

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

INDICATE FULL CAPTION:

DANIEL E. WOLFUS, Appellant
vs.
KENNETH A. BRUNK; RICHARD D.
MORITZ; BRADLEY J. BLACKETOR;
TIMOTHY HADDON; MARTIN M. HALE,
JR.; (See Attached Sheet)

No. 80613

Electronically Filed
Mar 10 2020 10:12 a.m.

Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court
DOCKETING STATEMENT
CIVIL APPEALS

GENERAL INFORMATION

Appellants must complete this docketing statement in compliance with NRAP 14(a). The purpose of the docketing statement is to assist the Supreme Court in screening jurisdiction, identifying issues on appeal, assessing presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, scheduling cases for oral argument and settlement conferences, classifying cases for expedited treatment and assignment to the Court of Appeals, and compiling statistical information.

WARNING

This statement must be completed fully, accurately and on time. NRAP 14(c). The Supreme Court may impose sanctions on counsel or appellant if it appears that the information provided is incomplete or inaccurate. *Id.* Failure to fill out the statement completely or to file it in a timely manner constitutes grounds for the imposition of sanctions, including a fine and/or dismissal of the appeal.

A complete list of the documents that must be attached appears as Question 27 on this docketing statement. Failure to attach all required documents will result in the delay of your appeal and may result in the imposition of sanctions.

This court has noted that when attorneys do not take seriously their obligations under NRAP 14 to complete the docketing statement properly and conscientiously, they waste the valuable judicial resources of this court, making the imposition of sanctions appropriate. See KDI Sylvan Pools v. Workman, 107 Nev. 340, 344, 810 P.2d 1217, 1220 (1991). Please use tab dividers to separate any attached documents.

1. Judicial District EIGHTH Department 27
County CLARK Judge NANCY ALLF
District Ct. Case No. A-17-756971-B

2. Attorney filing this docketing statement:

Attorney JAMES R. CHRISTENSEN Telephone (702) 272-0406
Firm JAMES R. CHRISTENSEN, PC
Address 601 South 6th Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Client(s) DANIEL E. WOLFUS

If this is a joint statement by multiple appellants, add the names and addresses of other counsel and the names of their clients on an additional sheet accompanied by a certification that they concur in the filing of this statement.

3. Attorney(s) representing respondents(s):

Attorney Robert J. Cassity and David J. Freeman Telephone (702) 669-4600
Firm Holland & Hart, LLP
Address 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Client(s) Moritz, Blacketor, Haddon, Sawchak, Sheridan, Yu, Newel & Knutson

Attorney Holly Stein Sollod, (Pro Hac Vice Telephone (303) 295-8085
Firm Holland & Hart, LLP
Address 555 17th Street, Suite 3200
Denver, Colorado 80202

Client(s) Moritz, Blacketor, Haddon, Sawchak, Sheridan, Yu, Newel & Knutson

(List additional counsel on separate sheet if necessary)

4. Nature of disposition below (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment after bench trial | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dismissal: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judgment after jury verdict | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of jurisdiction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Summary judgment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Failure to state a claim |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Default judgment | <input type="checkbox"/> Failure to prosecute |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of injunction | <input type="checkbox"/> Divorce Decree: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant/Denial of declaratory relief | <input type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Modification |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review of agency determination | <input type="checkbox"/> Other disposition (specify): _____ |

5. Does this appeal raise issues concerning any of the following?

- ☐ Child Custody
☐ Venue
☐ Termination of parental rights

6. Pending and prior proceedings in this court. List the case name and docket number of all appeals or original proceedings presently or previously pending before this court which are related to this appeal:

KENNETH A. BRUNK; RICHARD D. MORITZ; BRADLEY J. BLACKETOR; TIMOTHY HADDON; MARTIN M. HALE, JR.; TREY ANDERSON; RICHARD SAWCHAK; FRANK YU; JOHN W. SHERIDAN; ROGER A NEWELL; RODNEY D. KNUTSON; NATHANIEL KLEIN, Petitioners, v. THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE NANCY L. ALLF, DISTRICT JUDGE, DEPT. 27, Respondents, and DANIEL E. WOLFUS, Real Parties in Interest. The docket number of that proceeding is 76052.

7. Pending and prior proceedings in other courts. List the case name, number and court of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts which are related to this appeal (e.g., bankruptcy, consolidated or bifurcated proceedings) and their dates of disposition:

In re Midway Gold US Inc., et al. United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Colorado Case No. 15-16835MER.

8. Nature of the action. Briefly describe the nature of the action and the result below:

While the underlying action asserted several causes of action, this appeal only involves the First Cause of Action for Securities Fraud under California Corporate Securities Law of 1968, California Corporations Code §§ 25000, et seq. Appellant, a California resident, alleged that he purchased in California 1,200,000 shares of common stock from Midway Gold Corp. on January 23 and September 19, 2014 for \$889,414.00 based on materially false and misleading facts and omissions in violation of California Corporations Code Section 25401 giving him a private right of action under Section 25501 against defendants who were officers and/or directors of Midway and liable as such under Sections 25403 and 25504. The District Court granted defendants' motions to dismiss this cause of action initially by order filed therein on June 6, 2018 and later vacated and dismissed by order filed therein on January 10, 2020, notice of entry of which was filed and served on January 13, 2020.

