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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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ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. We're back on the record. Appearances for the record, please?

MR. GERRARD: Douglas Gerrard and Jim Shapiro on behalf of Shawn Bidsal. Mr. Bidsal is present.

MR. LEWIN: Rodney Lewin, Louis Garfinkel, and Mr. Golshani and Spencer Lewin attending remotely on behalf of CLA.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Spencer Lewin is who?
MR. LEWIN: My assistant.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. We had left off with Mr. Gerety, although I don't know if we just took him out of order.

MR. GERRARD: We took him out of order.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Because I'm not sure the claimant had actually rested. So have you guys agreed on who is testifying today and when and how, or what have we got?

MR. LEWIN: We talked about it, but I don't think we have an agreement yet.

MR. GERRARD: Well -- I'm sorry.
MR. LEWIN: I think the discussion I had with Mr. Gerrard was that he said he wanted to offer some of

1 Mr. Main's testimony.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Deposition testimony?
MR. LEWIN: Deposition testimony.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
MR. LEWIN: I said whatever he does, he has to proceed and rest, and I don't think we have an agreement on that yet.

MR. GERRARD: Yeah, sure, Judge Wall. It's pretty simple. I told you at the end of the last time we were here, you asked Mr. Lewin who his witnesses were for today and what we have left. I told you we have deposition testimony of Jim Main that we wanted to read into the record, but that if we ran out of time, you know, so that there wasn't time to read it into the record, we would tell you where it was so you could read it yourself. So essentially I told Mr. Lewin that same thing. Be ready to go with your witnesses on Monday morning because we're going to put that on, essentially last, if there's time. If there's not, then we'll -ARBITRATOR WALL: That's the only thing you have left?

MR. GERRARD: That's the only thing we have left. We have the right for rebuttal, so I'm not going to say that we won't put anything else on, but as far as our case in chief, yes. on their cased and rest. If he chooses to read instead of putting in deposition transcripts or citations, that's his choice. We have a cross-complaint, a cross-claim, so in theory we both have rebuttal. I thought they'd put their case on and we'd put on our case and that would be the end of it.

Talking about Mr. Main, we object to reading any part of his testimony. His deposition was not completed. As you remember, he, in the middle of the deposition, announced that he had to leave at 1 o'clock or 1:15.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, actually, it was closer to the beginning.

MR. LEWIN: It was after a first break. I have that.

ARBITRATOR WALL: It started about 9:23 a.m. and somewhere between 11:00 and 11:15 he said he had to leave at 1:15. You finished with him about 1:05 and gave -- I don't know if -- gave Mr. Gerrard about 20 minutes.

MR. LEWIN: It was me. I didn't finish.
ARBITRATOR WALL: You stopped.
MR. LEWIN: As a matter of courtesy, I wanted to give Mr. Gerrard an opportunity to ask some questions.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Then there was a motion to reschedule it. He, through counsel, had offered to submit to written questions pursuant to -- is it 31 -NRCP 31, I think. I denied the request to basically force him to be deposed again after he had indicated he had scheduling issues and couldn't accommodate that. He was subpoenaed to appear. His lawyer, about a week before the last hearing, sent an objection to the subpoena. I left it open for about a week. No one responded to the objection. No one -- I presumed it was -- as did Mr. Main's attorney, presumed that the objection was not going to be addressed by anyone and wasn't opposed, and that's where we were.

MR. LEWIN: So my point is is that the deposition -- forgetting about the subpoena issue, because if he was here, he would be here. But the deposition by itself is incomplete. I didn't have a chance to cross-examine him with respect to -- finish my examination of him, and I didn't have a chance to cross-examine him with respect to what Mr. Gerrard said.

So the issue -- Mr. Gerrard had the ability to subpoena him. I thought they had a subpoena issued for him as well. Maybe my memory is mistaken. But I thought I remembered that they also had a subpoena issued for him. The bottom line is is the deposition is

1 Page 993 incomplete and reading it would be improper, I believe. Any part of it.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Have you given Mr. Lewin the designations of the portions that you want to read in?

MR. GERRARD: No.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Are they from Mr. Lewin's questioning or from yours?

MR. GERRARD: Both. Most from him. I obviously only asked like 20 minutes of questions. Most of it is from his own questioning.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So that portion, of course, there's no need for -- there's no issue about incompleteness if it's the questions you asked and the answers you obtained.

MR. LEWIN: But I wasn't finished with him. The point of the matter is that if Mr. Main says something that $I$ know is incorrect but $I$ want to lead him down and let him take a position -- because I believe and I think the evidence will show that Mr. Main is biased for Mr. Bidsal, who has many, many relationships and has basically ignored my client for many years.

So the point being is the fact that $I$ start with the deposition. I let him testify on some issues. Don't get to documents or testimony that $I$ think might contradict some of his testimony. I don't know what

1 he's talking about here.
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ARBITRATOR WALL: You don't even know the areas that he's talking about to know whether it's complete or not.

MR. LEWIN: That is right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: So if you asked him questions for 15 minutes on a topic, moved on to another topic -especially, I suppose, if it was before 11:15 or whenever he announced that he only had half a day. So I guess $I$ can't really address it now because you can't address it now because we don't know what the portions are that are sought to be designated.

MR. LEWIN: Well, maybe we can --
ARBITRATOR WALL: At the first break I would ask if you can provide Mr. Lewin, Mr. Garfinkel with that information so that -- and I suppose me, so that I can address that.

Now, I'm not going to -- if we have other witnesses who are ready to go, I'm going to reserve to them the fact that they haven't rested yet until we can work out this deposition issue.

MR. LEWIN: That seems fair, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Thanks.
MR. LEWIN: This is a matter of schedules. Spencer tells me he can't hear anything. There's no
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1 sound. Are you able to allow him to have sound?

ARBITRATOR WALL: Oh. All right. Hold on.
That's going to be feedback. He can't hear anything?
MR. LEWIN: He said there's no sound. Usually when I'm talking he prefers no sound.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, I mean, the main system is up, so the room audio is on. I don't know maybe if it's his computer because this -- the room is not muted.

MR. LEWIN: Okay. Let me --
ARBITRATOR WALL: And the volume is almost all the way up.

MR. LEWIN: So scheduling, my intention is to proceed with Mr. Golshani. I have a number of first-party witnesses that I've scheduled because they're Zoom witnesses.

I have Jeff Chain scheduled for 11 o'clock. I may want to interrupt -- my plan is to interrupt Mr. Golshani if that were the case, if he is on, to take him.

I have Ms. Schindler from JPMorgan who will be about ten minutes at 1:30.

I have David LeGrand at 1:40.
And we have Henry Manabat currently at 3 o'clock. We'll push him back depending on where we are.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. All right. So then

```
1 let's begin with Mr. Golshani.
```

```
let's begin with Mr. Golshani.
Mr. Golshani, will you -- oh. Go ahead.
Whereupon,
BEN GOLSHANI,
having first been called as a witness, was duly sworn and testified as follows:
EXAMINATION
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Golshani, I'd like to go over a little bit of your background. When were you born?
A. I was born in 1950 .
Q. And that makes you 71, approximately?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And could you please explain to His Honor -- let me go back.
When did you come to the United States?
A. I came to the United States in 1979.
Q. And would you outline your educational background for us, please?
A. Yes. I have a BS degree and MS degree in civil engineering and structural engineering.
Q. And where did you receive that degree?
A. I received it in University of Tabriz in Iran.
Q. And since you've been to the United States, have
```

```
1 you had any further education?
```

```
you had any further education?
A. Yes. I took courses in extension items that \(I\) needed and courses.
Q. And when you came to the United States, would you outline your work experience from that time?
A. From when I came to the United States?
Q. Yes.
A. I started working for consulting engineers and then contractors, and later on \(I\) joined the government, City of Long Beach, and I worked there for some time supervising construction and designing structures and buildings.
Q. And were you doing the same type of work, designing and supervising construction and designing buildings when you were working for contractors?
A. In the Port of Long Beach?
Q. Before you started working for Long Beach or Los Angeles, were you doing the same type of work?
A. About the same, yes, sir.
Q. And English is your second language. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And when you did work for the City of Long Beach, what did you do specifically?
A. As I said, I designed buildings. I oversaw the construction, supervision of the construction, and
```

```
    1 contracts. I granted contract bidding, things like
    2 that.
contracts. I granted contract bidding, things like that.
Q. What department in the City of Long Beach were you in?
A. I was in the department of design and construction.
Q. Okay. And when you worked for Los Angeles, which department were you in?
A. City of Los Angeles, I worked there in the department of building and safety.
Q. Doing what?
A. Checking plans, checking building plans.
Q. And at some point in time, did you open your own
```


## business?

A. Yes. After $I$ worked a few years in city of Long Beach, I decided to work for myself.
Q. And what kind of business did you open?
A. I joined with some of my friends who were doing -- who were doing apartment buildings, and we would buy vacant land or tear down a building and get proper zoning and rebuild apartments and then subdivided them into condominiums and sold them.
Q. In terms of the subdivision, what was your responsibility?
A. Well, my responsibility was to check -- the civil
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1 engineer was doing the subdivision -- to check and read 2 the $C C \& R$ and see if it is done the way we want.
Q. And so at some point in time, did you open up a textile company?
A. Yes. There was a downturn in construction and real estate, and $I$ had friends in the textile. I had visited them a few times and I became interested, so they offered me a partnership and I accepted. And little by little I got more involved and I got interested in that business. It was both fun and it was a business, so I started doing textiles.
Q. Did you ultimately open up a company called Noveltex?
A. Yes. I formed a company called Noveltex, Incorporated.
Q. When did you do that?
A. I believe it was 1993. ARBITRATOR WALL: Can you spell the business? THE WITNESS: Pardon me? ARBITRATOR WALL: Can you spell the name of the business?

THE WITNESS: Yes. N-O-V-E-L-T-E-X and then the next word is I-N-C, Incorporated. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Describe to us generally what the business of

1 Noveltex is.
A. The business of Noveltex is to -- I was interested in environmentally friendly materials, so I went into that area, and $I$ would bring material from Europe and from China. I went there and visited many mills in also Russia and picked some mills and started learning and hiring consultants as to know what to order. And I -- so I ended up bringing raw fabric to the United States, and in the United States I would dye and print them. So I had a design team to pick the designs, and we prepared fabric suitable for garment manufacturers.
Q. It's a fabric business?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. What kind of fabric particularly?
A. Linen from flax.
Q. And you still have that business?
A. Yes.
Q. And in 20 -- let's talk about the period from 2012 to 2016. Did your business require you to travel?
A. A lot of travel.
Q. What kind of travel were you required to do?
A. Well, I traveled to negotiate business and I would check the production line, and I --
Q. I just want to know where you were traveling and

1 how long you were traveling.
A. You mean which countries?
Q. Which countries, how often would you go? How often would you be traveling out of Los Angeles for business during the time period from 2012 to $2016 ?$
A. Well, in the 2012 to 2016 , probably I would travel overseas three, four times a year.
Q. And did you have other businesses during that same time period?
A. Yes, I had other businesses.
Q. What were the other businesses? Forgetting about businesses you had with Mr. Bidsal.
A. Yes. I had other companies who were dealing with properties, purchasing property and managing them, and some of them were in distress situation, needed repair, so I would do the plan and I would hire contractor to renovate them and bring tenants. Things like that.
Q. Did those other businesses require travel as well?
A. Yes. They were in other states like Arizona, so it required a lot of my attention.
Q. Now, in Noveltex in 2012, how many employees did you have?
A. I had about 20 employees.
Q. What was Noveltex's address?
A. Noveltex's address is 2801 South Main Street in downtown Los Angeles.
Q. And is that where CLA's office is as well?
A. Correct. Yes.
Q. Were all of your business activities operated out of that Main Street address?
A. Yes.
Q. In 2012, can you tell us how many different properties you owned without giving a specific -- that were commercial properties?
A. In 2012. You know, I had invested in other property, I believe, in Las Vegas in 2010 and then I had some rental property, and that was about it.
Q. When you say "rental property," what kind of property was it?
A. It was condominiums that $I$ would buy and rent it.
Q. Did you acquire any other commercial real estate properties, not including the ones you had with Mr. Bidsal?
A. Yes.
Q. Before December 31, 2016?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. What other properties were those?
A. Before 2016, I had a few properties. I had acquired a few properties, as I said. Mostly distressed

``` in city of Phoenix, and \(I\) had been working on those.
Q. And were you managing those properties, the commercial properties?
A. Yes.
Q. For example, in the Phoenix property, what kind of property is that?
A. Well --
Q. I just want to know is it a shopping center? Apartment building?
A. One is an office building, and the other one is a shopping center.
Q. And were you managing those properties?
A. Not personally. I have property manager, but I make sure that everything is in order.
Q. So let's talk about Mr. Bidsal. How do you know Mr. Bidsal?
A. I knew Mr. Bidsal, you know, from a long time ago. We are relatives. He is my cousin.
Q. First cousin?
A. Yes. First cousin.
Q. And he's related to which of your brothers and sisters?
A. His mother is my father's sister.
Q. And when did you first meet him? Where were you?
A. I met him when he was a very young boy. Long
```

```
1 time ago. You know, when you have family gathering, we
```

``` meet.
Q. Now, at some point in time, did you become friendly with him in the United States?
A. Yes.
Q. And when was that?
A. Sometime in 2009, 2010 we met again and we started talking.
Q. Is it fair to say before that time while you were in the United States you did not have any kind of real relationship with him, other than being family members?
A. No.
Q. Is that yes?
A. No. We didn't -- I know of him and probably he knew of me, but we were not in contact.
Q. And at a point time did you and Mr. Bidsal start talking about business matters, real estate matters?
A. At one point?
Q. Yes.
A. It was 2010 .
Q. And how did that come about?
A. Well, we met at a family gathering, and he was talking about his investment and dealing in Las Vegas, and he thought that that was a very good -- I mean, it's a very good place to invest. I did have an investment
```

```
1 about that time also, so we had something in common, and we started talking about general business.
Q. And after that, are you able to tell us when in 2010 this took place?
A. The meeting?
Q. When you said you had a family gathering. Can you pinpoint that?
A. Probably was, you know, early 2010 sometime.
Q. And after that meeting, did you do anything to further investigate real estate opportunities in Las
``` Vegas?
A. As I said, we -- I had -- I was investing, and generally when you're investing in a place, you would research that place. I did.
Q. When was the next time that you had any discussions with Mr. Bidsal about business opportunities?
A. Well, when at that family gathering, as I said, he was talking about investment, and, you know, we started talking to each other. So at the end he told me when -- I told him that I'm coming to Vegas. He said, "Next time you are there, give me a call." And you know, a few months probably passed and then one time I came here with one of my friends, and I called him and he happened to be here, so I -- he gave me his address.
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Q. And from that point on, did your relationship with Mr. Bidsal grow in terms of friendliness?
A. Yes. We -- at that time we went and he showed me some of his projects, and then we talked a lot about other matters, about family and about philosophy and a lot of things, and after that we had -- we would have a meeting and, yeah, it developed to a friendship.
Q. Did your family and his family socialize together?
A. Yes. I introduced our family to each other and they became very -- they hit it off. They became very good friends and we would do a lot of events, four of us. We would go to different cities, places, and for lunch, dinner.
Q. And what's the time period we're talking about now?
A. I'm talking about mid-2010.
Q. Did there come a time in mid- 2010 when you discussed entering into a possible business relationship with Mr. Bidsal?
A. Yes.
Q. And when was that?
A. I don't remember the exact time, but during all

1 Page 1007 of these gathering and talks, he was talking that because of the -- those downturn of economy and real estate, he said that things are not doing good and -but he said he thinks that very soon it is going to be over and there is going to be a return and everything would be good, and it is a good idea to invest at that time.

