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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Exhibit 275: Respondent's 35

7119
7120-7130
7131-7202
7203-7358

7359-7410

7411-7531

7532-7657
7658-7783

7784-7814

7815-7859

7860-7934

7935-7975

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Nos. 80427; 80831, Order of Affirmance, unpublished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

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

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

9/1/22 35

Sale Deed dated September 22, 2011

Exhibit 6: Estimated Settlement 35

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

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

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

## Exhibit 11: Seller's Closing

8170-8171
Statement - Final dated
November 14, 2014

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

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

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

## NO. DOCUMENT

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

Exhibit 20: JAMS Final Award dated March 12, 2022
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1 Page 1139 the ethical rules to do. That's exactly what we did.

This idea that we should somehow keep the matter open, I don't think we should, but if Your Honor wants to and wants briefing on it, happy to do that, but I would submit that that briefing shouldn't be provided until or unless the attorney has said that he's willing to testify. I think we can give him whatever amount of time Your Honor thinks is a reasonable amount of time for him to decide whether he's willing to testify, and then if he is, we can brief that issue. But $I$ don't know why we would want to brief the issue --

ARBITRATOR WALL: What's the status of your appeal?

MR. LEWIN: They're --
MR. SHAPIRO: Still in briefing.
MR. GARFINKEL: Their brief is due. His client's brief is due relatively soon.

MR. LEWIN: They had a motion for an extension.
MR. SHAPIRO: End of May.
MR. GERRARD: Reply brief.
MR. SHAPIRO: We filed opening brief and they file one and we file one and then they get the final.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Just from a logistical standpoint, let's say I decided on a purchase price,

1 Page 1140

2 is no purchase until the Supreme Court rules. Right?
3 So in terms of logistics and timing of the essence --

MR. LEWIN: Just to respond to Mr. Gerrard. I love this guy. "I'm not going to repeat the arguments" and then he goes on for ten minutes with the argument. First of all, his duty as a lawyer and as a responsible litigant in this arbitration would have been to advise us that this was going to be their position. We -- I told you the last time we were here we were going to call. This morning we said who we were going to call, when they were coming. If he would have advised us then, we could have chewed some of this up then and not taken up Mr. LeGrand's time. We could have told him not to appear, No. 1.

No. 2, he's convoluting the issue about the members having the attorney/client relationship.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Look, you preserve everything. If you don't respond right now, I'm not going to say there's a waiver. I'm going to require it in writing anyway. So in terms of --

MR. LEWIN: I prefer it in writing.
ARBITRATOR WALL: In terms of finishing, I mean, we now have -- we haven't spent as much time on this as Mr. LeGrand's testimony would have taken if he had

```
    1 \mp@code { P a g e ~ 1 1 4 1 }
```

```
    testified. We also now probably have tomorrow afternoon
    if we need additional witness testimony, so I am not
    really concerned about a timing issue.
    MR. LEWIN: I'm just concerned about -- I can
    have Mr. Golshani testify, but again, I want to
    reserve --
    ARBITRATOR WALL: What time is Mr. Manabat?
    MR. GARFINKEL: I need to talk to Mr. Lewin about
    that.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: Was he 3 o'clock?
    MR. GARFINKEL: He was supposed to be at
    3 o'clock.
    MR. SHAPIRO: Do we need to take a break right
    now?
    ARBITRATOR WALL: We can take do that. Let's
    take a break. We'll be in recess.
    (RECESS TAKEN FROM 2:51 P.M. TO 3:06 P.M.)
    ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Mr. Golshani, you
    realize you're still under oath?
    THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
    Mr. Lewin.
    MR. LEWIN: By the way, one more comment before
```

```
1 we leave the issue. The issue with Mr. LeGrand, why
```

wouldn't that apply to Mr. Main? Just a thought. I'll
address that in our brief.
CONTINUED EXAMINATION
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Okay. So we were talking about the -- you began to speak to Mr . Bidsal about the way the profits were being distributed. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Before you began writing, did you have communications with him about that issue, about whether or not he was following the operating agreement?
A. Before I wrote a letter to him?
Q. Before you wrote the Email.
A. Yes. I had the talk.
Q. How many times?
A. A couple of times.
Q. And can you relay the conversations -- I think you said he said he was going to check?
A. Yes.
Q. I think that's where we left off. Did he ever come back to you and talk to you about that issue other than to tell you to contact Danielle Pena?
A. Yes.
Q. Danielle Pena is who?

```
A. Mr. James Main, the CPA, assistant.
Q. She's a CPA also. Right?
A. Yeah, probably.
Q. You called her and she never called you back?
A. That's correct. One time he responded to the call and I discussed that. She said she would check on it, and then she didn't call me back. I didn't call her back. She never took my call.
Q. Going back to the conversation you had with Mr. Bidsal, you said that after you weren't getting satisfaction with the CPAs, did you have further verbal conversation with him?
A. Yeah. I continued writing letters.
Q. And why did you turn -- why did you start writing about the issue?
A. Because I thought maybe that would be more effective and more official.
Q. Did you ever threaten -- during this time period, did you ever threaten Mr . Bidsal that you were going to file a lawsuit or arbitration or anything like that?
A. No, not at all. Why would I do that? No.
Q. Did you hire an accountant to perform an audit?
A. No.
Q. Even during the first arbitration did you hire an accountant to do an audit of the distribution?
A. No.
Q. And why not?
A. I didn't think of that.
Q. Did you try to reach Mr. Main to talk to him about the issue about -- you were talking with Mr. Bidsal about?
A. After Mr. Bidsal sent me his offer and then I talked to him about this distribution and he said "Talk to Mr. Main," after that I called him, yes.
Q. You called Mr. Main on the issue of whether or not Mr. Bidsal was distributing money properly?
A. Well, I told him about that capital issue and he wanted to check into it and he put me on hold, even, and we had a long conversation and talk and all that, and he told me that -- I asked him "Okay. In your opinion, what's the problem?" He said because Mr. Bidsal is over-distributing to himself.
Q. So when was this conversation?
A. It was in June of 2017. June, July 2017.
Q. Was it before or after Mr . Bidsal had made an offer to you?
A. No. After he made the offer.
Q. Did you ever tell Mr. Bidsal what Mr. Main said?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you tell him?
```

A. Sometime after that.
Q. What did he say?
A. He said he would talk to him to see what the issue is.
Q. Did you attempt to contact Mr. Main thereafter?
A. Yes. I contact -- I tried to contact by phone, by Email, and there is Emails that I have sent. There is record of those.
Q. Now, did Mr. Bidsal ever send you the tax returns to review before they were filed?
A. Would you repeat?
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal ever send you any of the tax returns for Green Valley before they were filed? MR. GERRARD: Objection. Lack of foundation. I think it calls for speculation, but I'm saying lack of foundation because I don't know whether or not -MR. LEWIN: I'll rephrase. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you ever receive any of the tax returns before they were filed?
A. No.
MR. GERRARD: Same objection. I think that calls for speculation unless he knew when they were filed. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. As drafts?

```
```

A. No.
Q. By the way, had you received the 2019 tax return?
A. Very late, yes.
Q. And was that a draft or was that the final?
A. I think it was a draft.
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal tell you whether or not the 2019 tax return has been filed?
A. I don't remember if he told me.
Q. All right. We're going to move on to something else. Before we do, I wanted to understand something. Earlier -- earlier when you said that you noticed that your name was not listed as a manager, that -- on the articles of organization for Green Valley, that you questioned Mr. Bidsal about that and he said, "Don't worry." Later you testified that Mr. Bidsal told you that the law only allowed one manager.
Can you explain those two pieces for me?
A. Before we even bid on the properties we had meet on co-management. And then after we bought, he said that it is not legal in state of Nevada to have two managers. He changed his opinion. And then when we went and talked to the attorney, the attorney said, no, you could. So we did put two managers -- co-management managers.
Q. I want to go to 2017. At any time in 2017 did

```

1

Mr. Bidsal contact you about possibly going into another deal with him?
A. From what I remember, yes.
Q. And when was this?
A. It was a few months after -- before he made his offer. He said there are other deals and all that, and I told him I have other projects and my money is tied up there and I was not interested.
Q. What was your health like at that point?
A. My health? I had heart issues for years, and in 2017 it started to deteriorate and become worse. Some days I was good and some days I was very miserable.
Q. Did you discuss those issues with Mr. Bidsal before this offer came in?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. He was very well aware of it.
Q. In terms of -- can you pinpoint -- you said it was a few months before the offer. The offer was dated July 7th. Can you give us a more -- better estimation as to when you had that conversation?
A. About him saying...
Q. Are you interested in doing another deal with him?
A. I don't remember. I can't pin down.
Q. Would it be the first quarter of 2017 ?
A. Probably, yeah.
Q. And was your money allocated for other projects?
A. Yes. I was thinking of getting involved in other projects.
Q. Keep your voice up, please.
A. Sure.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 37, please. MR. GARFINKEL: Hold on.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. 37 is Mr . Bidsal's offer to purchase membership interest dated July 7, 2017.
A. Okay.
Q. So how did you feel about this offer when you received it?
A. Well, I was surprised that he didn't talk to me about it, and I called him a few times, but I couldn't contact him. I couldn't talk to him. And then when I sat down and, you know, thought about it, I thought "This was our agreement and the gentleman wants out, so no problem." Later on when he called, I said, "I understand. You know, and I don't even want to know what is the reason, but sure. We can take care of it."
Q. So under the operating agreement, how much time did you have to respond to this offer?
A. From what \(I\) remember, 30 days.
Q. And then how -- and how soon after you responded one way or the other did the transaction have to close?
A. Another 30 days.
Q. And the terms of the deal was all cash?
A. All cash.
Q. Okay. Did it cross your mind that Mr. Bidsal is making an offer of 5 million dollars because he felt you were not in a position to buy him out?
A. It passed my mind, yes.
Q. The property in Green Valley had been listed at some time within the 12 -month period for how much?
A. For a higher price.
Q. What was the price?
A. I believe 6.3 million.
Q. And had you received an offer on the Greenway property independent of the Henderson property?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And how much was that offer?
A. I think it was like 1.6, 1.7.
Q. And so what steps did you take to evaluate whether or not Mr. Bidsal's fair market value of 5 million dollars should be accepted?
A. Well, I was involved with the properties, and I thought that it would be a good idea to appraise the
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1 property, this one, the Green Valley. So I wrote him a
2 letter. I said I would like to get access. At such a date \(I\) would like to appraise, and he said that's okay. And this probably was listed with another -- with a broker, with a lady whose name \(I\) believe was Danielle. And at the date \(I\) was there and she was waiting for us, and we did the appraisal and I left.
Q. It was no secret that you had an appraisal done. Right?
A. No.
Q. And of course -- Mr. Bidsal, did you ask him if he had done an appraisal before he made the offer? Did you ask him?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Did you do anything else to try to evaluate the Bidsal offer?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you meet with him?
A. Yes. I met with him.
Q. Do you remember where you met with him?
A. I met with him in his office late July.
Q. Okay. And why did you meet with him?
A. Well, I was thinking, you know, I still had to proceed, and I called him and I said, "You have made this offer. How do you calculate it if you want to buy
```

me out? How much money I would get? And if I want to buy you out, how much money I should pay you?"
He said he would do it, and a couple of weeks passed, and I believe I sent an Email, "Hey, you were supposed to send me these." He said, "Come to my office and we discuss it."
Q. His office where?
A. His office is in -- in the valley.
Q. In Los Angeles?
A. I think so.
Q. How long did you meet with him for?
A. I think about an hour.
Q. And did you -- so you were -- you said you were looking to find out if he bought you, what --
A. What we would both be paid. I wanted to see what my options are.
Q. Are you asking him because since he made the offer he would have already figured that out?
A. Yes.
MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading. ARBITRATOR WALL: Sustained. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Why did you want to want to find out -- strike that.
Did you think that Mr . Bidsal would have any

```
1 information about the purchase price when you asked for
2 that meeting?
information about the purchase price when you asked for
that meeting?
A. Yes, I assume so.
Q. And what did you think about that?
A. I didn't -- what do you mean?
Q. Well, you were asking him for his opinion. Why were you asking him for that opinion?
A. Because he's -- he was very familiar and he offered that 5 million. I was wondering that according to the formula, what, in his opinion -- what -- you know, I needed to know what \(I\) would be dealing with.
Q. And was there a discussion at that meeting about how the formula would work?
A. A little bit, yeah.
Q. Did you discuss what the COP would be?
A. He told me what he thinks the COP would be, yes. He had Mr. Henry calculate it, and he brought it in the room and he said he is the one who has calculated it and this is the calculation.
Q. Mr. Henry is -- Mr. Henry who?
A. Manabat.
Q. He was Mr. Bidsal's --
A. Employee.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 111, would you please, which is a document entitled "Green Valley Commerce
```

    1 Equity Balances Computation as of June 30, 2017."
    ```
```

A. That's right.
Q. You said that Mr. Henry brought in the document. What is this? Is this the document?
A. This is the document, yes.
Q. So tell me, did you and Mr. Bidsal discuss this document?
A. Yes.
Q. So I see that -- so it says -- so can you run us through this document?
A. From top to bottom?
Q. Well, first of all let me ask you: Did you and Mr. Bidsal discuss this document top to bottom?
A. Yes. He was familiar with it.
MR. GARFINKEL: Speak up. Speak up.
THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry.
MR. LEWIN: Let's slide down a dash. I want to make sure the court reporter and His Honor can hear you.
By the way, I want to admit Exhibit 111 in evidence.
MR. GERRARD: I don't know if there's been enough foundation laid yet, so I'm obviously going to still object.
ARBITRATOR WALL: 111 is in.
MR. SHAPIRO: It came in March 19th.

```

1 BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Tell me what Mr. Bidsal said about this document and what you said about this document during this approximately one-hour meeting.
A. What he said -- actually, the document shows on the top there are the cost of each building, how much we sold and the cost and the net. And then on the right side he shows how much it is receiving and how much is his share and how much is CLA share. On the bottom it said acquisition costs of Green Valley as to how much we bought. The COP. He considered whatever it was in the first escrow, which is \(4,049,250\). This is what he got. 4,000,049. And then he put how much he contributed and how much is my contribution. And then from that he deducted the money that the company received back for the sale of the three building and he came up with a total of 859,000 and he divided by 70 and 30 . And then he got each share of each partner as to the amount that was remaining, meaning on the initial cost minus whatever he sold, and this is whatever is -- this is about cost of sold. And then the rest of the formula is 5 million minus this, plus the capital contribution of each person. And then --
Q. Go on.
A. By the same token, he reduced the capital contribution of each person for the amount of the money that was distributed to them because of the sale.
Q. All right. Was there any discussion at this one-hour meeting about the fact that you claimed he had over-distributed money to himself?
A. We discussed that and he told me that, you know, it's a buyout and this is the way he wants to handle it, and, you know, he told me, "Ben, you can buy or you can sell. Use this and I am okay with both of them."
Q. When he said -- in essence he was telling you -he told you that you can buy or sell, did you understand he was saying forget about the over-distributions?
A. That's --

MR. GERRARD: Once again, leading. ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah. Can we keep that to a minimum?

MR. LEWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you tell Mr. Bidsal that you were -- whether or not you were willing to buy or sell at these prices without considering the over-distributions at that time?
A. I said, "Let's sit down and talk over-distribution."
Q. Was it a friendly conversation?
A. Yes. To me it was a business, but our friendship

1 mattered more.
Q. So what did you do after that meeting next in conjunction with considering Mr. Bidsal's buyout?
A. I accumulated this information. I went down and sat down and thought about it and decided that \(I\) would buy the property -- I would buy his share instead of him buying mine, according to our purchasing agreement. So we prepared a letter to that effect.
Q. I'm not there yet. I just wanted to know what you did next.
A. That's what I did.
Q. Did you do any further investigation about this?
A. Probably I did. I --
Q. Did you ask Mr. Bidsal what the condition of the property was?
A. No, not at that time.
Q. Did you know what the amount of cash was on hand?
A. I did know what was cash on hand.
Q. Was that discussed during the meeting?
A. I believe it was. And you know, I was buying his share and \(I\) was looking at the underlying asset also.
Q. He was buying your share?
A. Yeah.
Q. So the -- did you prepare funds? Strike that. Did you have another meeting with Mr. Bidsal

1 before you sent your August 3rd letter?
A. I don't think so. I don't know.
Q. Just take a look at Exhibit 38. Do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. This is your letter electing to buy Mr. Bidsal. Right?
A. That's right.
Q. So you say in this letter, "We will contact you regarding the setting up of the escrow."

