- \\
\hline 4 & MR. SHAPIRO: That's the problem. \\
\hline 5 & ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. All right. \\
\hline 6 & MR. LEWIN: I understand. \\
\hline 7 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I mean, I'll allow -- 36 is \\
\hline 8 & already in evidence, so he can explain what he was \\
\hline 9 & talking about. He said it's Country Club. \\
\hline 10 & MR. SHAPIRO: This is a letter to him so he \\
\hline 11 & really can't explain what he was talking about because \\
\hline 12 & it's a letter from CLA Properties. I mean, Ben's the \\
\hline 13 & one that should -- \\
\hline 14 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Not 1552. \\
\hline 15 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 16 & Q. In 1552 you're actually responding to both Ben's \\
\hline 17 & complaints about Country Club and Green Valley. Right? \\
\hline 18 & A. I can't be -- I can't be certain of that. \\
\hline 19 & Q. But in any case, by -- by the time you received \\
\hline 20 & the letter in January from Lida, you understood that Ben \\
\hline 21 & was objecting to the way that you were distributing \\
\hline 22 & money in Green Valley. Correct? \\
\hline 23 & A. Okay. \\
\hline 24 & Q. And he was also objecting on the same basis for \\
\hline 25 & Country Club. Right? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Relevance.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Take a look again at Exhibit 88, please.
A. Exhibit?
Q. 88 .
A. 88 .

MR. SHAPIRO: Again, Your Honor, this is the operating agreement of Country Club. I'm not sure how this is relevant to the present dispute.

MR. LEWIN: It's just to show that they had the same -BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Let's look over Exhibit B.
A. Okay.
Q. You had the same disproportionate capital contributions to the country club. Right?

MR. SHAPIRO: I mean, again, objection.
Relevance.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Sustained.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. You had the same Exhibit B. Exhibit B was the same in Country Club, except for the amount of capital, as Green Valley's Exhibit B. Right?

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Relevance.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm not going to admit 88 . 774 \\
\hline 2 & MR. LEWIN: Well, 1 just want to get to prove \\
\hline 3 & that the purpose of -- only to prove that Ben's \\
\hline 4 & complaint about Country Club is raising the same issue. \\
\hline 5 & So it's not like he's not sitting on his hands and not \\
\hline 6 & doing anything, not complaining about it. \\
\hline 7 & ARBITRATOR WALL: But as of January of 2016 he \\
\hline 8 & made a complaint with respect to how distributions were \\
\hline 9 & being made. \\
\hline 10 & MR. LEWIN: That's right. \\
\hline 11 & ARBITRATOR WALL: That came through \\
\hline 12 & Mr. Golshani's testimony. So all right. I don't need \\
\hline 13 & the Country Club operating agreement to establish that. \\
\hline 14 & MR. LEWIN: Okay. \\
\hline 15 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 16 & Q. By the way, so there's a series of E -mails \\
\hline 17 & between you and Ben from the beginning of 2016 that's \\
\hline 18 & going on where he's complaining about the way you're \\
\hline 19 & distributing money. Right? \\
\hline 20 & A. (Moved head.) \\
\hline 21 & Q. And some of them are in Exhibit 36. Is that \\
\hline 22 & correct? \\
\hline 23 & A. Yes. \\
\hline 24 & Q. And if you remember, you testified earlier today \\
\hline 25 & that you and Ben had a conversation where you said that \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1 he had agreed that the waterfall was not triggered by the sales of property and that he agreed with the way that you were distributing the funds. Do you remember that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. In responding to Ben's complaints, all of the complaints that he made, did you ever once say in writing, "Ben, remember we talked about this and you agreed?" Do you remember saying that?
A. Yes. There's an Email like that.
Q. Where does it say in this -- where does it say in the exhibit -- in your response or --
A. I don't know where it is --
Q. Wait. Wait. Where does it say in this response on January 25? Where do you refer to that conversation?