And he said that because of the economy, he was short in cash and he was looking for investor, and after a few time -- at that time, I had a lot of liquidity on the money -- my money and relative money. And one of those incidences that, you know, he was talking about the opportunity and him wanting to participate, but he was short on cash I said, "You know, I have a lot of cash, and if you like, we can work together."
Q. Okay. I want to put some time frame here. Do you remember when this conversation took place?
A. It was, like I said, 2010.
Q. But was it beginning? Middle?
A. Middle.
Q. Okay. And when Mr. Bidsal was talking about real estate opportunities, did he describe to you what he thought the real estate opportunities were?
A. Yes.
Q. What were the real estate opportunities that you
```

    1 and he were talking about investing in?
    ```
```

A. He was telling me that the market in Las Vegas is distressed at that time. There is a lot of
foreclosures. There are a lot of nonperforming loan notes that we can buy and invest. My partners on the property --
Q. I just want to talk about what you and Mr. Bidsal talked about.
A. All right.
Q. So you're talking about possibly buying distressed properties and nonperforming loans. Is that it?
A. That's right.
Q. So did you and he discuss how you could invest in distressed properties or nonperforming loans?
A. We did discuss, yes.
Q. And what was said between you and him about that?
A. In term of how to do it?
Q. Yeah. How would you go about it?
A. How do we go about it? We decided to become partners, and he told me that he has -- he has to work on --
Q. I'm not going to that part yet. How would you go about -- what kind of investments were you going to look for and --

```
A. Oh. We were going to invest in nonperforming loan and distressed properties because we had ability to -- if they needed construction, to take care of them.
Q. So at some point in time had you and he reached an agreement as to how you would proceed with the business relationship?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And had you discussed how you would go about locating either distressed properties or nonperforming loans before you made that decision?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was that discussion, please?
A. He said that he knows a lot of brokers in Vegas and in other cities in California that is active and they bring him good deals, and he talked about buying properties in auction. There were different companies that were offering both properties: distressed properties and nonperforming notes. Those are the things that he told me that he could do.
Q. Was there a point in time when you and Mr. Bidsal agreed to the terms of your partnership and proceeding?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you tell us when and give us an approximate time frame about when that was?
A. Well, it was, you know, in 2010. Sometime in
```

    1 June, July. In the summer.
    ```
```

Q. And did you and he discuss the terms of what the relationship would be?
A. Yes.
Q. And tell us what you and he agreed on in terms of what the business agreement would be.
A. He told me that to become partner, because of the economy situation, is -- cash is tight and he's short on cash, and he said that he needs to do a lot of work and -- you know, to find the properties, and he told me that I need to come up with 60 percent of the investment and he would take care of the other 40 percent. And so this was one of the agreements that we made at that time.

```

\section*{Q. Anything else?}
```

A. Yes.
Q. Explain to us -- tell us whatever terms you and he agreed on.
A. All of them?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, during many meetings that we discussed, he -- I agreed with that, and then I told him that I need to get, you know -- I don't mind investing more, but I need to get my money back. So we discussed as to how it should happen. He was telling me I need to

```
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1 invest more. However, he said that because he's going
2 to work there, the income that we get from the rent --
3 net income from the rent, we divide it 50/50. And then
4 I asked -- I told him that I invest more. However, I

5 need to get my investment back and become a part on the
6 investment. He said, "Yeah, we can arrange that." And
7 then he said that we agree that when -- beyond that rent
8 money, the net rent money, whatever earning we had, we
9 distributed according to our share of investment until
10 our capital account becomes zero.
11 Q. Did you talk about what kind of entity you would
12 be forming?
A. Yeah. The entity would be a limited liability corporation, which is good for real estate business. And then --
Q. You're telling us about what you and Mr. Bidsal agreed to. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. I want you to focus on what agreements you entered into before you started buying properties. MR. GERRARD: I'm going to have to object to the question. Obviously the question lacks foundation because it assumes that there was an agreement at this point in time, and as all we know, under the statute of Frauds, it would have to be in writing to be an
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1 agreement. I object to the question because it assumes
2 there was some sort of agreement at that point in time.
3 I don't mind the discussion about what they were
4 thinking about, but when he's asking what the agreement

5 was and what the terms of the agreement were, then
6 that's objectionable under the statute of frauds.

MR. GERRARD: I have no objection to what they discussed. It's the "What did you agree to?" That's what I have an objection to because --

MR. LEWIN: The point of this actual testimony, Your Honor, what they actually had agreed to in terms of an oral agreement and how that is consistent with the terms of the operating agreement.

1

MR. GERRARD: That's objectionable, Your Page \(\begin{aligned} & \text { Ponor, }\end{aligned}\) because under our Statute of Frauds in NRS 111.205 and 210, you cannot have an oral agreement that lasts for beyond a year, and certainly not one for the purchase of real estate. So, you know, this idea that there was some agreement, it's objectionable because under the law it cannot exist.

Having a discussion about what we might agree to in the future in a written agreement, I don't have any objection to that. But saying that you agree to it and that these were the terms, I'd absolutely have an objection to that because it's a violation of the Statute of Frauds.

MR. LEWIN: It's an oral partnership to go forward, and the purpose of that is only to show that when it was reduced in writing -- to interpret the writing, what their understanding on the going-forward basis was, and that understanding and agreement between the parties tends to show the interpretation of the written agreement.

ARBITRATOR WALL: But there's a difference to me between couching it as an oral agreement that can be enforced as opposed to "Here's what we discussed as evidence of the intention of the parties at the time that the operating agreement was drafted."

MR. LEWIN: That's the purpose of my questions.
ARBITRATOR WALL: On the first one I would sustain the objection. When we say "What was the agreement," it's kind of a generic term in terms of what we discussed. That's the way I'm interpreting it.

MR. GERRARD: Can we have him phrase the question "What did you discuss" instead of "What was the agreement," because that would violate 111.220?

ARBITRATOR WALL: And I would sustain that.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Golshani, did you and Mr. Bidsal discuss how the LLC would be managed?
A. Yes.
Q. What was said about that between you and

\section*{Mr. Bidsal?}
A. What do you mean -- how the LLC was formed?
Q. In terms of did you and he discuss who would be the manager of the LLC?
A. Yeah. We had discussed all of that. We agreed that both of us would be the manager and managing the company. Co-managers. And at that time we -- he told me that he has companies, management companies, that manage real estate, and he will take care of the day-to-day management of the property. All right? We made other -- we had other discussions.

1
Q. What other discussions did you have about how you would proceed to work together?
A. Well, one of the conditions that I had -- as I said, we had extremely good relationship at that time. I told him that, you know, we are becoming partners as friends and relative, and we are going to be working and everything should be doing good. The same way we became partner, if one of the partners doesn't want to continue with the partnership, for no reason even, he should be able to do that.

And he told me that he has experience in this matter and he would form the company and have -- he knows attorneys and they will write buy/sell agreement, but as a partner -- any partner could offer value for the company and the other partner would be able to either buy/sell at the same property or -- same at the sale price or buy at the same valuation within certain limit of time, of course, and all that. That was my other condition.
Q. So you indicated that there was a discussion about Mr . Bidsal would receive 50 percent of the rent income?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there a discussion about how that was going to be calculated?
A. Well, yes. We discussed that.
Q. And tell me what you and he discussed about that.
A. We discussed that the best way to avoid any dispute or any issues is we take the number from the tax return, the net income from the tax return, and that would be what we divide \(50 / 50\).
Q. Net income from where?
A. From rent.
Q. How would any other distributions be distributed?
A. And the other -- the other monies in the company would be distributed pro rata the investment share.
Q. Until when?
A. Until all the capital are paid and we are equal zero, and after that, everything else would be 50/50 also.
Q. You heard the claim that Mr. Bidsal had paid -that ultimately in the operating agreement the deal was that all distributions were to be \(50 / 50\) until substantially all the assets were sold. Was that ever mentioned to you?
A. No.
Q. Did the \(60 / 40\) ever change to \(70 / 30\) ?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did that take place?
A. We started working together, and -- and we
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1 started from looking at the property in California and 2 different cities. We went together and they were not performing, so we would get the package, and it was thousands of pages we divided them among ourselves and shared the information.
Q. I'm going to come to this, but right now \(I\) just want to know when did the deal change from 60/40 to 70/30? Approximately.
A. When we were a few months working together, one day he told me, "Ben, I have put a lot of work in this, and both now and after, if you buy something, if you buy and turn a piece of property or turn a loan to a property, there is a lot of work involved, and I have companies and are expenses and all that. I thought that 60/40 is not going to cover it. I need it to be changed 70/30."
Q. Approximately in time when was this?
A. It was probably late \(2010 / b e g i n n i n g ~ o f ~ 2011 . ~\)
Q. For how many months had you and he been working together looking at properties and whatnot?
A. We worked from -- I mean, up to what point?
Q. At the point in time where he said, "I need 70/30 instead of \(60 / 40\)," how much time had you spent investigating properties?
A. A few months we were looking for properties and

1 had 1018 had bid on properties, but we were not successful.
Q. All right. Okay. So going back after when you and Mr. Bidsal were talking about working together and what the terms of that relationship would be, after you -- after you agreed to the general structure of how you were going to proceed, what did you --

MR. GERRARD: Objection to the question again. There was no agreement as to how he was going to proceed in terms of Nevada law NRS 111.220.

ARBITRATOR WALL: With that understanding that you're talking about the discussions they had as opposed to an enforceable agreement.

MR. LEWIN: We're not going to claim that there was an enforceable agreement until he puts up cash. At this point is how they agreed to go forward.

MR. GERRARD: Again, that's the problem. They had not agreed to go forward in a legal fashion until an agreement actually existed, and under Nevada law you can't have an agreement before it's in writing.

ARBITRATOR WALL: That's true.
So rephrase, please.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. In essence, through these discussions, you and Mr. Bidsal had agreed that as a mechanism for going forward to try to locate properties to be possibly
```

1 purchased. Is that correct?

```
```

A. Yes.
Q. Going forward, is it true that's the understanding you would have -- what you ultimately would hope to put into a formal agreement?
A. We made that agreement. That's why we both started spending a lot of time on that.
Q. So this is still in 2010. What did -MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading. MR. LEWIN: He just said it was 2010. ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. I'm going to term it the "going forward agreement."
MR. GERRARD: Again, Your Honor, I object to the use of the word "agreement."
ARBITRATOR WALL: You can't -- here's the thing: If you're eliciting the testimony because you want that agreement orally between them enforced --
MR. LEWIN: No, I don't.
ARBITRATOR WALL: -- the law of course doesn't allow that. So you keep couching the questions in that vein, "based on your agreement." All of that. An agreement is a little bit of a term of art. I've already told you I'm taking this as they're discussions,

```
```

    1 but ultimately the operating agreement -- and he's talking about discussions he had in 2011 -- beginning of 2011, which is after the operating agreement is executed, so that's a little different. So --
    MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, I'm only offering -- they had an understanding about how they were going to proceed and to locate properties.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I like "understanding" better than "agreement."
BY MR. LEWIN:

```
Q. After you and Mr. Bidsal had the going-forward understanding, what did you and he do in terms of trying to locate the distressed properties or nonperforming

\section*{loans?}
A. He was looking and I started looking. We were both subscribed with the magazine that Auction.com would send every once or twice a month, and we would look at their property and share the information. That was one way to do it. And then he knew brokers and then I took him to some properties that my brokers showed. We were -- these are the things that we were doing to look at properties.

\section*{Q. Did you look at properties together?}
A. Yes.
Q. Where did you look at properties? In what

\section*{1 states?}
A. Well, like I said, we started from California. We would go to city of Glendale I remember. Looked at a few properties over there. We went to Bakersfield and, you know, north of Los Angeles. There were many of them available even to look at those. And also we came to Las Vegas to look at properties.
Q. Where did Mr. Bidsal live at this time?
A. I believe that he was living in Los Angeles, but he spent a lot of time in Las Vegas.
Q. And so did you look at properties in Las Vegas?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you travel to Las Vegas to look at property?
A. Yes. We traveled together.
Q. You traveled from Los Angeles with Mr. Bidsal to look at properties?
A. Yes.
Q. How many trips?
A. Many trips. Probably four or five, and each trip would be two, three days. You want me to tell them about --
Q. No. We don't need to go any specifics.

When you were in Las Vegas, what did you do

\section*{together?}
A. What we were doing?
    1 Q. Yeah. Generally.
Q. Yeah. Generally.
A. Well, I would pick him up in my car and we came here, and then we had those brochures that we had together looked at in some coffee shops and made notes and appraised them as to which one we want to look at, and then \(I\) was driving and we would go look at the properties one by one, and he was making notes.
Q. And so over what period of time were you doing this, looking at properties? Let me break that up.
At one point in time you bid at the auction to acquire the Green Valley/Henderson note?
MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. My question is: Before that, how many properties did you look at with Mr. Bidsal?
A. In Las Vegas?
Q. Las Vegas or anywhere else.
A. So many. In Las Vegas alone I think it was over 70, 80 that we covered. Even more.
Q. And now, Mr. Bidsal testified that you only looked at a few properties together. Is that true?
A. No.
Q. You looked at 70,80 properties alone in Las Vegas?

MR. GERRARD: Objection.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Sustained. He already kind of said that. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. All right. You said you received materials about these properties. The properties that you were interested in possibly trying to invest in, what kind of due diligence did you do or did you understand Mr. Bidsal was doing on those properties?
A. Well, like I said, because it was nonperforming loans, it came with a big package. Thousands of pages of documents. And then so we couldn't -- whatever property we saw, we couldn't go and look at those. First we looked at the property to see which one we are interested, and then we went and we visit the property. And after that we started looking at the loan documents, environmental reports, appraisals that came with it, rent rolls. So many documents. It was so much.

We divided -- I was good at the environmental because I had done environmental work and I would get those. I would get the one that had to do with the legal description survey, which was my line of work, and later on \(I\) would get appraisals and then \(I\) would -- in some of them, I would read the loan docs and report to him and he would tell me what he saw in the loan docs.

We shared the information. And we did that for many properties.
Q. At some point in time were you introduced to someone named Jeff Chain, C-H-A-I-N?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And who introduced you to Mr. Chain?
A. Mr. Bidsal introduced me.
Q. And what did you understand Mr . Chain did for a

\section*{living?}
A. Mr. Chain was a broker at that time and they had a relationship. He was very familiar with the Las Vegas area and he was familiar with the process of purchasing notes and converting them to the real property.
Q. Okay. And did he have a role with respect to the potential acquisition of distressed properties or nonperforming notes with you and Mr. Bidsal?
A. Yes, he did. What -- we would go to him and share with him what we had found or what we were interested. He would look at them. Many of them he knew and he would give us recommendation as to what is a good deal to go into and what is not.
Q. Okay. Ultimately he was -- strike that.

Skipping ahead now, was he involved in the
acquisition of the Green Valley note and deed of trust?
A. Yes, he was, and he acted as our broker, and then

1 after, he was involved.
Q. What was the name of his company?
A. I believe Millennium.
Q. Can you take out Exhibit No. 3, please? Just in the binder. It's the settlement agreement for the note purchase. MR. GARFINKEL: Exhibit 3 is going to be over here.