9. Issues on appeal. State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal (attach separate sheets as necessary):

The principal issue in this appeal is whether the District Court erred in interpreting the California Corporate Securities Law of 1968, concluding that the sale of the "security" occurred in 2009 when Appellant was granted certain employee stock options and not when he exercised certain of those options in 2014 and dismissing Appellant's First Cause of Action. Appellant relies on California Corporations Code Section 25019 which defines Midway's common shares to be "securities" under that law and Section 25017(a) which defines a "sale" to include "every contract of sale of, contract to sell, or disposition of, a security or interest in a security for value" and contends that the applicable sale occurred in 2014 when he paid Midway \$889,414 in exchange for 1,200,000 shares of Midway's common stock. Respondents contend and the District Court concluded that the applicable subsection is 25017(e) and that the exercise of a right to purchase common stock pursuant to an employee stock option is not an offer or sale.

10. Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues. If you are aware of any proceedings presently pending before this court which raises the same or similar issues raised in this appeal, list the case name and docket numbers and identify the same or similar issue raised:

None known at this time.

11. Constitutional issues. If this appeal challenges the constitutionality of a statute, and the state, any state agency, or any officer or employee thereof is not a party to this appeal, have you notified the clerk of this court and the attorney general in accordance with NRAP 44 and NRS 30.130?

☒ N/A

☐ Yes

☐ No

If not, explain:

12. Other issues. Does this appeal involve any of the following issues?

☐ Reversal of well-settled Nevada precedent (identify the case(s))

☐ An issue arising under the United States and/or Nevada Constitutions

☐ A substantial issue of first impression

☐ An issue of public policy

☐ An issue where en banc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of this court's decisions

☐ A ballot question

If so, explain:

13. Assignment to the Court of Appeals or retention in the Supreme Court. Briefly set forth whether the matter is presumptively retained by the Supreme Court or assigned to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, and cite the subparagraph(s) of the Rule under which the matter falls. If appellant believes that the Supreme Court should retain the case despite its presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals, identify the specific issue(s) or circumstance(s) that warrant retaining the case, and include an explanation of their importance or significance:

This appeal does not appear to be presumptively assigned to either court. Based upon the amounts involved and the earlier writ proceedings in the Supreme Court, Appellant believes that retention by the Supreme Court is warranted.

14. Trial. If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last? _____

Was it a bench or jury trial? _____

15. Judicial Disqualification. Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from participation in this appeal? If so, which Justice?
No.

TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

16. Date of entry of written judgment or order appealed from January 13, 2020

If no written judgment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for seeking appellate review:

17. Date written notice of entry of judgment or order was served January 13, 2020

Was service by:

☐ Delivery

☒ Mail/electronic/fax

18. If the time for filing the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion (NRCP 50(b), 52(b), or 59)

(a) Specify the type of motion, the date and method of service of the motion, and the date of filing.

☐ NRCP 50(b) Date of filing _____

☐ NRCP 52(b) Date of filing _____

☐ NRCP 59 Date of filing _____

NOTE: Motions made pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration may toll the time for filing a notice of appeal. See AA Primo Builders v. Washington, 126 Nev. ___, 245 P.3d 1190 (2010).

(b) Date of entry of written order resolving tolling motion _____

(c) Date written notice of entry of order resolving tolling motion was served _____

Was service by:

☐ Delivery

☐ Mail

19. Date notice of appeal filed February 12, 2020

If more than one party has appealed from the judgment or order, list the date each notice of appeal was filed and identify by name the party filing the notice of appeal:

20. Specify statute or rule governing the time limit for filing the notice of appeal, e.g., NRAP 4(a) or other

NRAP 4(a)(1)

SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY

21. Specify the statute or other authority granting this court jurisdiction to review the judgment or order appealed from:

(a)

☒ NRAP 3A(b)(1)

☐ NRS 38.205

☐ NRAP 3A(b)(2)

☐ NRS 233B.150

☐ NRAP 3A(b)(3)

☐ NRS 703.376

☐ Other (specify) _____

(b) Explain how each authority provides a basis for appeal from the judgment or order:

22. List all parties involved in the action or consolidated actions in the district court:

(a) Parties:

Daniel E. Wolfus; Kenneth A. Brunk; Richard D. Moritz; Bradley J. Blacketer; Timothy Haddon; Martin M. Hale, Jr.; Trey Anderson; Richard Sawchak; Frank Yu; John W. Sheridan; Roger A. Newell; Rodney D. Knutson; Nathaniel Klein; INV-MID, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company; EREF-MID II, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company; HCP-MID, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 25.

(b) If all parties in the district court are not parties to this appeal, explain in detail why those parties are not involved in this appeal, e.g., formally dismissed, not served, or other:

INV-MID, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company; EREF-MID II, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company; and HCP-MID, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company were dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction.

DOES 1 through 25 were never named or served.

23. Give a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate claims, counterclaims, cross-claims, or third-party claims and the date of formal disposition of each claim.

Appellant's Securities Fraud, Breach of Fiduciary Duty, Aiding and Abetting a Breach of Fiduciary Duty, Fraud and Negligent Misrepresentation causes of action all of which were dismissed on January 10, 2020 by Order Granting Defendants' Motions to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint.