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Argumentative. He asked a general question if there was an Email, and now he's trying to --

ARBITRATOR WALL: He can itemize, so overruled. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Is there anywhere where you reference that "By the way, don't you remember we had a discussion and an agreement" in this document, in this response?
A. Yes. CLA Bate No. 1279. So if you read my Email to him --

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Bidsal, do you realize \({ }^{\text {Page }} 7\) \\
\hline 2 & you're still under oath? \\
\hline 3 & THE WITNESS: Yes. \\
\hline 4 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 5 & Q. Mr. Bidsal, when you and -- did you and Ben ever \\
\hline 6 & meet with David LeGrand in person? \\
\hline 7 & MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. What point in time? \\
\hline 8 & MR. LEWIN: Ever. \\
\hline 9 & A. Yes, I did. \\
\hline 10 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 11 & Q. Did you have a meeting where you talked about \\
\hline 12 & what you wanted to have in the operating agreement with \\
\hline 13 & Mr . LeGrand and Ben? \\
\hline 14 & A. What we wanted in the operating agreement? We \\
\hline 15 & met in I think it was June/July of 2011. \\
\hline 16 & Q. And during that meeting, was there a discussion \\
\hline 17 & about how the -- what would constitute a capital \\
\hline 18 & transaction? \\
\hline 19 & A. I don't recall. \\
\hline 20 & Q. Was there any discussion about the stepdown \\
\hline 21 & allocations in the meeting with Mr. LeGrand where you \\
\hline 22 & and Ben were both present? \\
\hline 23 & A. You mean in 2011? \\
\hline 24 & Q. Before the operating agreement was signed. \\
\hline 25 & A. We had discussions. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

1
Q. Did you privately have discussions with Mr. LeGrand about what should be in the stepdown allocation or the waterfall, as we've described it?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Did you ever discuss Exhibit B to the operating agreement with Jim Main?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Did you describe to Mr. Main how you felt -strike that.

Did you describe to Mr . Main what would trigger the waterfall?
A. I don't recall having that discussion.
Q. Did you ever discuss what would trigger the waterfall with Mr. Main? MR. GERRARD: Objection. ARBITRATOR WALL: Was that the same question? MR. LEWIN: I thought I -- it was a little bit different. Okay, it's the same. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. When's the last time you spoke to Jim Main about the -- well, when's the last time before your deposition that you had spoken to Mr. Main about the operating agreement?
A. It was probably few -- few months.
Q. Okay. And at that time you were discussing
```

1 profit distributions with him?

```
```

profit distributions with him?
A. I don't recall the details.
Q. But we're talking about a few months prior to your deposition. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You initiated the process to buy the CLA's membership interest because you did not -- no longer wanted to manage the property. Right?
A. I didn't want to manage the property for the partnership.
Q. Isn't it true in March of 2017 you had asked Mr. Golshani if he was interested in purchasing other properties with you?
A. I don't recall that. ARBITRATOR WALL: Sorry. That was me. Hold on, Mr. Lewin.
(Interruption in proceedings.)
MR. SHAPIRO: You did it without anything? I'm impressed. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. In March of 2017 did Mr. Golshani tell you that he was a little tight with money and wasn't liquid enough to buy a property with you?
MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Compound.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.

```
A. I never thought that he didn't have money. Page He always had money. We both had it.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. My question is: Did he tell you that?
A. I don't recall that conversation.
Q. You don't recall that conversation, but you do recall a conversation in approximately March about buying other properties with Mr. Golshani. Is that correct?

MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Asked and answered. ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.
A. I don't recall having that conversation for that subject matter. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Okay. Well, when you first -- strike that. In approximately March of 2017 had you received a study from brokers analyzing the value of Green Valley's real properties?
A. We received DOVs at different times. I mean, I can't be that specific. It could be 2017 or 2018.
Q. Didn't you list some of Green Valley's properties in early 2017?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. You did. Right?
A. That's what I meant, yeah.
Q. And what properties did you list for sale?
A. We listed some buildings in Green Valley Commerce.
Q. And that was in -- that was approximately in March 2017?
A. I don't specifically remember which month, but the property had been listed for awhile.
Q. And would you have also listed the Green Valley property?
A. Green Valley property for lease or for sale?
Q. For sale.
A. I probably did, yeah.
Q. Do you remember what month you listed the properties for sale, the Green -- the Nevada properties for sale?
A. What month? No, I can't remember.
Q. Would it have been in the first quarter of 2017?
A. The properties of Green Valley Commerce were for sale off and on.
Q. But you received a study in 2017 that valued the properties -- all the properties at over 6 million dollars. Right?
A. You mean Nevada Henderson properties or --
Q. Nevada Henderson properties.
A. I don't recall, but \(I\) know it was listed.