Why did you say that? Why did you say that?
A. Well, about the escrow, the sale would be cash in escrow, so I knew that we need to have an escrow, and I said I would contact to take care of that.
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal ever cooperate and set up an escrow with you?
A. At the time that \(I\) sent the offer?
Q. No. Did Mr. Bidsal ever cooperate with you to set up an escrow to consummate the purchase?
A. You know, I waited some time, and then he -- you know, he said that he didn't want to sell, and I waited more and we had a meeting, and after that I --
Q. Okay.
A. Because it came later.
Q. I'm going to get to the meeting. Did he contact

1 you about setting up the escrow? Yes or no.
A. No.
Q. All right. Fine. You said that you waited and then you had another meeting with Mr. Bidsal. How soon after did the other meeting take place?
A. A few days later. I mean, when \(I\) send the offer, he called me and he said that we need to talk. There is a problem on that, and at that time \(I\) was very sick. When actually I send this offer, I was extremely sick and I had somebody else helping me, and I was under medication to be able to function. So later on he called me and I said, "I don't feel good. In a couple of days let's meet," and then we went to a place.
Q. That's fine. Let's focus on the question. We don't need to know every little detail.
A. Sorry.
Q. You had another meeting. Where was that meeting at?
A. We met at a coffee shop.
Q. What took place at that meeting in terms of the purchasing his interest?
A. On that meeting, you know, we discuss it and he indicated that he doesn't want to sell it at that price, and I said, "You yourself told me that you would sell it."
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1 & He said, "No, but if you want to buy it from me, \\
2 & you have to raise the price." I couldn't sell at that \\
3 & price. As we're talking, he mention something about \\
4 & 6.3 million, and then he told me that "If you go to \\
5 & court, it's going to be very difficult and your ability \\
6 & is not one-tenth of me" and things on that line, and I \\
7 & really didn't expect to have things like that, to have \\
8 & such a conversation. So we left. That was what \\
9 & happened in the meeting.
\end{tabular}
Q. Okay. So in your letter you say -- I'm talking about your letter on August 3rd, Exhibit 38. You say, "I trust there has not been any distribution of the cash on hand that I have not approved of either before or after July 7, 2017, nor should there be any such distributions, nor should any agreements be entered into including any sale agreements without CLA's written consent."

\section*{Why did you put that in the letter?}
A. Because to tell him that, you know, not to make distribution. I had counter to buy his share, the same way it was at that date. I didn't want it to be reduced. I informed him of that. My date of sale is this.
Q. What do you mean the same as it was on this date?
A. Whatever money was in the account, to be at the
```

1 same date that I'm on that it was on this same date, and
2 there are some other conditions. Not conditions, but

```
``` same date that \(I\) 'm on that it was on this same date, and there are some other conditions. Not conditions, but information that things would be kept the same.
Q. Did you prepare your funds to -- did you prepare your funds to buy Mr. Bidsal's interest?
A. Yes. Actually, before that, I had prepared the funds to be able to purchase his share.
Q. During that meeting, when you were talking about the second meeting, was there any further discussion about the improper distribution or distribution of money you felt he had done wrong?
A. Well, we discussed that, and then I felt that things are not going the way they're supposed to be, and I told him that \(I\) can let \(g o\) of the distribution and let's finish this thing. He said he would think about it. Later on he didn't answer, which I thought he wouldn't.
```

Q. During the meeting he told you he wanted 6.3 million. Was he going to go back and think about it some more? Was that the way the meeting was left?
A. No. When he told me, I didn't -- you know, I had a very bad feeling, and I wasn't feeling good and I don't know if anybody here knows about atrial fibrillation. It's where your heart, upper chamber beats, and it was about 200, and I kind of left to take
some medication. So that's where it stopped.
Q. Did you ask him during the second meeting why he -- if you paid 6.3 million, why he offered 5 million?

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading. He was asked what was discussed in the meeting. He doesn't have to ask specific questions that are leading. ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled. It's kind of a yes or no question.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Yes or no?
A. Can you ask...
Q. The question was: Did you ask Mr. Bidsal at the second meeting why he wanted 6.3 million if his offer was 5 million?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me what was said.
A. Because he thinks that's the value. That's how it should be done, and he had some other theories I didn't think was relevant.
Q. All right. Did you attempt to call Jim Main? Let's take a look at Exhibit 112. Also look at 113. So look at them both together. Pardon me. 114. ARBITRATOR WALL: 112, 113, and 114? MR. LEWIN: No, 112 and 114.

```
///
```

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

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. 112 is your Email to Mr. Main telling him you and Shawn were in the process of buy/sell and you wanted to talk to him?
A. Yes.
Q. 114 is his follow -- is a follow-up. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. It's a follow up on July 21st. And he said, "I'll call you back." Did he ever call you back?
A. No. No, he didn't call me back.
MR. LEWIN: I move to admit 112 and 114 into evidence, Your Honor.
MR. GERRARD: No objection.
ARBITRATOR WALL: 112 and 114 will be admitted. (Exhibits 112 and 114 were admitted into
evidence.)
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Please take a look at Exhibit 39.
A. Yeah.
Q. Exhibit 39 is an Email from Mr. Shapiro where Mr. Golshani is saying he wants to do an appraisal. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you received this document?
A. Yes.

```
Q. Again I see it's your Main Street address. All of your communications regarding Green Valley go to your Main Street address?
A. Yes.

MR. LEWIN: Move to admit Exhibit 39 into evidence.

MR. GERRARD: Isn't it already in?
ARBITRATOR WALL: It's not.
MR. GERRARD: Let me take a look here. I'm sorry. We have no objection.

ARBITRATOR WALL: 39 will be in.
(Exhibit 39 was admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Now, at the time when you made your offer, how did you believe -- strike that.

At the time that you made your offer, what did you think COP was that was set forth on Henry's equity analysis?

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading.
MR. LEWIN: I'll rephrase it.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Thank you. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. When you made your election to buy Mr. Bidsal's interest instead of selling, what did you believe the COP was that would be plugged into the formula?
A. \(C O P\) as defined by the operating agreement, the purchase of the property which we had bought, as it shows in the escrow closing statement, which is the cost of the loan plus the fee, minus, you know, 250 or so became \(4,048,960\) or so. I think that's the -- the COP.
Q. That was your opinion at the time?
A. Yes. And --
Q. Has that opinion changed since then?
A. My opinion -- actually, there was these discussions later on that some of the properties have been sold, so that's why COP should be reduced, and I am okay with that too. But either way is okay and I think the results would be about the same. However, if we consider COP to be exactly like the operating agreement at 4,000,048, then the capital contribution, which is the last part of the formula, would be whatever operating statement says that it is at the time of the purchase.

So for example, for Mr. Bidsal it would be 1.215 . If they want to take another time like a buyout, that's okay too. However, everything should be at that time, which they about -- observe that. They should take \(\$ 4,000,048\), deduct the cost of the building that was sold, and deduct from the capital contribution whatever capital that he received, and I would agree with that
```

1 result also.

```
```

Q. You're saying that there's the -- you're saying the second theory that you're talking about, you're saying reduce the -- take away the sale and the purchases and reduce the unreturned capital?
A. That's right. If I may say something?
Q. That's fine.
By the way, at any time before the conclusion of the first arbitration, did Mr. Bidsal ever tell you what he calculated to be his purchase price no matter what numbers he put in? Has he ever given you a number?
A. The only time that he gave me some number was the one that $I$ was in his office, but when $I$ offered, he didn't accept.
Q. So even when he started this arbitration, before we got his answer to interrogatories, had he ever disclosed to you what his calculation of the purchase price would be?
A. I haven't seen.
Q. All right. You said you put aside the money. Have you received interest on that money?
A. On my -- yes, I have.
Q. Can you tell us what the highest amount of interest rate you've received?

```

25 arbitration No. 1?
A. Send. No, I didn't.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit No. 40. ARBITRATOR WALL: Number what? MR. LEWIN: Number 40 . ARBITRATOR WALL: Pick a spot where it makes sense to take a little break. MR. LEWIN: Okay.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Did you authorize --

MR. LEWIN: Let me do it differently. I have a series of documents that rather than ask him about it just to lay foundation, they're all communications between myself and Mr. Shapiro, and maybe we can take a break and I can talk about whether or not they'll stipulate to putting in the documents.

ARBITRATOR WALL: That's fine. Whatever you want.

MR. GERRARD: We've already covered this in a motion in limine. We already filed a motion in limine with respect to whether Mr . Lewin would be permitted to testify in the trial and Your Honor already ruled that he wasn't able to, and obviously we're not -- he'd have to lay a foundation for these documents and he hasn't done that and he can't do that unless he testifies. That was the whole point of -- we told him we weren't

1 stipulating to those to begin with.

ARBITRATOR WALL: You told him that you weren't stipulating to those?

MR. GERRARD: We said we were not going to stipulate to those documents way at the beginning when we were having our conference about what documents we could and could not stipulate to. That's where everything broke down, because Mr. Lewin just thought that we should stipulate to all those documents. We said, No. 1, we don't think most of them are relevant; No. 2, you've never done anything to lay the proper foundation of these throughout the course of the litigation.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't know what documents you're talking about.

MR. LEWIN: I believe the order was that might call for me to testify, so we'd take it up at the time.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, specifically I said, "Claimant's motion in limine to exclude the testimony of" -- I might have said Lewis. That's a typo that appeared in the final order. I apologize -- "Lewin is hereby granted, reserving to Respondent the right to seek leave of the Arbitrator to present a specific and particularized application for the testimony of Mr. Lewin, including the precise purpose of such
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1 testimony, authority supporting its admissibility, and
2 the ability of Mr. Lewin to then continue as an advocate
3 for Respondent whether issues of attorney/client
4 privilege are implicated and the basis for any
5 limitation on Claimant's right of cross-examination
6 thereupon."

7

That's what I said.
MR. LEWIN: I interpret that as the issue really is these are just letters between counsel and what my testimony, if \(I\) had to give it, would be. I sent this letter -- \(I\) got this letter in the ordinary course of business. And some of the communications are communications from me to Mr. Shapiro and vice versa, and \(I\) think we're both there as representing the client. And I don't think that waives any attorney/client privilege and foundation and that it shouldn't disqualify me from testifying because it's testifying as to a foundational significant issue.

MR. GERRARD: Not to be difficult, Mr. Lewin, but the problem is a lot of those letters have hearsay in them. You're making statements of fact about what you think the facts are, and we don't agree with those facts. We don't think that the foundation has been laid for those facts, so we're not going to allow letters to come in where you're saying things that we don't think

1 is correct Page 1170
1 is correct and then trying to get it in through your
2 letter. That's the whole point. That why I said
3 there's never been foundation laid for these things and 4 we're not willing to stipulate to them. We're happy to 5 address them one at a time if we have to.

You know, for instance, your first letter that you just were making reference to talks about how you say "My client has the money to do this, that, and the other." Well, we don't agree with that. Why would we agree to let that letter come into evidence? We don't think there's evidence that's ever been presented to us during this case that your client had the money to close this purchase. That's exactly the point, is that we don't think that even if you got on the stand it would still be admissible. You can authenticate the letter, but it's still hearsay because you're making a hearsay statement based on out-of-court documents.

MR. LEWIN: It's to give notice to open escrow. MR. GERRARD: It's difficult, Judge, because I mean, without addressing them one at a time, it's really hard to say --

ARBITRATOR WALL: I haven't seen them. I don't know which ones you're talking about. I haven't gone through these, so I don't know which ones you're seeking to get -- I don't know what limitations there would be
```

    1 on Cross because I don't know what's in the letters 1171
    ```
``` you seek to authenticate a letter that you wrote that has facts \(A, B, C, D\), and \(E\), and \(A, B, C\), and \(D\) you learned from someone else, including your client, I'm not sure that doesn't --
MR. GERRARD: Waives privilege.
ARBITRATOR WALL: -- waive the privilege. And that's pretty much what \(I\) want to protect against when I wrote the order.
MR. LEWIN: We'll take a break and I'll look at it.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Great.
MR. GERRARD: We're getting almost to 4 o'clock.
I don't know how much longer Mr. Lewin has. Are we going to be cross-examining tonight or are we -- what's the...
MR. LEWIN: I probably have -- I'm closing in. I have another half hour.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Off the record.
(RECESS TAKEN FROM 3:58 P.M. TO 4:17 P.M.)
ARBITRATOR WALL: So 123 is admitted by stipulation. Right?
(Exhibit 123 was admitted into evidence.)
```

MR. GERRARD: Just so I don't forget, we Page 1172 move to admit Exhibit 67, which Mr. Golshani testified about earlier today and is not in evidence right now.

MR. LEWIN: I object to Exhibit 67. His
testimony was on that was to get the information because we were refused to get cross-examination of him.

MR. GERRARD: He said, "Did you get this," and he said yes, and then he wanted to know what happened after that and that's what he just testified to.

ARBITRATOR WALL: 67 I'm going to admit.
(Exhibit 67 was admitted into evidence.)
MR. SHAPIRO: Just to be clear, you said 117 as already in?

ARBITRATOR WALL: It isn't. 118's in.
MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Thank you. I just want to make sure I'm on the same --

ARBITRATOR WALL: I just remembered.
MR. LEWIN: We have a stipulation regarding some facts that relate to Exhibit 117. I want to put it on the record.

MR. SHAPIRO: We can put the stipulation on the record. I don't want to talk about 117 because 117 is not coming in.

MR. LEWIN: The issue of whether it comes in or not is not your decision. We don't need it in if we
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1 have a stipulation. The stipulation it is agreed that
2 Mr. Golshani -- Mr. Bidsal demanded as of the date --
3 elected to buy Mr. Bidsal's interest instead of sell, that Mr. Golshani demanded Mr. Bidsal not make any future distributions. Mr. Bidsal did not agree and he refused to cease making distributions.

MR. GERRARD: I think the stipulation is that -what we're willing to stipulate to, Rod, is very simple. Your client is taking the position that no distribution should have been made after the date that he made his offer. Our client does not agree with that position because his argument is that the transactions never closed and so distributions were made after that date as a result of that. That's what we're willing to stipulate to.

ARBITRATOR WALL: And the evidence of the distributions is already in here?

MR. GERRARD: Yep. And all the evidence is in the record of what actually has happened.

MR. LEWIN: I don't need 117 in. I agree with that set of facts, so we don't need it in. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Okay. Mr. Golshani, take a look at Exhibit 118, please. We have 118 in evidence. Right?

MR. GERRARD: It's already in.

1 BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. We don't have to go to 118. Let's go to 125.
A. Okay.
Q. This is a letter to you by -- dated December 26, 2017. Did you send this letter to Mr . Bidsal?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he ever respond to this acknowledging that he had received it?
A. I don't think so. I didn't see any.
Q. The purpose of sending this letter -- your purpose in sending this letter was to -- well, in the second paragraph you're talking about over-distribution again. You made a demand that he return the funds?
A. That's right.
Q. Did Mr. Bidsal ever return the funds as you demanded in this letter?
A. No, he didn't. MR. LEWIN: Move to admit Exhibit 125. MR. GERRARD: No objection. ARBITRATOR WALL: 125 will be admitted. (Exhibit 125 was admitted into evidence.) BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Golshani, we mentioned before that we had the first arbitration in this room before Judge Haberfeld. Do you remember that?

| 1 | A. Yes. Page 1175 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. After that you heard Mr. Gerety talk about the |
| 3 | fact that you never delivered any money to Mr. Bidsal. |
| 4 | Did you in fact try to deliver money to Mr. Bidsal after |
| 5 | the first arbitration? |
| 6 | A. No. |
| 7 | Q. Okay. And you also heard Mr. Bidsal testify that |
| 8 | he is ready to sell. Has he ever told you that he is |
| 9 | ready to sell? |
| 10 | A. No. |
| 11 | Q. Well, did he tell you he was ready to sell for 5 |
| 12 | million dollars fair market value? |
| 13 | A. Uh. |
| 14 | Q. Did Mr. Bidsal ever tell you he was ready to sell |
| 15 | based on the 5 million dollars fair market value? |
| 16 | A. No. |
| 17 | Q. He did indicate he would sell 6.3 million. |
| 18 | Right? |
| 19 | A. Yes. He told me that if I want to buy I have to |
| 20 | pay. |
| 21 | Q. And so did Mr. Bidsal ever say after the first |
| 22 | arbitration or in the judgment that followed that that |
| 23 | he would like -- that he would perform pursuant to Judge |
| 24 | Haberfeld's order? |
| 25 | A. No. |

Q. Not to say you had any duty to do so, but is there a reason you didn't send Mr. Bidsal some money?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the reason?
A. The reason is that on the -- when I made the offer, I sent him an Email and said "I have the money." I showed him proof of the funds and I asked him to open escrow.