24. Did the judgment or order appealed from adjudicate ALL the claims alleged below and the rights and liabilities of ALL the parties to the action or consolidated actions below?

☒ Yes

☐ No

25. If you answered "No" to question 24, complete the following:

(a) Specify the claims remaining pending below:

(b) Specify the parties remaining below:

(c) Did the district court certify the judgment or order appealed from as a final judgment pursuant to NRCP 54(b)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

(d) Did the district court make an express determination, pursuant to NRCP 54(b), that there is no just reason for delay and an express direction for the entry of judgment?

☐ Yes

☐ No

26. If you answered "No" to any part of question 25, explain the basis for seeking appellate review (e.g., order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)):

27. Attach file-stamped copies of the following documents:

- The latest-filed complaint, counterclaims, cross-claims, and third-party claims
- Any tolling motion(s) and order(s) resolving tolling motion(s)
- Orders of NRCP 41(a) dismissals formally resolving each claim, counterclaims, cross-claims and/or third-party claims asserted in the action or consolidated action below, even if not at issue on appeal
- Any other order challenged on appeal
- Notices of entry for each attached order

VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read this docketing statement, that the information provided in this docketing statement is true and complete to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I have attached all required documents to this docketing statement.

DANIEL E. WOLFUS


Name of appellant

March 10, 2020

Date

JAMES R. CHRISTENSEN

Name of counsel of record


Signature of counsel of record

NEVADA, CLARK COUNTY

State and county where signed


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 10th day of March, 2020, I served a copy of this completed docketing statement upon all counsel of record:

- ☐ By personally serving it upon him/her; or
- ☐ By mailing it by first class mail with sufficient postage prepaid to the following address(es): (NOTE: If all names and addresses cannot fit below, please list names below and attach a separate sheet with the addresses.)

x By E-Serve to All Parties.

Dated this 10th day of March, 2020


Signature

DOCKETING STATEMENT CIVIL APPEALS

Separate Sheet

Defendants Omitted from Caption:

TREY ANDERSON; RICHARD SAWCHAK; FRANK YU; JOHN W. SHERIDAN; ROGER A. NEWELL; RODNEY D. KNUTSON and NATHANIEL KLEIN Respondents.

Question 3. Additional Attorneys Representing Respondents:

Jason D. Smith
(702) 948-8771
Santoro Whitmire
10100 W. Charleston Boulevard, Suite 250
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
Client: Kenneth A. Brunk

Eric B. Liebman (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
Rebecca B. DeCook (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
(303) 292-2900
Maye White, LLP
1400 16th Street, 6th Floor
Denver, Colorado 80202.
Client: Kenneth A. Brunk

Mark E. Ferrario
Christopher R. Miltenberger
(702) 792-3773
Greenberg Traurig, LLP
3773 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 400 North
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169.
Clients: Martin M. Hale, Jr.; Trey Anderson and Nathaniel Klein



1 **ORDG**

2 Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779)
3 David J. Freeman, Esq. (10045)
4 HOLLAND & HART LLP
5 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
7 Tel: (702) 669-4600
8 Fax: (702) 669-4650
9 bcassity@hollandhart.com
10 dfreeman@hollandhart.com

11 Holly Stein Sollod, Esq. (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
12 HOLLAND & HART LLP
13 555 17th Street, Suite 3200
14 Denver, CO 80202
15 Tel: (303) 295-8085
16 Fax: (303) 295-8261
17 hsteinsollod@hollandhart.com

18 *Attorneys for Richard D. Moritz,*
19 *Bradley J. Blacketor, Timothy Haddon,*
20 *Richard Sawchak, John W. Sheridan,*
21 *Frank Yu, Roger A. Newell and*
22 *Rodney D. Knutson.*

23 **DISTRICT COURT**

24 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

25 DANIEL E. WOLFUS,

26 Plaintiff,

27 v.

28 KENNETH A. BRUNK; RICHARD D.
MORITZ; BRADLEY J. BLACKETOR;
TIMOTHY HADDON; MARIN M. HALE, JR.;
TREY ANDERSON; RICHARD SAWCHAK;
FRANK YU; JOHN W. SHERIDAN; ROGER
A NEWELL; RODNEY D. KNUTSON;
NATHANIEL KLEIN; INV-MID, LLC; a
Delaware Limited Liability Company; EREF-
MID II, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability
Company; HCP-MID, LLC, a Delaware Limited
Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 25.

Defendants.

CASE NO. : A-17-756971-B
DEPT. NO.: XXVII

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
MOTIONS TO DISMISS SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Electronic Filing Case

HOLLAND & HART LLP

9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor

Las Vegas, NV 89134

Phone: (702) 222-2500 ♦ Fax: (702) 669-4650

On March 16, 2018, Defendants Richard D. Moritz, Bradley J. Blacketer, Timothy Haddon, Richard Sawchak, John W. Sheridan, Frank Yu, Roger A. Newell and Rodney D. Knutson (collectively, the “D&O Defendants”) filed D&O Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint (the “Motion”), Defendants Martin M. Hale, Jr., Trey Anderson, Nathaniel Klein, INV-MID, LLC, EREF-MID II, LLC and HCP-MID, LLC (collectively, the “Hale Defendants”) Motion to Dismiss and Joinder thereto (the “Hale Joinder”) and Defendant Kenneth A. Brunk (“Brunk”) Motion to Dismiss and Joinder thereto (the “Brunk Joinder”) (collectively, the Motion, Brunk Joinder, and Hale Joinder will be referred to as “Defendants’ Motions”), wherein the D&O Defendants, Hale Defendants and Brunk (collectively, the “Defendants”) moved the Court to dismiss the Second Amended Complaint for Damages filed by Plaintiff Daniel E. Wolfus (“Wolfus” or “Plaintiff”) on February 5, 2018 (the “Second Amended Complaint” or “SAC”).

