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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 said the difference? You were talking about this number?
A. I was talking about this number --
Q. Okay.
A. -- under COP.
Q. At that meeting -- never mind.

Let's take a look at Exhibit 180. Now, we looked at the difference between this 180 and Exhibit 14. In the bottom part of this -- the bottom part of -Mr. Gerrard pointed out at the bottom part of this. All the parts under the double underscored figure of $\$ 95,272.65$ have been redacted. Do you see that there's some handwriting here that points to Shawn? There's an arrow going back and forth with the date of April 19, 2013?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you know whose handwriting that is?
A. It is the handwriting of Alex.
Q. Does that indicate that you received this document on April 19, 2013? Let me rephrase that. Did you receive this document before April 19, 2013?
A. I don't think so.
Q. If you had received the document before April 19, 2013, do you think that date would have been on there?
A. I don't think it would have.

MR. GERRARD: Hold on. I'm going to object.
Calls for speculation. There's no foundation that he would have any personal knowledge of who wrote that number.

ARBITRATOR WALL: That's the state of the evidence, but I'm going to overrule the objection.

MR. LEWIN: I thought he just said that it was Alex.

MR. GERRARD: He said he thought that that's whose handwriting it was, but he didn't say what that number means or...

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. It's not your handwriting. Right?
A. No.
Q. When you received this document, this date was on it?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that you received this document in 2012 when the sale was completed?
A. I have reason to believe that I received this document at the meeting because the penmanship of Henry at the bottom says Alex.
Q. Okay. Looking at Exhibit 206, these are
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1 documents that were produced on your behalf in this case. My question is: Is the fact that you produced these documents, do you know when you received them?
A. No, I don't know.
Q. Okay. Mr. Gerrard asked you a bunch of questions about "Do you have any evidence? Do you have any evidence?" In those instances where you said no, did you believe that your testimony constituted evidence?
A. Are you talking about the credit card?
Q. No. I'm talking about -- he asked you other questions. I'm going to get into the credit card. He asked you questions, "Do you have any evidence," for example, and you said no. Did you believe that -- did you understand that --

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I haven't heard the question
yet.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. When you were answering Mr . Gerrard's questions about "Do you have any evidence" or "Have you produced any evidence," did you believe that your testimony constituted evidence?

MR. GERRARD: Objection. Leading.
A. I --

MR. GERRARD: He's not asking what did you mean
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1 when you made that statement. He's telling him what
2 he -- he's --

ARBITRATOR WALL: It's a legal argument. Okay?
I guess what I'm saying is whether he's aware that his testimony might be considered evidence isn't really important for me to hear from him. His opinion on that is not really terribly relevant to me. We know that testimony can be evidence and that a lot of the questions were "Do you have any Emails or documents?" Things like that. "Have you ever seen any exhibits?" Things like that. So I get that his testimony could be evidence, but it isn't necessary for me to know that he knows that.

MR. LEWIN: Fair enough.
BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Mr. Gerrard asked you questions about if the property was listed for 6 million dollars. Remember those discussions?
A. Yes.

MR. GERRARD: I actually said in excess of 6 million.

ARBITRATOR WALL: 6.3. Was that the number? BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. He talked about the property. Whatever that listing agreement was in excess of 6 million dollars,

1 did that include Greenway?
A. No.
Q. He asked you questions about whether you had any evidence regarding the credit card. Take a look at Exhibit 40. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. It's not Exhibit 40. I apologize. It's exhibit -- I don't have my -- it's Exhibit 40 in the first arbitration exhibits. ARBITRATOR WALL: Is that 198? MR. GARFINKEL: What is it? MR. GERRARD: Yeah. That's 198.
A. 198?

BY MR. LEWIN:
Q. Yes.

MR. GARFINKEL: I'll get it. Do you have it? THE WITNESS: No. ARBITRATOR WALL: It's only a couple of pages away from 199.

MR. GARFINKEL: You mean what -ARBITRATOR WALL: What he's going to be looking at. MR. GERRARD: I didn't ask any questions about -ARBITRATOR WALL: You asked about the credit card. MR. GERRARD: I asked if it had been used to pay the deposit.
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``` in place, and he wrote me back that we are not in agreement and we can't open --
Q. I'm talking about the first arbitration. After the judgment was entered in this case. That's what I'm talking about.
A. After, if I open?
Q. Yes.
A. I didn't even -- I don't think so because nothing had changed. Everything was the same and he was continuing --
Q. When you say you were still ready, what do you mean?
A. I had the funds ready. I was able to close and I intended -- I wanted to. I was willing to close the deal.
MR. LEWIN: I have nothing further.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Anything else?
MR. GERRARD: Yeah. One question. Maybe two. ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. FURTHER EXAMINATION
``` BY MR. GERRARD:
Q. So you were looking at this Exhibit 40 which was a part of Exhibit 198. That document does not show that your credit card was used for any deposit or to pay any

1
``` portion of the purchase price for this property, does it?
A. It shows.
Q. Again, sir, that document does not show that your credit card was used to pay any deposit or pay any portion of the purchase price for this property, does it?
MR. LEWIN: Objection. Asked and answered, vague.
ARBITRATOR WALL: It's not vague. I'll allow it.
You may answer. Does that document show that your credit card was used for the deposit to purchase the note in May of 2011?
THE WITNESS: It doesn't say.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
MR. GERRARD: Nothing further.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. So what's left?
MR. GERRARD: The only other thing --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on.
MR. GERRARD: I thought you were asking me. I'm sorry.
ARBITRATOR WALL: And I was and I stopped. I apologize.
So your case in chief still has potentially Mr. Main's deposition?
```

MR. GERRARD: That's it. That's correct.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Have you had a chance to review those?

MR. LEWIN: I have, and I sent counsel an Email this morning telling him which ones $I$ was going to object to and identifying the parts that were put in.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So we had designations and cross-designations and objections.

MR. LEWIN: Mr. Gerrard was correct that the vast majority of his questions took place during mine -during my examination. I had some issues with the ones that he did because I never had a chance to follow up with those as he would have had a chance to follow up with mine. I think that's only two or three sections he wanted to read. I had objections within those sections as well.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Can those objections be resolved by meet and confer or do I need to rule on this?

MR. GERRARD: We haven't seen any authority of any kind that would say that this deposition transcript and our cross-examination questions can't be utilized. It was Mr. Lewin's responsibility to make sure that when he Noticed his deposition that he Noticed it for sufficient time for everyone to be able to ask their

1 questions.

What ended up happening was Mr. Lewin did not coordinate with Mr. Main and ask him how much time he would have available and what was going to happen on that day. He started the deposition, and then two-thirds of the way through the deposition we find out that Mr. Main --

ARBITRATOR WALL: About halfway.
MR. GERRARD: -- had a prior commitment, and so then Mr. Lewin asked questions for, you know -- I'm going to call it nine-tenths of the deposition. I got like 20 minutes. He had like three hours to ask questions. So there's no rule. There's no legal authority that says that just because he didn't finish asking his questions that the questions that were asked can't be used in a deposition, in a trial, or an arbitration. There's just no authority for that, and I further point out if Mr. Lewin wanted to follow up and complete that deposition, then he needed to do something about it. He needed to, you know, contact Mr. Main's counsel, and if Mr. Main's counsel didn't agree, then he needed to get with Your Honor to compel the remainder of that deposition to be completed. But he didn't do anything.

ARBITRATOR WALL: He did file a motion.

MR. GERRARD: He did what?
ARBITRATOR WALL: He filed a Motion to Compel to require Mr. Main to sit for a second deposition.

MR. GERRARD: Right. Right. Which went nowhere. ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, yeah.

MR. GERRARD: So that's the point is that, you know, there's no legal basis for them to argue that our cross-examination questions can't be used. His questions can be used but that mine can't. That's the purpose of cross-examination is for me to be able to ask my own questions in that deposition. And if somebody Notices a deposition, the other party -- you know, we don't both Notice the deposition. I have the opportunity to ask my questions as well. I had very little opportunity, but my questions are just as germane to this action as his are, and there's no basis under the law to exclude it.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Do you object to any of his designations?

MR. GERRARD: No.
MR. GARFINKEL: Your Honor, I just want to say, Mr. Gerrard made a number of representations to you that simply are not true. We did file a motion, Your Honor. I worked with his counsel, Mr. Flam, his general counsel for the company, quite extensively to try and schedule
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1 Mr. Main's deposition. I spoke to him multiple times,
2 and then we finally asked -- Mr. Main provided a
3 schedule of all the dates that he wasn't available. And
4 so once we looked at those, we were then able to come up
5 with dates that he was available.

11 one that was actually taken or to try to reschedule the 12 new one?

MR. GARFINKEL: No. Okay. So the one that was taken, the date it was taken was based on his availability. And I Noticed it up about a month in advance because $I$ wanted to schedule it. And when I looked at the dates, $I$ also took into consideration dates that $I$ knew that Mr. Gerrard and Mr. Shapiro were also available. That's why I scheduled it for that date, because $I$ also knew their schedule. So I went ahead and Noticed it up. I gave it to Mr. Flam. And frankly, it was kind of shocking that Mr. Main, all of a sudden, after a month of notice, said "I have another engagement." And during the deposition we thought that he agreed that he would come back. I then

1 worked with his lawyer --

ARBITRATOR WALL: It was a little ambiguous at the end of his...

MR. GARFINKEL: I worked with his lawyer quite extensively to get another date. It's a matter of Mr. Main and in-house. Now they said they're not going to do it. They offered for questions.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Correct.
MR. GARFINKEL: We filed a motion, and so we did pursue it. And Your Honor basically said "I can't force him to appear for a deposition." Based on the prior motion under the FAA, we would have to schedule -- we talked about the possibility if they weren't going to voluntarily appear, that you would order them to appear at the arbitration hearing. I mean, we're looking at a remedy for that.

Your Honor, if there's anything I'm missing -misstating, I stand corrected.

ARBITRATOR WALL: The order -- I'm sorry.
MR. GARFINKEL: If there's anything I misstated, I stand corrected.

ARBITRATOR WALL: You're correct with regard to the order for him to have a second deposition. I was aware of the offer from Mr. Main's counsel to allow him to submit to written questions under Rule 31, I think.
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1 And in that order, although it may have been in a
2 footnote, the rule requires leave of Court for that, and
3 I short circuited that requirement, I think, in the
4 order and said "Consider this leave granted and go ahead
5 and go forth with written questions to Mr. Main if
6 that's your desire." I remember that.
So to go back to what Mr. Gerrard said about authority that the questions he asked of Mr. Main can't be used because there was no redirect, I'm not aware of authority, but $I$ can't tell you I've ever looked. Is there any?

MR. LEWIN: I don't know. It's an incomplete deposition. The bottom line is that with respect to the areas that he's identified, I really only have -- I told him which ones I'm going to object to, and my objections are in addition to the fact that $I$ didn't have a chance to cross-examine him on it.

Just by way of a side note, I think -- and I think the evidence will show when we get to the closing argument that the reason why Mr. Main aborted the deposition is because Mr. Bidsal didn't like the way he was answering questions. But that's neither here nor there.

ARBITRATOR WALL: How is the evidence in closing argument going to show that?

MR. LEWIN: I think when we summarize what's happened with Mr. Main and how he's dealt with my client as opposed to --

ARBITRATOR WALL: Is this something that's in the deposition?

MR. LEWIN: No. Well, it will be a summary of what I think. I assume he was biased. I think he was biased. I believe that we should be able to show that. I believe that's what you'll see.

ARBITRATOR WALL: You just sort of casually dropped an allegation that counsel for claimant conferred with the witness and encouraged him not to appear for a second deposition, and I want to know before we complete the record on this -- I haven't read his deposition, so $I$ don't know if there's testimony in his deposition that supports anything like that contention or what other evidence you have, because you just sort of dropped it in there and said the evidence at closing argument will show support for your suggestion that either Mr. Bidsal or his counsel encouraged Mr. Main not to reappear.

MR. LEWIN: I didn't -- no. That's not what I intended to say. I said I think that Mr. Bidsal doesn't like his testimony. Obviously I'm not privy to the conversations with them, but $I$ do think the evidence
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1 will show that Mr. Main was biased. And the fact that
2 all of a sudden -- I think there's an inference that can
3 be drawn out of all of a sudden, after he gives certain
4 testimony, which $I$ think is important, he decides "I
5 can't go forward" and later "I'm not going to reappear," and then later asks for only things to be done by interrogatory.

Look, the issue really is about whether the transcript can be used. As I said, I have -- there's really only -- $I$ indicated some objections that $I$ have to his testimony. Let's proceed with his testimony. We'll make the objections as we go along.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Just read it and make them contemporaneously.

MR. GERRARD: That's fine with me.
ARBITRATOR WALL: How much are we talking about?
MR. GERRARD: I told you originally that I thought it would probably take us about 45 minutes to read it in. He's given some additional stuff that he's read. I think it could be done in an hour.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Do we still have Mr. Bidsal to testify?

MR. GERRARD: No.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Was that suggested yesterday or did I imagine it?

| 1 | MR. SHAPIRO: We said we reserve the right to do |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | a rebuttal. |
| 3 | ARBITRATOR WALL: After Mr. LeGrand? |
| 4 | MR. GERRARD: But we're not planning a rebuttal |
| 5 | case. |
| 6 | MR. SHAPIRO: I guess, yes, after Mr. LeGrand, |
| 7 | yeah, we would, but at this point we don't think we need |
| 8 | any rebuttal at all. |
| 9 | MR. GERRARD: I still want to respond to what |
| 10 | Mr. Lewin said because that's on the record and I take |
| 11 | great exception to it. |
| 12 | We had no communications of any kind with |
| 13 | Mr. Main or his attorney asking them not to cooperate |
| 14 | with answering questions. And to suggest that he's |
| 15 | biased I think is the most ridiculous thing I've heard |
| 16 | during this arbitration. He gave his testimony about |
| 17 | what it is that he did and what happened and his |
| 18 | interpretation of the agreement that he had to make in |
| 19 | order to do the things that he has to do as an |
| 20 | accountant. To suggest that he's biased, I mean, you |
| 21 | can make whatever arguments you want to make during the |
| 22 | case, but to suggest that we were somehow involved in |
| 23 | trying to elicit testimony from him that would be in |
| 24 | favor of Mr. Bidsal is ridiculous, and there's not one |
| 25 | shred of evidence to support it. None. | and asked if they would like to meet with us before the deposition to prepare for the deposition and he specifically said no; that Mr. Main did not want to meet to discuss anything because he didn't want to be on anybody's side in this case. He wanted to just say what it was that had been done. And you also heard testimony from your own expert witness and from our expert witness, both who said Mr. Main has a very good reputation in this town as a certified public accountant. And I taking exception to what you said, and there's no support for that. There's no evidence of any kind.

I'm prepared to proceed and read in, and if there's objections, he can raise them at the time, but I reiterate there's no authority that says that supposedly his questions can be read in during his 88 percent of the time spent in the deposition where he was asking questions and my 12 percent of the time wouldn't be allowed.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Is that the only basis for the objections?

MR. LEWIN: No, no. I want to make it clear. I'm not suggesting that $I$ was privy to any conversations between Mr. Gerrard or Mr. Shapiro or Mr. Bidsal with
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ARBITRATOR WALL: That's different from -- you couched it in terms of the reason he didn't reappear for deposition.

MR. LEWIN: I couched it the reason I think he aborted the deposition. If $I$ was unclear about that, $I$ think those were my exact words. That's the reason he aborted the deposition.

But the bottom line is, I'm withdrawing the objection about using the cross-examination.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
MR. LEWIN: Because that's -- as I realized this morning when $I$ was going through it, since he's reading a lot of my stuff, it wouldn't seem to be fair. But I do have an issue that if we want to take the time to read this or just go through them.

ARBITRATOR WALL: We've got the time now. I'd rather just do it now.

MR. GERRARD: That's our preference, Your Honor.
MR. LEWIN: I have Main's deposition here. We have the original.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Instead of opening the original and publishing it, does anybody have an objection to

1 just using the copy?

MR. LEWIN: I need a couple minutes. I'm looking for my -- the other document where I refer to my parts and his parts. Can $I$ just get a copy of that?

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'll just give it to you.
MR. GERRARD: I'll give you a copy of what you sent to me earlier.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So these are the portions.

MR. GERRARD: Those are the portions of the transcript that we're going to read in. He has some others that I just gave him back. I printed out his Email to me and gave it to him.

MR. LEWIN: The back part is the part that I object to.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. I'm going to need a -all right. Go ahead.

MR. LEWIN: What $I$ need is -- did you have --
MR. GERRARD: I'm going to ask the questions and have Mr. Shapiro give the answers, Your Honor, to read it.

Do you want to come down here closer, Jim?
MR. SHAPIRO: Yeah. Want to trade seats?
MR. GERRARD: So she can hear you okay.
Do you still have a copy of the excerpts I'm

```
1 going through? Do you want another copy?
    MR. LEWIN: No.
    MR. GERRARD: Do you want one too?
    MR. LEWIN: Can we open up this original
    transcript, Your Honor?
    ARBITRATOR WALL: Sure.
    MR. LEWIN: If you want to read along.
    MR. GARFINKEL: What do you want me to do? The
    original?
    ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait until they're ready.
    MR. SHAPIRO: What page you starting on?
    MR. GERRARD: 8.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: Are we going to go
    chronologically?
    MR. GERRARD: I'm just going to go through mine
    and then he can do his essentially cross-examination
    with his excerpts.
    MR. LEWIN: Whatever you want.
    MR. GERRARD: We're going to go right through the
    transcript from beginning to end, in this order.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Okay.
    MR. GERRARD: Ready, Judge? Page 8, Line 20 to
    Page 9, Line 19.
    "And in connection with your work as a CPA, when
        was the first time that you began doing any work for
```