He said that "No, we cannot open escrow because we have a problem." And you know, he mentioned things I don't remember correctly and vividly. So he didn't want to open escrow. I tried to open escrow myself but no escrow would entertain that without both parties be available and sign.
Q. Now, you also -- you heard Mr. Bidsal testifying that you were complaining about him receiving reimbursement for his expenses. First of all, did you ever complain about him being reimbursed for his expenses?
A. No.
Q. He was getting a disproportionate interest in the rents, $50 / 50$, because he was performing -- doing some work. What was he doing?
A. He was supposed to manage the property, lease, repair, write the leasing agreement, find tenants,

1 market.
Q. Right after the property was purchased, who was managing the property?
A. At that time, America Nevada was managing.
Q. And then after that, who managed the property after that?
A. I believe for a short period Mr. Jeff Chain did.
Q. And American Nevada and Millennium got paid fees for property managing. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you complain to Mr. Bidsal about paying fees to American Nevada or Millennium since he was supposed to be doing it in order to get 50 percent of the profits?
A. Probably I should. But I just thought I shouldn't.
Q. Now, when Mr. Gerety testified, Mr. Gerrard asked him was he hired to find offsets for the purchase price. When did you hire Mr. Gerety?
A. Why?
Q. When.
A. Last summer. Summer of 2020 .
Q. And who gave Mr. Gerety his assignment, you or the lawyers?
A. The attorneys gave him the assignment.
Q. Were you looking for Mr . Gerety to cheat

## Mr. Bidsal?

A. No.
Q. Were you looking for him to make up some claims where you're trying to reduce the purchase price?
A. No. No.
Q. What were you hoping that he would do?
A. I was hoping that --

MR. GERRARD: Hang on a sec. Lack of foundation. There's no foundation that Mr. Golshani ever spoke with Mr. Gerety to give him any assignment.

ARBITRATOR WALL: He testified just the opposite a minute ago, that the attorneys gave Mr. Gerety instructions, not Mr. Golshani.

MR. LEWIN: The question is what was he hoping Mr. Gerety would find out. He doesn't have to have the communications.

MR. GERRARD: His hopes, if he never communicated them to Mr. Gerety, is completely irrelevant.

MR. LEWIN: Sort of. If you don't think it's probative, then $I$ won't pursue it.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't think it's probative.
MR. LEWIN: Now I'm not going to ask him questions about management issues that relate to change over management. That all relates to the reasons why

|  | changing over management would be going to the whole 1179 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | management issue. |
| 3 | MR. GERRARD: Bifurcated issue. |
| 4 | MR. LEWIN: I just want to make sure the claim is |
| 5 | not made and I need to cover that. |
| 6 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Correct. |
| 7 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 8 | Q. Take a look at Exhibit 95, will you, please? |
| 9 | A. I got it. |
| 10 | Q. When was the first -- this is the 2011 general |
| 11 | ledger. Right? |
| 12 | A. That's correct. |
| 13 | Q. When was the first time that you saw this general |
| 14 | ledger? |
| 15 | A. I believe I first saw it when Jim Main produced. |
| 16 | Q. The documents produced by Mr. Jim Main's office? |
| 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | Q. Also take a look at Exhibit 18, the cost |
| 19 | segregation study. |
| 20 | A. Okay. I don't have it. |
| 21 | MR. GARFINKEL: Is it over there? |
| 22 | THE WITNESS: Yeah. |
| 23 | MR. GARFINKEL: Here you go. |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: Hold on. |
| 25 | / / / |

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Do you understand what a cost segregation study is?
A. I have an idea.
Q. Did you and Mr. Bidsal discuss having a cost segregation study?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. What did you and Mr. Bidsal discuss about having a cost segregation study done?
A. It was Mr. Bidsal's idea. I asked him what was the purpose. He said it's going to help us save on the tax payment, and he went ahead and did the cost segregation study. That's what he told me.
Q. Now, the cost segregation study is dated what date?
A. I believe it was 2013 sometime.
Q. Well, you have it right in front of you.
A. I don't see a date. Maybe inside.
Q. It's on the first page.
A. March 15, 2013.
Q. Now, there had been previously a tax allocation done by Mr. Bidsal. Is that correct?
A. It was the cost of each building in 2011. Yes.
Q. Take a look at Exhibit 12. This is the 2011 tax return.

```
A. Uh-huh. I'm sorry. That's the wrong exhibit.
Q. I'm referring to Exhibit -- you know, I'm going to pass on that. I'm not going to address that issue right now.
What I do want to talk to you about, you heard Mr. Wilcox's testimony regarding his calculations of COP. Is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And on the cost segregation study, what is the total amount of the costs? When Mr. Wilcox came up with the COP of \(\$ 3,967,182\). Correct?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you do some analysis to figure out how he got to that number?
A. Yes.
Q. So if you take -- let's take a look at the Exhibit 95.
ARBITRATOR WALL: The general ledger?
MR. LEWIN: The general ledger.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. I'm also going to ask you to look at Exhibit 97, which is the trial balance worksheet that was produced by Mr. Main. Keep going back on those.
MR. GERRARD: We object to Exhibit 97 being used. It's not in evidence. There's no foundation this
```

1 witness prepared this document.

MR. LEWIN: This is a document that, No. 1, was produced by the company accountant. No. 2, the -- it's their own exhibits offered to -- their own exhibits identify exhibits as "all documents," and it's No. -it's No. 80, which is "all documents disclosed by either party." That's their exhibit.

MR. GERRARD: Sure. We reserve the right to use other exhibits that have been disclosed, but that doesn't change whether this exhibit is admissible. There's no foundation that's been laid for it by personal knowledge, and it's hearsay unless Mr. Main's here to testify about it, how he prepared it, and what it is.

ARBITRATOR WALL: It's a document prepared by Mr. Main's office?

MR. GARFINKEL: The custodian of records for Clifton Larsen Allen did in fact execute an affidavit when the documents were produced and basically established that they were business records kept in the ordinary course. So why shouldn't this be able to come in?

MR. GERRARD: That affidavit has not been admitted as an exhibit.

MR. GARFINKEL: It was provided to you.

MR. GERRARD: It doesn't change anything, Mr. Garfinkel. Wanted to call you Garfield. I'm sorry. This is still a document that we have no foundation for. We don't know how it was prepared or why it was prepared or what the purpose of preparing it was.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Why are you trying to offer it? MR. LEWIN: What's going to happen is

Mr. Golshani is going to show that the numbers tied into this document tie into the general ledger and then tie into Mr. Wilcox's establishment of the COP, and some of those numbers on the general ledger, which Mr. -- which is in evidence and which is -- it's a record of Green Valley, show that there's a capital contribution payback, and so that has to do with whether -- the capital contributions that have been returned to the parties. So he goes through to match up the records to establish how that was calculated. The numbers match up. I think that's what he's used to match up the numbers.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Who prepared 97?
MR. SHAPIRO: Clifton Larsen Allen.
MR. GERRARD: We know they produced it. We don't know they prepared it because there's never been any testimony about it. That's the whole point.

MR. LEWIN: It's a Green Valley Commerce, LLC
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1 Trial Balance Worksheet. Nothing else. It's a business
2 record of Green Valley.

MR. GERRARD: Except it doesn't appear in any of Green Valley's records. So again, the point is this document has not been authenticated. We don't know who prepared it. We don't know why it was prepared. We don't know what the numbers on here are supposed to represent or where they came from, and that's why it's not admissible. That's why we're objecting to it.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. I'm going to admit 97 over the objection of Claimants. As to the information it contains, though, I mean, you know, some of this goes to weight rather than admissibility. I don't know where it came from. I don't know where the numbers came from.
(Exhibit 97 was admitted into evidence.)
MR. SHAPIRO: If there's no foundation and you don't know where it came from --

ARBITRATOR WALL: I know it came from the other CLA.

MR. LEWIN: If necessary we'll offer as an exhibit the affidavit from the custodian of records establishing that those are the business records.

ARBITRATOR WALL: To the extent that I'm allowing the document in is different from vouching for the
1 actual numbers that are in there that someone
2 calculated, because I don't have any foundation for
3 that.
actual numbers that are in there that someone calculated, because I don't have any foundation for that.

MR. LEWIN: All right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Turning to Exhibit 95 -- why don't you go through your calculations of how Mr. Wilcox's COP cost segregation study -- what the cost was arrived at.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Say that again.
MR. LEWIN: I said I want him to explain to you how he has analyzed how Mr. Wilcox's COP and the cost of the buildings on the cost segregation study were arrived at using these documents.

MR. GERRARD: So I'm not sure, Judge, why we're trying to analyze Mr. Wilcox's testimony. They already had their expert who testified after Mr. Wilcox to be able to testify about whatever things that they thought Mr. Wilcox had or hadn't done differently. What we have now is the fact that we had a month delay, which gave them a chance to go back and read through the record and try to figure out where he's trying to change testimony, and this analysis that he supposedly prepared is something that he did in the last 30 days after the last hearing had concluded and has nothing to do with any

```
personal knowledge that he had at the time. It's not like he's testifying he performed this analysis when he got this document. They're trying to use him as an expert.
MR. LEWIN: No. What's happening is Mr. Bidsal took an oath and he swore he knew nothing about this document --
ARBITRATOR WALL: What document?
MR. LEWIN: This general ledger.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
MR. LEWIN: He said it's done by American Nevada. And the bottom line --
MR. GERRARD: What does that have to do with the analysis --
MR. LEWIN: This actually shows that all these numbers tie into the cost segregation study and Mr. Wilcox's testimony showing that -- and the reason that he doesn't want -- the reason why he doesn't want it to come in is because there's entries in this --
MR. GERRARD: This is already in evidence.
MR. GARFINKEL: Let him finish, Doug.
ARBITRATOR WALL: You know what? Pushing me. That's my job. Okay?
MR. GARFINKEL: Sorry, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Here's what we're going to do.
```
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1 It's going to start with 500. The next time somebody
2 talks over somebody else, and I'm going to now -- from now on designate who has the floor to speak, and we're going to start at 500 sanction, and then it's going to go up from there each successive time no matter who gets hit. Because that's got to stop. Everybody is better than that. All right?

So I understand it's the end of the day. I understand there's a lot of things going on. I understand we had technical difficulties. I get all of it. But it's got to stop.

Mr. Lewin, do you understand?
MR. LEWIN: I understand.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Garfinkel, you understand?
MR. GARFINKEL: Absolutely.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Shapiro, you understand?
MR. SHAPIRO: I understand.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Gerrard, you understand?
MR. GERRARD: Absolutely.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Everyone's on notice.

All right. Finish. Mr. Gerrard, I think you were interrupted.

MR. LEWIN: I was interrupted.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Finish. Mr. Bidsal denying that this was a general ledger that was created by Green Valley, and our intention is to show, by tying the numbers together, that not only is that general ledger contrary to what Mr. Bidsal said, something that was performed by his company, but also that the payments here that are reflected as a return of capital, the reason why the COP was reduced from 4,000,049 to something less and tie it in with the worksheet where they add in the cost of the survey and some capitalized expenses. That's how all those numbers come together.

ARBITRATOR WALL: My recollection of the discussion regarding the general ledger was 311,000 or so and whether it was treated correctly as interest. Remember that?

MR. LEWIN: Yeah, I remember that. That was one number.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't recall -- when was this analysis done?

MR. LEWIN: So the -- originally even Mr. Bidsal testified and he and Mr. Golshani both agreed that the COP was 4,000,049 and some change. That number was reduced in the cost segregation study to the $3,967,000$.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Right.

MR. LEWIN: How did we get to that number? We talked about this -- Mr. Wilcox about where's the missing $\$ 92,000$. Nobody could really pin it down. When you look at the worksheet and Exhibit 95, you'll see on Exhibit 95 that there are -- there's funds that are a return of capital. So those funds plus -- those funds plus the capitalized cost on the worksheet make up the difference between the original cost of the note and what was on the cost segregation study. And that's what we're getting at. It's to show how these numbers tie together. And the cost segregation study says that these numbers on the cost segregation study were given by Mr. Bidsal. It says so right on the document.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So you want to walk Mr. Golshani through Mr. Wilcox's conclusions, the numbers he used, the cost segregation report numbers, and the general ledger?

MR. LEWIN: No. I want to walk him through -Wilcox used the cost segregation study numbers.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
MR. LEWIN: Mr. Gerety did.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Right.
MR. LEWIN: So what I want to do is with Mr. Golshani walk us through how the 4,000,049 -284,000, whatever it is, on the cost of the note, the

| 1 | COP came to be reduced to the $3,000,009$, and he Page 1190 |
| :--- | :---: |
| 2 | it by going through these documents. |
| 3 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Gerrard. |
| 4 | MR. GERRARD: My turn? Okay. This document, |
| 5 | Exhibit 95, is already in evidence. |
| 6 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. |
| 7 | MR. GERRARD: This Exhibit 18 cost segregation |
| 8 | study is already in evidence. |
| 9 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. |
| 10 | MR. GERRARD: There's been no foundation of any |

11 kind laid that Mr. Golshani at any time had any part in preparing either of these two documents.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Correct.
MR. GERRARD: He has no personal knowledge of how they were prepared or where the numbers came from or where the information came from. What they're trying to do is make an argument based upon documents that are here. They could just argue to the Court. They don't have to have Mr. Golshani walk through the documents that he has no personal knowledge of any kind about how the documents were prepared or where the numbers came from. There's no evidence that contradicts what Mr. Bidsal said about who prepared Exhibit No. 95. None.

So again, this whole idea that we're going to
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1 waste the time in this arbitration to have Mr. Golshani
2 trying to prepare the argument between the last
3 arbitration and now and try to walk through and come up 4 with some explanation for things that they want to try

5 to explain when he had no personal knowledge of how 6 either of these documents were prepared is completely

ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Lewin, anything else?
MR. LEWIN: He's walking through to aid to Court -- the arbitrator in order to be able to look at these numbers and point to the evidence and do it.

ARBITRATOR WALL: But the foundation. What's the foundation for Mr. Golshani to walk me through that as opposed to -- the documents are in -- you guys making the argument "Here's where this number comes from. It comes from here"?

MR. LEWIN: I agree we can do that. I can walk through it --

ARBITRATOR WALL: Because he hasn't made that -I apologize for interrupting. He hasn't really made that analysis until just now. Right? It wasn't contemporaneous.

MR. LEWIN: No. He has done it when analyzing the documents after hearing Mr. Wilcox's testimony. There's the issue of where's the missing money.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Right.
MR. LEWIN: He's able to show where the money is missing from. Or where it ends up. It ends up in a return of capital that Mr. Wilcox hasn't taken into account.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Well, I think the argument can be made -- I get what you're saying. I think the argument can be made without Mr. Golshani walking me through it because he really wasn't involved in the preparation of any of those documents. The documents are there. The numbers are there. The argument is there to be made.

MR. LEWIN: Okay. All right. I have one more area to cover. I'd like to take five minutes and talk about it with Mr. Golshani and see where we want to go with that. Is that okay? It's almost 5 o'clock. He's not going to go into Cross anyway.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I know. Okay. All right.

1 We'll take five minutes.
(RECESS TAKEN FROM 4:57 P.M. TO 5:05 P.M.)

MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, I have three new documents to talk about. The first --

ARBITRATOR WALL: What do you mean "new"?
MR. LEWIN: They're not on our exhibit list.
MR. SHAPIRO: Is that what you Emailed to us?
MR. LEWIN: No. Well, they might be. I Emailed you some audit documents which are a little bit different. This one is -- here, Doug. For reference, I'd like to mark this as 203. These are documents -this is Bates stamped CLA_Bidsal 0003646 through 49 .

Which one did I give you? Okay. Here you go. And that document has some red markings on it which Mr. Golshani will testify about. The next one to discuss along with that document is a document marked 204, which is CLA_Bidsal 2372 through 2374.

ARBITRATOR WALL: You gave me 203.
MR. LEWIN: Here's 204 .
And the last document is a Document 205, which is a part of the general ledger. This was supposed to be testified about by Mr. Manabat.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Didn't I just deny admission of

```
    1 what you marked as 204?
    2 MR. LEWIN: No.
```

```
MR. LEWIN: That's right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Why do I need this? It's the same Bates numbers as --
MR. LEWIN: Yes, but it's -- let me make an offer of proof.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
MR. GERRARD: Before we do that, I'm going to object to all of these because --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on before you do that. I'm sorry to interrupt.
Was there a 205? I didn't get that one yet.
All right. So let's let Mr. Lewin address these first.
(Exhibits 203, 204, and 205 were marked.)
MR. LEWIN: Mr. Bidsal testified that the 2011 general ledger was not prepared by his office. What Mr. Golshani has done is to go through with these documents and mark up the corresponding numbers so
```
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1 you -- and by the way, this Document 203 is a document
2 that Mr. Golshani found in the production from Mr. Main.
3 By the way, the Bates stamp CLA_Bidsal reflects it was a
4 document produced by Mr. Main. Mr. Golshani will

5 testify that this 203 is a general ledger that he believes was prepared by American Nevada, and he'll be able to explain how he's able to show that essentially showing the designation on the upper left-hand corner because he's reviewed other documents from American Nevada.