MR. LEWIN: It should be there.
MR. GARFINKEL: No, it's not. Here it is.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. It says in terms of -- there's a commission paid to Millennium Commercial. Is that Mr. Chain's company?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see it says finder's fee of \(\mathbf{\$ 1 9 , 2 5 0 ?}\)
A. That's right.
Q. Okay.
A. Let me see.
Q. Just at the same auction that you acquired the Green Valley note and deed of trust and distressed loan package, were you also successful in bidding on another distressed property?
A. Yes. On that same day we bought another note.
Q. Was that the Country Club?
```

A. Yeah.
Q. Was there a broker on that deal?
A. Jeff Chain.
Q. Okay. Going back in time, you said that you and Mr. Bidsal were investigating properties. Did you end up -- talking about before the Green Valley note. Did you and Mr. Bidsal bid on any other properties or notes?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Would you tell us, are you talking through Auction. com?
A. Through Auction.com, yes.
Q. And how many other properties did you and Mr. Bidsal bid on? I'm talking, again, before the Green Valley.
A. I understand. I don't know the number, but we did bid on some properties, but --
Q. In order to bid at an auction, what do you have to do in order to submit a bid?
A. In order to bid in an auction, you first need to guarantee, like, earnest money, couple of percent, and send to auction. However, they would also accept credit card. Then you need to -- you need to -- you need to send them proof of fund to prove that you would -- you are able to come up with the money if you got awarded. Auction.com --

```

1
Q. So you had to first of all put up a credit card or something in order to be able to bid. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you and Mr. Bidsal started bidding on properties, whose credit card was put up?
A. Well, like I said, he had informed me that he was not in a good shape financially, and I volunteered to give my credit cards. It was a few hundred thousand dollars altogether, and he would use those credit cards to be able to get into the bid.
Q. Had you or Mr. Bidsal discussed through what entity you would be doing the bidding?
A. What happened, yes.
Q. What entity did you discuss doing the bidding on the joint behalf?
A. The name of the entity, he said that he could bid under West Coast Investment, and there is another company. I believe Real Equity. That company would act as our agent to take care of the property, but we have to take care of the financial and we have to take care of the proof of funds.
Q. Do you recall when you first gave Mr. Bidsal the credit card or use of the credit card?
A. I -- well, it was sometime in 2010 later on, but I don't remember exactly.
Q. When the credit card is delivered to Auction.com, do they actually charge the credit card or --
A. No. They block -- let's say if it took \(\$ 50,000\) to bid, they block that amount from your credit. You couldn't use it.
Q. When would they charge the card, if ever?
A. They never -- if you were not the winner of the -- of the bidding, they would just release it. If you were the winner, you had to immediately pay 10 percent -- wire them 10 percent money and they would release that block.
Q. So was your credit card ever actually charged?
A. I don't remember it was charged, but it was blocked. Sometimes I had difficulty.
Q. Was that credit card used in connection with the Green Valley auction?
A. Yes.
Q. And I just want to make sure you know what I mean when I say Green Valley auction --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and also the Country Club auction?
A. Yes. MR. GERRARD: Objection. Lack of foundation. ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.
```

// /

```

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. At some point in time did you ask Mr. Bidsal to release the card?
A. Yes. What happened, I was going to Europe, and I wanted to, you know, buy ticket, and, you know, I had some expenses that \(I\) was paying with the credit card, and I realized that there is not much credit left, so I wrote him an Email. I said, "Would you please release," because I believe that he used that credit card to bid on other deals that he had since my limit was high. And then he released some of it.
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal acknowledge he received the Email from you?
A. Pardon me?
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal tell you he received the Email from you?
A. Yes.
Q. I'd like to mark as Exhibit 203, we have an Email February 21, 2012, which was marked in the first arbitration as Exhibit 40.

MR. SHAPIRO: Is there a Bates stamp?
MR. GERRARD: No. We object obviously, but --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on.
MR. LEWIN: It is one of our exhibits. I think on the exhibit list where the exhibits that were listed
```

1 in the first arbitration.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Please hold on.
MR. SHAPIRO: Well, 203, you didn't get to 203.
That's a new one.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Let him finish. He's talking
about did you have a general --
MR. LEWIN: We had identified it as an exhibit, I
believe. Let me take a look where it is.
MR. GERRARD: What exhibit number was it in the
last arbitration?
ARBITRATOR WALL: You have -- is it in 196, 197,
or 198?
MR. LEWIN: This would be in 198. It would be Exhibit 40, so it's in this book.
MR. GERRARD: It's not in the book. That's the problem.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on. 198.
MR. GERRARD: Which exhibit number did you say it was from the past?
ARBITRATOR WALL: 40. So it's one of the last four or five pages. Six or eight pages in from the back of 198.
Any objection to 40?
MR. GERRARD: No, but I object to 2-0 whatever it is.

```
```

MR. LEWIN: I'm not offering the entire 198.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I understand. We will admit what's marked as Exhibit 40 within Tab 198. For us it's a portion of 198. Got it?
(Exhibit 40 was admitted into evidence.)
MR. LEWIN: I'm going to show him the one page. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. This is an February 21, 2012 Email. Is this the Email you talked about?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had provided Mr. Bidsal with your credit cards from 2010 until this 2012 Email?
A. Yes.
Q. And he did cause some of the funds to be released. Is that correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. At some point in time did you become aware of the Green Valley/Henderson property?
A. Pardon me?
Q. At some point in time did you become aware of the Green Valley/Henderson property?
A. That's correct.
Q. And when was that?
A. As I said, in one of those brochures we located and we came to visit probably -- I mean, early 2011

```
```

    1 probably February or March. I don't remember.
    ```
``` probably February or March. I don't remember.
Q. Were you getting the packages directly?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it your understanding he was getting the same package?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the opportunity that was presented by the Green Valley/Henderson package?
A. What was the opportunity?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, we knew that it was a loan. And when we visited the property, we saw it was a business park, and there was a possibility to subdivide it into eight buildings and as a condominium to sell some of it. We saw that there was an opportunity to convert the loan to the real estate.
Q. Just to put a time frame around it, when was the bidding at Auction.com where the Green Valley/Henderson note package was purchased?
A. The auction itself?
Q. The actual auction itself?
A. May. I know we -- yeah. May. Sometime in May. Mid-May.
Q. So do you remember -- did you wire -- put the time frame again. You wired some money on May 20th.
```

| 1 | Does that help you? Page 1033 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading. |
| 3 | A. Yeah. |
| 4 | ARBITRATOR WALL: I mean, it's in the documents |
| 5 | we already have. |
| 6 | MR. GERRARD: I appreciate it, but I'd like to |
| 7 | know what the witness remembers, not what Mr. Lewin |
| 8 | remembers. |
| 9 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Understood, but this is our |
| 10 | only day of testimony. |
| 11 | MR. GERRARD: I haven't objected too many times. |
| 12 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Understood. Overrule it for |
| 13 | that question. Let's go. |
| 14 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 15 | Q. Did you go and see the Henderson property |
| 16 | together? |
| 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | Q. Did you have any conversations with Jeff Chain? |
| 19 | A. Later on, yes. |
| 20 | Q. What did Mr. Chain say? |
| 21 | MR. GERRARD: Objection. |
| 22 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Sustained. I need something |
| 23 | more particularized than that. |
| 24 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 25 | Q. Did Mr. Chain offer you any advice about |

```
1 property?
    MR. GERRARD: Calls for hearsay.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: That's a yes or no question.
    A. Yes.
    BY MR. LEWIN:
    Q. Did that advice help you make a decision in terms
    of whether or not to bid on the property?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And what was that advice?
    A. He said --
        MR. GERRARD: Objection. Calls for hearsay.
        MR. LEWIN: It's an exception. It's a state of
        mind to the extent he's relying on Mr. Chain's statement
        for the truth, because it shows what the course of
        action he and Mr. Bidsal took.
            MR. GERRARD: If he's saying that he relied upon
        the information, then he was relying upon the truth of
        the matter asserted. It's not a state of mind hearsay
        assertion.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Why is his state of mind regarding that particular property and whatever information he learned from Mr. Chain relevant?
MR. LEWIN: Because we heard Mr. Bidsal said he had a business opportunity tied up. He did everything. He found it. He did it. I'm trying to establish that
```

the fact is that Mr. Bidsal was not telling the Page ${ }^{103}$ when he did that. In fact, that there was a whole bunch of steps and they tied up the opportunity together.

MR. GERRARD: How does that have to do with --
MR. LEWIN: That's what Mr. Bidsal testified to. This was his opportunity and he let Mr. Golshani in simply because he's a nice guy. Like he did a lot of other things as a nice guy.

MR. GERRARD: So, Your Honor, obviously there's not -- he said a state of mind exception. There's no such thing as a state of mind exception in the hearsay rule. There's presence sense impression. There's excited utterances. But again, the way he asked the question was: Did you receive advice and did you rely upon that advice, and then he asked what was the advice. That's hearsay under NRS Chapter 51 because it's being offered for the truth of the matter asserted. If they want to bring Mr. Chain in to testify about what he said, then that's the witness it should come from. Not from this witness.

You know, I don't think there's any objection about did you rely upon the advice you got. As soon as he starts asking what these out-of-court statements were, that's hearsay.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Um, is Mr. Chain going to

```
testify?
```

testify?
MR. LEWIN: Yes, he is.
ARBITRATOR WALL: So he's --
MR. LEWIN: He's scheduled at 11 o'clock.
ARBITRATOR WALL: He's going to testify at the hearing and be subject to cross-examination regarding the statement. Right?
MR. GERRARD: Right. And that's where the statement should come in. Not from this witness. This witness is hearsay.
MR. LEWIN: Let me ask a different question.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you and Mr. Bidsal have a joint conversation with Mr. Chain about what he thought about the Henderson opportunity?
A. Mr. Chain?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Face to face or on the telephone?
A. Face to face.
Q. Mr. Bidsal -- after you met with Mr. Chain, whatever his advice was, you and Mr. Bidsal decided to bid on the Henderson note. Is that correct?
A. After that, yes, we decided to bid.

```

1
Q. You heard Mr. Bidsal say that he owned and controlled the Green Valley/Henderson opportunity before you even got involved. Is that true?
A. No.
Q. You've been describing all the things you were doing in connection with that opportunity. Right?
A. That's right.
Q. And after you'd met with Mr. Chain, did you do due diligence regarding the Green Valley opportunity?
A. Yes. I -- yes.
Q. Is that the same kind of due diligence that you described earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you and Mr. Bidsal have a plan if you were successful in obtaining the Green -- the Henderson note and loan package, what you would do with that after you obtained it, you were successful in obtaining it?
A. The plan was to first try to negotiate with the borrower and get the property because the loan amount was more than the worth of the property worth, and after that we would subdivide the property and get it ready for sale.
Q. Was there a point in time when you and Mr. Bidsal actually decided with proceeding with trying to obtain the Green Valley note?
```

A. I'm sorry?
Q. There was a point in time where you and he decided to try to bid on the property?
A. Yes.
Q. You talked about that?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you put in the 10 percent deposit on May 20 th, that indicates when was the bidding? When was the actual bidding?
A. The bidding was a day earlier. 19th.
Q. All right. By the way, was the Green Valley/Henderson note in default at the time that you were bidding on it?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know how much was in arrears under the note?
A. I -- we had information it was about 8 million dollars.
Q. Did you know how much were the past due payments that hadn't been paid?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Okay. Where did the bidding take place?
A. It was in a building in Las Vegas. In those days all the bidders would gather.

```
Q. And who -- did you and Mr. Bidsal also attend the

```

A. Yes.
Q. And what about increases in bids? Was that a matter of joint --
A. The increase was coming from the auction. It started from smaller increase, and after certain price it would go -- first, let's say $\$ 25,000$ increment. After a few it became $\$ 50,000$ increment. Then 100,000. Like that. We didn't have control how much --
Q. My question was really between you and Mr. Bidsal, how was the decision made to make an increased bid?
A. We were both looking at the monitor, and then when they overbid us, we would say okay. "Let's go" -sometime he would say, sometime I would say "Let's go one more higher and see what happens."
Q. This is something that you were jointly agreeing on --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in order to make an increase?
A. Yes.
Q. Why was Mr. Chain there?
A. Mr. Chain was there to --
Q. Was he participating in the recommendation?
A. He was a part of the conversation, yes.
Q. He was there as your broker?

```
A. Yes. He was our broker.
Q. So when you got the successful bid for the Green Valley notes, was there a deposit that was required to be put up?
A. Yes. We had to immediately send them the deposit.
Q. And so that deposit would be been due on May 20th. Right?
A. Actually, they expected to get it the same day. There was no possibility. Probably the banks were closed. After the cutoff time for wiring is like 1:30. I think it was past that, so...
Q. We established that you actually put up the \$404,000?
A. Yes, I put up.
Q. What happened to Mr. Bidsal's 30 percent share?
A. Well, he told me that he was -- his money was tight and he asked me to pay the whole thing and he said he would reimburse me, and, you know, we had such a great relationship and such a huge trust that \(I\) didn't hesitate. So I called my bank and arranged to pay the whole thing.
Q. Did he tell you that -- strike that.

Did you know before you started bidding that you were going to have to put up this 10 percent if you were

1 the successful bidder?
A. You mean all by myself?
Q. No, no. Were you aware that if you and Mr. Bidsal were the successful bidders, you'd have to put up a 10 percent deposit?
A. Yes.
Q. And the bidding was being done through what company?
A. LRA.
Q. My point, was it Real Equity or --
A. Yeah.

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled. We've already had that testimony out there.
A. They were our agent to do this.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal tell you before you started bidding that he couldn't come up with his 30 percent share of the deposit?
A. No.
Q. Only after you were successful. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you also have to put up a deposit for the Country Club property that you were successful at?
A. I did the same thing.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & Q. The deal on Country Club was the same deal as \\
\hline 2 & with respect to Green Valley. Correct? \\
\hline 3 & MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. Relevance. \\
\hline 4 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't know what the relevance \\
\hline 5 & at all is. \\
\hline 6 & MR. LEWIN: The relevance is they were bidding on \\
\hline 7 & two properties they ended up buying at the same auction. \\
\hline 8 & They had Mr. LeGrand draft both operating agreements, \\
\hline 9 & which are identical except for the amount of capital. \\
\hline 10 & They have the same provisions with respect to the \\
\hline 11 & waterfall and that there is documents in evidence about \\
\hline 12 & the fact that Mr. Golshani was complaining about both \\
\hline 13 & Country Club and Green Valley in that -- \\
\hline 14 & MR. SHAPIRO: Which we objected to. \\
\hline 15 & MR. LEWIN: -- and they tie in together the fact \\
\hline 16 & that he thought that the same waterfall, same meaning to \\
\hline 17 & Exhibit B was the same for both properties. \\
\hline 18 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah. Got that. I've said \\
\hline 19 & before I didn't think the Country Club portion of it in \\
\hline 20 & the operating agreement were relevant. I'm going to \\
\hline 21 & sustain the objection as to Country Club. \\
\hline 22 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 23 & Q. After the bidding was successful, did you and \\
\hline 24 & Mr. Bidsal talk about what were the next steps in \\
\hline 25 & proceeding? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. What proceeding?
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Q. You were successful in the bid for Green Valley. Did you and he talk about what to do next?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that discussion?
A. We had a plan, as I mentioned before, that first thing was we needed to form an LLC as we had agreed. Then the plan was that we hire an attorney to negotiate with the borrower to do a deed in lieu instead of going through the foreclosure process and subdivision. These were all in order when we started right away.
Q. Okay. Would you look at Exhibit 4, please? This is the articles of organization for Green Valley Commerce, LLC, which were filed on May 26, 2011. Did Mr. Bidsal tell you at or about that time that you had formed an LLC?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he show you this document before you actually put up all of your capital in terms of -- to actually complete the purchase of the note?
A. This document?
Q. Yeah.
A. I don't think so.
Q. Did he tell you that he had identified himself as the sole manager?
A. He didn't -- you mean before he showed me this document?
Q. That's right.
A. No, he didn't.
Q. At what point in time did you find out that he had designated himself as the sole manager of Green Valley Commerce, LLC?