```
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    1 Shawn Bidsal" -- I'm on the wrong page -- Page 8, Line
    2 20.
```

21 1983. And then I took a job for a short period of time

```
            "What is the highest level of education that you
    have?"
            MR. SHAPIRO: "College degree and some graduate
classes."
    MR. GERRARD: "And where did you go to college?
    MR. SHAPIRO: "UNLV."
    MR. GERRARD: "And you're a certified public
    accountant?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "That is correct."
    MR. GERRARD: "And when did you -- when did you
        first become a certified public accountant?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "1981."
    MR. GERRARD: "And can you tell me where you
    first -- where you first worked as a CPA as outlined in
        your work history until now?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "I was first hired by a firm
        Kafoury Armstrong & Turner. It was a statewide Nevada
        firm. I worked in the Las Vegas office from 1979 to
        1983. And then I took a job for a short period of time
        in Salt Lake City with a real estate company, very
        short. And then I returned to Las Vegas to join a firm,
        Hilburn, Pitchford & Company, which subsequently became
        Hilburn Main & Company, which subsequently became Main
```

|  | Gorman \& Company, which subsequently became Main Page 1308 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Amundson \& Company. And we joined CliftonLarsenAllen |
| 3 | January 1st of 2017." |
| 4 | MR. GERRARD: Page 13, Line 20. |
| 5 | "Okay. Before you joined Clifton, did any of |
| 6 | your prior firms do any work for Green Valley Commerce, |
| 7 | LLC? ${ }^{\prime}$ |
| 8 | MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes." |
| 9 | MR. GERRARD: "Okay. And what firms did work |
| 10 | that you were associated with -- I'm just going to call |
| 11 | it Green Valley, LLC, as Green Valley. Which one of |
| 12 | your firms had done work for Green Valley?" |
| 13 | MR. SHAPIRO: "It would have also been -- it |
| 14 | would have been Amundson, which was the predecessor to |
| 15 | us joining Clifton." |
| 16 | MR. GERRARD: Page 18, Line 3. |
| 17 | "In connection with Green Valley, was Shawn |
| 18 | Bidsal designated as an active or passive member?" |
| 19 | And Mr. Doerr said, "This is Blake Doerr talking |
| 20 | for Jim Main." |
| 21 | MR. LEWIN: Excuse me, Your Honor. I'm sorry to |
| 22 | interrupt. If there's colloquy or things that are not |
| 23 | pertinent, can we skip over those and just go to the |
| 24 | answer? |
| 25 | ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm not following along. I've |

Page 1309 just been taking notes. What are we talking about? MR. GERRARD: Mr. Doerr was the counsel that actually represented Mr. Main and his company. He was raising some questions which in this context $I$ don't mind skipping over.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
MR. GERRARD: That's fine.
MR. SHAPIRO: So Line 23. So the answer is,
"Yeah. I think what you're asking is, did -- you know, what happens is there's -- activities get designated into passive and active for purposes of tax classification. What you're asking is something that is generally determined at the participant in a partnership level or a company level. And for that reason, that question really is specific to -- to -- to Bidsal, not really Green Valley. I mean, the treatment, the tax treatment of a passive versus active is done on an individual level, not at a company level."

MR. GERRARD: "Okay. Does that show up on the K-1 that is issued with respect to Green Valley?" MR. SHAPIRO: "I believe so."

MR. GERRARD: "Okay. All right. Did you
prepare -- did you prepare the tax returns for Green Valley -- when I'm saying, like you as part of Clifton as your prior firm?"

| 1 | MR. SHAPIRO: "We did." Page 1310 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. GERRARD: "And, you know, can you tell me for |
| 3 | what years?" |
| 4 | MR. SHAPIRO: "I think since the entity was |
| 5 | formed until -- till current we have." |
| 6 | MR. GERRARD: "So that would be approximately |
| 7 | 2011 until -- through today. Is that correct?" |
| 8 | MR. SHAPIRO: "I believe so." |
| 9 | MR. GERRARD: Page 22, Line 4. |
| 10 | "From time to time did you ever communicate with |
| 11 | Ben Golshani, who's the principal of CLA Properties?" |
| 12 | MR. SHAPIRO: "Not necessarily directly. We had |
| 13 | some communication over the years. I believe Danielle |
| 14 | had talked to Ben about some tax returns and issues |
| 15 | during the years." |
| 16 | MR. GERRARD: Page 26, Line 4. |
| 17 | "Mr. Main, did you receive any instructions from |
| 18 | Shawn Bidsal with respect to communicating with Ben |
| 19 | Golshani regarding Green Valley accounting matters?" |
| 20 | MR. SHAPIRO: "No, I did not. If you mean was I |
| 21 | told not to communicate with Ben, the answer is no." |
| 22 | MR. GERRARD: Page 35. |
| 23 | MR. LEWIN: I have an objection to this section. |
| 24 | MR. GERRARD: Judge, can I go off the record for |
| 25 | one second? |

(Discussion off the record.)
MR. GERRARD: We're on Page 35, Line 7, through 36, 17, and as far as I know, Mr . Lewin did not make any objections during the deposition so I'm not sure -- we haven't asked any question yet, so...

ARBITRATOR WALL: No, no, no. I mean, but the question is Mr . Lewin is in the deposition.

MR. LEWIN: Yeah. My objection is that the answer is speculative. It's not responsive to the question. The question is -- the question says did he request to see the operative --

MR. GERRARD: Can we read the question so we can deal with it?

MR. LEWIN: I'm sorry. That's -- no. It's the answer that's the problem.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I understand. But I have to read it to know. So the question is: "When you began doing work for Green Valley, did you request to see the operating agreement?" You're not saying that's speculative?

MR. LEWIN: No, that's my question. It's a great question.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Super. I'm going to allow that question.

MR. GERRARD: Answer.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So did you have an objection to that question and that answer?

MR. LEWIN: The answer is that -- you know, I'll withdraw the objection to that question and answer.

MR. GERRARD: I would point out that if you don't raise an objection during the deposition, it's waived under the Rules.

MR. LEWIN: Hold on a second. The issue here with some of these things we're going to be covering is not an objection to my question. It's an objection to a nonresponsive answer.

ARBITRATOR WALL: But it's withdrawn as to this one.

MR. GERRARD: Line 16.
"It would have been your custom and practice when you're doing accounting work, preparing tax returns for an LLC, which is a limited liability company, to request the operating agreement. Is that true?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."

```
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because as part of your accounting work, you are -- you
    prepared K-1s for the owners of the LLC?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "(Inaudible.) Oh, there is it is.
    Never mind. Never mind. Sorry about that. Go ahead,
    Rod."
    MR. GERRARD: "Can you read the last question
    back, please."
    And then the witness answered on Line 7.
    MR. SHAPIRO: "I think the question was do we
    normally get an operating agreement as part or our tax
    preparation for an LLC tax return, and the answer is
    yes, we generally do. It's an exception if we don't."
    MR. GERRARD: "And in connection with Green
    Valley, did you rely on the operating agreement in order
    to determine how to allocate profits, losses, gains from
    sales and capital transactions?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes, we would have."
    MR. LEWIN: That question is -- move to strike
    the answer as nonresponsive. The question is "did he
    rely." He didn't ask in the global "yes, we would
        have."
ARBITRATOR WALL: Overruled.
MR. GERRARD: Page 67, Line 1.
    "So if Mr. Bidsal's original cap -- percentage of
```

1 the total capital was 30 percent, under what $\quad$ - Page 1314

2 describe the circumstances of how it would be reduced to
$3 \quad 26.925479$ percent?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "We don't -- we're just here as accountants, tax accountants to prepare the tax return. So what our duty or our function is, is to use the numbers, prepare the tax return, you know, do an accounting allocation of the income, and then we record the distributions, the actual distributions. So -- and then once end up with this ending capital. So what can happen in a partnership such as this is, is that if you make a hundred dollars on the books and you distribute a hundred dollars on the books, everything stays the same. But if there's any variation between what the accounting income is and the cash distribution for that year, it's going to throw it off. I mean, when $I$ say "throw it off," meaning that it just will alter the effects of the capital. Out of the, you know, hundreds of tax returns that we do, they start out, you know, being 1 percent [sic], and then inevitably they -- they skew -- get skewed a little bit from that just because there's a difference in between cash available for distributions and the accounting income."

MR. GERRARD: "Okay. So assuming -- assuming that Mr. Bidsal's share of -- strike that. Assuming

1 Page 1315
1 that capital -- that Mr. Bidsal's original capital
2 contribution was 30 percent of the overall capital, and 3 assuming that -- that all capital transactions are --

4 distributions were to be made in accordance with the 5 capital percentages -- in other words, 70 percent to CLA 6 and 30 percent to Mr. Bidsal, does this number on this

7 K-1 which shows that Mr. Bidsal's capital has been
8 reduced -- shares of capital has been reduced from 30 percent to 26.925479 percent, looks like that he has received greater distributions of capital than 30 percent?"

And I objected. I said I'll have to object to the question on multiple grounds. I'm going to withdraw that objection at this point.

Then Mr. Lewin said, "You can answer my question, sir."

MR. SHAPIRO: "That question was long and I -- I agree that it -- it's very confusing. And I'll go back and restate that what we did was we allocated the profit on the tax return based upon the percentages of $50 / 50$, and then we recorded the distributions. And because there are variations in between the accounting income and the cash to be distributed, it does throw off the percentages inevitably because there's just differences."

MR. GERRARD: Now let's flip to Page 70, $\begin{aligned} & \text { Page } 1316 \\ & \text { Line } 16 .\end{aligned}$
"When -- in connection with your work to do the tax returns for Green Valley, would it have been your custom and practice to read the operating agreement to see how the tax allocations and distributions were provided for?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Didn't I answer that already? (Inaudible.)"

MR. GERRARD: "My question was, did you receive -- my question was, did -- would it have been your custom and practice to read the operating agreement in its entirety?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "What our customary practice is, is to gain an understanding what the allocations by percentage are. But as far as reading and understanding the entire operating agreement, which is legal, we more skew in and really pay attention to what is the percentage allocation that we're supposed to deal with. But yes, you are correct. We do read and get an understanding."

MR. GERRARD: "Did you -- did you recall reviewing this operating agreement of Green Valley in or about the time you received it so that you could properly do your accounting work for Green Valley?" MR. SHAPIRO: "At some point in time in the
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1 preparation of the multiple years of Green Valley
2 Commerce's tax return, I -- I probably would have come
3 across the operating agreement. But generally our
4 accountants review it, they discuss it with the client,
5 and then we proceed on that basis. So I can't tell you
6 for sure at what point in time if $I$ went over the agreement page by page" --

ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait, wait. You only
designated through Line 24.
MR. GERRARD: I did but --
MR. SHAPIRO: So I start back at Line 25?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah.
MR. SHAPIRO: "So I can't tell you for sure at what point in time if $I$ went over this agreement page by page or if $I$ just looked at what the allocation percentages were meant to be."

MR. GERRARD: Page 74, Line 16.
"Were you given any instructions as to how to report the income taxes of Green Valley by Mr. Bidsal?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Well, we -- yes. I mean, probably we had a discussion, or at least I did with Danielle, that income was to be reported 50/50."

MR. GERRARD: "Okay. Going on in 5.2 it says, However -- however, that books and records with respect to the company's capital accounts and allocations of
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1 income, gain, loss, deduction or credit (or item thereof) shall be taxed under U.S. federal income tax accounts principles as applied to partnerships.

Was that how the allocations were supposed to be made?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Well, I mean, just to clarify, both parties, both partners had capital accounts that were accounted for. And we accounted for the allocation of income, you know, underneath the guidelines for federal income tax accounting."

MR. GERRARD: "And in terms of determining what is -- let's go to -- go to the last page of the operating agreement, which is it's on Page 28. It's Exhibit B. Do you see the reference to capital transactions?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
MR. GERRARD: "In terms of under the -- under the -- on a tax basis, what -- what -- in terms of -strike that.
"In connection with allocating income from capital transactions as opposed to ordinary income, what determination did you make in deciding what income was from a capital transaction and what income was ordinary income? I'm talking about for Green Valley."

MR. SHAPIRO: "Well, what we did was -- this

1 Page 1319
1 refers to -- this says cash distributions. What we did
2 is when we allocated gain from a sale, which would be a
3 capital transaction, we allocated it on a percentage
4 interest for tax purposes. What was done from a cash
5 distribution purpose was not. We had nothing to do with
6 that because we didn't write the checks."

MR. GERRARD: Page 83, Line 16.
"Okay. What I'm asking -- let me ask the question a little bit differently, Mr. Main. In looking at -- in looking at the documents that were provided, the financial records provided to you by Mr. Bidsal or his staff in connection with Green Valley, in order for you to make adjusting entries in order for -- to the tax
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1 returns and issue proper $K-1 s$, did you consider the
2 allocation and distribution schedule contained in
3 Exhibit $B$ of the operating agreement?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "What we did -- okay. It's easier to go back and -- and just tell you what we did.
"What we did is when there was" -- I'm going to start over.
"What we did is" --
MR. GERRARD: Start over.
MR. SHAPIRO: Starting over again.
"What we did is when there was a from -- not from a distribution standpoint because we had nothing to do with the distribution. Okay? But from the allocation of the accounting effects of a sale of a capital transaction, we allocated the gain from the sale of a transaction on the basis of 50/50. The distributions had nothing to do with -- so the distributions were done by -- by Bidsal. But when we were accounting for the transaction, the capital transaction, we allocated the gain from the capital transactions 50/50, okay, from the accounting standpoint. Cash is something different."

MR. GERRARD: "In terms of -- when you're talking about gain -- gain from a capital transaction, you're talking about gain on sale of property; right?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Correct."

MR. GERRARD: "Okay. So what you're saying is that you took the -- you allocated the basis on -- based on the pro rata capital accounts, and that would be 70/30, and you allocated the profit based on 50/50?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Well, there is no -- I mean, the -- if we -- if we bought a building for a million dollars and we sold it for a million-five, okay, we allocated that 500,000 of gain on a $50 / 50$ basis. There really isn't an allocation of the capital because that's part of the original basis of the property. So that becomes a distribution issue. When I looked at this, it was more -- this is related to a distribution of cash as opposed to an allocation of income from a sale."

MR. GERRARD: "And the income from the sale, what provision of the operating agreement did you use, if any, in order to allocate the gain $50 / 50$ pertaining to Bidsal? What provision of the operating agreement did you use, if any, to allocate the gain on the sale of the property 50/50 for tax purposes?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "I mean, I think this is confusing because this is -- I mean, customarily we [sic] would happen" --

ARBITRATOR WALL: "What would happen."
MR. SHAPIRO: -- "what would happen if you look at the final step, this almost assumes that we're
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1 selling all the properties or we buy one property and we're selling it all.
"The final step is how I interpreted this. And again, $I$ mean, you know, $I$ 'm not -- we did the tax returns. I'm not making a statement as an expert here. But when you go to -- after the third step, [sic] you deal with capital, when you go to that, the remaining profits, excess cash from the sale, would be 50/50. So if -- if we -- we bought a property for a million, we sold it for a million-five, the million is capital; the 500 is profit. So we -- when we sell something, economically we looked at it like that building sale -the profit from that building sale -- because we had multiple buildings, the profits from that building sale needed to be allocated 50/50 because it really was the profit from that sale, the excess profit over the original purchase. So that's just why we did that. I'm not -- you know, I'm not -- I'm just explaining why we did it in that fashion."

MR. GERRARD: "I'm not asking -- in doing it that way, did you rely on any portion of the operating agreement?"

MR. SHAPIRO: Yes -- excuse me.
"You can look right there at the final step.
That's where it is. The net profits or excess cash from

1 a sale is 50/50. That's just what $I$ was just getting 2 to. That's why we did it that way. Okay? I'm just 3 explaining why we did it this way."

MR. GERRARD: And this testimony, Your Honor, was all about Exhibit $B$ to the operating agreement.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Right. I understand.
MR. GERRARD: I knew that, but I just wanted to make sure the record was clear.

So now we're going to Page 90, Line 13.
"Okay. So it says here -- at the end there's a predicate paragraph, the last sentence, which says The Step-Down Allocation is:
"When you were -- when you were preparing the tax returns for Green Valley with respect to allocating capital gains, what did you understand the word
'step-down allocation' to mean?"
MR. SHAPIRO: "Rod, I'm going to tell you what I did which I've already said once. Okay?"

MR. GERRARD: "I remember what you said. I remember that. Go ahead."

MR. SHAPIRO: "We looked at this and interpreted that a gain from the sale of a property should be allocated 50/50. And that's -- that's what we did. That's how we interpreted this for the allocation for gain purposes not for distribution purposes. It's just

1 that at the end of the day, we looked at this like the
2 gains of the property's ordinary plus capital
3 transactions were meant to be 50/50 allocations because,
4 economically, that's what was supposed to happen. So
5 that was what we interpreted and what our thought process was when we were doing the tax returns."

MR. LEWIN: Excuse me. I'm going to object. That answer was nonresponsive and should be stricken. The question was, "Do you understand what a step-down allocation" -- and then he goes on to give some more voluntary information that wasn't answered by the question.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, yeah, but then he says he's going to tell you what he did on Page 90, Lines 20 and 21, and you tell him on Line 23 go ahead.

MR. LEWIN: Okay. Fair enough.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
MR. GERRARD: "Did you ever tell Mr. Bidsal that?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "I don't remember specifically telling him that, but that's how we did the tax returns for a number of years."

MR. GERRARD: Page 93, Line 5.
"Let me ask you -- the question was, did Mr. -do you remember having a conversation with Mr . Bidsal