And that the general ledger in 205 corresponds with the entries in the general ledger that Mr. Bidsal claims had -- pardon me -- 204. 204, which is the trial balance worksheet, ties into the general ledger those corresponding entries of each. And that also in the trial balance worksheet there are references to information from the property management company and that those tie into -- that information ties into -- on the worksheet ties into 203.

So the point of that is to show that Mr. Bidsal -- where the genesis of Exhibit 95 comes really, and it was generated by Mr. Bidsal's office and that did not come from American Nevada.

ARBITRATOR WALL: So the items in red on 203, 204, and 205 were added by Mr. Golshani?

MR. LEWIN: That's right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: So when they were produced -MR. LEWIN: Actually -- I'm sorry to interrupt. ARBITRATOR WALL: Go ahead.

MR. LEWIN: Actually, he worked with Mr. Manabat to put these numbers together, and then he independently verified these numbers himself to cross reference what they are.

ARBITRATOR WALL: The actual numbers in these documents haven't changed. But just the red stamps everywhere. And those were done by Mr. Golshani or by Mr. Manabat?

MR. LEWIN: Mr. Manabat with Mr. Golshani, and Mr. Golshani then independently verified those.

ARBITRATOR WALL: When?
MR. LEWIN: To prepare for today.
ARBITRATOR WALL: When did Mr. Manabat --
MR. LEWIN: In the last week. He actually created some other documents that I produced to counsel, but those would be subject to him being here. For example, if you look at the --

MR. GERRARD: Judge --
MR. LEWIN: If you look at the document on 203, if you look at the category 4406, that says "Contributions."

ARBITRATOR WALL: On?
MR. LEWIN: On 203. 5,000. It's got the cross-reference REF03. If you look at the trial balance worksheet, it says at 3600 , it says contributions record management company's financials, and it shows it's the 5,000 with the cross-reference of REFO3.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. So Mr. Manabat actually prepared the red -- put the red stamps on here or Mr. Golshani?

MR. LEWIN: Mr. Manabat put the red on, and then Mr. Golshani independently went through one by one to verify that they're correct.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. And what's 205?
MR. LEWIN: 205 is the -- is the -- is the -Mr. -- let me explain it this way: Mr. Bidsal produced a link to the QuickBooks records for the 2011 general ledger. From that link you can go in and manipulate the general ledger to get certain reports out of it. Those reports --

ARBITRATOR WALL: When you say "manipulate," you just mean electronically generate reports?

MR. LEWIN: That's a better -- electronically generate reports.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
MR. LEWIN: So Mr. Manabat and Mr. Golshani were
1 able to generate this report, which shows in part the --
2 a portion of the general ledger that has to do with
3 capital contributions, and that's cross-referenced to
4 the -- that is cross-referenced to the worksheet as 5 well.

MR. LEWIN: Yes, sir.
ARBITRATOR WALL: What about 203 and 205? Are those documents without the red stamps already in? Are they already either admitted into evidence or are they on the list?

MR. LEWIN: No. They're neither -- well, they are on the list to the extent that they -- Mr. Bidsal disclosed as part of his disclosure -- he identified all of Mr. Main's records as being disclosed as part of his disclosure in this case, and that would also be covered by -- I thought it was Exhibit 80 where they identified that they reserved the right to produce any document that was disclosed.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Right.
MR. LEWIN: Mr. Golshani testified that he was searching through Mr. Main's records and came upon the general ledger. It has in the upper right-hand corner

| 1 | ANC, and he then looked back at his documents that he |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | had received as part of the due diligence from American |
| 3 | Nevada when they were looking at the possibility of |
| 4 | buying the note and saw the same designation. So he |
| 5 | will testify, based on that, this is a general ledger |
| 6 | produced by American Nevada, who was managing the |
| 7 | property and was given to Mr. Main as part -- by |
| 8 | Mr. Bidsal as the part of doing business. That's the |
| 9 | testimony that he would offer. |
| 10 | MR. GERRARD: Is it my turn now, Judge? |
| 11 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Yes, sir. |
| 12 | MR. GERRARD: That was the most ridiculous bunch |
| 13 | of testimony by Mr. Lewin. There's no foundation for |
| 14 | anything he just said. There's no -- first of all, |
| 15 | let's take these one at a time. |
| 16 | but we have no foundation. |
| 17 | disclosed in this case. It was produced, although it's |
| 18 | been modified, but it was produced originally by CLA, |

MR. GERRARD: CLA the accounting firm. We have no foundation for these numbers, where they came from, the documents that they looked at to get this, and what Mr. Lewin is trying to do is testify. He's trying to

| 1 | testify about where these numbers came from. He's |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | trying to say what he thinks is the explanation for this |
| 3 | stuff. |
| 4 | That's not the way we do it under the law. We |
| 5 | have to actually lay foundation by someone with personal |
| 6 | knowledge, not someone is guessing 15 years after the |
| 7 | fact or 10 years after the fact about what they think |
| 8 | happened or trying to create some sort of an explanation |
| 9 | for. |

Now, as far as Mr. Manabat goes, Mr. Manabat has not been disclosed as an expert witness, but that's what they just tried to use him as. They disclosed an expert. He's already testified. They know he's already testified. So now they're trying to get some expert testimony in in a different way. So they have Mr. Manabat go and actually create Exhibit 205. Look at the date at the top left-hand corner. This was printed two days ago or six days ago. Seven days ago --

ARBITRATOR WALL: A week ago.
MR. GERRARD: -- by Mr. Manabat using apparently the QuickBooks records that they have access to to try to create a record for them to come up with some explanation for something that they don't have any knowledge of. Mr. Manabat didn't work for the company back when these numbers were prepared. He worked at the
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1 company from September 2015 until 2020 when he was
2 fired.

So for him to be guessing about where these numbers came from back in 2011 when they were created, there's no basis for that. He's not an expert. He has no personal knowledge.

Mr. Golshani is not an expert and he has no personal knowledge. There's been no foundation laid for why these documents were prepared or where the information came from. It's just pure speculation. They're wanting to come up with something that they never bothered to get their expert prepared for or to testify about, and they're trying to figure out a way to get it in, and Your Honor just told them that some of the exhibits that they wanted to put it were not admissible, so now they've come back with a new set and they're trying to do the same thing again.

They still haven't solved the foundation problem. It's pure speculation as to where these numbers came from. We have no foundation for where they came from. Just because they might have been on a document that was produced by CLA doesn't mean that CLA prepared them. And by CLA I'm talking about the accounting firm.

That doesn't mean that this document which is Exhibit 203 was prepared by Clifton Larsen Allen just
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1 because -- you know, accountants receive documents from third-party sources and put them in their file. We don't know what this is. We don't know whether it was prepared by Clifton Larsen Allen. We don't know who gave it to them. We don't know what the numbers are or where they came from. There's no foundation for any of that.

It's just pure speculation and guesswork on the part of counsel because he's the one that just testified, and I was biting my tongue while he was doing it because he said he was going to make an offer of proof. But proof of what? There's no proof. There's no evidence. There's no testimony about where these numbers came from. They're just pulling documents out and trying to create explanations for them.

Now, listen, if they had disclosed the documents on time and put them in as part of the exhibits and they wanted to make an argument based upon them, that would be one thing. But they can't get them into evidence without proper foundation because otherwise they're hearsay. There's no evidence saying that this is a business record of Clifton Larsen Allen that they prepared and that that's where the numbers came from. There's just an affidavit saying "This was in our file."

So there's no foundation for any of this stuff,
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1 and one of these reports was clearly prepared in
2 anticipation of today.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All of them were. The red portion.

MR. GERRARD: The red portion, yeah. But Exhibit 205 is actually a report that was generated a week ago. It's never ever been disclosed. Never been disclosed and there's no foundation for it, and that's what they wanted to use Mr. Manabat for, was to use him as an expert, apparently, to go back and say, "Well, I prepared this from the QuickBooks information. This is what it means." He wasn't even here in 2011. He didn't work for the company. He doesn't know where the numbers came from that were put into those QuickBooks originally. He's got no personal knowledge. He would never be able to testify to it, and neither can Mr. Golshani because he doesn't have any personal knowledge of it either. None of these documents are admissible.

MR. LEWIN: My turn?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Yes.
MR. LEWIN: First of all, when we receive -first of all, it's not expert testimony. It doesn't take expert testimony to generate a report out of QuickBooks if you know how to use QuickBooks. It's not
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1 expert testimony to make a demonstrative exhibit that 2 says the number on Document $A$ matches up to Document B.

3 That's not expert testimony. That's someone who sat 4 down and -- it's a demonstrative exhibit, more or less. 5 No. 1.

No. 2, so none of what Mr. Gerrard just said is relevant because we're not -- the numbers are the numbers. And the numbers are the numbers and all that these documents show is that there was a co-relationship between the general ledger report and the trial report and the other document which was -- which we believe -which Mr. Golshani -- it may go to weight, but it will show -- he will testify that this general ledger 203 is on the same form and looks like it's from American Nevada. That was given -- this was a general ledger for the time period when American Nevada was the property manager, according to Mr. Bidsal.

All the red markings are doing -- as I said, they give us a link to an electronic document. We can generate a report. Fine. We didn't know that Mr. Bidsal, by the way, was going to swear under oath that the 2011 general ledger was not prepared by him, was prepared by -- he thinks was American Nevada. He's the -- ultimately he was the person in charge of the accounting. He would know who generated the reports.
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1 He authorized delivery of these things to Jim Main's 2 office. He's the person responsible and he's the person 3 who got up and said -- attempting to disclaim any 4 responsibility for it or ownership of it, the 2011 5 general ledger.

So now this effort is to show that despite what he said, that the general ledger ties in to all kinds of other documents, including the tax returns that were filed under his supervision, and that these records are essentially demonstrative records to show that they tie in. That's not expert testimony. I could do it myself if $I$ took the time to match up the various things. And we all could.

These are documents that Mr. -- the issue is 203 is a document that was produced by Mr. Main with an affidavit. These are business records. They're admissible. I think everything else goes to weight. Mr. Golshani was just going to walk through these documents. I wasn't trying to give testimony. He was just going to walk through and explain how they relate to each other.

MR. GERRARD: Is it my turn? It's my objection, so I'm supposed to get the last say on this.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
MR. GERRARD: So listen, you heard Mr. Lewin say
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1 it looks like it was prepared by ANC. That's exactly
2 the problem. He has no idea who prepared this. It's 3 pure speculation. Pure, unadulterated speculation by

4 Mr. Lewin, and of course Mr. Manabat is trying to
5 testify as an expert because remember, if he doesn't
6 have personal knowledge under NRS Chapter 50 , he can't
7 testify. And 49 and 50. He cannot testify about prepared a report based upon numbers that he had no personal knowledge of, so of course it's never going to come into evidence because, No. 1, it's a report that was generated a week ago and was never disclosed in this case. Ever. That last exhibit. Never disclosed, ever, and it was prepared in anticipation of this testimony today, and Mr. Manabat can't testify about it because he didn't generate the numbers and he didn't put the numbers in and he didn't work there when the 2011 general ledger information was prepared. He didn't work there until five years later.

Mr. Golshani can't testify about it because he has no personal knowledge of it either. How is he supposed to testify to lay the foundation of where these numbers came from? And the two reports that supposedly came from -- the two reports that he's saying came from the records of Clifton Larsen Allen, again, there's no
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1 foundation for those numbers. We don't know where they
2 came from. We don't know who prepared them, and that's 3 the whole point.

They're trying to attribute to Mr. Bidsal information that Mr. Bidsal has clearly testified did not come from him. It's something that he didn't prepare. They don't like that answer. This is all an effort to try to attack the credibility of Mr. Bidsal as it relates to those numbers, but these documents are not admissible on their face. There's no foundation. They never produced them, and if it's a demonstrative exhibit, they have to produce that too, and they never produced any demonstrative exhibit at the outset of this case. Let's call a spade a spade.

What this is is they had a month between the last arbitration hearing and today to go back, read through the whole transcript, and try to figure out ways that they could try to get around testimony that they didn't like. That's where they created this stuff. Nobody has any personal knowledge of any of it that's been offered as a witness. I mean, there's no possible way under the rules of evidence that this comes into evidence. There's no foundation. It's pure speculation. And even if they came in, they couldn't tie the numbers to anything because they don't know where the numbers came
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1 from. They're just speculating about where the numbers
2 came from.

So again, Your Honor, $I$ think the objection is obvious, but lack of foundation, speculation, and they're trying to create new exhibits the day before we're supposed to have our closing argument. The first time we've ever seen this new document that they generated that they want a witness to testify about who was never disclosed as an expert.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Thank you. 205 is not going to be admitted. That's a document that was prepared a week ago by Mr. Manabat, has never been disclosed to anyone at any time. All right. So that's out.

204, the underlying document without the red stamps I just admitted, I think, as No. 97. The red references for virtually every entry on it has never been disclosed. It was -- at this point there's insufficient foundation to admit that document. And, I mean, if Mr. -- I don't know when Mr. Manabat worked there, if he originally did these, and whether he has personal knowledge of any of these numbers. So I'm not foreclosing the possibility that you could lay a foundation. As it stands now, there's insufficient foundation.

| 1 | 203, I just don't know its genesis, and I doge 1209 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | think anybody does. And in addition to that, I am |
| 3 | uncomfortable with new demonstrative exhibits the |
| 4 | last -- what was supposed to be the last day -- the last |
| 5 | afternoon of presentation of evidence being offered |
| 6 | without any notice. So these aren't the ones you said |
| 7 | you Emailed to Mr. Shapiro; is that right? |
| 8 | MR. LEWIN: Those were -- can I respond briefly? |
| 9 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Sure. |
| 10 | MR. LEWIN: The issue is not that anyone created |
| 11 | these numbers. All that was done -- all that was done |
| 12 | was that a report was generated using Mr. Bidsal's |
| 13 | QuickBooks. |
| 14 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Understood. |
| 15 | MR. LEWIN: There's no creation of numbers here. |
| 16 | And then you have -- so the numbers -- |
| 17 | ARBITRATOR WALL: 205 has never -- they've never |
| 18 | seen until five minutes ago. |
| 19 | MR. LEWIN: 205 was a report generated from his |
| 20 | QuickBooks. |
| 21 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. But they've never seen |
| 22 | this. |
| 23 | MR. LEWIN: No. |
| 24 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Never produced during the |
| 25 | litigation at all? |

MR. LEWIN: No. Our issue is that this is impeachment of rebuttal documents generated because of Mr. Bidsal's false testimony at the last set of hearings that American Nevada was the creator of Exhibit 95, the 2011 general ledger that is in the general ledger of Green Valley Commerce. So in effect, anyone who can operate a QuickBooks account can go to a QuickBooks record and ask if you have the facility to generate a report. It's not making numbers. It's generating a report from his own general ledger.

So just on the issue that these are numbers that are actually generated by Mr. Golshani or Mr. Bidsal, all they are are reports. All they are are cross-referencing reports. I guess I could take the time -- it's a cross-referencing numbers in the report, which is basically a review.

So I think that the foundation is sufficient to be able to -- to be able to admit the documents -- admit the documents having to show that the numbers on the trial worksheet are found on the general ledger or found on the other ledger.

The other ledger, having to do with 203, this is a document that was produced by the company's accountants. Whether it's in their files and were produced as a business record, and this is -- the issue
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1 here is do these -- does this ledger, regardless of where it came from -- because the weight that you would have to give it is if Mr. Bidsal didn't produce this general ledger, who did? By process of elimination, you can take it and be able to take it and derive that it would be the property manager at the time in 2011, which would be American Nevada. And then they cross-reference and was actually used by the company's accountant.

So I don't think the numbers are generated like inputted. They don't have to be inputted to draft a report. That doesn't take expert testimony. All he did was generate a report.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
THE WITNESS: It's the same as the one that's Bates stamped. This is the same one.

MR. LEWIN: Hold on.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. I think you've made your record. So I'm not going to admit 203, 204, 205.

Do you have additional questions for
Mr. Golshani?
MR. LEWIN: No, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
THE WITNESS: No.
MR. LEWIN: He reminded me about something.

```
// /
```

1 BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Golshani, when you were talking about COP and two ways of addressing $C O P$ and you said you wanted to explain something and I didn't let you explain, so forgive me. Tell the judge what you wanted to explain in terms of how you're willing to deduct from the COP the properties that have been sold and properties that have been bought, and you also had an explanation.

THE WITNESS: May I?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah.
THE WITNESS: As I said, the COP, according to operating agreement, should be whatever is under the escrow closing, which is $4,048,000$. And if they want to -- if we want to accept that as the formula, the numbers to be plugged in at the same time of escrow closing, both of the number, meaning the capital and COP, should be entered at the same time. So if the COP is $4,000,048$, capital account should be, naturally, 1.250 .

Now, if we go and say that COP should be at the time of the buyout, then we reduce the cost of the sold building, but at the same time we need to reduce from the capital account the cost of sold building and whatever money Mr. Bidsal has received under his capital contribution. Not the profit, but the capital
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1 contribution. Then both of them is acceptable.