MR. GERRARD: I'm going to object.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on.
MR. GERRARD: He's misstating the evidence, misstating the document. The document speaks for itself. The document is clearly marked that management, Paragraph 4, is members. Doesn't say that he's the sole manager because it was member-managed, not manager-managed, and it states right on there that it's members.

MR. LEWIN: Section 5 identifies those managers and there's only one named.

MR. GERRARD: Name and address of each manager or managing member.

MR. LEWIN: Of each.
MR. GERRARD: It's identifying him as a managing member, but it doesn't say that he's the manager.

MR. LEWIN: No, it says each manager or managing member.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR. GERRARD: Correct. Page 1046 \\
\hline 2 & MR. LEWIN: It says each. So if there were more \\
\hline 3 & than one manager -- and by the way, I call your \\
\hline 4 & attention to your trial brief that says that not only \\
\hline 5 & was Mr. Bidsal the sole manager, he was the sole owner. \\
\hline 6 & So I'll point that out later in closing arguments. \\
\hline 7 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I'll allow the question. \\
\hline 8 & Overrule the objection. \\
\hline 9 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 10 & Q. I forgot the question now. \\
\hline 11 & The question was: Did Mr. Bidsal ever tell \\
\hline 12 & you -- strike that. \\
\hline 13 & Before you put up all of your money to buy the \\
\hline 14 & note, did Mr. Bidsal tell you he identified himself as \\
\hline 15 & the sole managing member of Green Valley? \\
\hline 16 & A. No. \\
\hline 17 & Q. At what point in time did you find out that \\
\hline 18 & Mr. Bidsal was identified as the sole manager? \\
\hline 19 & A. Well, I -- \\
\hline 20 & MR. GERRARD: Again, you know, I'm sorry. I have \\
\hline 21 & to object. It does not say that he's the sole manager. \\
\hline 22 & It's not what the document says. \\
\hline 23 & ARBITRATOR WALL: So the question was at some \\
\hline 24 & point did you find out that Mr. Bidsal was the sole \\
\hline 25 & manager? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

question?

```
```

MR. LEWIN: That's correct.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Is that strictly from these articles of organization that you're going from?
MR. LEWIN: I'll ask him. May I ask the
ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah. You can ask him. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. At some point in time did you find out who had been identified as the manager of Green Valley?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you find that out?
A. I got this document and I realized -- shall I continue? I realized that my name is nowhere there, neither as a member or a manager, and $I$ went to him and I said "How come" --
Q. We're not there yet.
How did you obtain the document?
A. He gave it to me. He send it to me.
Q. When he gave it to you, did you have a conversation about how come it only has his name on it?
A. That's what I said, yes.
Q. What did Mr. Bidsal say?
A. Mr. Bidsal says that this is just a formality and my name would be there when the attorney prepares the operating agreement. They would put it there in the

```
```

    1 first sentence with everything.
    ```
```

Q. Okay.
A. And I took his word for it.
Q. Okay. Between you and Mr. Bidsal, who was going to do the negotiations with the borrower?
A. He was going to do it with the attorney that he said he had.
Q. Can you tell us how much time after the transaction was closed -- and that's, I think, June 3 when the escrow closed. How soon after that was a surveyor hired?
A. Very soon.
Q. Were you involved in the selection of the surveyor?
A. Yes. And I knew VTN from my previous experience with government.
Q. So at some point in time were you advised that Mr. Bidsal had hired a lawyer?
A. Yes.
Q. And who did Mr. Bidsal tell you he had hired?
A. I didn't know. Later on I learned that it was Mr. David LeGrand.
Q. And how soon after the bidding was successful for Green Valley did Mr. Bidsal tell you he had hired Mr. LeGrand?

```


1 had agreed to.
Q. So during the first meeting you had with

Mr. LeGrand, was Mr. Bidsal present?
A. Yes. He took me there.
Q. And did you, Mr. Bidsal, discuss with Mr. LeGrand about what the terms of -- what the understanding you had in terms of the going-forward relationship?
A. Yes. In detail.
Q. Was it any different than what you had described earlier as what your understanding was with Mr. Bidsal?
A. No. The same thing. We both told him the same thing.
Q. Did you tell him about the percentage?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you tell him about the percentage?
A. Well, I told him exactly what happened. I said that the percentage of investment should be 70/30. I put the 70 percent over. I needed to get that money back when -- you know, through the money other than net rent, and the proceeds from the net rent we will divide 50/50.

There was another discussion that we had agreed that both of us manage the property, be co-managers. And he only showed one manager, and I discussed with Mr. Bidsal. He said according to Nevada law, only one
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1 manager is allowed. So I discussed it with Mr. LeGrand
2 and I asked if that's the case. He said no. You can
3 have as many managers. So I agreed that both of us be 4 manager of that entity.

5 And then we discussed about the buy/sell
6 agreement, and \(I\) told him factually what we have
7 discussed. That \(I\) have seen people go into agreement,

24 lieu agreement? and because they didn't have a buy/sell agreement, they had to go to court for years and we both want to avoid that. We want a buy/sell agreement that anybody can buy and the other party has to either sell or buy at the same property. And he made notes. And these were the discussions we had with him.
Q. Did you discuss with Mr. LeGrand the return of

\section*{capital?}
A. Yes.
Q. Go ahead. What was said to LeGrand about that?
A. We said that we first -- we first distribute the rent money, the net rent money. Whatever is left we distributed according to the pro rata share of the capital of the partners.
Q. Okay. So at the time you met with Mr. LeGrand, did you understand he was also working on the deed in
A. I knew that, yes.
Q. You knew that from Mr. Bidsal?
A. Yes. I knew he was working on deed.
Q. Was that discussed in this first meeting as well or not?
A. We -- they just mentioned.
Q. So the operating agreement actually was not signed until approximately December 12th. So did you have an understanding of why it took so long to get that operating agreement for Green Valley executed?
A. Well, I didn't understand. It was just a simple operating agreement. We had a lawyer. Everybody was there, but it was delayed and delayed. It was not right.
Q. Did you ask Mr. Bidsal what was taking so long?
A. Yes. I asked him and he mentioned that he was busy and he would take care of it. And then weeks passed and then nothing would happen and I started getting anxious.
Q. Why were you anxious?
A. Because I had put a huge amount of money in, about 4 million dollars in both projects, and I didn't have a piece of paper to show that \(I\) was the owner. I had shares and, you know, there was no -- I wouldn't get any response, a favorable response that okay, let's sit down and finish this operating agreement. He would say,
```

1 "We'll do it. It takes time."
Q. When you say 4 million dollars, are you including
the money that you put up as capital for Country Club?
A. Yes. I put 2.8 here and the rest was there.
Q. Did you also talk about the time it was taking to
sign the operating agreement with Mr. LeGrand?
A. Well, at one point in time I talked to
Mr. Bidsal, and I said, "What is the hang up? Why
doesn't progress."
He said, "Mr. LeGrand says because of the
disparity of the capital, we need a formula to address
this. It's not like a straightforward thing."
I said, "So why don't they do the formula? They
said it is complicated, so I started getting involved to
see what is what and expedite.
Q. Okay. So will you take a look at Exhibit 6?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Make a spot where it makes
sense to take a short break.
MR. LEWIN: Let me get through this part.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
MR. LEWIN: Actually, I want to go to exhibit --
before Exhibit 6.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Well, looking at Exhibit 6, the first -- there's
a series of Emails. The first one on it is the Email

```

1 from November 29, 2011 that says, "Ben, attached find 2 the revised OPAG with right of first refusal."

Did you receive this?
A. I think so. Yes.
Q. I'd like to call your attention to -- I can set it up as a separate exhibit. I'd like to go to Exhibit 198 to Exhibit 26.
A. 26 ?

MR. LEWIN: That portion of Exhibit 198.
ARBITRATOR WALL: You've got to get him a different book.

THE WITNESS: I go up to 193.
MR. GERRARD: Which number?
ARBITRATOR WALL: 26.
MR. GARFINKEL: Which is it?
ARBITRATOR WALL: 198, and then Exhibit 26 within 198. He's already looked at 198 before, so that book should be up there somewhere, because he looked at Exhibit 40 within 198.

MR. GARFINKEL: The problem is I have theirs. Is it theirs or yours?

MR. LEWIN: Here it is. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
MR. GARFINKEL: Here you go.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. GARFINKEL: 198.
```

1 BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Exhibit 26 --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Any objection to Exhibit 26
within 198?
MR. GERRARD: No.
(Exhibit 26 was admitted into evidence.)
THE WITNESS: Do you know the DL number?
MR. GARFINKEL: Bates number.
MR. LEWIN: Just look for Exhibit 26.
THE WITNESS: I know I see 25 but --
MR. GARFINKEL: Sir, just keep going. Here you
go.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. GARFINKEL: No problem.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. We earlier saw Mr. LeGrand had sent in a document
with an operating agreement with right of first refusal,
and later, on this Exhibit 26, at 5:06 he sent another
version with the buy/sell agreement.
Looking at the -- looking at Exhibit -- you
received the operating agreement with the buy/sell
agreement. Is that correct?
A. At one point in time, yes.

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR. LEWIN: This will be a good time to take a 1056 \\
\hline 2 & break, Your Honor. \\
\hline 3 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Off the record. \\
\hline 4 & *** \\
\hline 5 & (RECESS TAKEN FROM 10:44 A.M. TO 11:03 A.M.) \\
\hline 6 & *** \\
\hline 7 & Whereupon, \\
\hline 8 & JEFF CHAIN, \\
\hline 9 & having first been called as a witness, was duly sworn \\
\hline 10 & and testified as follows: \\
\hline 11 & ARBITRATOR WALL: Is it Jeff, J-E-F-F, Chain, \\
\hline 12 & \(\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{N}\) ? \\
\hline 13 & THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. \\
\hline 14 & ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm going to turn you over to \\
\hline 15 & Mr. Lewin. \\
\hline 16 & EXAMINATION \\
\hline 17 & BY MR. LEWIN: \\
\hline 18 & Q. Good morning, Mr. Chain. Thank you for joining \\
\hline 19 & us today. Would you mind telling His Honor what kind of \\
\hline 20 & work you do? \\
\hline 21 & A. I'm a commercial real estate broker in Las Vegas. \\
\hline 22 & Q. And how long have you been a commercial real \\
\hline 23 & estate broker? \\
\hline 24 & A. 40-plus years. \\
\hline 25 & Q. And you hold a license with the State of Nevada? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. I do. A broker's license.
Q. And how long have you held that broker's license?
A. Probably 30 years.
Q. And do you have a company that you work with?
A. Yes. Millennium Commercial Properties.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on. Let me stop you.
Is your volume on as loud as it will go? Your
computer volume.
(Discussion off the record.)
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Chain, would you keep your voice up so that everyone can hear you? Try to do that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. We were talking about Millennium properties. How long have you had that business?
A. 25-plus years.
Q. And what kind of business does Millennium property do? Commercial properties? Residential properties? Or some other --
A. It just does commercial properties.
Q. Has that been your experience over the past 30 or so years?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. And do you know Shawn Bidsal?
A. I do.
Q. And when did you first meet Mr. Bidsal?
A. 25, 30 years ago.
Q. And do you know Ben Golshani?
A. I do.
Q. How long have you known Mr . Golshani?
A. It will be between 10 and 15 years.
Q. And do you remember when you first met

Mr. Golshani?
A. Some point in the late '08, '09, '07. Somewhere in that range.
Q. And do you remember in connection with -- have you ever had any conversations with Mr. Golshani and Mr. Bidsal about opportunities to buy either distressed properties or nonperforming loans?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And do you remember when that took place?
A. Probably '08, '09. Right after the crash happened.
Q. You were the broker regarding the -- I'm going to do this for a time frame. You were the broker for the purchase of a loan package relating to Green Valley in Henderson. Do you recall?
A. Yes, I do.

MR. LEWIN: Spencer, would you put up Exhibit 3?
ARBITRATOR WALL: You know what? While he's
```

    1 doing that, let's try having him mute his phone and use
    ```
``` his computer audio.
MR. LEWIN: Can you try muting your phone and just using the computer audio and see if that works?
THE WITNESS: Okay. Are you able to still hear me?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Is that any better?
THE REPORTER: Ask him to say something again.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Count to ten for me.
THE WITNESS: (Complied.)
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Go ahead.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Would you please take a look at a final settlement statement that should be on your screen that's dated June 3rd, 2011?
A. I see it.
Q. So do you recall ever discussing this business opportunity with Mr. Bidsal or Mr. Golshani?
A. Looking -- we were looking at a large list of properties and then talking to Mr. Bidsal and Ben on numerous times back in that era, kind of finding a package to purchase.
Q. Now, this closing took place on June 3rd, 2011. Were you involved with Mr. Bidsal and Mr. Golshani in looking for purchase opportunities in 2010?
```

A. I believe so, yes.
Q. And did you have a meeting with them where they discussed what they wanted to purchase?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us when the first of those meetings were, or have they sort of merged in your memory?
A. We looked at hundreds of properties back in that time, so $I$ couldn't tell you. I couldn't narrow down a date.
Q. Did they describe their relationship to you, what they were doing together?
A. They were together a lot of times, and my understanding is they were going to purchase $X$ amount of properties, and acquired this one and another one.
Q. Now, did you recommend this Green Valley purchase to them or did they come to you with it?
A. I was going through hundreds of properties, and we would narrow them down and send them off to ones I thought made sense.
Q. And would you have been doing that in 2010 as well as 2011?
A. Probably.
Q. Was this the first purchase that they had, as far as you know?
A. I don't know if this was first or Horizon Ridge

1 was first, but they were relatively close together.
Q. You said Horizon Ridge. Is that also known as the Country Club property?
A. Yes.
Q. So prior to the bidding for this Green Valley note package, you said that you had referred them to hundreds of properties?
A. I probably went through hundreds. Probably sent them 50. Could have been more.
Q. When you sent them recommendations out, did you send them to Mr. Bidsal, Mr. Golshani, or both of them?
A. I'm sure sometimes one, sometimes the other, and lots of times both.
Q. Regarding the -- strike that. Were some of these properties to be potentially -- or the opportunities to purchase through Auction. com?
A. Correct.
Q. And with respect to this Green Valley/Henderson loan package, this was a purchase of a note and security documents. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you attend the bidding for this property at the auction with Mr. Golshani and Mr. Bidsal?
A. Yes.
Q. Was anyone else there that you recall?
A. It was in an auditorium. I believe it was at Cashman Field. I believe on our team we were the only ones present.
Q. Did you observe how Mr. Golshani and Mr. Bidsal actually conducted the bidding?
A. I believe I was typing the numbers in. They were discussing the numbers.
Q. And then would you explain to His Honor how that process worked?
A. Um, they post the auction about ten days before they put up a due diligence. Go through and open the auction 72 ish, 96 hours prior, and the bid changes every five minutes. Then as it gets close to what they believe the end is, they reduce the increments down to 2 minutes and ultimately got down to 30 seconds. You would submit a bid and then you could (inaudible) whatever guidance they had in the platform at that time. Starting at $\$ 100,000$ increments. Towards the end it would be a few thousand dollar increments.
Q. You were typing in the bidding by Mr. Golshani and Mr. Bidsal?
A. I was.
Q. And do you recall, were you getting instructions from one of them, both of them, or either one of them?
A. Probably either one. We were all sitting together, so it was a very dynamic situation.
Q. Did you ever hear Mr . Bidsal or Mr . Golshani say who put up the proof of funds for this bidding?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. Did -- strike that. Now, I had -MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, there's a part of Exhibit 50 in evidence but not the entire 50 that I wanted to display to Mr. Chain, but $I$ was going to make it as a separate exhibit since $I$ wanted to put in -ARBITRATOR WALL: 50 is in evidence. MR. LEWIN: I have excerpted the pages I want. ARBITRATOR WALL: Why? 50 is already in. MR. LEWIN: Because -- okay. MR. GARFINKEL: Which one? MR. LEWIN: Spencer, please display Exhibit 50. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. While he's doing that, Mr. Chain, after the bidding was successful and title of the property was obtained, did you list any of the properties for sale?
A. At one point $I$ had buildings on -- Country Club buildings listed as well as the Green Valley buildings listed.
Q. In connection to -- and I'd like to, if we could,

1 look on Exhibit 50 --

MR. LEWIN: Spencer -- you have Exhibit 50 on your screen? Yes. Here we go. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. So if you could look at -- I'm going to refer you to Pages 620 through -- there's an assortment of pages here. Start at 620. Would you take a look at Exhibit 620, and was this -- and tell us in the succeeding pages what those pages are. I think they're your flyers. I just want you to focus on that part.
A. Looks like an Email from myself to Shawn regarding the Green Valley commercial.