```
    1 about how -- how the gains from a sale of Green Valley's
```

``` properties, capital gains, should be distributed, 50/50 or \(70 / 30\) or any other way?"
MR. SHAPIRO: "I never did. I just Emailed the distribution."
MR. LEWIN: I have an objection to the second sentence. I think it's misinterpreted. I think the reporter got it wrong and it's not responsive.
ARBITRATOR WALL: What do you think was wrong?
MR. LEWIN: It doesn't make any sense. I just Emailed the distribution. It doesn't make any sense.
ARBITRATOR WALL: "I just Emailed the distribution."
MR. LEWIN: Right. It said -- the question was, Did you have any conversation with Mr. Bidsal? He said he never did. That's responsive.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay.
MR. LEWIN: The second part said I just Emailed the distribution. I don't even know what he's talking about. I believe the reporter probably got that wrong. Doesn't make any sense, and it's not responsive.
MR. GERRARD: Obviously, I disagree. It is responsive. He's saying exactly what he did.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I'll overrule the objection.
MR. GERRARD: Page 96, Line 20.
```

(2age 1326 Valley tax returns, did you treat depreciation as ordinary item or a capital item or any of them?"

By Mr. Lewin, "Do you have the question in mind? Do you have the last question?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Well, I think your question was, is depreciation an ordinary income item or a capital item, and depreciation is a reduction of ordinary income, rental income, so it actually is an ordinary deduction. And then when you sell the property, it actually gets recognized as part of the gain, the recapture of it."

MR. GERRARD: Page 98, Line 4.
"Okay. And can you tell from looking at this tax return whether it is -- whether the financial transactions of Green Valley are being reported on cash or accrual basis?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "They're on a cash basis."
MR. GERRARD: Page 99, Line 21.
"And in terms of -- in terms of allocating profits and losses that -- the depreciation that was either -- reported for 2016 is a deduction against ordinary income; right?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
MR. GERRARD: Page 101, Line 23.
"Did Mr. Bidsal ask you whether the" -- hold on. Make sure I'm in the right place -- $\$ 72,278$ of depreciation for 2016 could be distributed as ordinary income to the members?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "No, I didn't have a discussion with Shawn Bidsal specifically on that. It's just depreciation being a deduction against rental income, and rental income being ordinary income, it gets allocated on the basis of the percentage interest, so it's 50/50. So it's just -- that's customarily what is done."

MR. LEWIN: Excuse me. I object to the last sentence. It's nonresponsive. It's also an opinion. He wasn't designated as an expert. Mr. Gerrard mentioned several times throughout the deposition that he shouldn't -- he wasn't designated as an expert. Expert opinion should not be applicable to him. He's testifying as to what is customary.

MR. GERRARD: He's not testifying as an expert. He's testifying about why he did what he did.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm going to overrule the objection. I'm not taking it as an expert opinion.

MR. GERRARD: Line 8.
"And did you -- are you saying you had a discussion with Mr. Bidsal about that or you didn't? I

1 don't understand."

MR. SHAPIRO: "No, I don't think I would have had a discussion with Bidsal about that because it's just customary to treat it as a rental expense and allocate it according to the -- according to the percentages." MR. GERRARD: Page 111.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Hold on. Let's go back. To me that underscores the previous objection when he's talking about it's customary is that the reason he didn't tell Mr. Bidsal is because it's customary for him to do that. So I think that's additional basis to overrule the objection.

MR. GERRARD: Page 111, Line 23.
MR. LEWIN: Slow down just a second until I get there.

ARBITRATOR WALL: What was it?
MR. GERRARD: Page 111, Line 23. This is starting my examination. Everybody there?

MR. LEWIN: Yep.
MR. GERRARD: "Page 12 has a heading without a number. It says 'Distribution of Profits.' Do you see that?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes, I do."
MR. GERRARD: "And right underneath that is a paragraph that says, 'The profits of the Limited

```
    1 Page 1329
    2 from time to time, as permitted under law and as
    3 determined by the Manager, provided however, that all
```

```
    distributions shall be in accordance with Exhibit B.'
    "Do you see that?"
        MR. SHAPIRO: "I do."
        MR. GERRARD: "Okay. And I just want you to
    remember that provision where it talks about
    distributions will be done in accordance with Exhibit B.
    And now let's turn, if you would, to Exhibit A -- well,
    actually, let's turn to Page 17 first, Page 17."
    MR. SHAPIRO: "Okay."
    MR. GERRARD: "And on Page 17, do you see there's
    like a Number 1 at the top of the page?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
    MR. GERRARD: "And the heading says 'Tax
    Provisions'? And then it says, 'The provisions of
    Exhibit A attached hereto are incorporated by reference
    as if fully rewritten herein.'
        "Do you see that?"
        MR. SHAPIRO: "I do."
        MR. GERRARD: "Okay. So basically this is
        telling us that Exhibit A is going to be the tax
        provisions of this operating agreement. So let's look
        at Exhibit A. That starts at Page 22."
```

MR. SHAPIRO: "Okay."
MR. GERRARD: "And Mr. Lewin asked you about
Section 4.1 .1 that talks about setting up capital accounts. Do you see where that starts?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
MR. GERRARD: "And my understanding from reading this, it just says that each member will have a capital account. It will be set up in accordance with Section 704 (b) of the Code. And then says under 4.1.1.1 that that capital account will be increased by certain things; correct?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
MR. GERRARD: "Which would include money contributed by that member to the company; right?" MR. SHAPIRO: "Correct." MR. LEWIN: I withdraw the objection. ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.

MR. GERRARD: "And then it talks about in Number
2, the fair market value of the property contributed by each member; right?

MR. SHAPIRO: "Correct."
MR. GERRARD: "And then Number 3, allocation to the members of income and gain; correct?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Correct."
MR. GERRARD: "And then in the next section,

| 1 | 4.1.2, it says that capital account's going to be Page 1331 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | decreased by, Number 1, money distributed to each |
| 3 | member; correct?" |
| 4 | MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes." |
| 5 | MR. GERRARD: "And then skip to the end, Number |
| 6 | 4, allocations to that member a loss and deduction. Do |
| 7 | you see that?" |
| 8 | MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes." |
| 9 | MR. GERRARD: "Nothing about what I just read is |
| 10 | inconsistent with the way you handled the accounting of |
| 11 | the capital accounts, is it?" |
| 12 | MR. LEWIN: Objection. That calls -- that calls |
| 13 | for an inadmissible opinion. |
| 14 | MR. GERRARD: Well, we didn't ask him for an |
| 15 | opinion. We asked if it was -- if the way he handled |
| 16 | the accounting was consistent with these provisions. |
| 17 | MR. LEWIN: I also object that it lacks |
| 18 | foundation. There's no foundation that he was aware of |
| 19 | how the accounting of the capital accounts -- what the |
| 20 | basis was for any opinions he had to gave. |
| 21 | ARBITRATOR WALL: I'll overrule the objection and |
| 22 | allow the testimony. |
| 23 | MR. SHAPIRO: "I believe we prepared the tax |
| 24 | returns on a basis consistent with -- with this |
| 25 | section." |

ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait. There was a question on Line 5 we didn't get to yet.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.
MR. GERRARD: I lost my place.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Page 115.
MR. GERRARD: Line 5.
"To your knowledge, did you act consistently with this manner of increasing and decreasing capital accounts?"

MR. LEWIN: I had another objection to the form of the question.

ARBITRATOR WALL: What was it?
MR. LEWIN: Acting consistent with, I'm not sure what that means. It's not showing what he's acting -what is he doing and acting consistently with. Is he walking around? Is he getting the tax returns to his people? This doesn't pin down anything.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'll overrule the objection.
MR. SHAPIRO: "I believe we returned the tax returns on a basis consist with -- with this section."

MR. GERRARD: "Okay. And then look at the next page, please. And specifically Section 5.1."

MR. SHAPIRO: "Okay."
MR. GERRARD: "You see where it talks about allocations, 5.1? Says, 'Allocation of Profits and
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1 losses' and for 'Tax and Accounting Matters'; correct?" it?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
MR. GERRARD: "So let's look at -- it starts out by saying, 'Each Member's distributive share of income, gain, loss, deduction or credit,' and then you just go to the end of that paragraph, says 'shall be determined as follows.' And go to 5.1.1.1 and it says, 'Except as otherwise provided... Section 1.1... items of income, gain, loss, deduction or credit (or items thereof) shall be allocated among the members in proportion to their Percentage Interests' -- capital $P$ percentage, capital I interest -- 'as set forth in the Exhibit 'B,' subject to the Preferred Allocation schedule contained in Exhibit
"Do you see that?"
MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
MR. GERRARD: "So the terms 'income, gain, loss, deduction or credit,' that covers everything doesn't,

MR. SHAPIRO: "I believe so."
MR. LEWIN: I withdraw the objection.
MR. GERRARD: "Everything that can be allocated on the tax return would be covered by those four terms; correct?"

MR. SHAPIRO: "I believe so."

```
    wouldn't it?"
```

    MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes, yes."
    MR. GERRARD: "So let's look at Exhibit B, which
    is where it tells us to look. And keep your -- I know
    it's hard because we're looking on a computer screen,
    but remember the section we just read said it will be
    allocated in proportion to their Percentage Interest as
    set forth in Exhibit B. So let's look at Exhibit B,
    which is on Page 28. Let me know when you have that
    up."
    MR. SHAPIRO: "I got it."
    MR. GERRARD: "Okay. And so here on Exhibit B,
    there is a heading right at the top on the left-hand
    side of the page that uses that same defined term
    Percentage Interest, 'Member's Percentage Interest';
    correct?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
    MR. GERRARD: "And according to this, the
    member's percentage interest is 50 percent Shawn Bidsal,
    50 percent CLA Properties; correct?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "Correct."
    MR. GERRARD: "And then to the right of that,
        there's capital contributions that are listed; correct?"
    MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes."
    | 1 | MR. GERRARD: "Okay. So now let's keep this page |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | open -- let's remember this page. We'll come back to it |
| 3 | in a few minutes. Let's open up to the actual tax |
| 4 | returns that you actually prepared, and I'm going to see |
| 5 | if I can figure out how I'm supposed to share these |
| 6 | things. Can you see -- I don't know if this is shared, |
| 7 | or if you click in the documents on that shared file, do |
| 8 | you see the ones under my name?" |
| 9 | So then there's -- we can skip the -- |
| 10 | MR. LEWIN: Agreed. Skip colloquy. |
| 11 | MR. GERRARD: Okay. So we'll go down to Line 25. |
| 12 | MR. SHAPIRO: "No, no. I see it. I see a tax |
| 13 | return." |
| 14 | MR. GERRARD: "Let's -- if you can click on one |
| 15 | that says '2011.GVC.Tax Return.'" |
| 16 | MR. SHAPIRO: "Yeah." |
| 17 | MR. GERRARD: "Do you have that up?" |
| 18 | "Mr. Doerr: Getting there." |
| 19 | The Witness -- |
| 20 | MR. SHAPIRO: "I do." |
| 21 | MR. GERRARD: "You already answered a question |
| 22 | about how the tax return was prepared. You said it was |
| 23 | prepared on a cash basis; correct?" |
| 24 | MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes, sir." |
| 25 | MR. GERRARD: "Okay. So looking at this |

```
    1 document -- and I'm sorry. I can't see your face
```

``` because I've got the document up here to make it a little bigger. I'd like you to look at this tax return" --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait, wait, wait. The designation stops at Line 17 on Page 119.
MR. GERRARD: Yeah. That's fine. We can stop there. I think I just missed the end of the question. We were doing this quickly.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
MR. GERRARD: That's fine. Now let's go to Page 123, Line 20.
"And underneath that, it says, 'It is the express intent of the parties that "Cash Distributions of Profits" refers to distributions generated from operations resulting in ordinary income in contrast to Cash Distributions arising from capital transactions or non-recurring events such as a sale of all or a substantial portion of the Company's assets or cash out financing.'
"Do you see that?"
MR. SHAPIRO: "I do."
MR. GERRARD: "So as I read this, it appears from that provision that other than a sale of substantially all of the company's assets or a refinance, everything
```

else is supposed to be distributed 50/50."
Mr. Lewin: Objection.
MR. LEWIN: My objection is that he's asking for inadmissible opinion. He's not asking what he did. He's asking for his opinion of your decision. He's not qualified as an expert to give that opinion.

MR. GERRARD: Well, and I actually asked him what he did. If you look at the next question, that's exactly what I'm asking him.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. So there's an objection to that question, but before the answer there's another question, so I'm going to bypass the objection.

MR. GERRARD: "Do you believe that the tax returns were prepared consistent with" --

MR. SHAPIRO: Where are you at? I'm sorry.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Line 12. I think the next one probably was supposed to be Mr. Lewin rather than Mr. Gerrard on Page 14. I mean, on Line 13.

MR. GERRARD: Let's just go to Line 18.
"Okay. Do you believe that the tax returns were prepared consistent with that interpretation?"

MR. LEWIN: I had an objection because he's talking about -- again he's referring to Mr. Gerrard's interpretation of the agreement and that -- and he's asking him for an inadmissible opinion and expert

```
1 opinion.
    MR. GERRARD: I'm actually asking him how the tax
    returns were prepared. Was it consistent with that
    interpretation of the agreement.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: We already established that he
    had to interpret certain provisions of the operating
    agreement to prepare the taxes and that it was customary
    for him to do that, to review the operating agreement,
    so I'm going to overrule the objection. I don't think
    it calls for expert opinion.
    MR. SHAPIRO: "Yes, I do. I mean, inasmuch as we
    allocated the profits 50/50, I believe we are correct."
    MR. GERRARD: That was the end of ours, Your
        Honor.
    MR. LEWIN: I was actually hoping it would go
        longer.
    Your Honor, are we going to break for lunch.
    ARBITRATOR WALL: Lunch? It's 3:45.
    MR. LEWIN: (Indiscernible.)
    ARBITRATOR WALL: So we're going to read in your
        designations.
    MR. LEWIN: We'll read mine. Can we take a short
        break before we do that?
    ARBITRATOR WALL: Sure. Off the record.
        // /
```

(RECESS TAKEN FROM 3:47 P.M. TO 3:59 P.M.)

ARBITRATOR WALL: We're back on the record. I have a copy of the designations from Respondents. Looks like it begins on Page 9.

MR. LEWIN: I'm going to read the question and Mr. Garfinkel will read the answers. And you'll see at some points I'm going to try to eliminate the colloquy so we just get to the questions and answers.

ARBITRATOR WALL: That's fine.
MR. LEWIN: Beginning at Page 9, Line 20 through 23. "QUESTION" --

MR. GERRARD: Hang on.
MR. LEWIN: -- "And in connection with your work as a CPA, when was the first time that you began doing any work for Shawn Bidsal or a company he was associated with?"

MR. GARFINKEL: Page 11, Line 20.
MR. LEWIN: The next one we go to is Page 10, Line 21.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, can you read the last question?

MR. LEWIN: "So can you read the last question, please?"

MR. GARFINKEL: Now go to the witness.
"I don't have the specifics in front of me, but it's probably been about ten years."

MR. LEWIN: Page 12, Line 24 through Page 13, Line 4.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait, wait, wait. You have two that are identical, by the way. But it's not to Page 13. It's Page $10 / 21$ to $11 / 4$.

MR. LEWIN: Right. He read that.
MR. GERRARD: They just skipped all the middle part that was the colloquy back and forth.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I got you.
MR. GARFINKEL: Do you want me to repeat that, Your Honor?

ARBITRATOR WALL: No. 12/24.
MR. LEWIN: "So in the context of the work that you've done for Mr. Bidsal or any of his companies since you first got involved with him, is it correct that you would be the person in charge of those accounts?"

MR. GARFINKEL: "That's correct."
MR. LEWIN: Page 19, Line 14 through 25.
"QUESTION: Okay. All right. And did you prepare -- did you prepare the tax returns for Green Valley -- when I'm saying, like you as part of Clifton or your prior firm."

| 1 | MR. GARFINKEL: "We did." |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. LEWIN: "QUESTION: And, you know, can you |
| 3 | tell me for what years?" |
| 4 | MR. GARFINKEL: "I think since the entity was |
| 5 | formed until -- till current we have." |
| 6 | MR. LEWIN: "So that would be approximately 2011 |
| 7 | until -- through today; is that correct." |
| 8 | MR. GARFINKEL: "I believe so." |
| 9 | MR. LEWIN: Page 20, Lines 8 through 11. |
| 10 | "Okay. So did you or your firm do any work for |
| 11 | Green Valley other than the preparation of tax returns?" |
| 12 | MR. GARFINKEL: "I don't believe so." |
| 13 | MR. LEWIN: Page 21, Line 3 through 16. |
| 14 | "So is it correct, then, that you would |
| 15 | receive -- you would receive a bundle of information |
| 16 | from Green Valley and then prepare the tax returns based |
| 17 | on that?" |
| 18 | MR. GARFINKEL: "That is correct." |
| 19 | MR. LEWIN: "All right. Are you able to describe |
| 20 | the division of work between yourself and Danielle Pina |
| 21 | with respect to Green Valley accounting work?" |
| 22 | MR. GARFINKEL: "Yes. Typically what would |
| 23 | happen is Danielle would be in touch with the accountant |
| 24 | for Green Valley and she would receive the information, |
| 25 | the ledgers, anything that was needed, and then she |


| 1 | would prepare the tax return, give it to me forPage 1342 <br> review. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | And those were the roles." |
| 3 | MR. LEWIN: I had on this -- Your Honor, I had |
| 4 | Page 22, Line 11 through 19 because Mr. Gerrard had only |
| 5 | referenced a part -- what I think was a part of the |
| 6 | answer -- he read the whole answer, but there was a |
| 7 | follow-up question. Do you want me to read the whole |
| 8 | section? |
| 9 | ARBITRATOR WALL: No. Just the portion. |
| 10 | MR. LEWIN: Page 22, Line 15 through 19. |
| 11 | "Okay. So you're not -- you're not saying that |
| 12 | took place. You just don't remember one way or another. |
| 13 | Is that fair to say?" |
| 14 | MR. GARFINKEL: "That's fair." |
| 15 | MR. LEWIN: Sorry. Stepped on your lines, Louis. |
| 16 | Page 30, Line 21 through Page 31, Line 17. |
| 17 | MR. GARFINKEL: Please repeat that. 30/21? |
| 18 | MR. LEWIN: 30/21. |
| 19 | "Okay. Have you spoken to Mr. Bidsal about this |
| 20 | deposition?" |
| 21 | MR. GARFINKEL: "He called me on the phone. |
| 22 | We're dealing with a few other matters for him and just |
| 23 | not in depth. Just like get ready for the deposition." |
| 24 | MR. LEWIN: "Did you have -- in the context in a |
| 25 | discussion with Mr. Bidsal about this deposition, how |