What I'm trying to say, Your Honor, it's not fair to take the capital contribution at the time of purchase, which is 1.2 million, and then have the cost of COP at the time of buyout. Both of them should be at the same time.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. So you're saying the capital has to reflect the return capital. Is that correct?
A. Return capital. Yeah. Whatever capital that Mr. Bidsal seems to be deducting from there.

MR. LEWIN: I have nothing further.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. So we'll begin
tomorrow at 1:00 with your questions for Mr. Golshani?
MR. GERRARD: (Moved head.)
ARBITRATOR WALL: Can we agree on a time when Mr. Manabat should be available?

MR. GARFINKEL: Your Honor, I don't know if he's going to be available tomorrow. Medical issue. I don't know if he'll be available. We'll see by tomorrow morning if he'll make himself available.

MR. GERRARD: Well, are we finishing then tomorrow?

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, except for Mr. LeGrand,

MR. GARFINKEL: You know, believe me, I
understand. Otherwise we should have taken him today.
We had him scheduled for today and we had time to take him today.

MR. LEWIN: We thought he would be available. In the last break -- we actually called him and said we'll schedule for tomorrow, and we got a late call just at the last break told us he may not be available. We'll try to track that down.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. And you are going to meet and confer on the two Main deposition designations?

MR. GERRARD: I already sent them to him.
MR. LEWIN: Do you have a hard copy?
MR. GERRARD: Hard copy of what?
MR. LEWIN: The Email you sent me, did you have a printout?

MR. GERRARD: No. I had my secretary type it.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Off.
(The proceedings were suspended at 5:39 p.m.)
that was my hope. try to track that down.
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Louis Garfinkel, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 3416
REISMAN SOROKAC
8965 South Eastern Ave, Suite 382
Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
Tel: (702) 727-6258/Fax: (702) 446-6756
Email: Lgarfinkel@rsnvlaw.com
Attorneys for Movant CLA Properties, LLC

## DISTRICT COURT

## CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CLA PROPERTIES, LLC, a California limited liability company,

Movant (Respondent in
arbitration)
vS.
SHAWN BIDSAL, an individual,
Respondent (Claimant in arbitration).

Case No. A-22-854413-J
Dept. No. 23

## APPENDIX TO MOVANT CLA <br> PROPERTIES, LLC'S MOTION TO VACATE ARBITRATION AWARD (NRS 38.241) AND FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT (VOLUME 18 OF 18)

## NOTE REGARDING INCORRECT INDEX

Appellant CLA's motion to vacate the arbitration award (1A.App. 1), was accompanied by an 18 -volume appendix. Each volume contained an index. Unfortunately, the index to the motion appendix contained errors regarding some volume and page numbers.

Under NRAP $30(\mathrm{~g})(1)$, an appeal appendix for the Nevada appellate court must contain correct copies of papers in the district court file. CLA is complying with that rule, providing this court with exact duplicate copies of all 18 appendix volumes that were filed in the district court with the motion to vacate the arbitration award. These district court volumes all contained the incorrect index that was filed with each volume of the motion appendix.

To assist this court on appeal, CLA has now prepared a corrected index showing correct volume and page numbers for the appendix that was filed in the district court with the motion to vacate. The corrected index is attached as an addendum to CLA's opening brief. And the present note is being placed in the appeal appendix immediately before the incorrect index that was contained in each volume of the motion appendix filed in the district court.
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| App. | PART | EX. <br> No. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 000169 | 2 | 114 | $12 / 05 / 19$ | Order Granting Petition for Confirmation of Arbitration <br> Award and Entry of Judgment and Denying <br> Respondent's Opposition and Counter-petition to Vacate <br> the Arbitrator's Award Joanna S. Kishner, Nevada <br> District Court Judge |
| 000180 | 2 | 115 | $12 / 16 / 19$ | Notice of Entry of Order Granting Petition for <br> Confirmation of Arbitration Award |

FINAL AWARD JAMS Arbitration No.: 1260005736

| App. | PART | EX. <br> No. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 000195 | 2 | 116 | $10 / 20 / 21$ | Interim Award - <br> Hon. David T. Wall (Ret.), Arbitrator |
| 000223 | 2 | 117 | $03 / 12 / 22$ | Final Award - <br> Hon. David T. Wall (Ret.), Arbitrator |

EXHIBITS

| App. | PART | EX. <br> No. | DATE | DESCRIPTION <br> [Parenthetical number (_) is exhibit identification at arbitration hearing] | DATE <br> ADMIT'D | OFF'D/ <br> NOT <br> ADMIT'D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000255 | 3 | 118 | 05/19/11 | Agreement for Sale and Purchase of Loan [BIDSAL004004-4070] (1) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000323 | 3 | 119 | 05/31/11 | Assignment and Assumption of Agreements [BIDSAL003993-3995] (2) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000327 | 3 | 120 | 06/03/11 | Final Settlement Statement - Note Purchase [CLAARB2 000013] (3) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000329 | 3 | 121 | 05/26/11 | GVC Articles of Organization [DL00 361] (4) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000331 | 3 | 122 | 12/2011 | GVC Operating Agreement [BIDSAL000001-28] (5) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000360 | 3 | 123 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 29 / 11- \\ & 12 / 12 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | Emails Regarding Execution of GVC OPAG [DL00 323, 351, 353, and CLAARB2 000044] (6) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000365 | 3 | 124 | 03/16/11 | Declaration of CC\&Rs for GVC [BIDSAL001349-1428] | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000446 | 3 | 125 | 09/22/11 | Deed in Lieu Agreement [BIDSAL001429-1446] (8) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000465 | 3 | 126 | 09/22/11 | Estimated Settlement Statement - Deed in Lieu Agreement [BIDSAL001451] (9) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000467 | 3 | 127 | 09/22/11 | Grant, Bargain, Sale Deed [BIDSAL001447-1450] (10) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000472 | 3 | 128 | 12/31/11 | 2011 Federal Tax Return <br> [CLA Bidsal 0002333-2349] (12) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000490 | 3 | 129 | 09/10/12 | Escrow Closing Statement on Sale of Building C [CLA Bidsal 0003169-3170] (13) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000493 | 3 | 130 | 04/22/13 | Distribution Breakdown from Sale of Building C <br> [BIDSAL001452-1454] (14) | 03/17/21 |  |
| 000497 | 3 | 131 | 09/10/13 | 2012 Federal Tax Return <br> [CLA Bidsal 0002542-2557] (15) | 03/17/21 |  |







| App. | PART | EX. <br> No. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 003489 | 9 | 230 | $01 / 26 / 21$ | Respondent's Emergency Motion for Order Compelling <br> the Completion of the Deposition of Jim Main, CPA |  |
| 003539 | 9 | 231 | $01 / 29 / 21$ | Claimant's Opposition to Main deposition |  |
| 003775 | 9 | 232 | $02 / 01 / 21$ | Jim Main's Opposition and Joinder to Claimant's <br> Opposition to Respondent/Counterclaimant's <br> Emergency Motion for Order Compelling the <br> Completion of the Deposition of Jim Main, CPA |  |
| 003778 | 9 | 233 | $02 / 03 / 21$ | Respondent's Reply In Support of Emergency Motion <br> For Order Compelling The Completion of The <br> Deposition of Jim Main, CPA |  |
| 003784 | 9 | 234 | $02 / 04 / 21$ | Order on Respondent's Pending Motions |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

and 2nd Amended SO
"Motion for Leave to Amend"

| App. | PART | EX. <br> No. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 003415 | 8 | 225 | $01 / 19 / 21$ | Letter to Wall requesting Leave to Amend |
| 003422 | 8 | 226 | $01 / 19 / 21$ | Respondent's Motion for Leave to File Fourth Amended <br> Answer and Counterclaim |
| 003433 | 8 | 227 | $01 / 29 / 21$ | Claimant's Opposition to Respondent's Motion for <br> Leave to file Fourth Amended Answer and <br> Counterclaim |
| 003478 | 8 | 228 | $02 / 02 / 21$ | Respondent's Reply ISO Motion for Leave to File <br> Fourth Amended Answer and Counterclaim |
| 003482 | 8 | 229 | $02 / 04 / 21$ | Order on Respondent's Pending Motions |

## "Main Motion to Compel"

| App. | PART | EX. <br> No. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 003791 | 10 | 235 | $02 / 05 / 21$ | CLA Motion For Orders Regarding Bank Accounts, <br> Keys And Distribution |
| 003834 | 10 | 236 | $02 / 19 / 21$ | Claimant's Opposition To <br> Respondent/Counterclaimant's Motion For Orders (1) <br> Compelling Claimant to Restore/Add CLA to All <br> Green Valley Bank Accounts; (2) Provide CLA With |





DATED this $22^{\text {nd }}$ day of June, 2022.

## REISMAN SOROKAC

By:_/s/ Louis E. Garfinkel
Louis E. Garfinkel, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 3416
8965 S. Eastern Avenue, Suite 382
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Tel: (702) 727-6258/Fax: (702) 446-6756
Email: lgarfinkel@rsnvlaw.com Attorneys for Movant CLA Properties LLC

## EXHIBIT 268

| 1 | JAMS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | ****** |
| 3 |  |
| 4 | SHAWN BIDSAL, an individual, ) |
| 5 | Claimant/Counter-Respondent, ) |
| 6 | v. ) JAMS Ref. No. 1260005736 |
| 7 | CLA PROPERTIES, LLC, a ) California limited liability ) |
| 8 | company, ) |
| 9 | Respondent/Counterclaimant. ) |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 | DAY 5 |
| 16 | ARBITRATION |
| 17 | BEFORE DAVID WALL, ESQ., ARBITRATOR |
| 18 | LAS VEGAS, NEVADA |
| 19 | TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2021 |
| 20 |  |
| 21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reported By Kele R. Smith, NV CCR No. 672, CA CSR No. } \\ & 13405 \end{aligned}$ |
| 22 | Job No. 740675 |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |

JAMS ARBITRATION,

## APPEARANCES:

For the Claimant/Counter-Respondent Shawn Bidsal:
SMITH \& SHAPIRO, PLLC
BY: JAMES E. SHAPIRO, ESQ.
3333 East Serene Avenue Suite 130
Las Vegas, Nevada 89074
(702) 318-5033
jshapiro@smithshapiro.com
GERRARD, COX \& LARSEN
BY: DOUGLAS D. GERRARD, ESQ.
2450 Saint Rose Parkway
Suite 200
Henderson, Nevada 89074
(702) 796-4000
dgerrard@gerrard-cox.com
For the Respondent/Counterclaimant CLA Properties:
LAW OFFICES OF RODNEY T. LEWIS, APC
BY: RODNEY T. LEWIS, ESQ.
8665 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 210
Beverly Hills, California 90211
(310) 659-6771
rod@rtlewin.com
(702) 314-7200

Also Present:
SHAWN BIDSAL
BENJAMIN GOLSHANI

| 1 |  I N D E X Page 1218 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | WITNESS: BENJAMIN GOLSHANI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | EXAMINATION |  |  |  |  |  | PAGE |  |
| 6 | By Mr. Gerrard |  |  |  |  |  | 1220, 1292 |  |
| 7 | By Mr. Lewin |  |  |  |  |  | 1280 |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2021 Page 1219 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 12:57 P.M. |
| 3 | -ooo- |
| 4 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay for Mr. Golshani to remain |
| 5 | where he is for testimony, Mr. Gerrard? |
| 6 | MR. SHAPIRO: Doug? |
| 7 | MR. GERRARD: What's that? I'm sorry. |
| 8 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. For him to stay where he |
| 9 | is for testimony? |
| 10 | MR. GERRARD: Yes. That's fine. All the moving |
| 11 | around I put things in a place. I'm looking for the |
| 12 | things you gave me yesterday. |
| 13 | MR. SHAPIRO: They're right here. |
| 14 | MR. GERRARD: Thanks. |
| 15 | MR. LEWIN: We have an exhibit set here if you |
| 16 | want to look at exhibits. |
| 17 | MR. SHAPIRO: Our exhibits are in the other room. |
| 18 | MR. GERRARD: We've got to grab them, Jim. |
| 19 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Let's go off the record. |
| 20 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 21 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Let's go back on |
| 22 | the record. Same appearances as yesterday. |
| 23 | Mr. Golshani, do you realize you're still under |
| 24 | oath? |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. |


| 1 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Mr. Gerrard, Page 1220 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. GERRARD: Thank you. |
| 3 | EXAMINATION |
| 4 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 5 | Q. So, Mr. Golshani, would you please open up to |
| 6 | Exhibit 5? |
| 7 | MR. SHAPIRO: Whatever is convenient. |
| 8 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 9 | Q. So let me know when you're there. |
| 10 | A. I am ready. |
| 11 | Q. So as you can see, Exhibit 5 is the operating |
| 12 | agreement for Green Valley Commerce, LLC. Correct? |
| 13 | A. Correct. |
| 14 | Q. And yesterday you gave a lot of testimony about |
| 15 | what your understanding of what the deal between you and |
| 16 | Mr. Bidsal would ultimately be. |
| 17 | Do you remember giving all that testimony? |
| 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | Q. And you talked about what your understanding was |
| 20 | from the time you first started talking to Mr. Bidsal |
| 21 | about doing a deal with him up to the time that the |
| 22 | operating agreement was actually signed. |
| 23 | Do you recall that testimony? |
| 24 | A. That's right, yes. |
| 25 | Q. But ultimately when you received this operating |

1 agreement or signed this operating agreement in December
2 of 2011, this operating agreement contained all of your understanding about what the terms were between you and Mr. Bidsal. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And, in fact, you initialed every single page of this operating agreement. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you signed the operating agreement. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would not have initialed a page of the operating agreement if the language on that page was different from your understanding of what it was supposed to be. Correct?
A. Uh, okay. Correct.
Q. And same thing. You would not have signed your name on the operating agreement if the entirety of the agreement was different from what your understanding of what the terms of the agreement were supposed to be. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And do you remember that you talked yesterday about, that you had it planned -- you testified that you and Mr. Bidsal had discussed a plan, and you said that your plan was, No. 1, to form an LLC; No. 2, to

1 Page 1222
1 negotiate to get property through a deed in lieu of foreclosure; No. 3 was to subdivide the property; and No. 4, you said, was to get the property ready for sale. Do you remember giving that testimony yesterday?
A. Uh...
Q. Sir, just yes or no. Do you remember giving that testimony yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So this idea that at the very beginning, before any property had ever been purchased, that you had this plan, and that the plan was to sell the property that you were ultimately going to get. If that really was the plan, you would have made sure that that plan was set forth in the operating agreement. Correct?
A. No.
Q. Let's take a look at what the operating agreement actually says, because the operating agreement is the agreement. Right? It incorporates what you were planning to do with this property. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So let's take a look at the operating agreement at Page No. 1.
A. Okay.
Q. First page says, "Business of the company." Do you see where I'm reading?

| 1 | A. Yes. Page 1223 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. It's under the defined terms. It says, "Business |
| 3 | of the company shall mean acquisition of secured debt." |
| 4 | So that part was certainly discussed and agreed |
| 5 | upon by you and Mr. Bidsal. Correct? |
| 6 | A. Yes. Which line are you reading? |
| 7 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Business of the company. |
| 8 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 9 | Q. Under the definitions. |
| 10 | ARBITRATOR WALL: It's about two-thirds of the |
| 11 | way down. |
| 12 | BY MR. GERRARD : |
| 13 | Q. Do you see it? |
| 14 | A. Yes. |
| 15 | Q. Okay. So certainly you and Mr. Bidsal had |
| 16 | discussed acquiring secured debt. Correct? |
| 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | Q. And the next thing it says, "Conversion of such |
| 19 | debt into fee simple by foreclosure." So you had |
| 20 | certainly discussed and had a plan to convert the debt |
| 21 | into, hopefully, the real property. Correct? |
| 22 | A. Correct. |
| 23 | Q. And then the next thing says the purchase or |
| 24 | otherwise -- I'm sorry. That's the fourth. |
| 25 | The next thing says, "And operation and |

1 management of real estate." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. There's nowhere in that plan set forth in the operating agreement. Nowhere in that definition of the business of this company does it say anything about selling real property, does it?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Misstating what the document says.

ARBITRATOR WALL: How do you misstate what the document says?

MR. LEWIN: He said nowhere in this plan. He included the word "plan" when he's talking about this paragraph.