MR. LEWIN: Spencer, would you scroll through the next page, please? Just keep scrolling, Spencer, so Mr. Chain can look at what we're talking about to the end of the flyer. The last page, which is 633. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. So, Mr. Chain, what are these documents that you just looked at?
A. Looks like an old marketing brochure that I would have put out into various commercial listing sites.
Q. Were you able to sell any of the buildings in the Green Valley Center?
A. We sold, I think, a couple of them. Possibly three. We sold the pharmacy building. I think the one

1 in the back.
Q. And at some point in time -- and I'm not going to go into this because this is sort of a separate issue, but to put some perspective on this. At some point in time was your company actually managing the Green Valley Center?
A. For a short period of time we managed the Green Valley Center, yes. We didn't take care of any of the financial sides. Just managed it from tenant showings, tenant relations. That was it.

MR. LEWIN: One sec, please.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. At the time that you began listing the properties, how many buildings were there, if you recall?
A. Eight or nine, I think.
Q. And did you recommend David LeGrand to Shawn Bidsal?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal ever tell you that after the auction that he was going to try to find another investor to replace Ben?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Okay. All right.

MR. LEWIN: I have nothing else.


1 BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. Try that again, Mr. Chain. Do you actually have an independent recollection when you first met Mr. Golshani?
A. No, I do not.
Q. When you said perhaps it could have been 2008 or 2009, that was just a guess, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And in terms of the number of properties that you actually showed to Mr. Golshani and Mr. Bidsal, do you actually have a specific recollection of how many there were?
A. I do not. I said it was probably around 50, but I have nothing to base that number on.
Q. And was the 50 , was that actually physically going out and showing them a property or where you sent them information about a property?
A. Combination. Sometimes I would take a big list and try to whittle it down to a smaller list and send them off and then ones that -- we walked a lot of property.
Q. So can you estimate how long it was from the first time that you met Mr. Golshani to the time that this first auction took place? We know the auction was in May of 2011. Would this process of sending

1 information about properties have started any earlier
2 than a few months before that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How many months before that?
A. Probably a year before. They were shown tens of thousands in that time frame.
Q. Tens of thousands of properties to these two individuals?
A. No. I look at buildings all day long, so I have no idea how many we looked at specifically related to that transaction or ultimately that transaction.
Q. Sure. I guess that's what I'm trying to find out. I'm trying to find out how much you actually remember from your own independent recollection.
A. It was 12 years ago, so...
Q. Did you speak with Mr . Lewin about your testimony today?
A. I got a subpoena from him and he sent me a couple documents and that was about it. We didn't discuss much else.
Q. Did you actually have a conversation with him?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you talk about when you first met with Mr. Golshani and first started showing properties to him?
A. He might have asked, and I probably would have given the same answer. As far as I know, the '08/'09 range.
Q. Do you have any actual documentation in your files that would reflect when you first met Mr. Golshani?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Any Emails that you sent him with

```
information?
```

A. Not from that time frame, no.
Q. Okay. Did you go back and look for Emails that you sent to Mr. Golshani?
A. I did, and I didn't have any -- I don't have any Email records from that period. I had a major computer issue five or six years ago that wiped out a lot of that stuff.
Q. What was the earliest you could find that you sent to Mr. Golshani?
A. Didn't pay attention, so I don't know.
Q. Wasn't 2008 or 2009 , was it?
A. I have no records from then.
Q. Did you speak with Mr. Golshani prior to your testimony today?
A. Only -- he called me probably six months ago and said "Can we subpoena you and will you testify," and I

```
1 said "I'm uncomfortable," and he said, "Subpoena
2 don't have a choice."
```

```
Q. Did you talk about the time frame when you met him?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you talk to him about how many properties you may have looked at before there was any auction?
A. I did not.
Q. And did he send you any documents to review?
A. He did not.
Q. You mentioned Mr . Lewin sent you some documents to review?
A. He did.
Q. What documents did he send you?
A. He sent me two things. One Email has a loan sale agreement which is blank, an executive summary and terms and conditions from Auction.com. Didn't really mean anything. And then 50 GBC properties, leases, and advertisements that Mr. Bidsal had been marketing the property.
Q. So you were shown an exhibit a few moments ago. Exhibit 50 had some marketing materials for some of the properties in this Green Valley Commerce group.
```


## Correct?

```
A. Correct.
```

Q. And it showed that those marketing materials were dated in August of 2012. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You don't recall ever attempting to market these properties prior to that, do you?
A. Um, you know, it was a long time ago. I don't know what date we officially started marketing.
Q. Okay. But the only documents that you've seen are these documents showing a date in August of 2012. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you don't have any independent recollection of anything happening prior to that. Correct?
A. I do not know when we started marketing.
Q. Okay. Do you know if there was any discussion during the time that the bidding was going on about what the plan was going to be for these properties, other than to manage them?
A. The plan was always to sell them off individually, as they're worth more on an individual basis than as a package.
Q. What do you base that testimony on? Off an actual recollection of them talking about that time?
A. My experience as a real estate breaker. ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on.

```
MR. GERRARD: Hold on a moment, sir.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Open your camera so he can see who he's talking to.
MR. GERRARD: Now you can see me. I didn't realize \(I\) wasn't on.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. I know, sir, there was a plan to market and sell the properties. We looked at documents associated with that. Correct?
A. Um, correct.
Q. But my question was really more towards when was that plan first developed?
A. It was the genesis of what the properties we were looking for were valued at properties and finding an office complex or retail complex that we can divide and sell individually.
Q. Okay. So that's your understanding generally of what types of properties they were looking for?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
MR. GERRARD: I don't have any other questions. ARBITRATOR WALL: Do you have any? MR. LEWIN: No. No further questions. ARBITRATOR WALL: All right, Mr. Chain. Thank you very much. You can disconnect both of them. THE WITNESS: Both of them. Okay.
```

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. We're going to take our luncheon recess now. I'm going to try the other room as well and see if that works better.
(RECESS TAKEN FROM 11:57 P.M. TO 12:57 P.M.)

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So it's 1:01, so we've got a half hour of testimony for Mr. Golshani. Is that right?

MR. GARFINKEL: That's right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Golshani, do you realize you're still under oath?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Is everyone ready to go?
MR. GERRARD: Getting there. Yes. I'm fine. All right.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Is your other half on?

MR. LEWIN: He said he got kicked off, but he doesn't have to be here for Mr. Golshani.

ARBITRATOR WALL: He shouldn't have gotten kicked off.
CONTINUED EXAMINATION

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Golshani, you heard Mr. Chain testify that he
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## 2 that?

A. I think we met, you know, through Mr. Bidsal in 2010. I'm sorry. Or even '11.
Q. He testified that several buildings -individual -- was the -- was the plan to sell all the buildings one by one or was the plan to sell some of them?

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.
A. The plan was to sell a few of them and then get the capital back and try to reimburse the other project and see what the situation -- actual situation is for the rest.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. You heard Mr. Bidsal testify that you did not want to sell. He had to convince you to sell buildings. Is he telling the truth?
A. No. We had discussed that long time before that.
Q. And you had -- at the time what was your total capital investment -- let me start over.

At the time that any the buildings were first listed for sale, how much money had you invested into Green Valley?
A. In the beginning, about $\$ 2.8$ million.
Q. Were you still looking for properties with Mr. Bidsal after the Green Valley note was filed?
A. I was not interested in the loans anymore and looking for regular properties.
Q. Now, do you know when -- there was -- do you know when the survey was completed?
A. Yes.

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Best evidence rule.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't know what we have.
MR. GERRARD: That's factually the point. They didn't put it in and they're asking about a document from 12 years ago that he did not prepare and he doesn't -- and we don't have the actual document which would answer the question. They didn't put it into evidence. That's why it's the best evidence rule objection.

MR. LEWIN: We talked with Mr. Bidsal about it. There is a document. Please look at Exhibit 7, which is the CC\&Rs. Maybe I should wait until you rule on the objection. Sorry.

ARBITRATOR WALL: If you're going to do it this way, then there is no objection pending.

MR. LEWIN: Okay.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. What is Exhibit 7, Mr. Golshani?

```
A. This is the \(C C \& R\) and -- and the pertaining documents.
Q. Is the survey attached to these CC\&Rs?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Would you please take a look at the documents beginning at Page 1411 and see if that helps you --
A. No.
Q. -- when the survey was completed?
A. The survey was completed August 2, 2011.
Q. Okay. And there was a record of survey that was recorded. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When was the record of survey recorded?
A. The recordation was August -- October, I believe, 7 of '10 or 2011.
Q. You indicated that you were familiar with the subdivision process?
A. Yes.
Q. What is the difference between having the survey actually completed and the record?
A. When the surveyor does his job, he can -- he would subdivide it and he would prepare the legal description and -- which goes into the documents, and when you do \(C C \& R\) is when you form a homeowner association, and you have some legal process to do that.
```



1
triggered unless there is a sale of all or substantially all of the assets or a cash offer at financing. You heard that statement?
A. Yes.
Q. You also heard Mr. Wilcox when he testified -- go through a scenario where he ended up with Mr. Bidsal having a negative capital account -- the possibility of a negative capital account. You heard that?
A. Yes.

MR. GERRARD: Misstates the witness's testimony. ARBITRATOR WALL: Let's get to the question rather than what he heard someone say. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Prior to signing the operating agreement, did anyone discuss with you the possibility of you being a creditor relying on Mr . Bidsal to make up any deficiency in his capital account?
A. No.
Q. Would you have signed the operating agreement where there were scenarios where you would end up with a positive capital account and Mr. Bidsal with a negative and the only remedy was for him to pay it back?
A. No.

MR. GERRARD: Objection -- go ahead. I withdraw the objection.

```
    1 BY MR. LEWIN:
    Q. Your answer was?
    A. No.
    Q. Would you have signed the operating agreement if
    you thought you can only recover your capital account on
    the sale of the last building?
    A. No, I would not.
    Q. Now, in terms of getting title from the borrower,
    just take a look at Exhibit 8. That's the deed in lieu
    agreement?
    A. All right.
    Q. Did you receive that agreement before this
arbitration started?
    A. Yes.
    Q. When did you first see it?
    A. I don't remember, but fairly recently after the
second arbitration.
Q. You mean the first arbitration?
A. Yeah. Before the second.
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal ever tell you there was no closing statement with respect to the transfer of title?
A. No.
Q. Did he ever talk to you about closing -- doing an agreement with the borrowers and not getting a closing statement?
```

```
A. No.
Q. Had he told you that there was no closing statement, would you have objected to him closing the deal with the borrowers unless there was a closing statement?
A. Yes.
MR. GERRARD: Objection. Question is vague and ambiguous as what he means by "closing statement."
MR. LEWIN: An escrow. A final settlement statement.
ARBITRATOR WALL: A final settlement statement for the deed in lieu?
MR. LEWIN: Right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. I'll overrule the objection, but there's generally not.
MR. LEWIN: If you don't think it's not probative --
ARBITRATOR WALL: There's not generally a closing statement for a deed in lieu, but...
MR. LEWIN: I'll withdraw the question. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Just so we can get off the operating agreement right now, Mr. Gerrard asked you about Exhibit 67 and having to do -- can we pull up Exhibit 67?
A. What about it?
```

Q. I just want to draw your attention to the formula in the buy/sell agreement. Refer to this Email, and can you -- if you drafted it and what you mean by "I came up with." Did you come up with the formula all by yourself or did you have some help with that?
A. Some help.
Q. From whom?
A. From Mr. Bidsal.
Q. Have you ever heard Mr. Bidsal say that you and he massaged the language of the buy/sell agreement? MR. SHAPIRO: Objection. He's asking if Ben ever heard Shawn say something? ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. I guess it's not hearsay because Shawn's here.

ARBITRATOR WALL: And he's a party opponent. MR. GERRARD: That only means if it's a statement against interests, so go ahead.
A. I heard him say that.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Where did you hear him say that?
A. In the first arbitration.
Q. During the testimony?
A. During the testimony.
Q. In this very room?


| 1 | properties for sale? Page 1083 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | Q. And for the price? |
| 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | Q. And the first sale was completed in 2012. Is |
| 6 | that correct? |
| 7 | A. The first. |
| 8 | Q. Sale? |
| 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | Q. And what building was that? |
| 11 | A. Building C. |
| 12 | Q. And we've already covered this, but just to set |
| 13 | this up: Were all the proceeds from the sale of |
| 14 | Building C used to purchase Greenway? |
| 15 | A. Not all. A little bit left. |
| 16 | Q. And that's what we call boot? |
| 17 | A. Boot, yes. |
| 18 | Q. And that boot was distributed? |
| 19 | A. It was distributed 70/30. |
| 20 | Q. And you're aware of that? |
| 21 | A. I became aware of it, yes. |
| 22 | Q. When did you become aware of that? |
| 23 | A. When they send me the calculations, I took a look |
| 24 | at it. I -- |
| 25 | Q. And how did that -- so were those calculations -- |

1 did they reflect your understanding of how the
2 distributions were to be made?
A. Well, actually, the distributions were to be made pro rata based on the capital contribution.
Q. And distributed 70/30?
A. No. At that time it was a little bit different. Mine was more because of the problem. A little bit different.
Q. They were distributed 70/30?
A. Yes, sir. Yes.
Q. You were fine with that at the time. Right?
A. At the time I was fine with it. I mean, it was there, but I mentioned it in 2010, yeah.
Q. In terms of feeling comfortable with the way the distributions were going to be made in the future, did the fact that the boot was distributed $70 / 30$ give you some reassurance?
A. Yes. I looked at it and I thought it was okay.
Q. When did you receive the 2012 tax return?
A. I believe 2012 was sent late 2013.
Q. Would you please turn to Exhibit 180? ARBITRATOR WALL: Does Spencer have it? Could he put it on the screen?