The Defendants’ Motions came before this Court for hearing on May 9, 2018 at 10:30 a.m. Robert J. Cassity, Esq. and David J. Freeman, Esq., of the law firm HOLLAND & HART LLP, appeared on behalf of the D&O Defendants. Mark E. Ferrario, Esq. and Christopher R. Miltenberger, Esq., of the law firm GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP, appeared on behalf of the Hale Defendants. Eric B. Liebman, Esq., of the law firm MOYE WHITE LLP, and Jason D. Smith, Esq., of the law firm SANTORO WHITMIRE, appeared on behalf of Brunk. James R. Christensen, Esq., of the law firm JAMES R. CHRISTENSEN PC, and Samuel T. Rees, Esq. appeared on behalf of Plaintiff.

On June 6, 2018, the Court entered an Order Regarding Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss. On June 12, 2018, Defendants filed a Petition for Writ of Prohibition or, Alternatively, Mandamus (the “Writ Petition”) with the Nevada Supreme Court, which was assigned Case No. 76052. In the Writ Petition, Defendants challenged the Court’s Order Regarding Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss. On July 26, 2018, the Nevada Supreme Court issued an Order Directing an Answer to the Writ Petition. On September 26, 2018, Plaintiff filed an Answer to the Writ Petition. On October 29, 2018, Defendants filed a Reply in Support of the Writ Petition. On April 2, 2019, the Nevada Supreme Court, sitting *en banc*, held oral argument on Defendants’

1 Writ Petition. On October 11, 2019, the Nevada Supreme Court issued an Order Granting
2 Petition for Writ of Prohibition, and the Supreme Court issued a Writ of Prohibition, instructing
3 this Court to vacate its Order Regarding Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and to enter an order
4 granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss. A Notice of Lieu of Remittitur was issued on
5 November 5, 2019.

6 The Court having carefully considered the D&O Defendants' Motion, Hale Joinder, Brunk
7 Joinder, Plaintiff's Consolidated Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to
8 Motions to Dismiss, the Defendants' respective reply briefs filed in support of the Motion,
9 together with all declarations filed in support of and opposition to the Motion and Joinders,
10 including the exhibits to the declarations, the oral argument of counsel presented at the hearing
11 on this matter, and having reviewed the Nevada Supreme Court's Order Granting Petition for
12 Writ of Prohibition, having been served with the Writ of Prohibition, and in accordance with the
13 requirements of the Writ of Prohibition, issues the following Order Granting Defendants' Motions
14 to Dismiss:

15 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

16 1. Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway") was a publicly traded Canadian Corporation
17 incorporated under the Company Act of British Columbia, with its principal executive offices
18 located in Englewood, Colorado. *See* Pl.'s Second Am. Compl. ("SAC") ¶ 23.

19 2. Midway was engaged in the business of exploring and mining gold, primarily from
20 mines located in Nevada and Washington (*see id.* ¶¶ 24, 30), including the Pan Mine located at
21 the northern end of the Pancake mountain range in Western Pine County, Nevada (*see id.* ¶ 32).

22 3. Defendants are alleged to be former directors, officers and/or controlling persons
23 of Midway. SAC ¶¶ 8-20.

24 4. Defendants INV-MID, LLC, EREF-MID II, LLC, and HCP-MID, LLC are each
25 Delaware limited liability corporations with their principal places of business in New York. SAC
26 ¶ 20.

1 5. Plaintiff, a California resident, became an outside director of Midway in
2 November 2008 and began purchasing Midway common stock in the open market in February
3 2008. *Id.* ¶¶ 7, 26 and 29.

4 6. In 2009, Plaintiff became Chairman of the Board and the Chief Executive Officer
5 of Midway, serving in both capacities until May 18, 2012 when he was replaced by Brunk. *Id.* ¶
6 27.

7 7. Plaintiff also received stock option grants pursuant to Midway's qualified
8 employee stock option plan on January 7, 2009 and September 10, 2009. *See* Mot. Exs. H, I.

9 8. At the time Plaintiff became Chairman of the Board and CEO, Midway had
10 properties in the exploratory stage where gold mineralization had been identified (*see* SAC ¶ 30),
11 including the Pan Mine (*see id.* ¶ 32).

12 9. Prior to May 2010, Midway made the decision to convert from a purely exploration
13 company into a gold mining production company using the Pan Mine as its initial production
14 mine. *Id.* ¶ 35.

15 10. In late 2011, when Plaintiff was still Midway's Chairman and CEO, an
16 independent contractor, Gustavson Associates, completed a feasibility study on the Pan Mine,
17 which predicted over 1 million ounces of gold existed at the mine, and could be commercially
18 mined (the "2011 Pan Mine Study"). *Id.* ¶ 44; *Id.* Ex. 1 at 9.