MR. GERRARD: I think the question is pretty obvious. I meant exactly what $I$ said.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Rephrase it, please.
MR. GERRARD: Okay. Okay.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Nowhere in this operating agreement does it describe a plan for you to sell real property, does it?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. The document speaks for itself.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. It's just yes or no, sir.
A. May you clarify -- I don't know what you mean by "plan."
Q. The plan is what you described. You testified yesterday that there was this plan, and the part of the plan that obviously there's a disagreement about is whether there was a plan at the outset to sell the real property that was going to be acquired. And I'm asking you where in this definition of business of the company does it describe that the plan was going to be to sell the property that you are obtaining?
A. Under this definition is not there.
Q. Okay. What it does say, though, is that you're going to take that property and manage it and operate it. Correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And do you remember when you testified yesterday that the concept behind this operating agreement also was that the net income was going to be divided 50/50? Do you remember saying that yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. And the net income was divided $50 / 50$, wasn't it?
A. No.
Q. In your tax returns, did you not see that all of the net income of this company was divided 50/50?
A. You're right. I'm sorry. I misunderstood you.

1
Q. Okay. And you also said that your understanding was that there was going to be management -- where there was going to be joint management of the company. Do you remember that testimony?
A. Correct.
Q. And if you look at Page 8 of 28 of this agreement -- let me know when you're there, sir.
A. I'm here.
Q. Okay. Article 4, Section 01, "Management." Do you see where I'm at?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this provision states that the company is going to be managed by two managers, and it says the managers will be Mr. Shawn Bidsal and Mr. Benjamin Golshani. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So your understanding of how this company was going to be managed is set forth in this operating agreement. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now I'd like you to also take a look at Article 5, Section 3. That's on Page 10. I know that these numberings is kind of messed up on this agreement. Page 10. Do you see on Page 10 where it says Section 3 ?
A. Correct.

1
Q. Okay. So here this section contains -- this section and Section 4 that comes right after contain the formula and the description of how this buy/sell was supposed to operate. Correct?
A. You mean the Section 3 or 4?
Q. Both. Section 3 and Section 4 contain the provisions that deal with the buy/sell between you and Mr. Bidsal. Correct?
A. That's what it says.
Q. Okay. Now, yesterday -- well, let's take a look. Go down to Section 4.1 where there's definitions. Do you see where the definition is right there for FMV?
A. Yes.
Q. It says, "FMV means fair market value obtained as specified in Section 4.2." Do you see where I'm reading?
A. I see that.
Q. So let's read Section 4.2, because the definition includes Section 4.2. 4.2 says, "Any member, defined as offering member, may give notice to the remaining members that he or it is ready, willing, and able to purchase the remaining member's interest for a price the offering member thinks is the fair market value. The terms to be all cash and close escrow in 30 days of the acceptance."

1
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, Section 4.2 is much longer. There's a lot of other information in this Section 4.2. Correct?
A. It seems that way.
Q. Okay. So let's read the next paragraph. It says, "If the offered price is not acceptable to the remaining member, within 30 days of receiving the offer, the remaining member or any of them can request to establish FMV based on the following procedure: The remaining members must provide the offering member the complete information of two MIA appraisers." Do you know what an MIA appraiser is, sir?
A. Yes. I know, yes.
Q. An MIA appraiser, they appraise the value of real property. Correct?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Objection. Never mind.
MR. GERRARD: Did you get the answer?
THE REPORTER: No.
A. Probably. I'm not sure. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. Didn't you just say yes when I asked that question? Now are you changing your answer to maybe or probably?

```
A. I'm sorry. Would you repeat your question?
Q. Sure. Isn't it true, sir, that an MIA appraiser appraises the value of real property?
A. Apparently so. I think so, yes.
Q. Okay. And we continue on. It says, "The offering member must pick one of the appraisers to appraise the property and furnish a copy to all members. The offering member must also provide the remaining members with the complete information of two MIA-approved appraisers. The remaining members must pick one of the appraisers to appraise the property and furnish a copy to all members. The medium of these two appraisals constitute the fair market value of the property, which is called FMV."
Do you see where I'm reading?
A. Yes.
Q. So according to this Section 4.2, to get to this term that we call fair market value or FMV, you must determine the fair market value of the property. Correct?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. That matter has been the subject of the first arbitration.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Understood. But he can still ask the question. / / /
```

```
    1 BY MR. GERRARD:
```

```
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Go ahead, sir.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I overruled it.
A. Would you ask the question?
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Sure. So according to this definition, the term "fair market value" is determining the fair market value of the property as being appraised by two MIA appraisers. Correct?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. Isn't that what \(I\) just read?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. It's argumentative. ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, I mean, if you're asking him if that's the process -MR. GERRARD: I am. ARBITRATOR WALL: "Not necessarily" is the correct answer.
MR. GERRARD: I'm asking him what the definition is because it ties into a different topic.
MR. LEWIN: Can \(I\) have a running objection? ARBITRATOR WALL: But the appraisal part is only when the remaining member doesn't agree to the offering member's fair market value, so that was the confusion \(I\) think that was in the question.
MR. GERRARD: Sure. I'm just looking at what the
```

```
1 term "FMV" means. Because under this agreement, Page 1231
```

``` doesn't just have a definition next to the word "FMV." It says you must look to Section 4.2.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Right.
MR. GERRARD: And if you look at Section 4.2, the only discussion of \(F M V\) is determining the value of real property by using MIA appraisals.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Correct?
A. No.
MR. LEWIN: Your Honor --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Where you going with this?
MR. GERRARD: I'm getting there very quickly, you'll see, in just a --
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Subject to a motion to strike, I'm going to let him go ahead.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Go ahead, sir.
A. My answer is no.
Q. Do you see anything in Section 4.2 or anything in the definition of FMV that says that FMV is supposed to include cash on hand in the bank at the time the offer is made?
MR. LEWIN: Objection, Your Honor. The document speaks for itself.
```

| 1 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled. Page 1232 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | You may answer. |
| 3 | A. So this is a new question. Is that right? |
| 4 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 5 | Q. Sure. And it's a yes or no question. |
| 6 | A. And would you please repeat on that? |
| 7 | Q. Sure. I'll be happy to say it again. Do you see |
| 8 | anything in Section 4.1, the definitions, or 4.2 that |
| 9 | states that FMV, fair market value, includes cash on |
| 10 | hand in the bank? |
| 11 | A. It implies. |
| 12 | Q. Sir, yes or no. Is it there or not? |
| 13 | MR. LEWIN: Objection. He's given his answer, |
| 14 | Your Honor. |
| 15 | MR. GERRARD: I asked for a yes or no answer. |
| 16 | ARBITRATOR WALL: He has a right to get -- I know |
| 17 | we went through this with Mr. Golshani about six weeks |
| 18 | ago. |
| 19 | A. So your question is? |
| 20 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 21 | Q. It's yes or no. Is there something in |
| 22 | Section 4.1 or 4.2 that states that the word "FMV," the |
| 23 | defined term "fair market value," includes cash on hand |
| 24 | in the bank? |
| 25 | A. I don't see that, no. |



BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Go ahead, sir. You didn't see anything in here that said that fair market value includes anything other than real property. Correct?
A. I see that myself, yes.
Q. Okay. So if we take the fair market value of the real property and we subtract from that the COP -that's cost of purchase. Correct?

MR. LEWIN: Objection.
MR. GERRARD: I haven't even asked a question yet.
A. Start it over. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. So if we take a fair market value of the real property of the company and we subtract from that the COP, the cost of purchase, then we're supposed to multiply that by . 5 -- correct -- under this formula?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Lacks foundation, No. 1, because it's dealing with a different paragraph of the agreement. No. 2, it's beyond the scope of my examination of Mr. Golshani yesterday.

MR. GERRARD: It's not beyond the scope of the examination. He specifically asked him about what he thought was the amounts that should be paid and whether

```
    1 they discussed what the amounts were that were Suge 1235
    2 to be paid.
```

```
ARBITRATOR WALL: Pursuant to the formula?
MR. GERRARD: Yeah. There was a whole discussion about COP.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Why is it without foundation for him to ask if the formula is fair market value minus cost to purchase times .5?
MR. LEWIN: Because he's including the term "real property" and he's -- that is his inserted term.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. So if Mr. Golshani disagrees, he can answer no that that's not the formula. Right?
You may answer.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Do you remember the question?
A. No, but I have a problem with the previous question.
```

Q. Sir, this is not the time for you to bring that up. I just need you to answer my questions yes or no.
A. Okay. What's your question?
Q. Okay. I'll ask it again. So in this definition, we've just covered the fact that this agreement has a definition of fair market value and that that definition only describes appraisals of real property.

1

So my question is: If we use that definition the way that the agreement states, and fair market value means the fair market value of the real property owned by the company, and we subtract cost of purchase from that, then we're supposed to multiply that, according to this formula, by .5. Correct?
A. I don't know how to answer that. You enter real property --
Q. Look at the --

MR. LEWIN: Can he please answer?
MR. GERRARD: It's a yes or no question. He's not answering yes or no.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't want to get to where I was six weeks ago, restricting him with every single answer to a response to a closed-ended question. So I know we've been through this. I know he tried. I know it relates to everyone, but $I$ know we spent time on this last time. So he can say "no," "yes," "I don't remember," "I don't know," "I can't answer it yes or no," or I suppose "I don't want to tell you," but --

MR. LEWIN: That's all right.
ARBITRATOR WALL: And then the explanation afterwards. You know, I can cut that off because that's cross-examination.

MR. LEWIN: I actually think, to be fair -- and

```
    1 you are fair, don't get me wrong about this. It's not a
    2 criticism. I think that's what Mr. Golshani was saying.
    3 He was saying that if -- you are fair, don't get me wrong about this. It's not a criticism. I think that's what Mr. Golshani was saying. He was saying that if --
ARBITRATOR WALL: He started to say "I have a problem with your question" and then started to go on, and you cut him off.
MR. LEWIN: I thought he was starting to say "I can't answer that question yes or no."
You heard the judge. If you have a problem with the question, keep it within those parameters.
THE WITNESS: All right.
BY MR. GERRARD:
```

Q. Let's be really clear about this. Let's look at the definition of cost of purchase on Page 10 of 28 , one page before what we were just looking at. Page 10 of 28 has at Section 4.1 some definitions. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And COP means "cost of purchase" as it's specified in the escrow closing statement at the time of purchase of each property owned by the company. That's what it says. Correct?
A. That's what it says.
Q. Last time I asked you questions, I asked you if there was an escrow closing statement for the purchase of the real property owned by this company, and you
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1 testified that other than the Greenway property, there was no escrow closing statement for any property of this company. Do you remember giving that testimony?
A. I said --
Q. Yes or no? Do you remember giving that testimony?
A. Somewhat, yes. I am --
Q. Sir, I'm not asking you for anything other than that.

Now, there was never a purchase of the real property owned by this company other than the Greenway property. Correct?
A. I don't know that. I can --
Q. Yes or no?
A. I cannot answer yes or no.

ARBITRATOR WALL: He said "I don't know."
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Let's now go back -- and isn't the fact that we have a disagreement about what the cost of purchase is one of the primary subjects of this arbitration?
A. I don't know if that's --
Q. You don't know if one of the primary things we've asked this arbitrator to decide is what the cost of purchase is under this operating agreement?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. He's arguing with him.

```
ARBITRATOR WALL: He's clarifying, but it will be the last one.
A. Okay. If you say so. If you say that one of the argument is that, sure, yes.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Let me ask it a different way. Have you or Mr . Bidsal ever been able to agree on what the number is for cost of purchase as defined in this operating agreement? Yes or no.
A. I think yes.
Q. You think that there has been at some point in time an agreement between you and Mr. Bidsal about what the cost of purchase was?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. He's arguing.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Cost of purchase for purposes of the formula.
MR. LEWIN: He's arguing with the witness unless he gets an answer that he wants.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Go ahead, sir.
A. I think we --
Q. Just yes or no.
A. I think what he says --
Q. Just yes or no, sir.
```

| 1 | A. What? | Page 1240 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Q. Yes or no? |  |
| 3 | A. Yes. |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Q. Okay. And is the document that you believe |  |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | constituted this cost of purchase, is that the |  |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Exhibit 111 that you made reference to yesterday? |  |
| 7 | ARBITRATOR WALL: He has to look at it. I don't |  |
| 8 | think he has it. |  |
| 9 | MR. GERRARD: I'll get it. |  |
| 10 | BY MR. GERRARD: |  |

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Is this the document that you believe showed an agreement on what the cost of purchase was?
A. No.
Q. Is there some other document --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that shows what the cost of purchase is that you and Mr. Bidsal agreed upon?
A. Yes.
Q. What exhibit is that?
A. It's the closing statement when we purchased the note.
Q. And you think that the closing statement from the purchase of the note should be the cost of purchase for purposes of this agreement, the operating agreement?
A. Yes.

1
Q. Okay. All right. So yesterday you had this Exhibit 111 shown to you, and your counsel asked you if this document demonstrated what the cost of purchase was and you said that it did. Where do you see anywhere in Exhibit 111 any cost of purchase information?
A. Well --
Q. First of all, is this an escrow closing statement?
A. No.
Q. Exhibit 111?

So it's not an escrow closing statement, so we
looked at the definition in Exhibit No. 5 -MR. LEWIN: Is he withdrawing the prior question? He asked the question and then he went on to another one.

MR. GERRARD: It's my examination, Counsel.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. The cost of purchase in Exhibit 5 says it's "Cost of purchase as specified in the escrow closing statement at the time of purchase of each property owned by the company." Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you consider this Exhibit 111 to be an escrow closing statement for the purchase of property?
A. The numbers --
Q. Sir, just yes or no.
A. No.
Q. Okay. And keep that exhibit in front of you, but let's look in that first binder that you have and let's look at Exhibit No. 3. Exhibit No. 3 is the final settlement statement for the purchase of the note. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you consider this to be an escrow closing statement for the purchase of any real property?
A. I can't answer that.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't know the answer.
Q. Does the escrow closing statement that we're looking at as Exhibit 3, does it show anywhere on that escrow closing statement any real property that's being acquired through this escrow?
A. I don't see that.
Q. Okay. Now let's go back to Exhibit 111. Exhibit 111, isn't this just a summary of all of the disbursement breakdowns from the sale of the three properties that have been sold by the company?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Let's take a look at it. First of all, at the time that Building $C$, Building E, and Building $B$

1 were sold, you received a disbursement breakdown from

```
Mr. Bidsal. Correct?
```

A. Yes.
Q. And in fact, if you look -- we'll come back to this Exhibit 111 in just one second, but let's grab the other binder and let's find where those are. So we had Exhibit 14. Do you have that in front of you, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And you received a version of this document.

Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's look at Exhibit 180 in the other binder you have. Should be the last document in that binder. MR. GARFINKEL: Exhibit -THE WITNESS: 180. MR. GERRARD: It might be in a different -ARBITRATOR WALL: Different binder as in 111? MR. GERRARD: Yeah. That's the way it is in

```
mine. I don't know if that's the way --
```

        ARBITRATOR WALL: It's a different binder. BY MR. GERRARD:
    Q. Just let me know when you get to that, sir.
A. I am here.
Q. Okay. So Exhibit 180 is the actual document that you received -- correct -- from Mr. Bidsal?

| 1 | A. I don't know. $\quad$ Page 1244 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q. Okay. If you look at Exhibit 180, the bottom |
| 3 | right-hand corner of the page, it has this little Bates |
| 4 | number. Says CLAARB2, and then there's a number, |
| 5 | 002109. Do you see where I'm looking? |
| 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | Q. And that represents that this is one of your |
| 8 | documents that you produced in this case. Do you see |
| 9 | that? |
| 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | Q. And if you compare that to Exhibit 14 in the |
| 12 | other binder, you can see that what you received had |
| 13 | some additional information related to other property |
| 14 | that was redacted on the copy that was produced by |
| 15 | Mr. Bidsal. Do you see how there's a difference between |
| 16 | Exhibit 14 and Exhibit 180? The bottom half -- |
| 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | Q. -- of Exhibit 180 has been redacted in |
| 19 | Exhibit 14. Do you see that? |
| 20 | A. Yes. |
| 21 | Q. Okay. But Exhibit 180 is the one that you |
| 22 | received. Correct? |
| 23 | A. No. |
| 24 | Q. This is the one you produced? |
| 25 | A. You mean made by Mr . Bidsal or -- |

Q. You've already testified that at the time of the sale of Building $C, \mathrm{Mr}$. Bidsal sent you what we have as Exhibit 14. What I'm asking you now is: Isn't the document you actually received Exhibit 180?
A. Yes. In the meeting, yeah.
Q. Okay. So if you look at Exhibit 14 and you compare that information on Exhibit 14 to the information that's in Exhibit 111, aren't the numbers the same in Exhibit 111 where it summarizes Building C sale as what we see on Exhibit 14?

MR. GARFINKEL: He referenced 111.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
A. It seems so.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. And then let's also look at Exhibit No. 23. Do you have that open, sir?
A. Not yet. Yes.
Q. And Exhibit 23 is a document you've already testified that you received from Mr. Bidsal at the time of the sale of Building $E$. Correct?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Are you changing your testimony from when you first testified a month ago?
A. I'm not sure what $I$ said the first time.
Q. Did you read your testimony from the first

1 session of the arbitration?
A. I looked at it.
Q. Okay. So in between this arbitration session and the first arbitration session, your counsel provided you with a copy of the transcript so you could read your testimony from before?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. It's attorney/client privilege.