1
```

Q. When you made your offer on July 7th, you page that the brokers had valued the Green Valley properties at over 6 million dollars. Right?
A. Yes. And we didn't sell.
Q. And you had received an offer for the Greenway property. Isn't that correct?
A. We did receive --
Q. In 2017?
A. We did receive an offer. It might have been 2017.
Q. And the offer was for approximately $\$ 1.6$ million.

```

\section*{Right?}
```

A. I don't remember the exact number.
Q. Do you mean the approximate number?
A. Not offhand. But it was somewhere between 1.5 and 1.7, 1.8.
Q. And what was the basis -- what was the -- the COP in -- for Greenway based on formula was how much?
MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Vague. There's no formula for COP.
MR. LEWIN: The cost of purchase based on the settlement statement when Greenway was purchased. That's what I'm talking about.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. How much was Greenway purchased for?

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Page 783 \\
\hline 2 & ARBITRATOR WALL: He's just asked how much -- the \\
\hline 3 & statement that you made is not universally agreed upon, \\
\hline 4 & so the question is simply how much was Greenway \\
\hline 5 & purchased on. This answer is not in response to you're \\
\hline 6 & saying that fits into the COP formula. \\
\hline 7 & MR. LEWIN: I understand. \\
\hline 8 & ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. \\
\hline 9 & A. Can you please rephrase? \\
\hline 10 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 11 & Q. What was the purchase price for Greenway, \\
\hline 12 & including all costs associated with it? \\
\hline 13 & A. I don't remember off the top of my head. Was \\
\hline 14 & it -- it's in the documents. Was it -- I don't \\
\hline 15 & remember. I have to look at the closing statement. \\
\hline 16 & Q. Okay. \\
\hline 17 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I mean, we've seen -- was that \\
\hline 18 & the 790? \\
\hline 19 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 20 & Q. 790 plus some costs? \\
\hline 21 & A. Yeah. \\
\hline 22 & Q. When you made your offer, you believe -- strike \\
\hline 23 & that. \\
\hline 24 & When you made your July 7 offer, you knew you had \\
\hline 25 & already received an offer for Greenway of over 1 and a \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
half million dollars. Right?
A. Sometime at that time, yeah.
Q. Okay. And when you were -- when you were making your offer, you were evaluating the value of the real properties. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. That included Greenway. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. What other real properties did it include?
A. What other property? It included the remaining buildings in Green Valley Commerce.
Q. And the -- so when you were considering how much to offer Ben, you knew that the brokers had valued the properties at over 6 million. Right?
A. They didn't -- they make -- brokers offered to get the listing so they can sell it. That's just a -there's a reason behind it. But it didn't sell for a long time.
Q. That wasn't my question. Please answer my question.
A. I did answer it. Yes. They did provide some sort of DOV.
Q. And also, when you were making your offer, you also looked at the financials of the company. Right?
A. The way I did it was --
Q. Please answer my question.
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you looked at the financials because you wanted to look at what the income stream was. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. As of July 7, 2017, you had owned either multiresidential or commercial properties either between 25 and 30. Right?
A. I don't count them, but in that range. 20 to 30 .
Q. Some of them were large. You owned a 72-unit apartment building in Los Angeles. Right?
A. No.
Q. You didn't?
A. July 7, 2017, no, I didn't.
Q. Okay. So at the time that you made your offer, having received the brokers evaluation of over 6 million dollars and having received an offer to purchase Greenway for around 1.5 plus, you believed that 5 million dollars was less than the fair market value of the company. Isn't that true?
A. No.
Q. When you consider the fair market value of the company, you were talking about the value of the company's assets. Right?
A. The real estate.```
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