19 11. Midway disclosed the study to the public in December 2011 (*see id.* ¶ 45), and
20 stated it was converting to a production company to bring the Pan Mine online as a profitable
21 revenue stream.

22 12. Plaintiff alleges that, by either mid or late 2013, Midway's management and its
23 board (including the D&O Defendants) knew the Pan Mine was being built and operated in ways
24 that were materially different from those assumed in the 2011 Pan Mine Study, but the Defendants
25 did not inform investors of the material impact on cash flows as a result of those differences. *Id.*
26 ¶ 65.

27 13. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges the Defendants failed to disclose that Midway (a)
28 was unable to raise sufficient cash to complete the Pan Mine project in the manner set forth in the

2011 Pan Mine Study, as well as fund on-going operations until the Pan Mine project produced sufficient revenues to cover these expenses, and (b) did not seek the proper permits and did not have the necessary facilities to process the gold solution once leaching was completed, and there would be a considerable delay before the facilities were constructed and permitted for operations. *Id.* ¶¶ 65, 86.

14. On January 23, 2014, Plaintiff exercised stock options to acquire 200,000 shares at \$0.56/share for \$112,000 Canadian Dollars (\$100,636 USD). *Id.* ¶ 69.

15. On September 19, 2014, Plaintiff exercised his stock option to acquire 1,000,000 shares at \$0.86/share for \$860,000 Canadian Dollars (\$783,778 USD). Plaintiff's acquisition of shares was also a result of his exercising certain of his qualified employee stock options. *Id.* ¶¶ 87, 88, 89.

16. Plaintiff has asserted claims against Defendants arising out of the Defendants' alleged failure to disclose certain facts regarding the progress (or lack thereof) of the Pan Mine project prior to Plaintiff's stock option exercises in 2014.

17. Plaintiff alleges that had he known these undisclosed facts, he would not have exercised his stock options in either January 2014 or September 2014. Plaintiff also alleges that he and his family were induced to hold their stock when, had they known the material facts, they would have sold their stock when Midway's stock price reached its peak on February 28, 2014. *See* SAC ¶¶ 106, 111, 114, 117, 124, 130, 131, 144-145.

18. Plaintiff alleged that he relied on these allegedly misleading statements in exercising his stock options, which were subsequently rendered worthless by Midway's bankruptcy. *See* SAC ¶¶ 95-96.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

19. When a plaintiff fails to "state a claim upon which relief can be granted," the Court must dismiss the claim upon motion under NRCP 12(b)(5). "In considering a motion to dismiss pursuant to NRCP 12(b)(5) the court accepts a plaintiff's factual allegations as true, but the allegations must be legally sufficient to constitute the elements of the claims asserted." *Sanchez ex rel. Sanchez v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 125 Nev. 818, 823, 221 P.3d 1276, 1280 (2009) (citation

1 omitted). “To survive dismissal, a complaint must contain some ‘set of facts, which, if true, would
2 entitle the plaintiff to relief.’” *In re Amerco Derivative Litig.*, 127 Nev. 196, 211, 252 P.3d 681,
3 692 (2011) (citation omitted). “Dismissal is proper where the allegations are insufficient to
4 establish the elements of a claim for relief.” *Stockmeier v. Nevada Dep’t of Corr.*, 124 Nev. 313,
5 316, 183 P.3d 133, 135 (2008) (citations omitted).

6 20. Plaintiff’s first cause of action is for Securities Fraud under the California
7 Corporate Securities Act. Cal. Corp. Code § 25401 provides: “It is unlawful for any person to
8 offer or sell a security in this state, or to buy or offer to buy a security in this state, by means of
9 any written or oral communication that includes an untrue statement of a material fact or omits to
10 state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances
11 under which the statements were made, not misleading.”

12 21. Cal. Corp. Code § 25017(a) provides: “Sale or sell includes every contract of sale
13 of, contract to sell, or disposition of, a security or interest in a security for value. Sale or sell
14 includes any exchange of securities and any change in the rights, preferences, privileges, or
15 restrictions of or on outstanding securities.”

16 22. Further, Cal. Corp. Code § 25017(e) provides: “Every sale or offer of a warrant or
17 right to purchase or subscribe to another security of the same or another issuer, as well as every
18 sale or offer of a security which gives the holder a present or future right or privilege to convert
19 the security into another security of the same or another issuer, includes an offer and sale of the
20 other security only at the time of the offer or sale of the warrant or right or convertible security;
21 but neither the exercise of the right to purchase or subscribe or to convert nor the issuance of
22 securities pursuant thereto is an offer or sale.”

23 23. After review of the plain language of Cal. Corp. Code § 25017(e), the Court
24 concludes that neither the exercise of the right to purchase shares nor the issuance of securities
25 pursuant thereto is an offer or sale. The sale or offer is deemed to occur at the time of the offer
26 or sale of the right to purchase the share.

1 24. Although Plaintiff contends this provision relates to stock warrants, stock warrants
2 are listed separately from rights to purchase and is separated by the word “or,” implying that the
3 provision applies to both warrants and rights to purchase shares.