MR. LEWIN: No. He doesn't have that one. I got it. No, I don't actually.


| 1 | ARBITRATOR WALL: I'll allow it. Page 1086 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. GERRARD: Okay. |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: Answer. |
| 4 | A. Late 2013, I believe. |
| 5 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 6 | Q. Well, if you take a look -- I just want to get |
| 7 | the date down. If you take a look at page marked |
| 8 | 2554 -- |
| 9 | A. Okay. |
| 10 | Q. -- the date is September 10, 2013? |
| 11 | A. 2544 ? |
| 12 | Q. In the top right-hand corner. |
| 13 | MR. SHAPIRO: It's not there. |
| 14 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 15 | Q. 2554? |
| 16 | A. Oh. 9/10/2013 is 2554. |
| 17 | Q. We previously looked at your Exhibit 16 where |
| 18 | your K-1 was dated August 8, 2013. When you received |
| 19 | any $\mathrm{K}-1 \mathrm{~s}$ and letters, were the tax returns ever |
| 20 | accompanying them? |
| 21 | A. I generally received tax return. I seldom got |
| 22 | K-1s however. |
| 23 | Q. Okay. Now, in terms of -- in terms of the |
| 24 | Greenway -- that was the property that the exchange was |
| 25 | done -- who located that property? |

```
A. I located the property.
Q. How did you locate it?
A. I was active in Auction.com on my own and was looking for properties in different cities. I found that.
Q. And did you bring it into the partnership?
A. Yeah. I put it in the contract under CLA property and we had sold -- I brought it to the Green Valley so we can do exchange for Building \(C\).
Q. Did you ask for a premium?
A. No. I didn't ask for nothing.
Q. The checks that were referred to in the breakdown with respect to the sale for the boot, how did you receive those checks?
A. Generally, all the checks goes to my office and the accounting people get them and decide which belongs to what entity and register them and deposit them.
Q. Would it be -- when -- all of the entities went to the Noveltex office?
A. Yes.
Q. How many entities were receiving business documents there in 2012?
A. In 2012, probably three.
Q. Okay. And then after checks -- were the checks deposited before you saw -- did you ever get the checks
```

1 or were they deposited before you saw them?
A. They deposit the check. Generally I am -- I had so much to do, I was not in the office, and that's why our policy was whatever check they get, they just deposit. And no, I didn't see the checks.
Q. Mr. Bidsal said that before he ever issued checks, he got your consent for any checks relating to Green Valley. Is that true?
A. No.
Q. Did he ever seek your consent before he issued any checks to you?
A. No.
Q. Or to himself?
A. No.
Q. So did you register any complaints about any distribution to Mr. Bidsal in 2012?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Let's turn to 2013. When did you get your 2013 tax return?
A. I got it in 2014 .
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 19.
A. 19?
Q. Yes. And then also take a look at Exhibit 21.
A. 21. Okay.
Q. Just look at those both together.

```
A. Okay.
Q. Exhibit 21 is a letter with a K-1. Right?
A. It is a \(K-1\) for Green Valley.
Q. It's dated September 9, 2014?
A. That's right.
Q. And did the tax return accompany this letter?
A. I'm not sure if this was from the tax return, but tax return contains the \(K-1\).
Q. Okay. So was it -- and this is for the year 2013 tax return. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there a building sold in 2014?
A. '14 or '13?
Q. '14?
A. Yes. A building was sold in 2014.
Q. And that was building what?
A. Building E.
MR. LEWIN: You know, perhaps -- it's almost
1:30, Your Honor.
Spencer, is anyone in the waiting room? ARBITRATOR WALL: No. We would know. MR. LEWIN: Oh, he wouldn't know. You would know. ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah.
```

```
/ / /
```

```
/ / /
```

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

```
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 22.
A. Okay.
Q. And what is this?
A. This is a closing statement for Building E.
Q. And this is dated November 14, 2014?
A. November 14, 2014.
Q. Okay. Did you become concerned about distributions -- strike that. In 2014, did you become concerned about how distributions were being made?
A. Yes.
Q. So previously you testified you started making complaints in 2013. What complaints did you make in 2013?
A. In 2013?
Q. 2013.
A. 2013 I noticed -- actually, I didn't make complaint, but in 2013 I noticed that my capital account is going up and Mr. Bidsal's is going down. And it wasn't much. 2000. And the year before it was about the same. So I looked at the \(\mathrm{K}-1 \mathrm{~s}\) and I didn't have the time to sit down and get the answer.
I called Mr. Bidsal and we were talking about other things. I casually mentioned to him that, by the
```
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1 way, this number is different. What do you think? He
2 said that, "I don't know. Should be okay, but I'll
3 check." And then I pursue and forgot about it and he
4 forgot about it too because it wasn't much. You know?
5 So I just mentioned it to him. We had a very good relationship, and you know, $I$ was sure this thing was going to be resolved. And there was other issues too and we resolved, so this to me wasn't --
Q. By the way -- when you look at your tax return for 2013 that you received in 2014, September or later, did you look at it right away? Did you look at it upon receipt?
A. No. No. As -- in those days I was extremely busy and $I$ was running two, three different businesses and $I$ was traveling a lot, and there were a lot of things I should learn, so I didn't have time to check things, and $I$ was relying, on the case of Green Valley, 100 percent on Mr. Bidsal to be very careful about this. So no, I didn't -- I wasn't waiting for them and I didn't check them right away.
Q. Did you have an indication from anybody or any source that Mr. Bidsal was intentionally not following the distribution requirements of the operating agreement?
A. At what time?
Q. In 2013.
A. No.
Q. Okay. In 2014 you received a tax return that shows -- a 2014 -- what did it show? You can locate the K-1 if you want for 2014. Either way, what did it show about the distributions in your capital account?
A. 2014 tax return?
Q. Yeah. You can look at 21. That's your K-1, if it's easier.
A. Exhibit 21. That's 2013.
Q. Right. We were talking about the 2013 tax return that you received in 2014.

ARBITRATOR WALL: You asked him about the 2014 tax return.

MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry. I thought I said look at the tax return you received. My mistake.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Look at the 2013 tax return that you received.
A. I have the $\mathrm{K}-1$ here.
Q. What was the status of your $\mathrm{K}-1$ account?
A. It is 71.95 percent, which is almost 72 percent.
Q. What is Mr. Bidsal's?
A. It doesn't have it here, but generally whenever mine is over, his is under.
Q. At some point in time did you become aware of how

1 the sales proceeds were distributed with respect to the 2 sale of Building E?
A. Yes.
Q. When was that?
A. It was --

ARBITRATOR WALL: When did he become aware or
when was the sale?
MR. LEWIN: When did he become aware.
A. I noticed it probably end of 2014 or '15.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you -- did you begin -- did you contact Mr. Bidsal in 2014 after September 9th to talk about the fact that there was some problems with the way the funds were being distributed?
A. Because of the sale?
Q. Or because of your $\mathrm{K}-1$.
A. After 2014, yeah.
Q. I'm asking did you contact him in 2014?
A. In 2014, I don't remember.
Q. But at some time you did contact him?
A. Yes.
Q. When's the first time you recall contacting him?
A. I contact him when $I$ got the tax return after a couple of months, and then we had a discussion in the office and they were bringing me the report and saying
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1 that we receive a check. It's 70/30 and things like that, which was in line with what we had. And then I took at look at it and I realized 70/30 is only the capital and he's not following the waterfall.

So I started making calls serious and I said about end of 2015, what do you think -- what's the reason you're doing it this way?
Q. When do you first recall speaking to Mr. Bidsal about this issue about the sale of building -distributions from the sale of Building E?
A. It was about the end of 2015. In 2015.
Q. Why didn't you contact him before then?
A. Like I said, I didn't -- I was not aware that every year it is becoming like this, and I was not aware that it has become -- it is becoming more, and when there was a sale, big numbers started adding. So that's why. Like I said, we were in extremely good terms. I'm the one who put the down payment without any payment and I paid about 4 million dollars into our investment.

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Move to strike. Nonresponsive.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on. There's an objection.
MR. GERRARD: He answered the question. Now he's going off on something completely different.

MR. LEWIN: The question was why didn't you call

1 him earlier, and I think he's explaining.

MR. GERRARD: I don't think that was the question. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. The bottom line is -- you've seen the first communications that we've seen are in January 2016 that refer to December 2015. Is that the first time it was in writing?
A. I think so. Probably in 2015 I sent an Email.
Q. If you were concerned about the way monies were being distributed, why didn't you ask him earlier?
A. Because of trust. I didn't scrutinize to see what has happened. You know? Can I talk about what --
Q. You can tell kind of what your mindset was and how and when you made complaints about distributions.
A. So what I'm trying to say, at those dates, there was such a good relationship with Shawn, and I have so much trust. As example, I was saying he had my money without me having any paper with him. If something happened to him, I cannot easily prove that that money was mine. I trusted him. That trust continued and I thought that could take care of it. I had a lot on my plate, so I didn't scrutinize.
Q. When you did contact Mr. Bidsal, it was verbally. Right?

```
A. Yes.
Q. For the first time?
A. A couple of times.
Q. How many times did you have in 2015 those conversations?
A. A couple of times.
Q. Can you tell what was said in those conversations?
A. I asked him about why there is a disparity in the capital ratio, and first he said didn't know, and then he said he would look into it. And then later on he direct me to Tina from the CPA office, which I called and she answered. I told her the problem. He never called me back when I called. He would not take my call. It was like that.
Q. When did you first raise the issue about the fact he was only distributing the sale proceeds \(70 / 30\) with respect to the basis of the funds?
MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading. He asked him what did you talk about, and none of this was included in that answer, so now he's telling him what he wants the answer to be.
ARBITRATOR WALL: He asked when. When did you talk about the fact it was \(70 / 30\), so...
MR. GERRARD: Right, but he's supplying the
```

```
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```

```
information that he wants it to be about when the witness never testified about that.
ARBITRATOR WALL: He has to an extent. I'll overrule that.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. When did you talk to Mr. Bidsal about the fact that the distributions of the sale he was distributing the costs on a 70/30 basis but the gains on a 50/50
```


## basis?

```
A. It was end of 2015 and then in 2016.
MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, if \(I\) could have a moment.
I want to make sure that -- I want to make sure that Spencer alerted the witnesses to the new...
ARBITRATOR WALL: Do you want to break and go off the record?
MR. LEWIN: I'll send him a text.
Maybe we should take a couple-minute break. He says he's done it.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Let's go off the record.
(RECESS TAKEN FROM 1:42 P.M. TO 1:50 P.M.)
ARBITRATOR WALL: We're going to take a break from Mr. Golshani. Is that right?
MR. LEWIN: Yes.
```

MR. GARFINKEL: Who do we have on here?
MR. LEWIN: The first one is Kasandra Schindler. ARBITRATOR WALL: Ms. Schindler, can you hear me? THE WITNESS: Yes.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Good afternoon. I'm David Wall. Can you raise your right hand, please. Whereupon,

KASANDRA SCHINDLER,
having first been called as a witness, was duly sworn and testified as follows:

ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Lewin.
EXAMINATION
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Ms. Schindler, thank you very much for joining us this afternoon. Sorry to have kept you waiting. Would you please state your occupation?

ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on. Let's do this. Is it Kasandra, $K-A-S-A-N-D-R-A$ ?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Last name $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}$ ?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Thank you.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Would you please state your occupation?
A. I'm a financial advisor with JPMorgan.

| 1 | Q. Do you know Ben Golshani? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | Q. In what capacity do you know him? |
| 4 | A. It's hard to hear you. I'm going to put on my |
| 5 | ear pods and see if that helps. |
| 6 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Keep your voice up because this |
| 7 | is where the sound is coming from. |
| 8 | THE WITNESS: I'm going to see if I can hear you |
| 9 | a little bit better. |
| 10 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 11 | Q. So can you hear me better now? |
| 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | Q. Okay. Thank you. |
| 14 | In what capacity do you know Mr. Golshani? |
| 15 | A. As a client of the firm. |
| 16 | Q. And do you handle his account? |
| 17 | A. I do. |
| 18 | Q. And where do you work? |
| 19 | A. JPMorgan in Newport Beach. |
| 20 | Q. Is that a bank? |
| 21 | A. It is. |
| 22 | Q. And your title is what? |
| 23 | A. Financial advisor. |
| 25 | Q. And in connection with Mr. Golshani, I asked you |

1 me some information about interest he earned during the years 2017, '18, and '19. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you do that?
A. Yes.
Q. First of all, can you tell me what the average -what kind of accounts does Mr. Golshani have at JPMorgan?

MR. GERRARD: I'm going to object. This is a clear violation of the best evidence rule, and it's a clear violation as to the disclosure obligations under this arbitration. They have disclosed no documents, no bank statements of any kind from JPMorgan Chase, nothing that would allow this witness to be able to testify or authenticate it as a record or a business record.

What they're trying to do is substitute her testimony for their failure to provide the actual documents that they were absolutely required to disclose if they were going to try to use it as evidence. It's inappropriate for them to try to use this witness to bypass their obligation to produce the actual documents that we have no ability to even cross-examine on or question during depositions because it simply was never disclosed.

So we brought this up once before in motions in

1 limine when they were claiming that they wanted to use 2 this witness. We made it very clear we were going to 3 object at the trial. Your Honor said that you were going to wait until trial to decide the issue.

To sum up one more time: They've not disclosed any documents from JPMorgan Chase. None. They did not disclose this witness at the beginning of the case either. So basically what we have is them trying to put on testimony with no documents, even though she absolutely had to review documents in order to arrive at the testimony she's about to give you. That's a violation of the best evidence rule.

MR. LEWIN: I think she can testify as to what kind of accounts he has and during that time, what -the applicable interest rate that he was receiving as an average, which is what $I$ asked her to testify about.

ARBITRATOR WALL: What about the records that she relied on?

MR. LEWIN: Well, I don't think that the records have to be made as an exhibit for her to give her testimony.

ARBITRATOR WALL: She can just --
MR. LEWIN: Mr. Golshani can testify about what interest he received. I was trying to do it through a third-party witness. even if Mr. Golshani tries to testify about it because they had their opportunity to produce the records. They did not produce the records. This witness does not have independent knowledge of what his account balances are without reviewing the records. She just testified that she looked at the records to be able to arrive at the information she's about to give us, and those records themselves constitute hearsay. Her testimony constitutes hearsay. The only way to get around that hearsay would for them to claim it's a business record. But if it is, then we're entitled to the record. That's the purpose of the business -- sorry -- of the best evidence rule.

ARBITRATOR WALL: So February 25th was the date that claimants filed a motion in limine to exclude late and improperly disclosed witnesses and improperly disclosed documents. There was an opposition filed on March 3rd, and one of the issues was with respect to Ms. Schindler. And I noted in the order from approximately March 4 th or 5 th of 2021 -- I basically said the following, and $I$ will read from the order.
"Ms. Schindler from JPMorgan Chase Bank was designated in Respondents' third supplement on February 16th, 2021 to testify, quote, about funds on
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1 hand controlled by Ben Golshani and available to
2 complete the purchase of the Bidsal membership interest
3 as well as interest earned thereon, as well as bank
4 records as necessary."

That came from the third supplemental disclosures.

The order goes on to say, "Claimant argues that no records from Chase Bank have been disclosed in this case such that Schindler would be qualified to authenticate bank records in a position with Chase Bank. Claimant also notes that she may be Mr. Golshani's personal banker and therefore would have become known to Respondent long before she was disclosed as a witness. In response, Respondent does not address those issues, saying only that Schindler is, quote, offered to testify about funds on hand and available to Ben Golshani (and thus CLA) and the interest rate earned on those funds." The order goes on to say, "Given the fact that Ms. Schindler was identified with contact information prior to the close of discovery, it is the determination of the arbitrator that the motion in limine to exclude her as a witness is hereby denied without prejudice, reserving to Claimant the right to object to the nature of her testimony (attempting to authenticate records not previously disclosed, lack of relevance in
1 Mr. Golshani's personal holdings, etc.) if she's
2 presented as a witness."

Okay. So where we are is you intend to have her testify about holdings or accounts of Mr. Golshani and interest earned thereon?

MR. LEWIN: That's correct.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Without having ever disclosed those records?

MR. LEWIN: Correct.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, that would violate a number of evidentiary rules, in addition to disclosure requirements. So I'm sustaining the objection to the last question. I don't know what else you intend to get from her.

MR. LEWIN: Okay.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Let me try -- during the year 2018, what was the highest interest rate that was available for savings accounts at JPMorgan Bank?

MR. GERRARD: Same objection, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: We don't care about that one.
You may answer. Ms. Schindler, when there's an objection you're doing the right thing and waiting until I jump in. So you may answer that question.
A. 2 and a quarter percent.

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