```
    1 long would you say your conversation with him was? Page You
    2 know what, we're having a hard time hearing. I'm having
    3 hard time hearing you. Before it was actually better
    before."
    MR. GARFINKEL: "Fifteen, 20 minutes."
    MR. LEWIN: "Okay. And -- and what" -- what
    was -- let me start over.
    "And -- and what was discussed in that 15 or
    20 minutes about the deposition?"
    MR. GARFINKEL: "We spoke about the expert
    reports, and I basically just said I -- their expert
    reports, I'm instructed not to review these. So that
    was pretty much the gist of the conversation, that I
    was" --
    MR. LEWIN: "Go ahead. Continue."
    MR. GARFINKEL: "No. That's where we cut it off.
        That's where I cut it off."
    MR. LEWIN: Page 64, Line 12 through 24. No,
    actually I'll start at 15. 15 through 24. No, no.
    We'll start at 12.
    "Can we take a five-minute break? We have been
        going for a while."
    A brief recess was taken.
    "In an off-the-record discussion Mr. Main has
    advised that he can only go until 1:15 today. He has
```

    1 indicated we'll proceed until that time, and that if if the
    2 deposition is not concluded, which I don't think it will
    be, it will have to be adjourned and continued to
another day that we'll try to set.
"Have I correctly stated what you told us, Mr. Main?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "Yes."
MR. LEWIN: Page 73, Line 21 through Page 74, Line 5.
"With respect -- my question is that was it your understanding in connection with the work you were going to do for Green Valley, that the allocations into capital accounts were to be made on a tax basis?"
MR. GARFINKEL: I'm sorry. I apologize.
ARBITRATOR WALL: 74, Line 1 through 5.
MR. GARFINKEL: Apologize.
"If what you said -- I didn't completely hear
that, but if what you said, Rod, was that it was my understanding the allocations to the capital accounts would be made on a tax basis, the answer is yes."
MR. LEWIN: "Okay. Let's take a look at Section 5."
MR. GERRARD: Is this new? You haven't designated this.
MR. LEWIN: I beg your pardon.

ARBITRATOR WALL: So now it's 75, Line 21 .
MR. LEWIN: Through 76, Line 9.
"In connection with allocating income from
capital transactions as opposed to ordinary income, what determination did you make in deciding what income was from a capital transaction and what income was ordinary income? I'm talking about for Green Valley."

MR. GARFINKEL: "Well, what we did was -- this refers to -- this says cash distributions. What we did is when we allocated gain from a sale, which would be a capital transaction, we allocated it on percentage interest for tax purposes. What was done from a cash distribution purposes was not -- we had nothing to do with that because we didn't write the checks."

MR. LEWIN: Next one is Page 79, Line 15 through Page 81, Line 17.
"Looking at Exhibit B, the -- the -- the cash distribution of profits, it says -- by the way, did you look at this Exhibit $B$ in the context of making adjusting increase for the purposes of tax reporting for Green Valley?"

MR. GARFINKEL: "We would have used this. We should have used this as it relates to the allocations that were made on the tax returns, if that's what you mean."

``` the -- and here it has a Preferred Allocation and Distribution Schedule. And the first says upon -- it talks about cash distributions from capital transactions. Do you see that?" MR. GARFINKEL: "Yep." MR. LEWIN: "And a capital transaction would include a refinancing event or a sale of a -- of a company asset; correct?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "Correct."
MR. LEWIN: "And the sale of one of Green Valley's properties would be the sale of a company asset. Would that be true in terms of your making allocations?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "Yes."
MR. LEWIN: "Okay. So the distribution to the second allocation, sometimes called a waterfall" -- let me restart that.
"Okay. So then the distribution is the second allocation, sometimes called a waterfall; isn't that correct?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "Yes."
MR. LEWIN: "Okay. But the first -- the cash generated from a sale of company asset, including Green Valley's properties, were first to pay current expenses
```

| 1 | and liabilities; right?" |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. GARFINKEL: "Correct." |
| 3 | MR. LEWIN: "Then pay outstanding loans; right?" |
| 4 | MR. GARFINKEL: "Correct." |
| 5 | MR. LEWIN: "And then to pay -- to pay each |
| 6 | member pro rata an amount into their capital accounts; |
| 7 | right?" |
| 8 | MR. GARFINKEL: "Correct." |
| 9 | MR. LEWIN: "Unless those capital accounts are at |
| 10 | a zero; right?" |
| 11 | MR. GARFINKEL: "I see that." |
| 12 | MR. LEWIN: "I didn't get an answer. Is that |
| 13 | correct?" |
| 14 | MR. GARFINKEL: "I see that, yes." |
| 15 | MR. LEWIN: "Okay. And as you're sitting here, |
| 16 | do you recall that -- that originally the capital |
| 17 | accounts for Green Valley when it first started were |
| 18 | 70 percent -- were 70 percent of the total capital in |
| 19 | Mr. -- in CLA and 30 percent with Mr. Bidsal; is that |
| 20 | correct?" |
| 21 | MR. GARFINKEL: "Yes." |
| 22 | MR. LEWIN: Then Page 83, Lines 15 through 87, |
| 23 | Line 17. |
| 24 | "Okay. What I'm asking -- let me ask the |
| 25 | question a little bit differently, Mr. Main. In looking |
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1 at the documents that were provided, the financial
2 records provided to you by Mr. Bidsal or his staff in
3 connection with Green Valley, in order for you to make
4 adjusting entries in order for -- to the tax returns and
5 issue proper K-1s, did you consider the allocation and distribution schedule contained in Exhibit $B$ of the operating agreement?"

MR. GARFINKEL: "What we did -- okay. It's easier to go back and just tell you what we did."

MR. GERRARD: Judge, we're rereading testimony that's already in the record.

ARBITRATOR WALL: We did this. We did all the way to $86 / 25$.

MR. LEWIN: Okay. Let me read from 87 --
"QUESTION: I see. So -- so -- so we're talking -- when you said the final step, you're talking about Exhibit $B$, the subparagraph under the column Preferred Allocation and Distribution Schedule, it has First Step, Second Step, Third Step, and then Final Step. What you just referred to was that portion of this -- the final step; is that correct?"

MR. GARFINKEL: "That is correct."
MR. LEWIN: "Okay. And in terms of -- did you ever -- did you ever tell Mr. Bidsal that the distributions from the -- of the profits from the sale

```
    1 of the properties should be distributed 50/50?"
```

```
of the properties should be distributed 50/50?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "I don't remember ever having a discussion with Mr. Bidsal on what should -- what the distribution should be. That's -- that's -- that was his -- that was his responsibility."
MR. LEWIN: Then Page 88, Lines 3 through 11.
"Did Mr. Golshani ever call you and ask you about how the profits -- the capital gains from the sale of Green Valley's properties should be distributed?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "I do not remember a conversation
like that. But you're also talking about, again, distributions versus allocations, so there's two different things. But I don't remember talking to Ben about that."
MR. LEWIN: Then we go to 88, 20 through 89, Line 13.
"Did you ever have a conversation with Mr. Bidsal where you discussed with him whether or not the gain from the sale of Green Valley's property should be allocated for tax purposes in accordance with the third step here on Exhibit \(B\) which says pro rata based on capital contributions?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "I don't remember a conversation with Bidsal about that."
MR. LEWIN: "Do you ever remember having a
```
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1 conversation with Mr. Bidsal where he told you that Ben
2 Golshani was claiming that the profits from the sale of
3 Green Valley's properties should be distributed 70 percent to him and 30 percent to Mr. Bidsal until their capital accounts were fully paid off?"

MR. GARFINKEL: "I don't remember a conversation like that."

MR. LEWIN: Next is Page 90, Line 16 through 91 Line 10 .
"When you were -- when you were preparing the tax returns for Green Valley with respect to allocating capital gains what did you understand the word
'Step-Down Allocation' to mean?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "Rod, I'm going to tell you what
I did which I've already said once. Okay?"
ARBITRATOR WALL: This has already been read in.
MR. GERRARD: We did this too.
MR. LEWIN: This is in the record already. All right. 94 Line 6 through 12.

MR. GARFINKEL: Hold on one second. Let me just get there. Got it.

MR. LEWIN: "I guess my question was, did he -based on his review of the operating agreement, did he have an understanding of how distributions of capital gain money was to be distributed regardless of how it

| 1 | was allocated? And that's just a yes or a no." Page 1351 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. GARFINKEL: "No." |
| 3 | MR. LEWIN: Then we go to 94, Line 18 through 95, |
| 4 | Line 18. |
| 5 | "Are you aware of any -- of any income that was |
| 6 | received by Green Valley other than ordinary income as |
| 7 | defined by the tax -- by tax -- by the tax code?" |
| 8 | MR. GERRARD And then I said, "Yeah. Once again |
| 9 | Rod, you're asking him to give you a legal opinion about |
| 10 | what the characterization is of the income made by this |
| 11 | company, not how it was reported, not how it's on the |
| 12 | tax return, and he doesn't have to answer those |
| 13 | questions. He's not here as an expert." |
| 14 | But I said I don't have any objections. |
| 15 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Skip down to |
| 16 | No. 10. |
| 17 | MR. LEWIN: "Okay. Okay. All right. So let |
| 18 | me -- can you answer my question, sir?" |
| 19 | MR. GARFINKEL: "I think I already answered it, |
| 20 | honestly, because I think I was asked what types of |
| 21 | income there were and how I allocated it, which there |
| 22 | was interest, there was rental income, and there was |
| 23 | capital gains. And I answered that we allocated it |
| 24 | $50 / 50$ on the tax return without regard to any |
| 25 | distributions." |