4 25. Plaintiff claims the alleged misrepresentations, namely the 2013 and 2014 Material
5 Facts impose liability on Defendants under Cal. Corp. Code § 25401 for the alleged misleading
6 sale. However, the application of Cal. Corp. Code § 25017(e) indicates that the sale occurred in
7 2009 when the stock options were issued, and there are no allegations that the sale in 2009 was
8 based upon any untrue statement of a material fact or an omission of the same. Accordingly, the
9 California Securities Fraud cause of action fails as a matter of law and is subject to dismissal with
10 prejudice as to all Defendants.

11 26. With regard to Plaintiffs’ claims, “[t]he question whether a suit is derivative by
12 nature or may be brought by a shareholder in his own right is governed by the law of the state of
13 incorporation” *Kennedy v. Venrock Assocs.*, 348 F.3d 584, 589-90 (7th Cir. 2003); *see also*
14 *Kepley v. Lanz*, 715 F.3d 969, 972-73 (6th Cir. 2013).

15 27. As Midway Gold is a British Columbian corporation, the test British Columbian
16 courts apply when evaluating whether a claim is direct or derivative is whether “the gravamen of
17 the cause of action alleged [arises] as a result of wrongs done to the company. . . . If the damage
18 that flows is a direct result of the wrongs done to the company, then those damages can only be
19 claimed by the company.” *Robak Indus. Ltd. v. Gardner*, 2006 CarswellBC 2533, para. 5 (Can.
20 B.C.S.C.) (WL).

21 28. In making this determination, the courts in that jurisdiction examine “the nature of
22 the damages suffered as alleged in the pleadings.” *Id.* at para. 13; *see also Luft v. Ball*, 2013
23 CarswellBC 820, para. 34 (Can. B.C.S.C.) (WL) (“In order for a complaining shareholder to
24 maintain a personal action for breach of duties owed to the company, that shareholder must show
25 that he or she has suffered damage or loss in a manner distinct from other shareholders.”).

26 29. The Nevada Supreme Court recently adopted Delaware’s “direct harm” test for
27 distinguishing between derivative and direct shareholder claims in *Parametric Sound*, 133 Nev.
28 at 427, 401 P.3d at 1108. In order to determine whether a shareholder claim is direct or derivative,

1 the court must consider: “(1) who suffered the alleged harm (the corporation or the suing
2 stockholders, individually); and (2) who would receive the benefit of any recovery or other
3 remedy (the corporation or the stockholders, individually)?” *Id.* (quoting *Tooley*, 845 A.2d at
4 1033).

5 30. Pursuant to the direct harm test, the relevant inquiry in addressing who suffered
6 the alleged harm is: “Looking at the body of the complaint and considering the nature of the
7 wrong alleged and the relief requested, has the plaintiff demonstrated that he or she can prevail
8 without showing an injury to the corporation. *Parametric Sound*, 133 Nev. at 426, 401 P.3d at
9 1107-08 (quoting *Tooley*, 845 A.2d at 1036). Applying the direct harm test as set forth in
10 *Parametric Sound*, Wolfus’s fiduciary duty claims are derivative because he has not demonstrated
11 a harm that is independent of the injury to Midway as a corporation.

12 31. The gravamen of Wolfus’s Second Amended Complaint is the Directors’ alleged
13 mismanagement of Midway, specifically, mismanagement in the form of failing to secure
14 sufficient capital for the Pan project, deciding not to sell assets to create necessary capital, and
15 purportedly allowing a certain Director to “tak[e] effective control of Midway and the Pan project
16 even though” Wolfus contends that Director “lacked the ability to manage the Pan project.”
17 Wolfus also alleges the Directors failed to appropriately employ supervisory staff for the Pan
18 project, which delayed production. Further, Wolfus alleges the Pan project failed because the
19 Directors, rather than cut costs to purchase necessary equipment, “decided not to purchase this
20 necessary equipment” and instead purchased equipment for which the company had not secured
21 the appropriate permits. These alleged acts of mismanagement and imprudent investment
22 decisions impaired or prevented what Wolfus describes in his Second Amended Complaint as the
23 “two major events” required for the Pan project to succeed: Midway securing necessary permits
24 and securing necessary financing for the project. SAC ¶ 46.

25 32. The Court concludes, based on the body of his Second Amended Complaint and
26 the nature of his claims, that Wolfus’s breach of fiduciary duty claims describe a derivative action
27 based on the Directors’ alleged mismanagement of Midway. His Second Amended Complaint
28 merely reflects an unavailing attempt to characterize the derivative claim as a direct claim

1 personal to him. Such an effort does not alter the nature of his claims. *See Kramer v. W. Pac.*
2 *Indus., Inc.*, 546 A.2d 348, 352-53 (Del. 1988) (holding that where the gravamen of a
3 stockholder's complaint is director mismanagement, the cause of action is derivative in nature).
4 Notwithstanding his attempt to characterize his claims as direct, the essence of Wolfus's claims
5 allege harm to Midway from which injury resulted indirectly to each of Midway's shareholders.
6 Accordingly, Wolfus's breach of fiduciary duty claims are derivative and he lacks standing to
7 pursue them.

8 33. Wolfus argues that California common law, as set forth in *Small v. Fritz Cos.*, 65
9 P.3d 1255 (Cal. 2003), permits him to assert claims for fraud and negligent misrepresentation
10 directly. Regardless of how Wolfus purports to characterize these claims, however, he has simply
11 repackaged his fiduciary duty claims under different labels. Here, Wolfus attempts to frame his
12 cause of action as one for fraud and negligent misrepresentation, but the claims are based on what
13 the Directors purportedly should have disclosed about their management of Midway. The
14 underlying nature of Wolfus's fraud and negligent misrepresentation claims are derivative as they
15 are dependent on alleged injuries to Midway.