```
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. How about for 2019? Same question.
A. 2.71 .
Q. What about for 2019?
A. 2019 --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Ms. Schindler, let me ask: Are you referring to a document? THE WITNESS: Yes. ARBITRATOR WALL: What's the document? THE WITNESS: Year-end statement. ARBITRATOR WALL: Year-end statement of what? THE WITNESS: Of Mr. Golshani. MR. GERRARD: Again, Your Honor, I'd move to strike the testimony. ARBITRATOR WALL: The motion to strike is granted.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Are you able to testify about the available interest rates in 2017, '18, and 19?
ARBITRATOR WALL: For who?
MR. LEWIN: For the bank, without looking -without reference to Mr. Golshani's accounts.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Wouldn't be relevant.
MR. LEWIN: All right.
Ms. Schindler, I don't think we have anything
```

```
1 further then. Thank you for coming.
```

```
ARBITRATOR WALL: Thank you very much.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. LEWIN: Do we have Mr. LeGrand?
MR. GERRARD: Not yet.
MR. LEWIN: He told me he was in the waiting room.
ARBITRATOR WALL: No. She popped up in the waiting room.
MR. LEWIN: I'm going to call him.
THE WITNESS: We'll go off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. LeGrand, can you hear me?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.
Whereupon,
DAVID LEGRAND, ESQ.,
having first been called as a witness, was duly sworn and testified as follows:
MR. GERRARD: Your Honor, before we proceed, I have to raise an objection about Mr . LeGrand testifying at all, and I think voir dire is going to be appropriate. Mr. LeGrand has not only attorney/client privilege obligations to the entity Green Valley Commerce, but also has ethical responsibilities under our Rules of Professional Conduct 1.4, 1.7, and 1.13.
```

ARBITRATOR WALL: Nevada code?
MR. GERRARD: Yes. Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct. I don't know how he would possibly testify in a proceeding and take a position adverse to that of his client. It's obvious he's had communications with Mr. Golshani and Mr. Lewin without ever notifying his client of those communications. There are serious issues that are raised by his willingness to appear, which will likely have to result in a Bar complaint. I want to do voir dire before any questions are asked him so I can determine what the extent of the confidentiality problems are and the attorney/client privilege breaches.

MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, these objections are a thinly veiled attempt to intimidate the witness. If he was going to bring up these objections, he should have done so before. He's saying he's violating ethical obligations and a Bar complaint. He testified without objection in the first arbitration.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't see that as a waiver.
MR. LEWIN: The bottom line is that he did work for Green Valley.

MR. GERRARD: I don't want to hear Mr. Lewin's -ARBITRATOR WALL: It's not an offer of proof right now, so...

1 Gerrard to basically threaten him with a Bar complaint if he testifies.

MR. GERRARD: It's not a threat. It's my obligation to let Mr. LeGrand know of my concerns. It's not a threat. It's exactly what we anticipate is a problem. I need to conduct voir dire so I can see the extent of that before any questions are asked so Mr. LeGrand is fully advised of the position that we have as it relates to this.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I mean, any time an attorney testifies regarding client communications, there's generally a waiver somewhere along the line or an exception to the Rules of Professional Conduct that apply somehow.

MR. GARFINKEL: Your Honor, may I speak? Mr. LeGrand's deposition was taken in the litigation.

MR. SHAPIRO: No.
MR. GARFINKEL: Yes.
MR. SHAPIRO: No. No.
MR. GARFINKEL: I'm talking.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Stop. Stop. This litigation was me. In the litigation was he deposed?

MR. GARFINKEL: No, he was not.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. That's what they were