```
MR. LEWIN: 96, Line 20 through 97, Line \(\begin{gathered}\text { Page } \\ 18 .\end{gathered}\)
"In connection with the preparation of the Green
Valley tax returns, did you treat depreciation" --
Is this already in?
ARBITRATOR WALL: It is. 96/20 to 97/10 is in. You asked for all the way for \(97 / 18\).
MR. LEWIN: I'll continue on from Line 13.
MR. GARFINKEL: I'm sorry. Say that again, Rod.
MR. LEWIN: I'm just continuing on from 97/13 through 18.
"Did Mr. Bidsal ever ask you for any advice regarding the distribution of cash based on depreciation?"
"ANSWER: No."
ARBITRATOR WALL: Wait.
MR. GARFINKEL: I thought you said 11, Rod.
Let's start at 11. Am I right?
MR. LEWIN: No. Let's start at 13. I'm sorry.
Let me start over. I'll just ask the question. I've always been an understudy.
"Did Mr. Bidsal ever ask you any advice regarding the distribution of cash based on depreciation?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "No."
MR. LEWIN: "With respect to Green Valley?"
MR. GARFINKEL: "No."
```

| 1 | MR. GERRARD: I think that's it. |
| :--- | :---: |
| 2 | ARBITRATOR WALL: No, no. Those are objections. |
| 3 | Oh, there's one more at the top. I'm sorry. |
| 4 | MR. GARFINKEL: Am I incorrect? |
| 5 | ARBITRATOR WALL: No. |
| 6 | MR. LEWIN: I don't understand that. No. I |
| 7 | withdraw that. |
| 8 | ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. We'll cross that |
| 9 | one out. |
| 10 | He's a far better Jim Main. I'm just telling you |
| 11 | right now. |
| 12 | You're a far better Jim Main. I'm not convinced |
| 13 | which is the better Mr. Lewin. |
| 14 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 15 | ARBITRATOR WALL: Does everybody have calendars |
| 16 | available? Before we get to the calendars, I think -- |
| 17 | go ahead. |
| 18 | MR. LEWIN: I'd like to discuss the issue with |
| 19 | Mr. LeGrand. Earlier I think it may have been an |
| 20 | off-the-record discussion. I think we talked about |
| 21 | briefing the issue, and Mr. Gerrard said he doesn't want |
| 22 | to brief it because he doesn't know if Mr. LeGrand is |
| 23 | going to testify. |
| 24 | ARBITRATOR WALL: There's no sense in briefing |
| 25 | the attorney/client privilege issues and waivers and |
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1 things if Mr. LeGrand isn't going to testify.

MR. LEWIN: Well, respectfully, I disagree with that.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Why?
MR. LEWIN: No. 1, Mr. LeGrand -- one of the issues with respect to Mr. LeGrand testifying is whether there will be a ruling on the issue of whether or not attorney/client privilege has been waived, No. 1.

No. 2, forgetting for the moment about the threat about filing a Bar complaint --

MR. GARFINKEL: Rod, could you speak up?
MR. LEWIN: Forgetting about the threat of the Bar complaint, I'm not going to discuss that now. The issue is we want a ruling on the waiver of the attorney/client privilege and the ruling on the objection that was made by Mr. Gerrard. That may, in fact, have some impact on Mr. LeGrand's decision because he'll have a judicial ruling to decide whether or not he would testify or not. I understand his position. I haven't talked to him, but I understand if I was placed in the same position, what $I$ would be thinking.

But $I$ think it's important to have a ruling on the waiver because $I$ believe contrary to what Mr. Gerrard has said, that there's been an absolute waiver with respect to most, if not all, and I think it's all
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1 of his right to testify. So I think we should brief it.
2 We should be entitled to a ruling. He's here by
3 Subpoena. Once we have a ruling, if there's a ruling by
4 you that the privilege has been waived, that may have 5 some impact on whether or not he'll show up and whether 6 or not we can compel him to show up. Just to finalize 7 that. I know you're at a disadvantage. You don't know to get this information in front of you with the law. ARBITRATOR WALL: Understood. MR. GERRARD: Let me know if you want a response because I have one.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm trying to piece it together because I'm not sure that $I$ think that a ruling from me hypothetically saying the privilege has been waived would necessarily give him comfort if the case goes beyond me. "Him" being Mr. LeGrand. I'm trying to walk through that.

MR. LEWIN: If I can comment on that. Your ruling would be binding on Mr. Bidsal. I think there's a lot of moving parts that have to be pieced together, but your ruling would be binding on Mr. Bidsal, and I think Mr. LeGrand is entitled to -- we're entitled to it. He's an important witness, but $I$ think he's also entitled to it.

MR. GARFINKEL: Yesterday on the record Mr. LeGrand was concerned about Mr. Gerrard's allegations and the potential for a Bar complaint. I think -- I mean, I would not want to leave the record at that. All we have is "Mr. LeGrand, there may be a Bar complaint" without any ruling of whether or not the privilege has been waived. I took it as a threat to Mr. LeGrand, so, Your Honor, I think there should be more here than that.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Just for the record, I didn't. I took it as what was necessary for him to be aware of before he testified. Any lawyer who testifies in a case involving their client has to know whether the privilege has been waived, because it's obvious to all of us that if we testify to privileged information and the privilege hasn't been waived, that the possibility of a Bar complaint is the remedy.

MR. GARFINKEL: Sure, Your Honor. Of course. But the concern was Mr. LeGrand previously testified at a deposition about this -- about the operating agreement and also at the prior arbitration. For all of this to come out all of a sudden now, $I$ frankly was surprised because this has been going on for years and no one's ever raised it.

ARBITRATOR WALL: As I said yesterday, in my mind

1 before he testified -- because we actually briefed this 2 issue with the potential of Mr. Lewin being a witness in

3 the motions in limine. To me, the very, very first
4 inquiry that had to be made before Mr. LeGrand did

5 anything was whether the privilege had been waived. So to me it was the necessary precursor to him testifying.

MR. LEWIN: Yes, Your Honor, but honestly, I don't want to get into the contents with Mr. Gerrard on this, but that issue should have been brought up way before we spent the time coming here and preparing for this arbitration at great expense, and not in front of the witness, because $I$ can tell you the language that Mr. Gerrard used was "If you testify, there's going to be a Bar complaint," which, by the way, there may never be a Bar complaint because of the issue of waiver and privilege. He should not have brought that up in front of the witness. It's witness intimidation.

ARBITRATOR WALL: The witness is a lawyer. The witness is aware of privilege issues. It's different. I don't know what the expense difference is. I mean, you would have had to have the same expense to present the testimony we already presented.

MR. LEWIN: No. I don't know Mr. LeGrand realized that was an issue. I'm not speaking for him. Remember he testified twice and there's no assertion of

| 1 | the attorney/client privilege. If I'm a lawyer, I |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | wouldn't think there's an issue. As to the expense, I |
| 3 | think when we ultimately get to the bottom of this, |
| 4 | we're going to be back here again. |
| 5 | ARBITRATOR WALL: I think we can do it by Zoom, |
| 6 | but all right. |

MR. GERRARD: Obviously they're not happy with the ruling that Your Honor made yesterday.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Which ruling?
MR. GERRARD: The ruling we were not going to force Mr. LeGrand to testify.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Oh.
MR. GERRARD: Mr. LeGrand said he wasn't comfortable testifying, and what I told him was what rules -- or what $I$ wanted to cover with him in voir dire, which is what $I$ said at the beginning, were the Rules of Professional Conduct that go well beyond whether there's attorney/client privilege. This is not just a privilege issue. It's not limited to privilege. Let's take it one step at a time. First of all, Mr. LeGrand has never testified about the communications that he had with Mr. Bidsal.

ARBITRATOR WALL: With respect -- let me interrupt you. Really all $I$ want to reach right now is whether we're going to brief it on the front end or the

1 back end.

MR. GERRARD: There was a very long dialogue on the other side. I'm trying to make a record because I don't agree with any of it. The point is I don't think we should have to brief this issue until Mr. LeGrand decides whether he's going to testify. Your Honor doesn't have jurisdiction to decide whether there's conflict of interest or not. Your Honor may be able to decide if there's been a waiver of a privilege --

ARBITRATOR WALL: That, I have.
MR. GERRARD: He has an irreconcilable conflict of interest. It was demonstrated by the way he acted leading up to this testimony and his communications with the other side and his taking on Mr. Golshani as a client without the permission of his other client, which is the company.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm not even aware of that.
MR. GERRARD: Mr. Shapiro told you about that. Mr. LeGrand wrote an adversarial letter on behalf of Mr. Golshani to Mr. Shapiro about what the offers and acceptances meant and so on and so forth. So the point is there are conflict issues that cannot be resolved by this arbitrator. That's why I brought it up at the beginning. That's why I let him know exactly what our concerns are. It's not just limited to whether there's

1 been a waiver of a conflict.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Privilege.
MR. GERRARD: I'm sorry. Privilege. Which there's never been. We never waived the communications that he had with the attorney for the company. Those can be disclosed to Mr. Golshani as another representative of the company, but they cannot be disclosed to a third party like Your Honor. That's the whole point. That's what the privilege is there for, so they can have communications that are not something they have to be concerned about being disclosed to a third party.

There's never been a disclosure, and unless Mr. LeGrand says that he plans to testify -- you know, I would never touch with a ten foot pole a dispute between two owners of a company if $I$ was the company's attorney. I would say "That's between you and your lawyers. I'm Switzerland." And any lawyer with half a brain would do that because there's a potential that you're going to have a Bar complaint if you take a side.

He has clearly taken a side, and Rule 1.7 does not permit him to do, and I wanted him to be aware of that. I'm not going to mince words. I made clear what our position is so he could make an informed decision what he was going to do. He has not told us -- anyone

1 doesn't tell us that he wants to testify, there's no reason in the world why we should spend the time and money to brief a moot issue.

ARBITRATOR WALL: On the issue that Mr. Gerrard raised, I can hypothetically say, "You know what? For these reasons I think the attorney/client privilege has been waived." That goes to the admissibility of his testimony. Okay? Issues of conflict of interest or violations of the model rules of professional conduct don't affect admissibility, but they still have a potential effect on Mr. LeGrand as a lawyer. So even if I rule that the privilege is waived, thereby opening the gate to admissibility, it doesn't absolve any issue of a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct opening Mr. LeGrand up to a Bar complaint or otherwise. And so that's the issue that's been raised, and I don't -- I won't address --

MR. GARFINKEL: Fair enough.
ARBITRATOR WALL: -- the issues of whether the Rules of Professional Conduct -- because as Mr. Gerrard has stated, it's not within my authority.

MR. GARFINKEL: Fair enough.
MR. LEWIN: We don't agree with Mr. Gerrard's presentation. He says things as though they're just
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1 correct and somehow there's a conflict, and I don't 2 necessarily agree with that, but $I$ think we need the 3 opportunity to brief these issues, the privilege and his 4 claim there's some kind of conflict. It depends on the 5 testimony he's given.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All we're really talking about now is the order in which certain things occur. We can save a lot of time, effort, and expense if he were made aware that $I$ see two concrete issues. One is privilege, which $I$ can rule on. And the second is conflict of interest under the model rules, which $I$ cannot and won't. And he's already heard from a representative of a manager -- 50 percent manager of an LLC for which he was the lawyer that they believe there's a conflict of interest and will follow through with potential remedies.

So what I'm saying is even if I resolved the waiver issue, the privilege issue in a way that would allow him to testify, then for him to say, "Look, there's conflict of interest issues here that $I$ don't want to jeopardize so I'm not testifying" would mean we wasted all the time and effort with the privilege.

MR. LEWIN: I don't agree with that. I just don't. Lawyers in disputes -- in shareholder disputes and other matters are frequently called to testify in
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1 matters about that. I haven't researched this matter
2 entirely and I think we're entitled to present our
3 position to you and brief it because he is -- look, they
4 want to stop him from testifying in even percipient
5 matters. It's not a matter of him giving an opinion who
6 is right; who is wrong. It is a matter of him testifying about things he saw, heard, did, for example.

ARBITRATOR WALL: You might be right, and I'm sorry to interrupt, but I'm trying to focus on what I need, and that is, for instance, if there was no issue of the waiver of attorney/client privilege, no. But he came to this hearing via Zoom and said, "Look, I think I have a conflict of interest. I think that I'm uncomfortable testifying, and I'm not going to testify." I would respect that and I would -- unless you showed me some authority saying that despite that position, I had the ability, much less the wherewithal, to compel him to testify, I would likely grant his request not to.

MR. LEWIN: All we're asking to do is to research and brief the issue.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Both issues.
MR. LEWIN: And address them and see how that plays out. I believe the conflict of interest issue is a bogus one, personally. I know the letter Mr. Shapiro says is an adversarial letter. If you have two members
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1 of a partnership, entity, that go to the company lawyer 2 and say "What do you think this is about" --

ARBITRATOR WALL: But I'm not going to resolve it.

MR. LEWIN: I understand. I believe it's important for us to be able to brief it and get some decisions from you on some items. The waiver issue may provide -- the waiver issue itself may provide us the ability to present evidence without him testifying, because under the JAMS rules you have some flexibility as to what prior recorded testimony you may be able to receive.

I want to brief those things. Remember, he's given two days of testimony. He gave a day in his deposition -- not a whole day, but in Arbitration No. 1. So there's issues whether you can receive that testimony or any of the documents that were delivered without objection. There's a num -- whether you can receive those. There's a whole bunch of issues that may be pertinent, regardless of whether or not he refuses to testify. We want the chance -- I think we're entitled the chance of briefing this issue.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm going to let you brief the issue. It's just whether we find out something else first.

MR. GERRARD: Again, if he's not going to testify, it's a waste of time. And so I think we need to contact him, perhaps in a joint call, and just ask him "Are you planning to testify or not?" Because if he's not planning to testify, it's a moot point because it doesn't matter what -- you know, listen, they're talking about all these other things that are not part of this record. They're talking about things that are not disclosed on any of these exhibits, that are not -you know, what they're basically saying is "We want to be able to reopen this up and find another way to get in evidence what we didn't get in through Mr. LeGrand." That's what they're saying. That's their responsibility to have done long before this arbitration took place.

The only thing that Mr. LeGrand could testify about that would in any way involve what we're here for is if he was to say that he had conversations with Mr. Bidsal about what -- the language of the operating agreement, the provisions of Exhibit $B$, and the buy/sell language, what those things meant. That's the only way that it could have anything whatsoever to do with what we're here for.

If they're just talking about the Emails that show what versions of the agreement went back and forth between the parties, they're all in the record. They've
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1 been admitted. It's only the communications that are 2 privileged and a privilege that he doesn't have -3 Mr. Golshani does not have the right to waive that is at 4 issue.

So again, we're wasting all kinds of time when we could be wrapping this up, and they don't want to wrap it up. They don't like what happened yesterday. But again, why are we spending time if Mr. LeGrand is not going to testify? If we contact him and he says, "Yes, I'm going to testify," well that's a different issue. If he says "I'm not going to testify," then we're wasting our time.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Well, what he said yesterday was he wanted to speak with independent counsel and potentially Bar counsel.

MR. GERRARD: Correct.
MR. LEWIN: And the fact that Mr. Gerrard keeps saying the same thing doesn't make it right. Neither does it make it right if $I$ say the same thing. He doesn't know what questions I might ask of Mr. LeGrand or not, so the issue really is that this should happen beforehand. There's no reason to put it out afterwards because if I'm in Mr. LeGrand's position with counsel, he may find that there's an issue of waiver that's been resolved. His lawyer may say it's okay within certain
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1 limitations. We don't know what's going to happen.
2 Mr. LeGrand has been on our witness list from the very 3 beginning.

MR. GARFINKEL: Theirs too. They identified him right at the beginning of the case, so $I$ don't get that.

ARBITRATOR WALL: All right.
MR. LEWIN: Look. I'm not anxious to spend Mr. Golshani's money on things that aren't necessary, but this is really important.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Based on the little Mr. LeGrand said yesterday, $I$ believe the issue of privilege, as well as the issue of any conflict of interest, are issues that affect his ability to testify. I don't want to sit around and wait for him to speak with independent counsel, much less Bar counsel, who isn't going to have any background in this case and understand what's going on. So I'm going to allow -- we're going to be briefing two issues. Okay?

Issue No. 1 I will broadly refer to as attorney/client privilege. Whether there has been a waiver, who has the ability to waive the privilege, and if there's any waiver in part as it relates to certain issues and not others. Okay? That's all under No. 1 .

No. 2 -- and this is only if you want to brief it -- whether I have the authority to compel Mr. LeGrand

```
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```

```
    to testify if he has reservations about violating either
    privilege or the Rules of Professional Conduct.
Those are the two issues.
MR. LEWIN: Can I suggest a third issue?
ARBITRATOR WALL: What?
MR. LEWIN: You talked about waiver of conflict.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Waiver of privilege.
MR. LEWIN: I think we should brief whether there's been a waiver of conflict.
ARBITRATOR WALL: That's his decision.
MR. LEWIN: No. A waiver by these parties of the conflict. I think they have the ability of waiving a conflict, No. 1; and No. 2, who on behalf of Green Valley has the authority to waive that.
ARBITRATOR WALL: That's fine. We can address that issue too.
MR. GERRARD: That's a waste of time. The waiver, by law, has to be in writing. Have you shown us any written waiver of any conflict? Because I've never seen one and one doesn't exist.
ARBITRATOR WALL: That part will be pretty easy to brief.
MR. LEWIN: May I suggest we defer setting the next session? Set a briefing schedule, but --
ARBITRATOR WALL: That's what \(I\) was going to do.
```

``` Set a briefing schedule. Okay. All right. Is two weeks enough time?
MR. LEWIN: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. GARFINKEL: Can I say one thing, Your Honor?
I talked about this yesterday but I don't think you were here. I'm going to be changing firms the beginning of next week, and I'm just going to need a little time to kind of get organized. It's going to be very challenging because I've got to move out of the old firm and then moving to Reisman \& Sorokac --
ARBITRATOR WALL: Into what?
MR. GARFINKEL: Reisman \& Sorokac. And I have to admit it's a little daunting with this arbitration and everything going on. I'm asking if \(I\) can be accommodated to some degree. I'll be involved in the Nevada stuff.
ARBITRATOR WALL: How about May 14th, in two and a half weeks?
MR. LEWIN: Can we have a responding brief, Your Honor?
MR. GERRARD: How --
ARBITRATOR WALL: One thing at a time. Does that work? May 14 th?
MR. LEWIN: He needs more time.
MR. GARFINKEL: I'm not trying to be difficult.
```

I'm trying to be practical about this. Normally I wouldn't do it, but I've been with the same partner for 23 years. It's a major change.

MR. LEWIN: May 21st. That's like three and a half weeks.

MR. GARFINKEL: I'll have to get it done.
ARBITRATOR WALL: How long do you need after that?

MR. GERRARD: So what are we -- contemporaneous briefs, no replies, no oppositions?

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't want to do contemporaneous. I don't want to do replies. I want to do one each and then we'll have argument.

MR. GERRARD: You want him to do one and we'll respond to that?

MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, can $I$ be heard on that?
ARBITRATOR WALL: In a moment. So from -- what did I say?

MR. GERRARD: You said May 21st.
ARBITRATOR WALL: May 21st. Two weeks would be June 4th. Three weeks would be June 11th.

MR. SHAPIRO: I'm going to be out of town from the 27 th to the $3 r d$, but if Doug's in town, $I$ don't want to delay this.

MR. GERRARD: I don't want to either. I think

```
    1 the front end is going to be hard. I'm leaving May 28th
```

``` for a week. See, Mr. Shapiro and I, we're both going to be in Hawaii at the same time and place.
MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, if we can move the deadline to the \(18 t h\) and then set ours to the 26 th. MR. GARFINKEL: May 18th? I don't want to do that. I want to do May 21 st.
MR. GERRARD: Then that pushes us out until the second week of June.
MR. GARFINKEL: So be it.
MR. GERRARD: Listen, I'm not trying to create problems for you, but --
MR. GARFINKEL: Well, you are.
MR. GERRARD: This has dragged on for a long
time. We had a month between when the original testimony was given and this, and there is an advantage to having things done and making a decision when we're close to when the events have happened.
We'll do whatever you would like us to do, Judge Wall.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm going to push it out. MR. GERRARD: Okay.
ARBITRATOR WALL: June 11th. MR. LEWIN: And there's no reply, Your Honor? ARBITRATOR WALL: No reply.
```

MR. LEWIN: So it's been our experience in dealing with briefs in both of these arbitrations that sometimes the reply is necessary because of the way -the characterization of certain things.

ARBITRATOR WALL: I mean, I understand what replies are for, but $I$ don't need it.

MR. LEWIN: I was trying to be nice about what $I$ think about their briefs.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. I can tell you that I share that opinion, having seen a lot of them in this proceeding.

Now here's the thing: So I want to do a hearing with argument. I don't care if it's telephonic or by Zoom. Whatever you prefer.

MR. GERRARD: For closing?
ARBITRATOR WALL: No. To argue these issues. All right. Do you want it telephonically? Do you want it by Zoom? Keep in mind that if you want it reported --

MR. LEWIN: I think by Zoom would be better.
MR. GERRARD: Either way is fine.
ARBITRATOR WALL: All right. Here's the problem: I have either full-day mediations or full-day arbitrations from June 14 th to June $23 r d$ every day but Saturday and Sunday.

MR. GERRARD: So you want to do it on Saturday is what you said?

ARBITRATOR WALL: Yeah. Saturday is fine.
MR. GERRARD: So how long do you want, Judge, to review the briefs?

ARBITRATOR WALL: I don't need that much but -unless I do it in the evenings.

MR. GERRARD: I can do it on the 12 th or the 26th.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Are those Saturdays?
MR. GERRARD: Yeah. Those are Saturdays.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I thought you were kidding.
MR. SHAPIRO: I thought that was facetious.
MR. GERRARD: If it is, that's fine, but we do want to get it done.

MR. SHAPIRO: Well, okay. So you said through the 23 rd. So we could do -- potentially 24 th or 25 th would be available for oral arguments?

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'd probably be flying home on the 24 th.

MR. LEWIN: Are you willing to do it on a Saturday, Your Honor?

ARBITRATOR WALL: If I was, I would choose the 19th.

MR. LEWIN: That works for me.

MR. GERRARD: I can't do the 19th.
MR. SHAPIRO: I'm out of town as well.
MR. GERRARD: But I could the 12 th or the $26 t h$.
MR. LEWIN: The 12 th you would have just gotten the papers.

MR. GERRARD: That's why I asked how much time you would need because it's two days after.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Let's go off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
ARBITRATOR WALL: So my recitation of the issues for briefing are already on the record. So Respondent's brief will be close of business 5 p.m. Pacific on May 21st, 2021. Claimant's brief in response will be due close of business, that's 5 p.m. Pacific, on June 11th, 2021. We will have a Zoom hearing, argument only and only regarding the issues surrounding these briefs on June 25 th at 1 p.m. Pacific. Everything else schedule-wise we will take from there.

MR. SHAPIRO: No further briefs?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Just those two briefs. Just those two briefs. Sometimes I get replies when I haven't set out those in the briefing schedule, so I'm making it clear I don't need a reply brief.

MR. LEWIN: I understand.
ARBITRATOR WALL: I will give people a full

1 opportunity to be heard on the 25 th.

Other than Mr. LeGrand, the Respondents have -and any testimony, say, from Mr. Golshani after Mr. LeGrand testifies, if he is allowed to testify, Respondents have rested. Right?

MR. LEWIN: Well, the issue with Mr. Golshani comes up and possibly Mr. Manabat in the event --

ARBITRATOR WALL: Mr. Manabat, that's --
MR. LEWIN: As I mentioned yesterday, if Mr. LeGrand is not going to be permitted to testify, depending on what happens, we may have -- we have changes in strategy, so we probably would have maybe Mr . Bidsal and Mr. LeGrand and Mr. Golshani because those are issues -- I'd like to address those issues. No reason for us to address those issues at this moment, but we would have -- that would be part of our rebuttal case. Just our case. Our rebuttal case.

MR. GERRARD: There's no rebuttal case if we don't put a case on.

MR. LEWIN: I understand.
MR. GERRARD: And we're not putting one on.
MR. LEWIN: I'm not -- I'm not trying to work in more stuff. We could have addressed this issue -- we could have addressed this issue months ago, so our whole strategy in the event that LeGrand doesn't testify has
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1 to be looked at from our perspective and then we may 2 want to bring back Mr. Bidsal and Mr. Golshani.

ARBITRATOR WALL: If Mr. LeGrand is not allowed to testify, you're going to bring back Mr. Bidsal?