16 34. Wolfus's Second Amended Complaint alleges that, had he known of the
17 purportedly undisclosed facts the Directors withheld, Wolfus "would have sold all of his Midway
18 shares . . . in February 2014 when Midway's stock price began to fall from its peak." The nature
19 of the harm alleged here cannot be understood apart from the decline in Midway's stock value
20 which ostensibly resulted from the Directors' purported mismanagement. The decline in
21 Midway's stock value did not result from any misrepresentation or omission, but from the
22 Directors' alleged failure to successfully manage the Pan project. Generally, such an allegation
23 will sustain a derivative action, not an action for direct injury to the shareholder. *See, e.g., Rivers*
24 *v. Wachovia Corp.*, 665 F.3d 610, 614-15 (4th Cir. 2011) ("The well-established general rule is
25 that shareholders cannot pursue individual causes of action against third parties for wrongs or
26 injuries to the corporation that result in the diminution or destruction of the value of their stock."
27 (internal quotation marks omitted); *Smith v. Waste Mgmt., Inc.*, 407 F.3d 381, 384-85 (5th Cir.
28 2005) (concluding a shareholder's claims for fraud and negligent misrepresentation were

1 derivative because alleged corporate misrepresentations that “caus[e] a decline in the company’s
2 share price when the truth is revealed,” injure the corporation directly and the shareholders only
3 indirectly.); *Pareto v. FDIC*, 139 F.3d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1998) (concluding a shareholder’s
4 allegations of breach of fiduciary duty and corporate mismanagement “describe[d] a direct injury
5 to the bank, not the individual stockholders,” and allegations of “depreciation of stock value
6 [were] an indirect result of the injury to [the bank] which resulted in its closure”).

7 35. Even if the Court were to entertain Wolfus’s argument that his claims for fraud
8 and misrepresentation allege direct harm personal to him, his pleading would be inadequate
9 pursuant to the very authority upon which he relies, specifically, the decision in *Small v. Fritz*
10 *Cos.*, 65 P.3d 1255, 1265 (Cal. 2003).

11 36. Having determined that Wolfus’s claims against the Directors are derivative in
12 nature, as allegations of mismanagement which harmed Midway directly, the Court concludes the
13 law of British Columbia, where Midway was incorporated, controls Wolfus’s claims. *Vaughn v.*
14 *Le nnt’l, Inc.*, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 166, 175 (Ct. App. 2009) (“Under the internal affairs doctrine, the
15 rights of shareholders in a foreign company, including the right to sue derivatively, are determined
16 by the law of the place where the company is incorporated.” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

17 37. British Columbia law requires a corporate shareholder to apply for leave of the
18 court of that jurisdiction before filing a derivative action, and requires the shareholder to provide
19 notice of such application to the company and demand that the directors take remedial action prior
20 to commencement of the suit. Business Corporations Act, R.S.B.C. 2002, c. 57 §§ 232(2)(a) &
21 233(1)(a)-(b). The failure to obtain leave of court is fatal under British Columbia common law.
22 *Bruneau v. Irwin Indus. (1978) Ltd.*, 2002 CarswellIBC 1107, para. 19 (Can. B.C.S.C.) (WL)
23 (“[W]here an action [is] in fact a derivative action but commenced without leave, the appropriate
24 remedy [is] to strike it as disclosing no reasonable claim.”).

25 38. Wolfus concedes that if his claims are derivative, they are also subject to an
26 effective pre-suit demand requirement which he failed to satisfy. Failure to comply with such a
27 requirement is equally fatal to his complaint. *Vaughn*, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 171-72 (holding a pre-
28

1 suit demand requirement imposed by the British Virgin Islands Business Companies Act of 2004
2 imposed a substantive requirement determining whether a shareholder had standing to sue).

3 39. Wolfus also lacks standing to pursue derivative claims on behalf of Midway as a
4 result of Midway's bankruptcy, over which the estate's trustee has exclusive standing to litigate.
5 11 U.S.C. §§ 323, 541; *Estate of Spirtos v. One San Bernardino Cty. Superior Court Case No.*
6 *SPR 02211*, 443 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2006) ("The bankruptcy code endows the bankruptcy
7 trustee with the exclusive right to sue on behalf of the estate."); *Delgado Oil Co. v. Torres*, 785
8 F.2d 857, 860 (10th Cir. 1986) (explaining that the bankruptcy estate of a corporate debtor
9 includes any derivative right of action the corporation may have to recover damages for
10 misconduct, mismanagement, or neglect of duty by a corporate officer or director).

11 **ORDER**

12 Based on the foregoing, and good cause appearing,

13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Court's Order Regarding Defendants' Motion to
14 Dismiss dated June 6, 2018 is VACATED;

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
16 Claim for Securities Fraud, which is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
18 Claim for Breach of Fiduciary Duty, which is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
20 Claim for Aiding and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty, which is hereby DISMISSED with
21 prejudice.

22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
23 Claim for Fraud, which is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89134
Phone: (702) 222-2500 ♦ Fax: (702) 669-4650

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
2 Claim for Negligent Misrepresentation, which is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED this 9 day of ^{Jan 2020} ~~December~~ 2019.