MR. GERRARD: It's not privileged to give him a document, Your Honor.

MR. LEWIN: I'll let him answer, but I don't want to waive any attorney/client privilege after that.
A. When you say "arbitration," you mean 2000 -BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. I mean, the beginning of this arbitration happened approximately a month ago. Between that date and this date, did your attorney give you a copy of the transcript so you could review the testimony you gave when $I$ questioned you at the beginning of this arbitration?

MR. LEWIN: Hold on. Now he's adding words so he could review his testimony. I have no problem with him asking if $I$ gave him a copy of the transcript without asking for what reason.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. All right. Wait, wait,

```
1 wait, wait.
```

```
MR. GERRARD: I'm really not sure what the objection is because \(I\) didn't ask for a privileged communication.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Here's the thing: With respect to Exhibit 23, my notes say he testified last time that he doesn't think he got it.
MR. GERRARD: I can go back and pull the transcript and show you where he testified that he received it. But that's not -- right now the question I'm asking is: Did you receive the transcript from your counsel to be able to review your testimony from the last time you testified.
MR. LEWIN: Objection. Attorney/client privilege. I offered -- delivery of a document is privileged.
ARBITRATOR WALL: You can ask him if he's reviewed the transcript from his prior testimony. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Have you reviewed the transcript from your testimony you gave last time?
A. I have looked at it.
Q. Okay. All right, sir. Let me give you what we're going to ask to be marked as exhibit next in order, which I believe would be 206.
```

MR. GERRARD: Find my pen in all this stuff.
(Exhibit 206 was marked.)
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. What we've marked as Exhibit 206, this is a two-page document. Do you have it in front of you, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And if you look at the first page of that, which is Bates marked CLAARB2 --

MR. LEWIN: Excuse me. These documents are not on the exhibit list, Your Honor.

ARBITRATOR WALL: He hasn't offered it yet.
MR. LEWIN: I don't think he should be able to ask questions about it before he --

MR. GERRARD: I have to authenticate it to be able to ask questions.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So we have CLAARB2-1550 is the first page. Do you see where I'm looking?
A. Yes.
Q. And this document looks the same as Exhibit 24, doesn't it?

ARBITRATOR WALL: 23.
MR. LEWIN: I don't think he should be able to ask questions, Your Honor.

MR. GERRARD: I'm sorry. As Exhibit 23, yes.
A. Looks like it.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. But this document is a document that you produced from your own files. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So we know that you received it because you produced it from your own files. Correct?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. There's no foundation on this issue. He could have received it any time, including the first arbitration.

MR. GERRARD: All I can say is if he produced it from his own files, then that must mean that he had the document, because he would not have been able to produce it otherwise.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Are you offering at this point? MR. GERRARD: I am going to offer it, yes.

MR. LEWIN: No. 1, this is not listed as an exhibit. No. 2, there's -- apparently he's offering this to try to establish that Mr. Golshani received it. There's no foundation as to when he received these documents. He could have received them at the first arbitration or after. That's not something he would necessarily know.

MR. GERRARD: My response is: At the end of our pre-arbitration disclosures, the last thing that we
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1 listed was a catch-all that said any documents that have been disclosed in this case by either side, because we didn't know if they were going to ask a question where we would have to --

ARBITRATOR WALL: It still has to be independently admissible.

MR. GERRARD: It is. It was produced by them. He can't claim not to have had it when it was in his possession and produced.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Do the Bates numbers reflect whether it was produced in this arbitration or in the one before Judge Haberfeld?

MR. SHAPIRO: Read the Bates number again.
ARBITRATOR WALL: It's CLAARB2.
MR. SHAPIRO: That is the Bates number system that Mr. Lewin chose to produce documents in this case.

MR. LEWIN: And I can't tell you sitting right here whether that document -- we received this document or how we received it. We produced it because we received thousands of pages of documents in the first arbitration as well having to do with everything.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Right.
MR. LEWIN: But if it's being offered to establish he got this document at the time of the sale, there's no foundation -- the document wouldn't establish

```
1 that.
```

```
ARBITRATOR WALL: Why is the second page different?
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Sir, now, if you look at --
ARBITRATOR WALL: No, I'm asking you.
MR. GERRARD: Oh, I'm sorry.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Why is the second page --
MR. GERRARD: The second page matches up with
Exhibit 26. That's for the sale of Building B.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. So look, it is the same exhibits as 23 and 26 , the first page of each. Those have Bidsal Bate numbers on them. These have the Bates numbers that my understanding is are attributable to productions from CLA during this arbitration proceeding.
MR. LEWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: So for that limited purpose, I will admit 206.
MR. GERRARD: Thank you, Your Honor.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
(Exhibit 206 was admitted into evidence.)
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Now let's take a look at Exhibit 23. Exhibit 23. And we're going to compare it to Exhibit 111. In
```
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1 Exhibit 111 there is -- in the top half of the page there is a summary of the sale of Building E. Do you see where I'm looking?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And if you look at the information in Exhibit 111, you can see that that same information is contained in Exhibit 23. Correct?
A. It seems like it.
Q. Okay. And now let's look at Exhibit 26. So Exhibit 26, this is the summary that Mr. Bidsal sent you of how the distributions were going to be made on the sale of Building B. Correct?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. There's no foundation. ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait, wait, wait. What's the objection?

MR. LEWIN: He says this is -- he uses the word to show you how it would be. The foundation was he sent them before the sale.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Well, the witness can answer no.

MR. GERRARD: And, Your Honor --
MR. LEWIN: The question is --
ARBITRATOR WALL: It's not foundational but all right.

MR. GERRARD: I have a problem with what
1 Mr. Lewin is doing, because he's basically coaching the
2 witness. He's not -- these are not real objections. He
3 just doesn't want -- he wants the witness to hear what
4 he's going to say before the witness answers the
5 question. That's not an appropriate objection.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I overrule the objection.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Take a look again, Mr. Golshani, at Exhibit 26, and you can see that the information on Exhibit 26 also shows up in Exhibit 111 on the summary of the sale of Building B. Correct?
A. Looks like it, yes.
Q. Right. And Exhibit 26 is a document that Mr. Bidsal provided to you at the time of the sale of Building B. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then if we take a look at Exhibit 111 again, at the bottom of the page it shows what the purchase price was for the original promissory note. Correct?
A. Where is it?
Q. The bottom half of the first page of Exhibit 111. There's just one page there, so -- at the bottom half it says, "Summary of capital and distribution balances. Acquisition costs of Green Valley Commerce." It has a number of $\$ 4,049,250$. Correct?
A. That's what it says, yes.
Q. That was the price that was paid for the promissory note. Correct?
A. No.
Q. You don't think that that amount was paid for the promissory note?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Just answer yes or no.
A. No.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. Let's go back and look at Exhibit 3 again. ARBITRATOR WALL: Do you have Exhibit 3?

Mr. Golshani, do you have Exhibit 3 in front of you? THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. On Exhibit 3, is this the breakdown of what was paid for the promissory note?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And the number that's added up at the bottom -- hang on a second. I'm sorry. If you look at the -- I need my other glasses -- the left-hand column at the bottom of the box shows $\$ 4,049,959$. Correct?
A. Or 48,000.

MR. GERRARD: Is that what it says? I'm not sure. Does that say 48 or $49 ?$ I can't read it.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I think it says 48 , but $I$ can't

```
1 tell.
2 BY MR. GERRARD:
```

```
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. The number \(\$ 4,049,250\), is that the number that's been carried on the company's books for the purchase of the promissory note?
A. I believe -- yes or no. I'm not sure.
Q. Down below that, let's just assume for purposes of this question that that's the number that was carried on the company's books for the purchase of the note.
A. The 49?
Q. The \(\$ 4,049,250\). Below that it then just shows the money that was generated from the sale of each of the three buildings and how those proceeds were distributed. Correct?
A. Looks like it.
Q. Okay. All right. Do you see anywhere on this document where it says anything about cost of purchase? MR. LEWIN: Are you talking about Exhibit 111? MR. GERRARD: Yes. For purposes of the COP number in the operating agreement.
A. My understanding is -- yes or no? BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Yes or no, yeah.
A. Yes, I do see.
Q. What number do you see for cost of purchase?
```

| 1 | A. On the top it says "acquisition cost of Green |
| :--- | :---: |
| 2 | Valley" and it puts 4 million 49 . That's what I see. |
| 3 | Q. That's the number that you read as being cost of |
| 4 | purchase? |
| 5 | A. That's what this document said. |
| 6 | Q. Okay. Let's go back now to Exhibit 5 to the |
| 7 | definition that we were looking at earlier on Page 10 of |
| 8 | $28 . \quad$ I'm sorry. Page 11 of 28. The formula. Not the |
| 9 | definition but the formula. In that formula in the |
| 10 | middle of the page we talked about the FMV number. It |

11 says minus COP. We talked about COP. It says you have
12 to times that by 50 percent. Correct?

## A. Correct.

Q. And then you're supposed to add something to it. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You're supposed to add the capital contribution of the offering member at the time of purchasing the property minus prorated liabilities. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So what do you consider to be the time of purchase of the property?
A. At the time of closing the escrow.
Q. Of what? What escrow? Closing for the purchase of the note?

```
A. For the note, yes.
Q. Okay. On the date of the closing of the purchase of the note, what was Mr. Bidsal's capital contribution? \$1,215,000?
A. It sounds correct, yes.
Q. Okay. So according to this formula, Mr. Bidsal would get, in addition to his 50 percent of the appreciation of the property, he would receive \$1,215,000. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Sir, according to the operating agreement, if you are the person that's going to purchase the property, it contemplates that that is going to be done through an escrow. Correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Sure. The word "escrow" is actually used in the operating agreement. Correct? At the top of Page 11 of 28 it says, "The terms to be all cash and close escrow within 30 days of the acceptance."
Do you see that?
A. It looks like it, yes.
Q. All right. Sir, what do you think the words "acceptance" means?
A. The one that is here?
Q. Yes.
```

A. The acceptance is when $I$-- in this case?
Q. I'm just asking in general. What do you think the word "acceptance" is?
A. When somebody accepts.
Q. Okay. So if I make an offer to you to sell my house for $\$ 100$ and you accept that, do you believe that at the point that you say you accept it, that we have an agreement?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Irrelevant and incomplete hypothetical. If he's talking about acceptance, this issue has been decided in the first arbitration.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm unsure where the hypothetical is going but...

MR. GERRARD: I'm happy to explain more if we need to, but $I$ think it's obvious it's not an objectionable question.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Relevance maybe in terms of a hypothetical.

MR. GERRARD: I'm sorry?
ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm not sure the hypothetical is relevant.

MR. GERRARD: Give me a minute and you'll see how it's relevant.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Subject to a motion to strike, I'll hold the objection in abeyance.

1 BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. In that hypothetical, if I agree to offer to sell you my house for $\$ 100$ and you accept that offer, do you believe that we have a binding agreement at that point in time?
A. I don't know the exact law on that.
Q. Okay. Well, when you --

MR. LEWIN: Move to strike.
ARBITRATOR WALL: It's not necessary.
MR. GERRARD: We're not done with it yet, Your Honor.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. When you were deciding you wanted to make an offer to Mr. Bidsal for his property interest, his membership interest in this company, did you speak with someone to try to ascertain what these words mean, the word "acceptance" and the word "counteroffer"?

MR. LEWIN: Objection to, No. 1, again it's trying to relitigate the issue decided already in the first arbitration; and No. 2, it calls for attorney/client communications.

MR. GERRARD: I haven't asked him to disclose any communications. I just asked him if he spoke with anybody.

ARBITRATOR WALL: It's a yes or no question. It doesn't invoke attorney/client.

MR. LEWIN: He still is attempting to relitigate the first arbitration.

ARBITRATOR WALL: No, not by that question, but I get it.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Go ahead, sir.
A. What's the question?
Q. Sure. Did you speak with anyone to determine what the words "acceptance" and "counteroffer" mean before you responded to Mr. Bidsal's original offer to purchase your membership interest?

MR. LEWIN: It's a yes or no.
A. No.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. Now look at where we were looking on Page 11 of 28 on Exhibit 5 right above the formula.

ARBITRATOR WALL: The second time?
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. The formula we were looking at was the one right above Section 4.3. Right above that there's a paragraph that starts, "The remaining member shall have 30 days." Do you see where I'm reading? Are you with me, sir?
A. Are you talking about below the formula? The

1

```
paragraph after that?
Q. Well, I know it's hard because the formula appears more than one time. Where it says Section 4.3.
A. I see that.
Q. There's a paragraph above that and then a formula.
A. Yes.
Q. And then right above that there's a small Roman numeral 1 and Roman numeral 2?
A. Yes.
Q. And the sentence above that. It says, "The remaining member shall have 30 days within which to respond in writing to the offering member by either No. 1, accepting the offering member's offer; or No. 2, rejecting the purchase offer and making a counteroffer to purchase the interest of the offering member based upon the same fair market value according to the following formula."
Do you see where I'm reading?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ask anyone before you responded to Mr. Bidsal's original offer to buy your membership interest -- did you ask anyone what the word "counteroffer" means?
MR. LEWIN: Again, that's a yes or no.
```

A. I don't remember. I don't think so.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Do you have an understanding that the word "counteroffer" means a rejection of the offer and you're making a new offer? Do you have that understanding? MR. LEWIN: Objection. It's irrelevant. ARBITRATOR WALL: Why is it relevant? MR. GERRARD: It's relevant because of the tender issue. If he believes that there was an acceptance and that he had the right -- a binding agreement, then he had an obligation to perform. It's directly relevant to one of the issues that's before Your Honor, which is the timing of when he had to perform and the timing of when any performance was required in this case. Because it has to be based upon the language of the operating agreement, and the operating agreement uses very specific legal terms that have a specific meaning.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Why --
MR. GERRARD: And I want to know what the witness's understanding of those terms were so that we can understand his actions.

ARBITRATOR WALL: How does any definition of the term "counteroffer" relate to the tender issue?

MR. GERRARD: Because of the first sentence at the top of the page that says that the terms are
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1 supposed to be all cash and close escrow within 30 days 2 of acceptance.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Right.
MR. GERRARD: So if there was an offer and it was rejected by a counteroffer, there's one of two ways this can go. Either they believe that there is no need for an acceptance, despite the language of the agreement by Mr. Bidsal of their counteroffer, or that they had an agreement at that point in time. So it has to be one or the other. Either there was an agreement and they thought they had a binding agreement, which then obligated them to perform within 30 days of acceptance, or they had to have understood that Mr. Bidsal had not accepted and that that has a legal significance. And that is obviously the basis for whatever actions they did or did not take.

You can't have it both ways. Either you had an agreement that was enforceable and you were obligated to perform or you had an agreement that you did not think was enforceable and so you weren't certain how performance was supposed to be done.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Lewin.
MR. LEWIN: First of all, the tender issue has been subsumed by the first arbitration, No. 1 .

No. 2, I don't even understand what he's saying.
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1 His understanding of the word "counteroffer" has nothing 2 to do with tender.

No. 3, he covered this with Mr. Golshani in detail in his opening questioning.

No. 4, I never asked Mr. Golshani any questions about the word "counteroffer" or his understanding of the word "counteroffer" or actually even anything having to do with the process of his -- let me withdraw that.

The point is that they're attempting to relitigate the issues covered in the first arbitration, and I think that matter has been covered by him already. MR. GERRARD: What's at issue in this arbitration is the date on which performance is required, because if performance was required back in September of 2018 or July or whatever it was of 2018 when these offers were made and the counteroffer was made, if that was the date of performance, then that has a significance in terms of, you know, what the distributions were that were after that date, whether distributions were allowed after that date.

This Court has to decide what the date of performance is or if there is even an obligation to perform, and that is not something that was litigated in the first arbitration. The first arbitration simply decided the issue of what the fair market value was that
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1 would have to be paid. I'm not asking you to litigate 2 that.

Now, as far as the question about tender goes, we made that clear in our briefs all throughout this matter that that is directly at issue because performance is excused under Nevada law if a proper tender is not made. Even if you think that the other party has not performed, it does not relieve you of your obligations to perform if you believe you have a right to perform, both under the law of specific performance and the law of tender.