MR. LEWIN: And possibly Mr. Golshani. Because that has to do with what questions we covered with Mr. Bidsal and what questions we covered with

Mr. Golshani, because we assumed that Mr. LeGrand was going to be testifying. We had no reason not to believe he's not going to be testifying based on what we would talked about ad nauseam. So I think those would be the two witnesses, I believe.

ARBITRATOR WALL: Okay. Well, here's the thing: Mr. Golshani is here. Mr. Bidsal is here. So if Mr. LeGrand is not allowed to testify, in order to what I would consider reopen your case or present additional testimony from Mr. Bidsal or Mr. Golshani, there's going to have to be an offer of proof as to why that testimony can't come in today.

MR. LEWIN: Because $I$ have to change strategy. I'm not prepared.

ARBITRATOR WALL: That was yesterday. We dealt with Mr. LeGrand.

MR. LEWIN: Right. But we don't know whether -as I said yesterday, I don't know -- I had planned --
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1 certain information that $I$ had planned on getting from 2 Mr. LeGrand. If he's not going to testify, then $I$ have

3 to prepare to present that information by other means. That would be Mr. Golshani and Mr. Bidsal. I'm not prepared to do that today, and it may not be necessary for me to do that.

ARBITRATOR WALL: So that's what I would require under those circumstances.

MR. LEWIN: I'll show you.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Not today. If I determine that
Mr. Golshani -- that the privilege hasn't been waived or -- not Mr. Golshani. I'm sorry. Mr. LeGrand. If I decide that the privilege has not been waived, or if Mr. LeGrand otherwise chooses not to testify, reopening with more testimony from Mr. Bidsal when he's available here and now and available to testify would require some significant offer of proof as to why his testimony couldn't be taken today or yesterday. That's what I would require. Because $I$ think that would unnecessarily extend our hearing.

MR. LEWIN: The point being, Your Honor, because it's not fair to expect me to have prepared to testify with respect to what documents $I$ may want to use with Mr. LeGrand. If we're going to have issues -- I think we're still going to have some issues -- Mr. LeGrand may
1 be able to testify about some things and not about
2 others. That's a possibility.

```
```

ARBITRATOR WALL: I'm telling you what I'm going to require. So be prepared.
MR. LEWIN: I'll be prepared. I'll be prepared to address the issue of prejudice as well.
MR. GERRARD: And I assume that comment applies to both witnesses. Right?
ARBITRATOR WALL: Correct.
MR. GERRARD: Because they had all day to do it.
ARBITRATOR WALL: Anything else before we recess?
MR. LEWIN: No.
MR. GERRARD: No.
ARBITRATOR WALL: We'll go off.
(The proceedings concluded at 5:06 p.m.)
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APPEARANCES (continued)

ALSO PRESENT: Judge Rob Bare
ALSO PRESENT: Shawn Bidsal
ALSO PRESENT: Benjamin Bahlman Golshani

JUNE 25, 2021 1:05 P.M. LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA JUDGE WALL: Appearing on behalf of the claimant Mr. Bidsal, Mr. Bidsal is present, Mr. Doug Gerrard is here on his behalf. Okay.

On behalf of CLA Properties, their
representative, Mr. Golshani is present. Mr. Lewin, Rodney Lewin is present. Mr. Louis Garfinkel is present. And appearing specially, I think, Judge Rob Bare is present. Good to see you.

JUDGE BARE: Good to see you too, Judge.
JUDGE WALL: Okay. So we might want to
completely reiterate where we were at -- at -- at the end of April. But there were a couple of issues that -- that needed to be resolved that \(I\) asked for briefing on. I got the respondent's brief, dated May 21 st, 2021, and I got the brief from the claimants on June 21th, 2021. To my knowledge, that's all the briefing. I didn't ask for a reply brief, and -- and that's all the briefing that \(I\) have.

So a couple of discrete issues. One is the issue of whether the attorney-client privilege has been waived; whether the attorney-client privilege -- I guess, all surrounding issue one is attorney-client privilege, whether it has been waived, whether Mr. Golshani can waive it for communications between Mr. LeGrand, the
attorney, and Mr. Bidsal acting in his position as a manager of Green Valley Commerce.

And then secondarily the issue was with respect to any claim of a violation of the rules of professional conduct. I had said previously at our hearing that while I believed I had the authority to resolve any issue about whether there has been a waiver of attorney-client privilege, that \(I\) have no authority, frankly, to --

Somebody is getting feedback. So maybe if you are not speaking, maybe you mute your mic., if you don't mind.

With respect to a conflict of interest under the Rules of Professional Conduct, I'm not in a position to assure, for instance, Mr. LeGrand that \(I\) find no violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, no conflict of interest. Go ahead and testify. You're -you're free and clear of any potential ethical violation. You're not within my jurisdiction.

So that was the issue of conflict of interest, and as a part of that, whether, if Mr. LeGrand, as he stated to us in some respects during the voir dire process at the end of April, was reluctant to testify because of some potential ethical violation, whether, in fact, I could compel him to testify in the arbitration anyway.

I think I intimated at the April hearing that \(I\) didn't think I could. I'm pretty sure I said that I didn't think \(I\) would under those circumstances. But I open that up for potential briefing, as well.

So I read the briefs. I don't really want a complete regurgitation of them. Since the respondents filed the initial brief -- I intend to give both sides opportunities to be heard, but \(I\) will hear from you first, anything in addition to what's in the brief.

Is it going to be Mr. Bare or Mr. Lewin or Mr. Garfinkel? Judge Bare. Sorry.

JUDGE BARE: It's going to Judge Bare, Your Honor.

JUDGE WALL: Okay. Judge Bare.
JUDGE BARE: Well, thanks a lot, Judge Wall. You know as I look at the screen, I feel like I see two Hall of Famers based upon your time in Nevada and what you've got framed on the wall behind you.

JUDGE WALL: All right. All right.
JUDGE BARE: We've known each other for a while. You know that's my way of simply saying, good to see you again and, of course, I hope you are doing well. Thanks for the opportunity here today.

I did want to respectfully ask sort of a housekeeping structural question, if \(I\) could, please, and
that is, you know, \(I\) was specially retained regarding the brief and the argument, and as it turns out in this instance, there is a story to be told. There is a chronology of events, a lot of moving parts. Perhaps respectfully you can see that in the --oh-oh.

JUDGE WALL: Are you trying to screen share?
JUDGE BARE: Something happened.
JUDGE WALL: What are you trying to do?
JUDGE BARE: The meeting -- everything went off my computer for some reason.

JUDGE WALL: We can still see and hear you.
JUDGE BARE: I can't see and hear anybody for some reason.

JUDGE WALL: Do you want to try to log out and log back in?

JUDGE BARE: I'm sorry. That is what is going on right now. I'll try that.
(Discussion off the record.)

JUDGE BARE: Getting back to the housekeeping matter, Judge, \(I\) wanted to ask about, \(I\) was talking about how perhaps it is reflective from the attachments to our brief that there was a lot to the chronology of events going back a few years having to do with what we believe to create a clear, factual predicate for the waiver of
the attorney-client privilege.

And so the housekeeping matter I would respectfully ask you is, is there a time limit or time, sort of, schedule that you'd like me to keep, because, of course, I will be brief, I will be to the point, I will be relevant as best \(I\) possibly can, but \(I\) do know in preparing for this now that in order to fully go through various instances from the exhibits, it's going to take me a little bit of time, maybe 45 minutes or more, \(I\) would say, maybe even an hour.

And what \(I\) mean by that is consistent with what I said about don't regurgitate the brief, \(I\) was so happy to hear that because it was not my intention to do that. Of course, \(I\) know you've read the briefs and understand the law. And since there is so much volume to the exhibits, what I thought I would do, that I would hope would be helpful to you, would be a go-through and identify specifically a number of items in the exhibits and how they relate to the attorney-client waiver argument that we have.

So that's my question.
JUDGE WALL: No, whatever you need to do. You know \(I\) don't want a regurgitation of the brief, because \(I\) did read it.

Before you begin, it occurs to me, Mr. Gerrard,

I haven't done a separate disclosure as it relates to Judge Bare in this case. I can tell you and I'll make a disclosure now on the record that obviously \(I\) know him from his time on the bench. I probably got to know him a little better after I left the bench. I tried at least one case in front of him. I can tell you that -- that those facts don't create for me any conflict that -- that I don't have the slightest doubt about being able to be impartial with Judge Bare on there, but since normally when we get a notice of appearance of new counsel, JAMS promulgates a new disclosure form, but \(I\) don't think that was done in this case.

So if you wanted the opportunity to speak to Mr. Bidsal privately, \(I\) could move you into a breakout room for that purpose before we begin the argument, but \(I\) think it is probably necessary to at least get that on the record, or whatever your pleasure.

MR GERRARD: Well, as to any potential
conflict, we don't have any problem with Your Honor allowing Mr. Bare to participate. I don't have any concerns about that.

I have, however, some rather serious concerns and will object to what Mr. Bare just stated he wants to do, because the whole purpose of the brief was to provide to not only Your Honor, but also to us, what the basis
was of their argument. And what Mr. Bare is saying he wants to do is not included in their brief.

JUDGE WALL: I assume some of the documents he was referring to were ones that were referenced in the brief. I guess I don't know that.

MR GERRARD: I would expect so, but, for instance, if you look at the brief they say something like, Mr. LeGrand's deposition was taken on such-and-such a date. A copy of it is attached. There was extensive questioning. They don't include any references to any testimony from any deposition in their brief for us to respond to. They just attach a brief and say, generally, this is what we think it means.

So if they are now saying, well, we want to revise our brief by going through for Your Honor all the specific references that we think matter, well obviously we didn't have an opportunity to respond to those, because they didn't identify them in their brief.

That's one of the things we pointed out in our brief, is that they did not reference any specific testimony by Mr. LeGrand in any of the references in their brief.

So, obviously, for them to now be able to go back and revise their brief, and we don't have any chance to do it, because \(I\) can't obviously respond on the fly to
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any testimony they may decide they want to revise their brief by referencing, it is wholly inappropriate. JUDGE WALL: Judge Bare -JUDGE BARE: I'm not sure -JUDGE WALL: -- you're the only one who knows what you're going to be referring to. JUDGE BARE: Right. I'll start with the idea that we're not going to -- I will not refer to anything other than what is attached to our brief by way of exhibits in that DropBox. We did in the brief allude to the fact that there is a storied history that stands for the proposition that clearly in so many instances the attorney-client privilege is waived by Mr. Bidsal's failure to object to Mr. LeGrand participating in various forms -- forums at various levels, and, you know, I disclosed and attached to the brief all of the items relevant to that.

In fact, all of the items that are attached are ones that the defense counsel actively participated in. Mr. Shapiro was at both depositions -- or he was at the deposition and the arbitration with Judge Haberfeld.

And then all the other items were disclosed in discovery in part of our 16.1 discovery items in the case. So there is no revision. It's -- I just think that -- again, because the chronology has gone on for so
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long, and there are so many instances, and there are so many interesting things in here, that on behalf of my client \(I\) feel as though you respectfully might want to focus on, and \(I\) think as a good advocate what \(I\) ought to be doing in this argument today is focus on specific parts of the exhibits to show you how the attorney-client privilege was waived or how the issue was put into the case, the at-issue doctrine, if you will.

So there is no revision here of the brief.

JUDGE WALL: Okay. Well, I'm going to allow you to argue. I'm going to allow for contemporaneous objections to things that weren't included in the brief, and, Mr. Gerrard, that you didn't have a chance to respond to, and on an ad hoc basis determine whether any additional briefing is necessary based on that or whether we can address it today or whether it ought not to be used in the argument.

So I'm just going to take it on an ad hoc basis as it comes. All right?

Judge Bare.

JUDGE BARE: All right. Thanks a lot. All
right. Judge Wall, what \(I\) want to do is I want to go through first the relevant story, based upon the factual chronology of what happened here, because, respectfully, we feel as though the only way you can really get a feel
for the waiver of the attorney-client privilege is to really see what happened here relevant to that waiver over and over again.

And once I do that, and that's probably what will take more time than anything from my perspective, I then want to turn to telling you by way of an offer of proof to assist you what it is we want to do with Mr. LeGrand in this arbitration should you grant our request to compel him to testify, ask him to testify, or he does testify. In other words, what's the relevance now of his testimony, and \(I\) think that that ties in to the law in this situation in that if you look especially at the Wardly case, Nevada Supreme Court, 1995 , you will see fairness in this context where Mr. Bidsal has put at issue the buy-sell provision and everything attached to it, including the waterfall Exhibit B. It is consistent with the law. It is all about fairness.

And so I think we should tell you what we want to do with Mr. LeGrand in fairness consistent with the law when we question him in this particular arbitration. So I'll do that.

I know, again, that you've read the brief and you know the law, but \(I\) would like to have a few moments to highlight the law, but if you want me to forgo that, I would be happy to do that in all due respect.

And then lastly it's my plan to comment on their brief. I can skip that if you'd like or maybe I will just skip that if \(I\) get a rebuttal opportunity after Mr. Gerrard has spoken.

But let me go ahead and please ask you to consider a number of things that happened on the timeline that \(I\) think really speak volumes as to the fact that this attorney-client privilege issue has been waived for a long time. And then I'll talk a little bit about the at-issue element, because, remember, this particular arbitration, the one, Judge Wall, you're presiding over resulted from a demand for arbitration by Mr. Bidsal.

And while I'm at that, let me just hopefully briefly say I'm going to talk about this, but it comes to mind by way of a highlight now. Please consider the context in which Mr. Golshani and really CLA Properties, I -- I might sort of treat them as one in the same. Mr. Golshani is the 100 percent owner of CLA Properties who is the -- you know, \(50 / 50\) partner in Green Valley Commerce, as you know.

But, you know -- well, why don't \(I\) just get to the facts. If I don't, I'll take more than an hour, and nobody wants that. I just want to talk about how the at-issue doctrine becomes relevant, but I'll get to that. All right.

So here is the factual predicate that \(I\) would ask you to consider to be so on-point, important, and tells the story about what really happened here.

So it all starts with Exhibit A to our brief, which as you can see there is the Notice of Deposition of David LeGrand from February 28th of '18. You might, of course, have surmised, and you probably already know, that this stems from a District Court case where Mr. Bidsal sued Mr. Golshani, Bidsal vs. Golshani, District Court, that case is affectionately referred to as the Mission Square Case.

Let's take a look, please, at this Notice of Deposition of Mr. LeGrand. Keep in mind that when this Notice of Deposition comes in to Mr. LeGrand, he's already been maybe about seven years past his involvement in creating Green Valley Commerce for these two managers, Golshani and Bidsal.

So here is a Notice of Deposition again of that lawyer who jointly represented them both along the way.

Let's start with the idea of who receives the Certificate of Service for, again, this request to depose the attorney responsible for creating Green Valley Commerce. Well, that's Mr. Shapiro, James Shapiro. You can see the Certificate of Service there.

What does the Notice of Deposition say in

February of 2018? Well, what it says on page 3 , paragraph 2, and I'm sure Mr. Shapiro saw or had a duty to see, there is a paragraph right there, paragraph 2, talks about privilege, that if there is a privilege to be asserted here, now is the time to assert it.

When you get hit with this Notice of Deposition and Service, that the lawyer who helped your client, Mr. Bidsal, form the Green Valley Commerce, you know, and it is not just that. It is not just the deposition, of course, as is standard. This notice comes with the subpoena duces tecum. What does the subpoena duces tecum ask for? All documents showing preparation, drafting, and/or interpretation -- and/or interpretation of the operating agreement of Mission Square, which was substantially similar to the operating agreement of Green Valley Commerce.

So that starts the analysis.
Right at that point in time had there been any desire to assert an attorney-client privilege, one could have, in my view, successfully actually been asserted by Mr. Bidsal through his counsel who receives the Certificate of Service that Mr. LeGrand, his lawyer, is being asked to be deposed and further being asked to provide documents, including interpretive documents of the Green Valley Commerce operating agreement. No
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objection.
But what really happens? Things about this.
This little story about what happens when LeGrand now follows through with the subpoena and the Notice of Deposition is an interesting one that, again, I think has a lot of weight in showing there is a waiver of attorney-client privilege. What really happens?

I take this right from Mr. LeGrand's testimony in the case, in the deposition, and then the record that we have attached.

And there is no dispute. I'm sure there is no dispute that what Mr. LeGrand would say that he did to comply with, especially the subpoena is what? He says, well, \(I\) took five to six hours on a Sunday to go through all my records, get on my computer and find everything, five to six hours.

MR GERRARD: Your Honor, here is where we need to start our objections. None of this is referenced anywhere in their brief. Just because they attached the deposition transcript to their brief doesn't mean they referenced any specific testimony out of that transcript in the brief, which is what is required, and they didn't do that. There is none.

So what they want Your Honor to do is to allow them to make arguments for the first time that were never
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included in their brief. This is nowhere in their brief. This statement he's making reference is nowhere in the brief.

JUDGE BARE: It is in the brief. We talk about what LeGrand did to come up with the 600 pages or more than 600 pages that ultimately came about. It is in the deposition. Mr. Shapiro was there during the questioning. In fact, this came up both in the deposition and the arbitration.

Further, Mr. -- or Judge Wall, I think you already ruled on this, and, you know, it has been ruled upon, and I'm starting to feel, especially with the facial expressions that Mr. Gerrard is making, this is consistent --

JUDGE WALL: Wait. Wait. Wait. I'm going to handle that. All right? So we can just kind of dispense with that stuff. Or we can do it by teleconference. All right.

Let me ask you this. Isn't there a fundamental difference between the waiver of privilege as it relates to GVC documents as opposed to the waiver of privilege for communications between Mr. Bidsal as a manager of GVC and Mr. LeGrand? I don't think -- and I say this. I don't think there is -- there is any dispute that the documents that were produced pursuant to that subpoena
duces tecum, Mission Square, or otherwise, or GVC, are no longer privileged if there ever was one.