```
1 trying to say.
    MR. GARFINKEL: Mission Square is pending in
    state court, and also the first arbitration --
    ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't care about the
    Mission --
    MR. GARFINKEL: He also testified at the first
    arbitration. He was the drafter of the Green Valley
    operating agreement. It says that in there.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: I understand.
    MR. GARFINKEL: I guess they could go ahead -- I
    understand why Mr. Lewin is making those objections,
    because I think he's right. All of a sudden, after
    years, now they're objecting?
ARBITRATOR WALL: What \(I\) was saying is I don't consider litigation for Mission Square to be a waiver in this action. I don't consider his testimony before Judge Haberfeld to necessarily be a waiver. The issues are somewhat different. So with respect to the -- you know, what is at issue, which is sort of how the Nevada Supreme Court look at attorney/client waivers for purposes of testifying, they're ostensibly and potentially different. I haven't read his testimony previously to know whether the issue of a waiver was explored or not.
MR. GARFINKEL: Never was.
```

| 1 | MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, with respect to the 1110 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | waiver -- |
| 3 | ARBITRATOR WALL: There's two waivers going on. |
| 4 | I was saying "waiver" in terms of waiving |
| 5 | attorney/client privilege to allow him to testify to |
| 6 | communications; and secondarily, the waiver and estoppel |
| 7 | kind of thing by having him say if he's testified |
| 8 | before, then there's a waiver on the issue of whether he |
| 9 | can testify. |
| 10 | MR. LEWIN: There's actually two matters. First |
| 11 | of all, he testified -- his deposition was taken in both |
| 12 | the Mission Square case and the arbitration. The |
| 13 | testimony itself, once there's a waiver of an |
| 14 | attorney/client privilege -- if there was one, by the |
| 15 | way, and I'm not agreeing there was one to waiver - |
| 16 | it's gone. |
| 17 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Not for all purposes, no. I |
| 18 | disagree. |
| 19 | MR. LEWIN: If he testifies about the drafting of |
| 20 | the operating agreement or communications that he's had |
| 21 | regarding that and has produced documents concerning |
| 22 | this which were produced both in a deposition in -- Mr. |
| 23 | Shapiro took his deposition. |
| 24 | MR. SHAPIRO: No. |
| 25 | MR. LEWIN: You were present during his |

1 deposition.
MR. SHAPIRO: I was present but didn't Notice it.
MR. GARFINKEL: They got all the documents --
ARBITRATOR WALL: One at a time for her.
MR. LEWIN: That horse is out of the barn, I submit. So it doesn't -- I don't think you can waiver the attorney/client privilege here and assert it here on the same subject matter.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't know it's the same subject matter. If the same subject matter is the Green Valley transaction, that's a little narrower than discussions with respect to different provisions which may or may not have been an issue in his prior testimony. I haven't seen his prior testimony.

MR. LEWIN: Understand that he was -- and I think he'll testify he considered his client to be --

MR. GERRARD: I don't want to hear Mr. Lewin speaking for Mr. --

MR. LEWIN: After you threaten him and you complain about me telling him?

ARBITRATOR WALL: Do I get to speak or do you want to take control? Do you want to sit here?

MR. LEWIN: I apologize, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. LeGrand, can you hear me? I'm going to mute my own microphone for a moment. All

1 right?

THE WITNESS: Very good.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Go ahead.
MR. LEWIN: I apologize, Your Honor, if I overstepped before, but the bottom line is that Mr. LeGrand testified, as they well know. They have his deposition that he represented Green Valley Commerce. He had meetings. He had meetings with Mr. Bidsal on behalf of Green Valley Commerce that he billed Green Valley Commerce. He had meetings with both Ben and Shawn regarding the operating agreement, and there's written communications. And to the extent that his testimony about what he reviewed with both of them -understand they are both managers. They both -- both of them or either of them can waiver the privilege.

MR. GERRARD: No. No.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't think Mr. Golshani could waive the privilege with respect to discussions that the lawyer had with Mr. Bidsal.

MR. LEWIN: It depends what capacity Mr. Bidsal is here for. Remember Mr. LeGrand is going to say the client was Green Valley, and that's been billed and that is what he considered the client. That's what he said in his deposition and at the first arbitration.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Gerrard.

MR. GERRARD: Sure. It's very straightforward, $\begin{gathered}\text { Page } 111\end{gathered}$ Judge. NRCP 1.13. That's the rule that deals with an organization as a client. It clearly states that if a lawyer represents an entity as a client, that that is the client. And then Subpart $G$ of that rule states that if the lawyer representing that organization also wants to represent any of its officers, directors, employees or members -- that word is used, members -- that the organization's consent to that dual representation is required by Rule 1.7 .

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
MR. GERRARD: That has never occurred here, and Mr. LeGrand has been acting on behalf of one of the members of this entity adversely to not only the client, because he's about to give testimony or they're going to try to elicit testimony that's inconsistent with what his client, the company, did. In other words, the company took a certain position. They filed tax returns. They took all the actions that they did that you've already heard testimony about based upon their understanding of the operating agreement, and now they're trying to bring in Mr. LeGrand after the fact to take a position that's inconsistent with the one taken by the entity, which is his client, and under Rule 1.7, they cannot do that.

Mr. LeGrand cannot take a position inconsistent with that of his client, nor can he be prepping or speaking with one of the members to the exclusion of the other member without the other member's consent. That's very clear under Rule 1.7. Rule 1.7 deals with the conflict of interest that arises when there's a concurrent conflict of interest. And a concurrent conflict of interest is defined as the representation of one client that will be directly adverse to another client.

And here he's been representing Mr. Golshani individually and speaking with Mr. Golshani and his lawyers individually without to consent of the company -- because that consent would have to come from both managers, not just one -- and he's been divulging, apparently, attorney/client privilege communications. Because as long as he is just speaking with Mr. Golshani, he's okay. The minute they try to bring that to Your Honor, it's a breach of the attorney/client privilege.

So the problem is he has an irreconcilable conflict of interest. He did not get the consent of the entity to be able to speak with Mr. Golshani individually, to discuss this case with just Mr. Golshani and his lawyers without notifying Mr. Bidsal of what it was that was the issue, No. 1.

No. 2 , he does not have the right to take any position that's inconsistent with his client, which is the company, which is exactly what they're trying to put him on for.

No. 3, he's never obtained any waiver of a conflict or obtained the consent of either the client or Mr. Bidsal. Both of those -- all three of those are violations of 1.7. Now as to the attorney/client privilege issue specifically, that's, of course, dealt with in NRS Chapter 49. NRS Chapter 49.115 states in the exceptions -- these are the exceptions to the attorney/client privilege. And if you could bring that up, Your Honor, that would probably be easier for you to see it. I'm specifically looking at exception No. 5.

MR. LEWIN: What are you looking at?
MR. GERRARD: NRS 49.115. No. 5 is the one at issue. There is no privilege as to a communication relevant to a matter of common interest between two or more clients if the communication was made by any of them to a lawyer retained or a consultant in common when offered in an action between any of them.

MR. SHAPIRO: Any of the clients.
MR. GERRARD: I'm sorry. Right. So again --
MR. GARFINKEL: Green Valley is not a party.

MR. GERRARD: Yeah. Here we have an irreconcilable conflict of interest, and there's no way they can get around the attorney/client privilege because this is a communication which is a matter of common interest between two or more clients.

MR. SHAPIRO: No. The client was Green Valley. He was very clear in his testimony. Green Valley is not a party.

MR. GERRARD: Exactly. So the exception does not apply, and he has never gotten the consent of the entity. So, Judge, this is the problem that we have with Mr. LeGrand. Somewhere along the line he thought it was appropriate for him to start having communications with Mr. Golshani and Mr. Golshani's lawyers and apparently discussing communications he had with Mr. Bidsal, which he does not have the right to do. They're privileged. Mr. Bidsal has never waived any privilege, and the client could not waive the privilege because it would require the consent of both of the parties that are managers. And so -- that has not happened. That's very clear, so I have very grave concerns about this witness providing testimony with the irreconcilable conflict of interest that exists.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Why wouldn't this have been raised as soon as Mr. LeGrand was Noticed as a witness?

MR. GERRARD: We didn't raise it because he hadn't done anything to violate it. Unless or until Mr. LeGrand decides he's going to appear, he's the one that needed to object to the Subpoena. He has an absolute obligation, a fiduciary duty to my client and the entity to preserve that privilege and not violate his ethical responsibilities, and we had to wait to see if he was actually going to decide to appear. Not only is he appearing, he's obviously had communications. MR. SHAPIRO: Not only that, the issues in the prior arbitration didn't have the same inherit conflict. When the arbitration was first filed, the extent and scope of this arbitration was a little unknown. It gets narrowed down as the process goes by. And as it has been narrowed down, most of those issues that he could testify to are eliminated. It's irrelevant. The only remaining issues he can testify to involve an inherit conflict that didn't exist in any of the prior existing proceedings.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Why not?
MR. SHAPIRO: The issue was who was the drafter of specific language. That's not privileged. There was discussion about where that language came from. That was it. There wasn't discussion about what it meant. That wasn't what David LeGrand's testimony was used for.
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1 Obviously the intent of the parties, that's what the 2 Court is supposed to interpret. It didn't get into any 3 issues that were privileged.

In this case he's going to try and come in and take a position that's contrary to his client and contrary to the actions of Green Valley Commerce over the years, and that's where the conflict comes in.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Lewin.
MR. LEWIN: First of all, there's no conflict that exists to the extent he represented Green Valley. He worked with both Mr. Bidsal and Mr. Golshani in creating the operating agreement. They've listed as exhibits in their own exhibit list all kinds of communications between him and Mr. LeGrand and Mr. Bidsal and Mr. Golshani.

ARBITRATOR WALL: For me that doesn't waive the attorney/client privilege for any other conversations they had.

MR. LEWIN: The claim here is in essence that Mr. Bidsal is his client and he's going to testify --

ARBITRATOR WALL: No. Green Valley Commerce, LLC is the client, and he can't testify without the consent of Green Valley Commerce to protected communications by the managers, and the consent is not unilaterally Mr. Golshani's to waive consent.

1 MR. GARFINKEL: The first litigation $--\quad$ Page 1119
2 disagree with Mr. Shapiro. The first litigation
3 ultimately involved -- the first arbitration involved 4 what the Green Valley operating agreement said and what 5 it meant, and that's what Judge Haberfeld did. He had 6 to interpret the operating agreement.

Similarly, you have to interpret the operating agreement in this case. What you're dealing with now is Exhibit B. It's no different from the first one. Mr. LeGrand testified about the drafting process and what the intent was because he communicated with Mr. Golshani and Mr. Bidsal, and that's what the first arbitration was about. That's what Judge Haberfeld had to do. He had to interpret the contract. He said it was ambiguous.

The bottom line is he listened to the testimony of Mr. LeGrand and that's how he ruled. It's no different here. What's funny is they identified Mr. LeGrand as a witness. So did we. They knew he was going to be testifying. They've put into all kinds of Emails that deal with the drafting process. They're trying to be creative and keep him from testifying, but it's no different from the first arbitration. He was brought in to testify about what the intent was of the parties in the drafting of the agreement. It's no

1 different.

MR. SHAPIRO: He never testified --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. One at a time.

MR. LEWIN: The documents we intend to question him about are documents produced by him in the first litigation.

ARBITRATOR WALL: "Him" being?
MR. LEWIN: Mr. LeGrand. Mr. Shapiro knows about it. They're documents we disclosed. Documents on our witness list. And who is to say that one manager can assert privilege for Green Valley but the other one can't waive it? Do they need consensus to assert the privilege? Again, his testimony is not against Green Valley. Green Valley is not a party here. His testimony and the idea of whatever Mr. Bidsal does is somehow convoluted into the action of the LLC -- if he does something as a manager that is not in accordance with the operating agreement, that's not contrary to Green Valley. The action is against him to try to address improper distributions that he's made and try to come to the purchase price. He is the drafter of the agreement. He had meetings with both of them. He had discussions with both of them. I don't think there's an issue of privilege here. If there was, it certainly was

1 waived when he produced the documents we intend to ask 2 him about.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't know that that constitutes a waiver.

MR. GERRARD: It's really straightforward. When you read the rule, he must get the consent of the client to waive the conflict. He hasn't done that. He could never do it because one manager acting alone can't do it. In fact, if you're asking for a waiver, the waiver can't be given by the party that intends to use the information against the other party. That's what the rule says.

So there's just no way that he could have ever obtained the waiver of the conflict of interest. It just can't happen. And his conflict doesn't go away. It's irreconcilable because what he's done, he had communications clearly with representatives of the client. Those communications are privileged. They can't go to a third party. What they're saying is, in essence, because he was involved in communications that both Mr. Bidsal and Mr. Golshani were there for, that that somehow waives the privilege. Of course it doesn't. It's as soon as that information is tried to be communicated to a third party like Your Honor that the privilege must be invoked. and Rule 1.7 demonstrates that there is an irreconcilable conflict of interest. He doesn't have the consent.

Then you get to Rule 1.4A1. 1.4A1 is another clear violation of his ethical responsibility. It says that the attorney has a -- quote, the lawyer shall, one, promptly inform the client of any decision or circumstances with respect to which the client's informed consent is required by these rules.

These rules include 1.7, and in fact it's very specific when you look at 1.7 and 1.13 that he must obtain the informed consent of the client. Guess what? There's never been a disclosure to Mr. Bidsal that Mr. LeGrand was having conversations with the attorneys for Mr. Golshani. Never. They have never disclosed -- he has never disclosed to my client that he had been contacted by them and they wanted him to give information about communications that he had had with a representative of his client. That's never happened. Nor has he ever asked for that consent to be able to have those communications, and he's not allowed to do that. That's a violation of the privilege.

That's the problem. There's nowhere for them to go with this because Mr. LeGrand has not fulfilled his
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1 ethical duties under the Rules of Professional Conduct
2 to his client and certainly not to a representative of
3 the client in the form of Mr. Bidsal, who is also a manager of the company.

He would have to receive that disclosure he was having a communication at all and obtain his consent, and once that consent was given, that still wouldn't change the privilege issue.

MR. LEWIN: Can I --
ARBITRATOR WALL: No.
MR. SHAPIRO: I want to go to this whole thing about consent. When you think about it, who has to give consent? Green Valley Commerce. That is the client. How does Green Valley consent? According to the operating agreement, there's a majority vote. And there's an arbitration dispute if they can't get a majority vote. We're here under that arbitration clause. 50/50 ownership. You can't get an affirmative vote of the managers or members of that company to waive a privilege. It can't be. When you look at the operating agreement, unless Shawn agreed to provide consent, it doesn't exist.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Lewin.
MR. LEWIN: I want to point out that the rule that Mr. Gerrard talks about --

ARBITRATOR WALL: Which one?
A. 49.115 Section 5 talks about communications between two or more clients.

ARBITRATOR WALL: The client is Green Valley.
MR. LEWIN: So that rule doesn't apply because that rule applies when you have two clients and a lawyer is representing both of them and now one is against the other. That's not the case here.

ARBITRATOR WALL: That would be an exception. That circumstance you just described is what subsection 5 of 49.115 is about.

MR. LEWIN: That's not what we have here.
MR. GERRARD: That's what $I$ was saying.
MR. LEWIN: Mr. Bidsal was not a client. This operating agreement was drafted and there's a waiver that Mr. Garfinkel was pointing out. There's a waiver in here on Section 1 on Article 13 of Page 20, but this has to do with legal counsel to the company.

MR. GERRARD: That's not -- sorry.
MR. LEWIN: He is trying to convolute the fact he may have had conversations with a co-manager, and as a lawyer that restricts his ability to testify about conversations about what he did in terms of drafting this agreement and what conversations he's had with both of them together and all kinds of things. It doesn't
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1 hold water that Mr. LeGrand is unable to testify.

On top of which, as I mentioned before, the documents that -- some of the documents $I$ intend on asking questions about, including this -- the operating agreement, has been disclosed and has been disclosed both in his prior deposition, in the arbitration hearing, and he's been -- should be allowed to testify about those here. It's quite common when you have people talking about the interpretation of an agreement to have the drafter of the agreement testify about it. That is neither for or against the interest of the company. It is what it is.

I want to correct Mr. Gerrard. He said it's never been disclosed that Mr. LeGrand has had conversations with Mr. Golshani. In the first arbitration and in his deposition he testified about the fact that Mr. Golshani had contacted him after he received Mr. Bidsal's offer and had communications with him. Those documents were disclosed, actually, in the first arbitration and he testified about them. So Mr. Gerrard is wrong when he says the fact that Mr. Golshani has never had conversations with him, never been disclosed or known is untrue.

Lastly, it's not coincidental that in his first arbitration -- in the proceeding, Mr. LeGrand testified
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1 about how Mr. Bidsal contacted him shortly before his 2 deposition and asked him if he wanted to do legal work 3 for him.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, that doesn't matter.
MR. SHAPIRO: I want to follow up on what Rod said. It is true Mr. LeGrand did disclose he had conversations directly with Ben. In fact, he wrote an adversarial letter to me that he didn't send because he said, "Wait a second. I think I've got a conflict." And he never sent the letter. In his testimony he said, "I started to realize $I$ was getting into a conflict situation. I didn't want anything to do with it."

Mr. LeGrand is acknowledging himself there's some conflict issues and we're asserting it. The issues didn't arise because -- I mean, look, if it was the same issues in the first arbitration and the second arbitration, we wouldn't be here. Right? This would be resolved. We're here because the issues are different. The issues of conflict didn't come up in the first one. It is coming up now. The problem is what LeGrand thought when he drafted the document is irrelevant because the document needs to be what the intent of the parties were and LeGrand is not a party. The only testimony he can give is based upon conversations he had that are protected by the privilege.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Is he a Nevada lawyer?
MR. LEWIN: Yes.
MR. GERRARD: Yes.
MR. LEWIN: Testimony would be about what conversations he had with both.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm concerned about not only the invocation of the privilege. Frankly, I'm concerned on behalf of the lawyer. I'm going to start by taking him on voir dire on these issues to lay some foundation for it, and then I'll let both counsel inquire without getting into the substance of the communications. Fair enough?

All right, Mr. LeGrand, this is David Wall. I appreciate your patience. Can you hear me all right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
ARBITRATOR WALL: There's been a fair amount of discussion outside your presence. There's certain issues that $I$ want to reach by way of sort of a quasi-voir dire. All right?

First of all, the issue that has come up was one of privilege. Your client, as I understood it, is Green Valley Commerce, LLC. Is that right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Tell me if and how you believe as the lawyer or former lawyer for Green Valley
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1 Commerce, LLC that the attorney/client privilege has been waived such that you can discuss conversations that you had with Mr. Golshani and conversations that you had with Mr. Bidsal. I don't want to know the substance of the conversations. Do you understand where I'm going?

THE WITNESS: Um, well, I do understand where you're going, and at this point, having been threatened with Bar action, I'm going to decline to testify until I have had the opportunity to consult independent legal counsel.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. The client is Green Valley Commerce, LLC. Right?

THE WITNESS: Yes. But, you know, entity privilege is a little bit different than an individual privilege, and Mr. Golshani, as the major funder and a co-manager in principal, has waived any privilege.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Do you believe that waiver extends to conversations that you had with Mr. Bidsal?

THE WITNESS: Well, of course it does. That's how entity privilege works. As between the members there is no privilege to Mr. Bidsal or to Mr. Golshani. I am free to disclose to either of -- my understanding of the Nevada ethics are that I'm free to disclose to either member anything that the other member or manager says.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't disagree with thage.
The question is whether you can disclose communications by either member to someone else without each member's consent and/or waiver of the privilege.

THE WITNESS: Well, $I$ don't know the answer to that, so I'm going to consult with either Bar counsel or independent legal counsel.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. All right.
Mr. Lewin, any questions at this time for Mr. LeGrand?

MR. LEWIN: Yes.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. LeGrand, you gave your deposition in --

ARBITRATOR WALL: You might want to look in there and speak as loud as you can.

MR. LEWIN: I thought the microphone is here.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. LeGrand, you did your deposition in front of Mr. Shapiro and Mr. Garfinkel. Right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And did Mr. Shapiro raise the issue of attorney/client privilege?
A. No, sir.


## 1 lawyer?

A. Yeah.
Q. And during the arbitration proceeding that you also testified in with respect to Judge Haberfeld, did Mr. Shapiro or his other associated lawyer ever raise the attorney/client privilege?
A. No, sir.

MR. LEWIN: Anything else?
MR. GARFINKEL: (Moved head.)
MR. LEWIN: I don't think I have anything else.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't know if you need to question him because he said he's not going to question him.

MR. GERRARD: If he's not going to testify, there's no reason to. I've got questions if he is.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm not going to put
Mr. LeGrand in that position to somehow direct him to give up his right to speak to independent counsel or Bar counsel or whoever he wants, to tell you the truth. We can figure out what to do with respect to the closing of this hearing, but I'm certainly not going to put him in that position.

So all right. Mr. LeGrand, you are free to log off at this time and we will contact you -- someone will contact you if it becomes necessary to have you testify

1 at some point in the future. All right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Thank you.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm not going to put him in that spot.

MR. LEWIN: I understand. I'm not quarrelling with that, but $I$ am quarrelling with the waiting and sandbagging and waiting until we get to this hearing when we know that we have this day to finish the hearing and tomorrow is closing arguments.

ARBITRATOR WALL: There's been a little bit of that on both sides frankly.

MR. GARFINKEL: If they filed a motion in limine before, why wouldn't they do it for something as important as this?

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, they filed a motion in limine, and you still brought the witness and had them reading documents nobody had ever seen. So I think we're on a level playing field, frankly.

MR. LEWIN: There's a little bit of difference. Ms. Schindler's testimony is a minute part of the case.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't know what it's going to be.

MR. LEWIN: Mr. LeGrand, who is the drafter of the agreement and testified before is a major part of our case.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Understood. I'm not going to make him testify now.

MR. LEWIN: I know that. I don't know how we proceed.

ARBITRATOR WALL: My inclination would be that we finish everything but Mr. LeGrand. That Mr. LeGrand has the opportunity, if somebody still wants to call him as a witness, to seek independent counsel on that. Honestly, I would probably want --

MR. SHAPIRO: Some briefing, Your Honor?
ARBITRATOR WALL: -- briefing on this issue in addition to, you know, the position that Mr. LeGrand is going to take. We may brief it and I might say, "He can testify," and he might say "I'm not going to."

MR. LEWIN: I have a different possible solution. I'm not sure that $I$ want to use it to the exclusion. Under the rules I think that you are able to take testimony by way of prior depositions even though they may have not been taken in this case, prior deposition testimony about matters relating to -- that may have some bearing on this case. I think the rules -- by the way -- the way I read the rules -- and I have to admit that I may not be the most expert on that -- you have flexibility in that regard as to how you take testimony and to what extent you determine you want to apply the

1 rules of evidence.

ARBITRATOR WALL: It's a little different here because it's not simply the JAM rules because it also says it's administered by JAMs -- originally said, I think, they're expedited rules, but we stipulated out of that to the comprehensive rules. But it also says it's governed by the federal authority, so...

MR. LEWIN: Well, let me just say --
ARBITRATOR WALL: It doesn't say governed by the -- administered by JAMs but governed by the Federal Arbitration Act.

MR. LEWIN: There's an issue about how the federal arbitration rule is going to play with that. I'm just not prepared to talk about that.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Got it.
MR. LEWIN: We briefed that in the appeal to some extent, which set of rules apply. We came here to finish this up. Mr. Golshani -- I can't finish Mr. Golshani's testimony until I know what's happening with Mr. LeGrand.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Why?
MR. GERRARD: Why?
MR. LEWIN: Because Mr. LeGrand's not going to be able to testify. I had matters that I expected Mr. LeGrand to testify to that I wouldn't necessarily
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1 need Mr. Golshani to testify to. In order to prepare
2 Mr. Golshani to testify about that stuff, he's not
3 prepared to testify because I didn't need him.
4 Mr. Golshani -- the issue really is the threat of the 5 complaint is really what scared him off. complaint is really what scared him orf.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, look. I would have brought it up with him before he testified. It was clear to me that there's an issue here that $I$ wanted to make sure before the attorney testified that there was a waiver of privilege. So it was going to come up if -you know, sua sponte from me one way or another, so -just because $I$ have to satisfy myself that there's been a waiver any time an attorney testifies.

MR. LEWIN: Here's where we are. We're supposed to be finished with Mr. Golshani and have Mr. Manabat. We're supposed to be finished with these people today and have closing tomorrow. Closing is not going to happen without Mr. LeGrand.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Correct. So we have tomorrow afternoon.

MR. LEWIN: If we had -- if Mr. Bidsal's counsel had raised this issue in a timely fashion, we could have maybe even postponed these hearings until we figured this out or briefed it so we wouldn't be doing it at the last minute. We spent a lot of money coming up here and
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1 preparing for these two hearings. It's not our fault.
2 It's not our fault. I truly believe the end result,
3 we're going to find a waiver by way of prior testimony.
4 I don't think you can say -- in other words --

ARBITRATOR WALL: I haven't seen it.

MR. LEWIN: I have. I know which questions I was going to ask him.

As I said, finishing with Mr. -- I can finish with Mr. Golshani but that -- that puts us at a disadvantage because unless they finish with their cross-examination of him, with reserving the right to bring him back if we need to if Mr. LeGrand is not able to testify, that's one issue. I don't want to put him on unprepared to testify about areas that $I$ didn't think $I$ had to cover because $I$ do -- from his prior testimony, not from my conversations with him. I knew what his prior testimony was. I knew what he was going to answer.

I mean, ultimately what this really comes down to it's really what the drafter of the agreement -- is he going to admit there's a typo? Is he going to say there's not?

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't know if I agree with that.

MR. GERRARD: Judge, I'm sorry. I just have to
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1 respond. Obviously this insinuation that this is
2 sandbagging is ridiculous. We did not know whether
3 Mr. LeGrand was going to come and appear and testify or
4 not until he does it. He has an ethical responsibility
5 to preserve the privilege and he has also ethical
6 responsibilities under the Rules of Professional Conduct. It's not my job to call him up and say, "This is what your duties are. What are you planning on doing?" It's his job to preserve those -- you know, those rights that belong to the client, and we've already gone through that whole argument. I'm not going to make it again about why the privilege exists. They don't have to agree, but it cannot be waived. It cannot be waived unless they've asked that specific question before, and they haven't.

So the point here is this is not about and has never been about what David LeGrand drafted or didn't draft. We have those documents. We have them. We can see exactly what he did, and his testimony about what those things mean is what they want, and that testimony isn't relevant because it doesn't matter what he thinks it means. It only matters what Mr. Bidsal and Mr. Golshani thought that it meant. It's their intent. It's their contract.

Mr. LeGrand, his testimony about what it means is

1 completely 100 percent irrelevant unless he testifies
2 that he gained that understanding of the intent by
3 divulging a privileged communication with my client.
4 That's the whole point. He cannot testify about
5 communications he had with a client representative. He never waived it and the entity has never waived it, and it's never been raised to be waived. It has to be waived in writing, according to the rules.

Counsel keeps arguing that it just can be magically erased because some questions were asked to him about who drafted the document before. That doesn't require divulging an attorney/client communication. For him to say who drafted the document is for him to say what he saw happen. Not what my client thought that the document meant or what Mr. Golshani thought that the document meant. Those are very different things.

And so, you know, I take great exception to this idea that we're sandbagging. We didn't know if they were going to call him. We're not sandbagging anything. We didn't know -- just because they put him on a witness list? They put a lot of names on the list that haven't been called. We don't know what's going to happen until it happens. We don't know that he's going to breach his obligations to the client until it happens. I warned
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