The way that this came up in Mr. Lewin's examination yesterday is escrow. He kept talking about did you open an escrow? Did you make any efforts to open an escrow? That's where I'm going with this is what his understanding was, what did he understand he had to do or not do, and then what did he actually do. And Mr. Lewin did ask about that yesterday in his examination. That's why I'm cross-examining him on this. Although Mr. Lewin is absolutely correct. I did cover this in the first examination. I'm doing it now because of what he said yesterday about the escrow.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. I'm going to overrule the objection and allow the questioning. I'm pretty sure $I$ made my feelings known about the tender issue --

```
MR. GERRARD: You did.
ARBITRATOR WALL: -- at the beginning of our hearing in March with respect to MILs or Motion For Summary Judgment, which is what I think I said. I have all my notes of the prior testimony. To the extent we're, you know, tilling the same ground, I'd like to limit that for time concerns, but I am going to overrule the objection.
MR. GERRARD: I will make it shorter because of time concerns.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Sir, yesterday you testified that you tried to open an escrow. Do you remember saying that yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, that's different from the testimony you gave when I asked you questions about this about a month ago. My question is --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Is that a question?
MR. GERRARD: No. It's a statement. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Where is any evidence that you attempted to open an escrow?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. That question is argumentative.
```

```
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Have you produced any evidence?
A. I don't know -- I'm not sure if we produced or not.
Q. Okay. If you contacted an escrow company and you submitted a request to them that they open an escrow and you wanted to deposit money in that escrow, they would have created documents for you to sign or they would have sent you notification that they were unwilling to open the escrow. Do you have anything of the nature of either of those two things?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. That question assumes facts not in evidence. No foundation. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Go ahead.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Restate the question because you sort of testified. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. First of all, when you made an attempt to open an escrow, did you submit any documentation to the escrow company?
A. I don't remember the circumstances.
Q. Okay. What escrow company did you go to?
A. I don't know -- I don't remember the name.
```

Q. Was it in California or Nevada?
A. California.
Q. And you don't know the name of the escrow company. Correct?
A. I can find out.
Q. Do you know the name of the escrow officer that you spoke with?
A. I can find out. That was a long time ago. I don't have that memorized.

MR. LEWIN: Say you don't remember.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on. It's a yes or no question. If you don't remember, the answer is no. Why you don't remember is not part of the answer. All right?

MR. LEWIN: If he doesn't remember, the answer is "I don't remember."

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, correct. If the question is "Do you remember," then the answer is "No."

MR. LEWIN: All right. BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So to be clear, you've known that whether you opened an escrow or not was a disputed matter in this case. Correct?
A. At what time?
Q. Throughout this case. Throughout this
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1 arbitration, you've known that whether you've ever
2 opened an escrow and ever had the money to pay Mr. Bidsal or deposited the money to pay Mr. Bidsal was all in dispute. Correct?
A. I heard it, yes.
Q. Okay. But to date you have not produced any evidence of ever discussing an escrow with any escrow company. Correct?

MR. LEWIN: Objection.
A. No.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. That's not correct? It is correct or it's not?
A. No, it is not correct.
Q. Okay. What evidence have you provided showing that you attempted to open an escrow?
A. I am not sure what evidence, but I did contact an escrow company.

ARBITRATOR WALL: That's not the question.
THE WITNESS: Oh. What evidence?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Sure.
A. I don't know where the evidence is, but I do have it.

BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Let me be clear about this. All of the documents that have been disclosed in this case you have received.

| 1 | Correct? Page 1270 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | Q. Have you reviewed them all? |
| 4 | A. Not necessarily. |
| 5 | Q. Okay. Have you seen any exhibit in any of the |
| 6 | binders of exhibits throughout this arbitration that |
| 7 | would show that you ever tried to open an escrow? |
| 8 | A. I don't remember. |
| 9 | Q. Did you write a check to an escrow company? Yes |
| 10 | or no. |
| 11 | A. No. |
| 12 | Q. Did you send a wire transfer to an escrow |
| 13 | company? Yes or no. |
| 14 | A. No. |
| 15 | Q. Exhibit 111 that we were looking at a minute ago, |
| 16 | does it show cash on hand anywhere in this document? |
| 17 | A. I don't see it. |
| 18 | Q. Thank you. |
| 19 | The real property that was owned by the company |
| 20 | Green Valley Commerce, LLC, it had been continuously |
| 21 | listed for sale for years prior to the July 7, 2017 |
| 22 | offer made by Mr. Bidsal to you. Correct? |
| 23 | MR. LEWIN: Objection. It's compound. |
| 24 | MR. GERRARD: How is that compound? |
| 25 | MR. LEWIN: You asked about the property. |


| 1 | MR. GERRARD: I don't understand the objection. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't understand it either. |
| 3 | MR. LEWIN: Is he talking about all of the |
| 4 | property? |
| 5 | ARBITRATOR WALL: The property. |
| 6 | MR. GERRARD: That's what I said. |
| 7 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 8 | Q. Do you remember the question? |
| 9 | A. Would you elaborate on that? |
| 10 | Q. I'll ask it again. Isn't it true, sir, that all |
| 11 | of the property that Green Valley Commerce Center, LLC |
| 12 | owned had been continuously listed for sale for years |
| 13 | prior to the July 17, 2017 offer made by Mr. Bidsal? |
| 14 | A. Not correct. |
| 15 | Q. You testified yesterday that the property was -- |
| 16 | had been offered for sale for more than 6 million |
| 17 | dollars. Correct? |
| 18 | A. Correct. |
| 19 | Q. But it never sold for that amount in excess of |
| 20 | 6 million dollars, did it? |
| 21 | A. It did not. |
| 22 | Q. Yesterday you testified that you had a long |
| 23 | conversation with Jim Main in June of 2017 during which |
| 24 | Mr. Main told you that he thought that Mr. Bidsal was |
| 25 | over-distributing to himself. Do you remember that |

```
1 testimony you gave yesterday?
    A. Correct.
    Q. Do you have any Email or any written
    correspondence of any kind from Mr. Main to corroborate
    the testimony that you gave yesterday?
    A. No.
    Q. Let's look at Exhibit 50. Do you have that, sir?
    A. Not yet.
    Q. Okay.
    A. Yes, I have it.
    Q. And then could you also in the other binder open
        up to Exhibit 7? And specifically to Exhibit B to
    Exhibit 7 on Page Bidsal 1411. So it's way towards the
back. 1411.
    MR. GARFINKEL: These are not Bates stamped.
    MR. GERRARD: They're not Bates stamped?
    MR. SHAPIRO: Let me give you my version. What
exhibit was it?
    MR. GERRARD: It's Exhibit No. 7.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: 7.
    MR. LEWIN: Is that the CC&Rs?
    MR. GERRARD: Yes.
    MR. SHAPIRO: This will have Bates stamps in it.
    BY MR. GERRARD:
    Q. Let me know when you're there, sir.
```



1 of 2011. Do you remember that testimony?
A. I remember that testimony.
Q. Okay. And if you look at the stamp at the bottom of this page, it shows that this document was recorded on October 7th, 2011. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the middle of that -- just to the left of that is where it shows that the record of survey is dated 08/11. Correct?
A. 08 ?
Q. 08, meaning August 2011. Do you see that?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. The record of survey had been completed, at least according to this, by August 2011, but it wasn't recorded until October 7th of 2011. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But in either event, whether you consider the subdivision to be done when the recording took place or before that, the property that we see in Exhibit 50 -remember Exhibit 50 was the information that was shown yesterday to both you and, I believe, to the broker? Remember he testified that these flyers were when this property was listed for sale?

MR. LEWIN: Are you talking about Mr. Chain?
MR. GERRARD: Yes.
A. What did he testify?
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BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. That these flyers -- that this information in Exhibit 50 showed when the property was listed for sale. Do you recall that?
A. Not entirely.
Q. Okay. But the date of these flyers, at least based upon the Email that these are attached to, was August of 2012. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So the first information you provided about when these properties were listed for sale came nearly a year after the date that the subdivision map was recorded. Correct?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Sir, have you provided or seen any evidence in this case that a credit card belonging to you was used to bid for this property?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Isn't it true, sir, that the Green Valley Commerce Center note acquisition was the first deal you did together with Mr. Bidsal?

MR. LEWIN: Objection. Vague.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.

```
You may answer.
A. With Mr. Bidsal, yes.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Okay. Now, you gave a lot of testimony yesterday about your previous experience. Isn't it true, sir, that you only had one real estate deal that you were involved in managing, which was a condo project in the early 1990s?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Prior to when?
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. Prior to the deals that you did with Mr. Bidsal.
A. Probably, yes.
Q. Isn't it true, sir, that your real estate development activities ceased in 1992 until 2011 when you started these deals with Mr. Bidsal?
A. That is not true.
MR. GERRARD: Do we have Mr. Golshani's deposition testimony from January 4, 2021?
MR. SHAPIRO: We already produced that, did we not?
MR. GERRARD: I don't know if we did or didn't.
MR. SHAPIRO: That was already put into evidence.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Yes, we did.
MR. GERRARD: Do we have a copy of it for Mr. Golshani to read from?
```

```
ARBITRATOR WALL: Oh, wait.
MR. SHAPIRO: My folder is empty. What I can
do --
MR. LEWIN: Let me see if -- I don't know if \(I\)
have a copy.
MR. SHAPIRO: I have a mini copy.
MR. LEWIN: I have a copy.
But you said it was in evidence. It's not in evidence.
ARBITRATOR WALL: We sort of published it.
MR. LEWIN: Let me just get my electronic copy.
A. Would you repeat the question also?
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. I'm going to ask you to read out of your deposition transcript in just a minute.
MR. LEWIN: Do you have a page number?
MR. GERRARD: Yeah. Page 38.
BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. I'm going to ask you the question I asked you starting at Line 10, and I'll ask you to read the response you gave.
MR. LEWIN: Hold on. This is not impeaching him.
MR. GERRARD: It's not for you to decide that. I haven't asked the question.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I haven't heard the question.
```

| 1 | Which page? Page 1278 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. GERRARD: Page 38. |
| 3 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 4 | Q. Starting at Line 11. "So after you started your |
| 5 | textile business in early 1990s, did you stop the real |
| 6 | estate construction and/or development businesses that |
| 7 | you were engaged in?" |
| 8 | What was your answer, sir? |
| 9 | A. "Yes. Maybe it was not completely stopped, but |
| 10 | it was a lot less." |
| 11 | Q. And let's look down on the next page, Page 39, |
| 12 | starting at Line 6. |
| 13 | "QUESTION: Let me help you" -- |
| 14 | A. Line what? |
| 15 | MR. LEWIN: Wait a second. |
| 16 | MR. GERRARD: Page 39, Line 6. |
| 17 | MR. LEWIN: Wait one second. |
| 18 | BY MR. GERRARD: |
| 19 | Q. Do you have that, sir? |
| 20 | A. (No response.) |
| 21 | Q. Okay. So on Line 6 I asked you the question, |
| 22 | "Let me help you. I'm asking, I think, a more general |
| 23 | question than your answer. I'm asking when did your |
| 24 | real estate development activities cease?" |
| 25 | And your answer was "Cease?" |


| 1 | I asked you "QUESTION: Cease. Stop." Page 1279 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | You said, "Is that what you're asking?" |
| 3 | I said "Yes" and you said what? |
| 4 | A. "I believe around 1992." |
| 5 | Q. Okay. |
| 6 | MR. LEWIN: He can read the remainder. |
| 7 | MR. GERRARD: This is not cross-examination, |
| 8 | Mr. Lewin. |
| 9 | Your Honor, if this is a good time to take a |
| 10 | quick break, I think I'm done. I just want to converse |
| 11 | with Mr. Shapiro and my client, but I think I'm done, if |
| 12 | that would be a good time for a quick break. |
| 13 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. We'll take a |
| 14 | ten-minute break and we'll go off the record. |
| 15 | *** |
| 16 | (RECESS TAKEN FROM 2:18 P.M. TO 2:30 P.M.) |
| 17 | *** |
| 18 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Everybody ready to go? |
| 19 | MR. GERRARD: Yes, I pass the witness. |
| 20 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Golshani, you realize |
| 21 | you're still under oath if there's going to be |
| 22 | additional questions? |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 24 | / / / |
| 25 | / / / |

> FURTHER EXAMINATION

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Golshani, get Exhibit 5 in front of you, would you, please. You were asked some questions about the plan.
A. What?
Q. You were asked some questions about the plan. Is there anything in this document that says that this is an integrated document? In other words, this contains all of the agreements and understandings?
A. I don't think so.
Q. The plan Mr. Gerrard was asking you about that says business of the company, was the business of the company to hold its real property forever?
A. No.
Q. Was the business of the company to -- well, take a look at Section 12.2. That's right.
A. What page is it? MR. GARFINKEL: 12.2. ARBITRATOR WALL: What page? Because the numbering leaves a little to be desired. MR. SHAPIRO: Rod, do you have a Bates number or page?

MR. LEWIN: I should have wrote that down. I didn't.

| 1 |  | MR. SHAPIRO: What page of 28 are you looking at? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  | MR. GARFINKEL: Page 19 of 28? Article 12. |
| 3 |  | ARBITRATOR WALL: That's Article 12, Section 2. |
| 4 |  | MR. SHAPIRO: So, Rod, at the bottom of the page. |
| 5 |  | MR. LEWIN: I understand that. I'm looking for |
| 6 | it mysel | lf. |
| 7 |  | ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait a minute. On Page 7, |
| 8 | Section | 12.2 of Article 2? Is that what you're looking |
| 9 | for? |  |
| 10 |  | MR. LEWIN: I'm looking for the voting |
| 11 | requirem | ment. |
| 12 |  | ARBITRATOR WALL: That's it. |
| 13 |  | MR. GARFINKEL: 6 and 7 of 28. |
| 14 |  | ARBITRATOR WALL: It's on Pages 6 and 7 of 28. |
| 15 |  | MR. LEWIN: Sorry. Should have made that note. |
| 16 | BY MR. | LEWIN: |
| 17 | Q. D | Do you see where it says -- |
| 18 |  | MR. LEWIN: What page do you have, Your Honor? |
| 19 | Do you h | have a Bates number? |
| 20 |  | MR. GERRARD: It's Bidsal 7. |
| 21 |  | MR. SHAPIRO: Bidsal 6. |
| 22 |  | ARBITRATOR WALL: Do you want this one? |
| 23 |  | MR. LEWIN: This is -- |
| 24 |  | ARBITRATOR WALL: It was just open to it. |
| 25 |  | MR. LEWIN: I'm looking for the voting |



ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.
A. No, I do not agree.

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Let's go to Section 4.2.

ARBITRATOR WALL: So that's Pages 10 and 11. BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Gerrard asked you questions about MIA. Do you know whether or not -- strike that.

First of all, do you know the term "MIA" means?
A. I used to know it, but I'm not clear right now.
Q. Do you know whether or not MIA appraisers appraise anything other than real estate? For example, do they appraise businesses?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Mr. Gerrard asked you a question about the appraisal process. Did the appraisal process ever get triggered in this transaction?
A. No.
Q. He asked you what you thought was being included in the sale. Or he referenced that. Take a look at Section 4.2, the first sentence. It says, "Any member (offering member) may give notice to the remaining members that he or it is ready, willing, and able to purchase the remaining member's interest for a price that the offering member thinks is a fair market value."

| 1 | When it said "the remaining member's interest, " |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | what did you believe the word "interest" calls for? |
| 3 | A. The interest that person had under the company, |
| 4 | including the -- |
| 5 | Q. Okay. The membership interest? |
| 6 | A. Yeah. The membership underlying it. |
| 7 | Q. And let's go to Exhibit 111. |
| 8 | MR. GARFINKEL: 111. |
| 9 | THE WITNESS: 111? |
| 10 | MR. GARFINKEL: 111. |
| 11 | ARBITRATOR WALL: You don't need this anymore? |
| 12 | MR. LEWIN: I got it. Thank you. |
| 13 | BY MR. LEWIN: |
| 14 | Q. Mr. Gerrard asked you questions about whether |
| 15 | there was any reference to the COP on this document. |
| 16 | You referred to the section that said "acquisition cost |
| 17 | of Green Valley Commerce"? |
| 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | Q. Did you and Mr. Bidsal have a discussion about |
| 20 | this number here, as to whether or not -- regarding |
| 21 | whether or not this was -- what that meant? |
| 22 | A. That was the cost of acquiring -- there is a |
| 23 | little bit difference. That one actually is the same as |
| 24 | escrow closing statement, but the cost of the note is |
| 25 | about \$300. |

Q. At the meeting that you had with Mr. Bidsal where you received this document, was the discussion you had about buying and selling using this number as COP?

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Sustained.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Okay. At the meeting where you received this document at Mr. Bidsal's office, was anything said about what this number $\$ \mathbf{4 , 0 4 9 , 2 5 0}$ meant?
A. He said it is a COP.
Q. Just going back to Exhibit 3 --

MR. GARFINKEL: Did you say Exhibit 2?
MR. LEWIN: 3.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. If you look in the -- we were talking about looking at the -- you said there was a bit of a difference between the figure that was on Exhibit 111 and what you thought was some other number. Are you looking in the number in the lower left-hand corner of the --
A. No. I'm looking at the closing statement number on the left, which is $\$ 4,048,959$. If you deduct from the other one, like I said, there was about $\$ 290$ difference. It's minor.
Q. So that's what you were talking about when you
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