Well, there probably was. But those were produced without objection.

But isn't there -- and this is what \(I\) want to focus on, frankly, so to the extent that I'm helping you -- helping you focus things a little bit -- isn't there a fundamental difference between those two things?

JUDGE BARE: I take it that is a question for me, respectfully.

JUDGE WALL: It is.
JUDGE BARE: Sorry about that. Thank you.
There is a fundamental difference, no doubt. Documents from GVC are one thing. And -- well, the other items do include, and that's one of the things \(I\) intend to cover actually, and \(I\) find very important, they do include a lot of correspondence, email correspondence as between Mr. LeGrand and Mr. Bidsal before Mr. Golshani is even involved with Mr. LeGrand. In fact, I'm going to show you a month, month-and-a-half of time before Mr. LeGrand even starts to deal with Mr. Bidsal -- I'm sorry -- with Mr. Golshani.

JUDGE WALL: Okay. So recognizing there is a fundamental difference, \(I\) don't need to see the portion of the deposition or refer to it that talks about his
production of \(600-\) plus pages on the thumb drive or whatever it was. All right.

JUDGE BARE: Right. I'm not trying to point that out specifically line and verse. Rather what \(I\) will do is point out other items, line and verse, from our disclosures. Again, only attached to the brief.

But \(I\) just want to make the argument. I mean it is an argument that has to be made. I'm here to argue relevant items that \(I\) think would lead respectfully, Judge Wall, to a conclusion from you that is supportive of our side. I think I should have the right to do that; just like Mr. Gerrard should have the right to make his argument. I mean if he wants -- if Mr. Gerrard wants to go first, I don't have a problem with that.

JUDGE WALL: No. I want you to continue your argument.

JUDGE BARE: Okay. I'm going to continue my argument. Thank you.

What I'm suggesting here that is important is the extent to which Mr. LeGrand went to comply, especially with the subpoena, is all well known to Mr. Shapiro. He knows about it for a number of years. But look at what happened here. Five to six hours on a Sunday, LeGrand spends. There is a thumb drive provided to Mr. Garfinkel. Mr. Garfinkel, who, of course, is
counsel for Golshani, gets the thumb drive and prints items out on it. It turns out some of the things are missing. No problem. No criticism there.

But what does Mr. Garfinkel do on behalf of Mr. Golshani to be sure all items are disclosed? He does personally meet with Mr. LeGrand, and they print items out, and they compare the printout to the thumb drive. And --

MR GERRARD: Again, \(I\) have to object. None of this is in the brief. There is no declaration from Mr. Garfinkel or a declaration from Mr. LeGrand about what was done. None of this testimony appears in their brief. I just -- I can't overemphasize the prejudice to us by allowing them to file a brief that has none -JUDGE BARE: Read the exhibits. Read the exhibits.

JUDGE WALL: Judge, we have a court reporter, as you know. They prefer one at a time. So I'm going to -- not just for her benefit, but for mine zealously protect that. All right?

JUDGE BARE: Fair enough. Can I say something?
JUDGE WALL: We had these discussions during our arbitration hearing. Okay? About people talking over one another or -- and -- and I pretty strictly policed it there, and \(I\) don't want to change it now.

So I'm going to let Mr. Gerrard finish.
MR GERRARD: Sure, Judge. I mean, when a brief is filed, under the Rules of Civil Procedure in Nevada, and, of course, you've been following those rules for purposes of the trial, and the arbitration, I should say, it's required that the -- that the facts that you're relying upon be set forth in your brief, not that you make one generalized statement.

We think one sentence that says, "We think this is what the deposition means," and then you attach the transcript, and then later you come in and say, "Now I want to go through and cite all the different language that \(I\) think supports our argument," which obviously we can't respond to, because it wasn't in the brief.

And so you said you were going to do it on an ad hoc basis.

JUDGE WALL: Correct.
MR. GERRAD: And so I'm only interrupting as I need to to say I'm objecting because what he's stating right now is essentially not supported by any declaration. It's not supported by any affidavit. And it's not included anywhere in their brief. So --

JUDGE WALL: So I would -- I would --
JUDGE BARE: Can \(I\) respond or no?
JUDGE WALL: -- extend to -- to respondents the
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opportunity to rebut what's in your brief using documents that they attached to their initial brief.

So some of this is maybe going a little far
afield in terms of -- of a declaration from

Mr. Garfinkel, but he's here. I'm going to overrule the objection at this point.

But, Judge, you understand \(I\) want you to kind of stick to what we've got and kind of reach the issues that concern me most.

JUDGE BARE: I respectfully want to do that, and that's what I've been trying to do. I just want to say since there is a record that \(I\) disagree that we didn't mention anything in our brief about this. If you look at page 2 of our brief, the bottom of it, we say in responding to the subpoena duces tecum in the Mission Square litigation, Mr. LeGrand spent several hours searching his electronic files, had multiple communications with Mr. Golshani's counsel, Luis Garfinkel, and that communication with Mr. Bidsal's counsel. Mr. LeGrand produced in excess of 600 pages of documentations responsive to the superintendent. And it goes on from there, and references the second supplemental 16.1 disclosure, Exhibit B to our brief.

So what I'm doing to you I'm -- you know, if \(I\) could -- I could have mentioned every word from the
supplemental disclosures, but \(I\) don't want to do that in a brief.

So it has been referenced, and the exhibit -Exhibit B, which is our 16.1 second supplemental disclosure, is there. Mr. Shapiro participated in that. And so I don't know how it is, respectfully, I wouldn't be allowed to now reference parts of that exhibit.

JUDGE WALL: Well, I overruled the objection. So --

JUDGE BARE: Understood. I wanted to make my record here on that. Thank you for that.

Enough said about that.
A lot happened to have Mr. LeGrand comply with the -- especially again the subpoena.

And so we got 600 pages which is, again, Exhibit \(B\) to our brief, the 16.1 second supplement from Mr. Golshani.

On page 5 of Exhibit \(B\), to this motion practice, you can see we start, and \(I\) want to cover some of the emails, because what happened was Mr. LeGrand did, consistent with what \(I\) tried to describe the extensive effort put forth, Mr. LeGrand did give to Mr. Garfinkel, again, counsel for Mr. Golshani, all while Mr. Shapiro knows this is going on on behalf of Mr. Bidsal, 600-and-some pages, which is, again -- it surfaces now
essentially as, you know, the disclosure, 16.1 disclosure made in the underlying case.

But when you look at this, you'll see that not just Mission Square is talked about, but really Green Valley Commerce relevant to this arbitration, a number of documents, a number of emails, a number of interesting items appear in the 600 pages of disclosure.

And I want to cover some of those because in my view they tell the story of the waiver of attorney-client privilege. So \(I\) want to start on page 5. And I'll try to move as quickly as \(I\) can through this.

MR GERRARD: Judge, once again, I'm objecting. None of these exhibits are referenced. They attach a 16.1 disclosure that is 600 pages, and they think we're supposed to hunt through those to understand which of those documents they're relying upon for their -- for their argument? I mean, if there were specific emails or specific documents in that production that they are relying upon for their argument, why are those not referenced in their brief anywhere?

JUDGE WALL: Can you respond to that question?
JUDGE BARE: Well, they are attached as
questions and answers, and part of the disclosure that came up in the oath in the deposition and -- in the Judge Haberfeld arbitration. And it is all consistent with the
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argument that we make. I mean, I guess we could have asked for a -- an extension of the page limit and gotten to a couple hundred pages.

MR GERRARD: Again, Judge, the only way \(I\) can respond to this is we don't do trial by ambush. We don't -- we don't play hide the ball and then suddenly at the time of the hearing for the first time provide what the basis of our argument actually is. You know, the whole point of us having briefs done and Your Honor giving us an opportunity to respond to their brief is for them to identify the specific exhibits that they are relying upon for their argument. These -- there is not one single email between Mr. LeGrand and any of the members of this LLC that is referenced in their motion. Not one.

And they haven't identified in their motion anything that they are relying upon from this 16.1 disclosure. If you read the top of page 3 of their brief, it simply says, "The documents produced by Mr. LeGrand were Bates stamped and produced in the Mission Square litigation as part of Mr. Golshani and CLA Property LLC's Second Supplemental NRC 16.1 Disclosures. Copy of that is attached. Mr. Bidsal did not object to the documents produced." That's it.

They don't say that there is some document
that's within that production that they are relying upon for their argument that there is a waiver of the attorney-client privilege. It is just -- I've never seen anything like this, let alone, you know, from experienced counsel. I mean you cannot -- you cannot make brand new argument for the first time at the hearing. Or, you know, identify the documents that you're really relying upon for the first time at the hearing.

JUDGE BARE: Can \(I\) respond to that? \(I\) mean \(I\) just want to ask --

JUDGE WALL: Judge Bare, you may respond.
JUDGE BARE: Well, you know, what \(I\) really want to say is this really seems consistent with the fact that in their brief they accuse me of misrepresentation and they further accuse me of being ignorant. It is starting to feel that is a manner of practice, frankly,

Mr. Gerrard has. That is what it is starting to feel like to me with these continued interruptions, and this particular objection \(I\) felt was already ruled upon. More than that, this argument is simply just
that. It is consistent with what they had. You identified the dates upon which the documents were provided. They -- we went first. They had an opportunity to respond to that. They have had plenty of opportunity, and they actively participated in everything

Page 27
that is in the exhibits.
It's their -- their disclosures that we're relying upon here, and it's a deposition and arbitration that they were at.

MR GERRARD: Your Honor, I apologize. If there is anything in our brief that made any derogatory comment of any kind, I'm not aware of it. I certainly don't practice that way, and I'm not sure what Mr. Bare is making reference to.

But that's not my intention, and I am -- I am making ad hoc objections as Your Honor stated that \(I\) was to do, because this issue has not been ruled on, because as it comes up, you asked me to bring it to your attention, and that's what \(I\) do.

JUDGE WALL: Okay. I'm going to overrule the objection.

Judge Bare, you understand what he's talking about. I asked for a specific briefing on how, if the privilege was waived, tell me how. And -- and there was some pretty general references to it along with about a thousand pages attached collectively of exhibits. And to now say, okay, on page 847 of those thousand, here is something to look at. Here is a waiver. Here is the way we think it was waived. That makes it more difficult. You understand.

I mean, from a briefing standpoint, that makes it more difficult for the plaintiffs. So I -- you know, so I'm sensitive to what he's saying, because I asked for very specific things in the briefing and I didn't really get them. And I went through and read as much as I could of everything that you submitted in terms of the exhibits, you know. So that makes it obviously a little more difficult. So \(I\) understand his objection.

So I -- I -- you know, I mean it may be that you -- you lay out what you want to lay out, and then Mr. Gerrard can have an opportunity to -- to file a supplemental brief, because of all the potential references to things that weren't in yours. And then we reconvene. I mean, I suppose that's -- that's, you know -- drag this thing out for long enough, but -- but that's a possibility.

So I guess I will say that right now I'm considering doing that procedurally. And -- and I understand his frustration.

MR GERRARD: Judge, if that is what you are planning to do or you are really going to do that, I would prefer these things that they are making reference to be put in writing so that we don't have to order a copy of the transcript so that we can make sure that we cover the things that they're raising orally for the
first time.

JUDGE WALL: Mr. Lewin, Mr. Garfinkel, Judge Bare.

JUDGE BARE: Can we have a moment with our client?

JUDGE WALL: Sure. Do you want me to move you into a breakout room?

MR. GARFINKEL: Yes, Judge.
JUDGE WALL: All right.
(Recess was taken.)
JUDGE WALL: Back on the record.

Mr. Lewin, Mr. Garfinkel, Judge Bare. On procedural issues.

JUDGE BARE: Respectfully, Judge Wall, it's really your call. I mean, we're willing to do whatever you like in this regard. Obviously, we felt that especially given that defense counsel participated actively in everything that is attached by way of exhibits and all our arguments were made certainly in a more generalized sense, but that was by way of intention. This is a time for argument. We think they are clearly on notice that we're talking about instances in a whole chronology of events where the attorney-client privilege was waived.

But given your feelings on this, our thought,
respectfully, would be, it's just up to you. I can either give the whole argument, which we'll reference a number of things specifically only from our exhibits.

Again, items either from the -- the 600
pages -- well, I think it is all from the 600 pages pretty much, because in there are a lot of emails as between Mr. LeGrand and Mr. Bidsal only prior to Mr. Golshani even being involved in this.

But in any event we would agree to either giving the whole argument, and if \(I\) do that, we acknowledge and would agree to simply stop and allow Mr. Gerrard or the other side to file a -- a brief in response to the specifics that I've mentioned; or, in the alternative, we will provide a more specific brief and the associated argument with how the specific items fit within all the theories that we have layed out in our moving papers.

I will tell you it wouldn't be that difficult to do, you know, because, again, it would just be a matter of making a lengthier brief, but one that references line and verse various items from all these pages of things that happened, you know, over the years.

JUDGE WALL: Okay. So I would prefer not to have arguments by each side weeks apart. It is just harder for me to compartmentalize, and I'm sure you, of
all people, can understand that.
MR GERRARD: Can I make a comment, Judge,
before you make a decision?
JUDGE WALL: Sure.
MR GERRARD: Thanks.

Obviously, we have a big problem with this.
When we were at the end of the arbitration, and we were down to this final witness, and they asked for an
opportunity to brief this issue before Your Honor decided anything. And Your Honor gave them not just couple of weeks, but because Mr. Garfinkel was moving, you gave them a long period of time, more than -- I think it was in excess of three or four weeks for them to put together their briefs, and you were very specific about what you wanted them to show to you.

If there has been a waiver of this attorney-client privilege, show me where it's happened. Tell me what the waiver is. Tell me why there was a waiver. Brief the issue. And also to deal with the conflict issue that we had raised.

And the brief that we got back at the end of that time period has none of the information in it that you requested in terms of anything specific showing a breach of the attorney-client privilege, no reference to any deposition testimony, no reference to any arbitration
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testimony, no reference to any specific emails that they want to claim. None of that is there. And then we responded to what they had provided.

And in addition to that, we did specifically make reference to the testimony from the transcript that we thought showed that there was no waiver of any attorney-client privilege, that it still exists, and we thoroughly briefed the issue and the conflict issue which they didn't even address in their brief.

I frankly don't think it is fair for them to get a second bite at the apple. I think that they should be forced to make their argument based upon what they actually presented in their brief, not rebriefing the issue and, you know, now coming up with a new argument that they didn't come up with before, or identify new exhibits that they had time to identify before, but chose not to. And giving an opportunity to address issues they never even addressed in their original brief.

So I just don't think what has been done is what Your Honor asked to be done.

And we have, you know, spent the time and the money to allow them to brief it and for us to brief it, and the longer that this thing gets delayed from when the arbitration was, the more difficult it is for everybody to remember what happened hat the arbitration. And I
just think, you know -- maybe you have got an eidetic memory \(I\) don't have, but \(I\) really, Judge, think this is prejudicial, and it is not a level playing field. They shouldn't be getting a second bite of the apple.

You told them what you wanted them to do. And they presented what they thought they wanted to present, and they shouldn't be able to enlarge that now in the hearing or enlarge it by filing another brief.

JUDGE WALL: Okay. The objection is noted.
I'm going to allow a supplemental brief with some restrictions. Okay?

We're not going to reach legal issues that we didn't reach in the first brief. We're not going to add additional exhibits that were not referenced or attached to the initial brief. Okay?

We're going to -- I mean the -- the briefs
spoke -- the brief that you filed spoke in some generalities, and all of the exhibits were attached. You know, if we just -- if there was no argument, I would have to go through again all those -- those hundreds of pages and try to kind of glean how the generalities squared with what you attached, because ultimately all I care about is getting the right answer.

So this is a supplemental brief. I don't need you to repeat what's in the former brief. Okay?
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How long do you need to prepare that?
JUDGE BARE: Well, I don't know the answer to that, because it's -- that brief is a collaborative effort with a lawyer in Louis' firm, a guy named Glenn Machado who appears in the case, as well. And he's not here. I don't know the answer.

Louis, do you have a thought?
MR. GARFINKEL: Let me ask you something, Judge
Wall. All we're talking about is -- from what \(I\) understand, it -- let me -- from what I understand is that you -- you had certain examples that you wanted to reference, all right, from the exhibits, and you want to basically, rather than -- rather than just relay them right now, what you're going to do is basically reference them in another document. So \(I\) don't really think it should be that difficult. Am I right? I mean, all we're really looking at is just annotating our original brief with specific references that are part -- that are already in the exhibits. Am I correct? That's what we're talking about. So \(I\) mean \(I\) don't \(--I\) don't \(--I\) don't envision that as being very difficult.

I mean how long -- Rob, how long do you think that would take? A week and a half maybe? I mean just to get organized? And Rob, you have the stuff.

JUDGE WALL: You have the holiday in between.

So \(I\) was thinking July 9th.
MR. LEWIN: That's fine, Your Honor. July 9.
As long as that works with Judge Bare.
JUDGE BARE: That's fine with me, but one thing
about me I always tell people the way it is, and I always will, and \(I\) work with Glenn. He is just not on the call. I don't know what his schedule is.

MR. GARFINKEL: Rob, we'll work through that.
Okay? We'll work through that. All right?
JUDGE BARE: No problem. I was being
respectful to him. He's not on the call right now. We can agree to July 9th.

JUDGE WALL: All right.
Mr. Gerrard, two weeks would be July \(23 r d\). MR GERRARD: Which I think is fine, Your Honor. JUDGE WALL: All right.

So let's reschedule our Zoom. How is
August 5th? That will give me time to read everything over again.

JUDGE BARE: That is fine with me.
MR GERRARD: Your Honor, \(I\) do have a trial
that's scheduled for that time, but it is on a stack in front of Judge Gonzalez, and I don't know right now, so if you want me -- let's say yes, but if it turns out that the calendar causes a problem, can we please be flexible
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enough to move that?
JUDGE WALL: Yes.
MR. GARFINKEL: That works for me, Your Honor. JUDGE WALL: Mr. Lewin, is that okay?

MR. LEWIN: That's fine.

JUDGE WALL: It will be by Zoom. Let's say
August 5th. Is this time okay or do you want the morning?

MR. GARFINKEL: This time is fine, Your Honor.
MR. LEWIN: This time is good.

JUDGE WALL: All right. 1:00 p.m. Pacific.
All right.
MR. LEWIN: Your Honor, while we have you here, can I ask you for a housekeeping matter, I've been thinking about our closing arguments. I know you said you wanted briefs. Is that still your view? You don't want it briefed. You would rather have oral argument.

JUDGE WALL: Of the two, I would rather have oral argument, because \(I\) like to jump in and ask questions and be a little bit of a pest, but it helps me to focus on the issues that are important to me.

MR. LEWIN: All right. So what I've been thinking about, \(I\) don't know how you intend to have that structured. We have a claim and a counterclaim. Is it your intention -- I'm trying to figure out in terms of
framing -- sort of writing up my argument mostly, but is it your intention to have the -- well, claimant, the claimant respond to rebuttal and vice versa, or is it -I just don't know how you are going to handle that. It would be helpful in terms of finishing my preparation. JUDGE WALL: I mean, I can tell you what generally happens. What generally happens, if you haven't gleaned it by now, is, for instance, claimant would argue, and \(I\) would probably ask some questions. Respondent would argue. I would probably reach six more issues. I would give claimant's counsel a chance to respond, not only in terms of a reply, but also in terms of all the issues \(I\) brought up during respondents' argument that weren't covered before.

And then \(I\) will allow respondent's counsel probably to chime in on new issues \(I\) raised with the other side that hadn't been -- I mean it is far more interactive than it is a formality of, you know, jury trial. Let's put it that way.

MR. LEWIN: Okay.

JUDGE WALL: So my guess is that at some point you're going to have to just trash your notes and answer my questions. But it could -- it could devolve into something much more sophisticated. Who knows.

MR. LEWIN: You mean, I should throw away the
```

speech I already wrote?
JUDGE WALL: No. You can go ahead and have it.
I may stop you and say, "Wait a minute. How about this?"
MR. LEWIN: Sure. I got it.
JUDGE WALL: Anything else we need to cover
today? Off the record.
(The hearing ended at 2:09 p.m.)

```
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\hline 15:14 16:22 17:4 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{los} 4: 1 \\
& \operatorname{lot} 6: 157: 4.23
\end{aligned}
\] & missing 21:3 mission 15:11 & 20:22 25:5,6,6 \\
\hline 17:12 18:5,23 & lot 6:15 7:4,23 & mission 15:11 & 31:3 \\
\hline 19:18,19,21 20:20 & 24:13 31:6 & \[
25: 4 \text { 26:21 }
\] & 0 \\
\hline 20:24 21:6,11 & louis \(2 \cdot 214: 735 \cdot 4\) & moment & \\
\hline 23:16,20 24:13,20 & louis 2:21 4:7 35:4
35:7 & moments 13:23 & object 9:23 11: \\
\hline 24:22 26:13,20 & \[
\text { luis } 23: 18
\] & \[
\text { ney } 33: 22
\] & object 21.2311 .14. \\
\hline legrand's 10:8 & m & 20,20 & g 22: \\
\hline 17:8 & machado 35:5 & morning 37:8 motion 24:18 & objection 17:1 \\
\hline lengthier 31:20 & making 18:2,13 & motion 24:18 26:14, 16 & \[
19: 423: 624: 8
\] \\
\hline level 34:3 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 28: 9,1129: 22 \\
& 31: 20
\end{aligned}
\] & 26:14,16 & 27:19 28:16 29:8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[objection - provide]
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[provided - saying]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline provided 20:24 & reconvene 29:14 & remember 14:10 & response 31:13 \\
\hline 27:23 33:3 & record 7:19 9:3,17 & 33:25 & responsible 15:22 \\
\hline ovision 13:15 & 17:9 23:12 24:11 & repeat 34:25 & responsive 23:21 \\
\hline purpose 9:15,24 & 30:11 39:6 40:9 & reply 4:18 38:12 & restrictions 34:11 \\
\hline purposes 22:5 & records 17:15 & reported 1:13 & resulted 14:12 \\
\hline pursuant 18:25 & refer 11:8 19:25 & 40:7 & retained 7:1 \\
\hline put 12:7 13:14 & reference 10:20 & reporter 21:17 & revise 10:15,24 \\
\hline 24:22 29:23 32:13 & 18:2 24:7 28:9 & 40:4 & 11:1 \\
\hline 38:19 & 29:22 31:2 32:2 & reporter's 1:10 & revision 11:24 \\
\hline q & 32:25 33:1,5 & 40:1 & 12:9 \\
\hline question 6:25 8:21 & 35:12,14 & representative \(4: 6\) & ridge 2:22 \\
\hline 13:20 19:9 25:21 & referenced 10: & represented 15 & right 6:19,19 \\
\hline questioning 10:10 & 17:18,21 24:3 & request 13:9 15:21 & 11:7 12:19,21,22 \\
\hline 18:8 & 25:13,20 26:14 & requested 32:23 & 14:25 16:3,18 \\
\hline questions 25:23 & 34:14 & required 17:22 & 17:8 18:16,18 \\
\hline 37:20 38:9,23 & references 10:10 & 22:6 & 20:2,3,11,12 \\
\hline quickly 25:11 & 10:16,21 \(23: 22\) & reschedule 36:17 & :20 22:20 29:17 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{r}\) & 35:18 & resolve 5:6 & 30:9 34:23 35:12 \\
\hline ised 32:20 38:16 & referencing 11:2 & respect 5:3,12 & 36:13,16,23 37:11 \\
\hline raising 29:25 & referred 15:10 & 13:25 & 37:12,22 \\
\hline reach 23:8 34:12 & referring 10:4 & respectful 36:11 & rob 3:3 4:8 35:22 \\
\hline :13 38:10 & 11:6 & respectfully 6:24 & 35:24 36:8 \\
\hline read 6:5 8:14,24 & reflective 7:22 & 7:5 8:3 12:3,24 & \(\boldsymbol{r o d} 2: 18\) \\
\hline 13:22 21:15,15 & regard 30:16 & 19:10 20:9 23:10 & rodney 2:13,14 \\
\hline 26:18 29:5 36:18 & regarding 7:1 & 24:6 30:14 31:1 & 4:7 \\
\hline really 6:5 12:25 & regurgitate 8:12 & respects 5:21 & room 9:1 \\
\hline 13:2 14:7,16 15:3 & regurgitation 6:6 & respond \(10: 12,17\) & rosalie 1:13 40:3 \\
\hline 17:2,7 25:4 27:7 & 8:23 & 10:25 12:14 22:14 & 40:16 \\
\hline 27:12,13 29:4,21 & reiterate 4:12 & 22:24 25:21 26:5 & rose \(2: 8\) \\
\hline 30:15 34:2 35:15 & relate 8:19 & 26:10 27:9,11,24 & rpr 40:17 \\
\hline 35:17 & relates 9:1 18:20 & 38:3,12 & rtlewin.com 2:18 \\
\hline reason 7:11,14 & relay 35:13 & responded 33:3 & ruled 18:11,11 \\
\hline rebriefing 33:13 & relevance 13:10 & respondent 1:3,7 & 27:19 28:1 \\
\hline rebut 23:1 & relevant 8:6 11:17 & 2:5,12 38:10 & rules 5:4,13,15 \\
\hline rebuttal 14:3 38:3 & 2:23 13:2 14:24 & respondent's 4:15 & 22:3,4 \\
\hline receives 15:20 & 20:9 25:5 & 38:15 & s \\
\hline 16:21 & reluctant 5:22 & respondents 6:6 & \\
\hline recess 30:10 & relying 22:7 25:16 & \[
22: 25 \text { 38:13 }
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
saw 16:2 \\
saying 6:21 10:1
\end{tabular} \\
\hline recognizing 19:23 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 25:19 26:12,17 } \\
& 27: 1,728: 3
\end{aligned}
\] & responding 23:15 & \[
10: 14 \text { 29:3 }
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[says - teleconference]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline says 16:117:13 & signature 40:15 & stamped 26:20 & sunday 17:14 \\
\hline 22:9 26:19 & similar 16:15 & standard 16:10 & 0:24 \\
\hline schedule 8:4 36:7 & simply 6:21 \(26: 19\) & standpoint 29:1 & superintendent \\
\hline scheduled 36:22 & 27:20 31:11 & stands 11:11 & 23:21 \\
\hline screen 6:167:7 & single 26:1 & start 11:7 15:20 & supplement 24:16 \\
\hline searching 23:17 & tuation 13 & 7:18 24:19 25:10 & supplemental \\
\hline second 23:22 24:4 & six 17:14,16 20:23 & starting 18:12 & 23:23 24:1,4 \\
\hline 24:16 26:22 33:11 & 38:10 & 27:15,17 & 26:22 29:12 34:10 \\
\hline 34:4 & skip 14:2,3 & starts 15:4 16:17 & 34:24 \\
\hline secondarily & slightest 9:8 & 19:21 & supported 22:20 \\
\hline see \(4: 9,106: 16,22\) & som & state 40: & 22:21 \\
\hline 7:5,12,13 13:2,14 & sophisticated & stated 5:21 9:23 & supportive 20:10 \\
\hline 15:5,24 16:3 & 38:24 & 28:11 & supports 22:13 \\
\hline 19:24 24:19 25:3 & sorry 6:11 7:17 & statement 18:2 & suppose 29:14 \\
\hline seen 27:3 & 9:12,22 & 2:8 & supposed 25:15 \\
\hline sell 13:15 & sort 6:24 8:4 14:17 & stating & supreme 13:13 \\
\hline sense 30:20 & \(8: 1\) & stems & sure 6:2 11:4 \\
\hline sensitive 29:3 & speak 9:13 & stenographically & 17:11 21:5 22:2 \\
\hline sentence 22:9 & speaking 5: & 40:7 & 28:8 29:24 30:6 \\
\hline separate & specially & stick & 31:25 32:4 39:4 \\
\hline serious 9:22 & specific 10:16,20 & stop & surfaces 24:25 \\
\hline service 15:21,24 & 12:5 17:21 25:17 & storied 11:11 & surmised 15:7 \\
\hline 16:7,22 & 25:18 26:11 28:18 & story 7:3 12:23 & surrounding 4:23 \\
\hline set \(22: 740: 6\) & 29:4 31:14,15 & 15:3 17:3 25:9 & t \\
\hline seven 15:15 & 32:14,23 33:1 & strictly 21:24 & t 2:13,1 \\
\hline shapiro 11:20 & 35:18 & structural 6:25 & take 8:8 12:18 \\
\hline 15:23,23 16:2 & specifically 8:18 & structured 37:2 & \[
13: 5 \text { 14:22 15: }
\] \\
\hline 18:7 20:22 24:5 & 20:4 31:3 33:4 & stuff 18:17 35:24 & \[
\text { 17:8 } 1
\] \\
\hline 24:23 & specifics 31:13 & submitted 29:6 & taken 10:8 30:10 \\
\hline share 7 & speech \(39: 1\) & subpoena 16:11 & 40:5,10 \\
\hline Nn 1:2 & spends 20:24 & 16:11 17:4,13 & \[
\text { talk } 14: 9,14,23
\] \\
\hline shorthand 40:3 & spent 23:16 33:21 & 18:25 20:21 23:15 & 18:4 \\
\hline show 12:6 19:20 & spoke 34:17,17 & 24:1 & talked 25:4 \\
\hline 32:15,17 & spoken 14:4 & substantiall & talking 7:21 21:23 \\
\hline showed 33:6 & square 15:11 & 16:15 & 28:17 30:22 35:9 \\
\hline showing 16:12 & :14 19:1 23:16 & successfully 16:20 & 35:20 \\
\hline 17:6 32:23 & 25:4 26:21 & suddenly 26:6 & talks 16:4 19:25 \\
\hline side 20:11 31:12 & squared 34:22 & sued 15:9 & \[
\text { tecum } 16: 11,11
\] \\
\hline 31:24 38:17 & st \(2: 8\) & suggesting 20:19 & \[
19: 123: 15
\] \\
\hline sides 6:7 & stack 36:22 & suite 2:8,15,22 & teleconference \\
\hline & & & 18:17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[tell - weeks]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { tell } 9: 2,613: 18 \\
& 25: 928: 1931: 18 \\
& 32: 18,1836: 5
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { thought } 8: 16 \\
& 30: 2533: 634: 6 \\
& 35: 7 \\
& \text { thousand } 28: 21,22
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
\text { two } 6: 1615: 16
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { wall } 2: 34: 2,11 \\
6: 14,15,18,197: 7
\end{gathered}
\]} \\
\hline & & 19:8 36:14 37:18 & \\
\hline & & u & 7:9,12,15 8:22 \\
\hline :6 & & ultimately 18:6 & 10:3 11:3,5 12:10 \\
\hline telling 13:6 & three 32:13 & ultmately 18.6 & 12:22 14:11 18:10 \\
\hline tells 15:3 & row & 25 & 18:15 19:11,23 \\
\hline ms & mb 20:1,24 & understand \(8: 14\) & 20:10,15 21:17,22 \\
\hline 32:23 37:25 38:5 & 21:1,7 & \[
3: 7 \text { 25:15 } 28:
\] & 22:17,23,25 24:8 \\
\hline 38:12,12 & ties &  & 25:21 27:11 28:15 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { testify } 5: 16,22,24 \\
13: 9,9,10
\end{gathered}
\]} & time 6:178:3,3,9 & \[
32: 135: 10,10
\] & 30:2,6,9,11,14 \\
\hline & 9:4 13:5 14:9 16:5 & understood 24:10 & 31:23 32:4 34:9 \\
\hline testimony 10:11 & 16:18 17:25 19:20 & understood 24.10 & 35:9,25 36:13,16 \\
\hline 10:21 11:1 13:11 & 21:18 26:7,7 27:6 & & 37:2,4,6,11,18 \\
\hline 17:8,21 21:12 & 30:1,21 & valley & 38:6,21 39:2,5 \\
\hline 32:25 33:1,5 & 32:12,22 33:16,21 & 16,22 16:8,16 & want 4:11 6:5,24 \\
\hline thank 19:12 20 & :18,22 37:7,9 & 16:25 25:5 & 7:15 8:23 10:14 \\
\hline 24:11 & 37:10 40:6,10 & various 8:8 11: & 11:1 12:3,22,22 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{thanks 6:15,23} & timeline 14:6 & 1:15 31:21 & 13:6,7,18,24 \\
\hline & today 6:23 12:5,16 & versa 38:3 & 14:23 17:24 19:5 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\text { thing } 19: 1429: 15
\]} & 39:6 & verse 20:4,5 31:21 & 20:7,15 21:25 \\
\hline & told & vice 38:3 & 22:12 23:7,10,11 \\
\hline 33:23 36:4 & top & view 16:20 25 & 24:1,19 25:8,10 \\
\hline things 10:19 12:2 & transcribed 40:8 & 7:1 & 27:10,12 29:10 \\
\hline 12:12 14:6 17:2 & transcript 1:10 & violation 5:4,15,17 & 30:6 33:2 35:12 \\
\hline 19:7,8,15 21:2 & 7:20,21 22:11 & 5:23 & 36:24 37:7,17 \\
\hline 29:4,13,22,25 & 29:24 33:5 & v & wanted 7:219:13 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{```
    31:3,22
think 4:8 6:1,2,3
```} & transcription 40:8 & volume & 24:10 32:15 34:5 \\
\hline & trash 38:22 & volumes 14:7 & 34:6 35:11 37:16 \\
\hline 9:11,16 10:13,16 & treat 14:17 & vs \(1: 415: 9\) & wants 9:23 10:2 \\
\hline 11:24 12:4 13:11 & trial 22:5 26 & W & 14:23 20:13,13 \\
\hline 13:18 14:7 17:6 & 36:21 38:19 & wait 18:15,15,15 & wardly 13:13 \\
\hline 18:10,23,24 20:9 & tried 9:5 2 & 39:3 & waterfall 13:16 \\
\hline 20:11 22:9,9,13 & true & waive \(4: 2\) & way \(6: 2111: 9\) \\
\hline 25:14 28:24 30:21 & try \(7: 15,1825: 10\) & waived \(4: 22,2\) & 12:25 13:6 14:15 \\
\hline 31:5 32:12 33:10 & 34:21 & 11:13 12:7 14:8 & 15:19 26:4 28:8 \\
\hline 33:11,19 34:1,2 & trying 7:7, & 28:19,24 30:2 & 28:23 30:18,20 \\
\hline 35:15,22 36:15 & 23:11 37:25 & waiver 5:77:25 & 36:5 38:19 \\
\hline thinking 36:1 & turn & :19 13:1,2 17:6 & e've 6:20 23:8 \\
\hline 37:15,23 & turns 7:2 & \[
\text { 18:20,21 } 25: 9
\] & week 35:23 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{thoroughly 33:8} & 36:24 & 27:2 28:23 32:16 & weeks 31:24 32:11 \\
\hline & & 32:18,19 33:6 & 32:13 36:14 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[weight - zoom]
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline  \\
\hline y \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { years } 7: 2415: 15 \\
20: 2231: 22
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline z \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { zealously } & 21: 19 \\
\text { zoom } & 36: 17 \\
37: 6
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```
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