5
6 Nancy L. Alf
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE


7 Respectfully submitted by:
8

9 Robert J. Cassity
10 Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779)
11 David J. Freeman, Esq. (10045)
12 HOLLAND & HART LLP
13 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

14 Holly Stein Sollod, Esq. (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
15 HOLLAND & HART LLP
16 555 17th Street, Suite 3200
Denver, CO 80202

17 *Attorneys for Richard D. Moritz,*
18 *Bradley J. Blacketor, Timothy Haddon,*
19 *Richard Sawchak, John W. Sheridan,*
Frank Yu, Roger A. Newell and
Rodney D. Knutson

20 I3844471_v1
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



1 **NEOJ**

2 Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779)
3 David J. Freeman, Esq. (10045)
4 HOLLAND & HART LLP
5 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
7 Tel: (702) 669-4600
8 Fax: (702) 669-4650
9 bcassity@hollandhart.com
10 dfreeman@hollandhart.com

11 Holly Stein. Sollod, Esq. (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
12 HOLLAND & HART LLP
13 555 17th Street, Suite 3200
14 Denver, CO 80202
15 Tel: (303) 295-8085
16 Fax: (303) 295-8261
17 hsteinsollod@hollandhart.com

18 *Attorneys for Richard D. Moritz,*
19 *Bradley J. Blacketor, Timothy Haddon,*
20 *Richard Sawchak, John W. Sheridan,*
21 *Frank Yu, Roger A. Newell and*
22 *Rodney D. Knutson.*

23 **DISTRICT COURT**

24 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

25 DANIEL E. WOLFUS, ,

26 Plaintiff,

27 v.

28 KENNETH A. BRUNK; RICHARD D.
MORITZ; BRADLEY J. BLACKETOR;
TIMOTHY HADDON; MARIN M. HALE, JR.;
TREY ANDERSON; RICHARD SAWCHAK;
FRANK YU; JOHN W. SHERIDAN; ROGER
A NEWELL; RODNEY D. KNUTSON;
NATHANIEL KLEIN; INV-MID, LLC; a
Delaware Limited Liability Company; EREF-
MID II, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability
Company; HCP-MID, LLC, a Delaware Limited
Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 25.

Defendants.

CASE NO. : A-17-756971-B
DEPT. NO.: XXVII

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER
GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS
TO DISMISS SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

HOLLAND & HART LLP

9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89134

Phone: (702) 222-2500 ♦ Fax: (702) 669-4650

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an Order Granting Defendants' Motions to Dismiss
Second Amended Complaint was entered on the 10th day of January 2020. A copy is attached.

DATED this 13th day of January 2020.

By /s/ Robert J. Cassity

Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779)
David J. Freeman, Esq. (10045)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Holly Stein. Sollod, Esq.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 17th Street, Suite 3200
Denver, CO 80202

*Attorneys for Richard D. Moritz,
Bradley J. Blacketor, Timothy Haddon,
Richard Sawchak, John W. Sheridan,
Frank Yu, Roger A. Newell and
Rodney D. Knutson.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 13th day of January 2020, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS TO DISMISS SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT** was served by the following method(s):

☒ **Electronic:** by submitting electronically for filing and/or service with the Eighth Judicial District Court's Odyssey eFileNV Electronic Filing system and serving all parties with an email address on record, as indicated below, pursuant to Administrative Order 14-2 and Rule 9 of the N.E.F.C.R. That date and time of the electronic proof of service in place of the date and place of deposit in the U.S. Mail.

James R. Christensen, Esq.
JAMES R. CHRISTENSEN PC
601 S. 6th St.
Las Vegas, NV 89101
jim@jchristensenlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Mark E. Ferrario, Esq.
Christopher Miltenberger, Esq.
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
10845 Griffith Peak Drive, Ste 600
Las Vegas, NV 89135
ferrariom@gtlaw.com
miltenbergerc@gtlaw.com

*Attorneys for Martin M. Hale, Jr. Trey
Anderson, Nathaniel Klein, INV-MID, LLC,
EREF-MID II, LLC, and HCP-MID, LLC*

Jason D. Smith, Esq.
SANTORO WHIMIRE
10100 W. Charleston Blvd., #250
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
Email: jsmith@santoronevada.com


Attorneys for Kenneth A. Brunk

☒ **U.S. Mail:** by depositing same in the United States mail, first class postage fully prepaid to the persons and addresses listed below:

Eric B. Liebman, Esq.
Rebecca DeCook, Esq.
MOYE WHITE LLP
16 Market Square, 6th Floor
1400 16th Street
Denver, CO 80202

Attorneys for Kenneth A. Brunk

/s/ Valerie Larsen
An Employee of Holland & Hart LLP



1 **ORDG**

2 Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779)
3 David J. Freeman, Esq. (10045)
4 HOLLAND & HART LLP
5 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
7 Tel: (702) 669-4600
8 Fax: (702) 669-4650
9 bcassity@hollandhart.com
10 dfreeman@hollandhart.com

11 Holly Stein Sollod, Esq. (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
12 HOLLAND & HART LLP
13 555 17th Street, Suite 3200
14 Denver, CO 80202
15 Tel: (303) 295-8085
16 Fax: (303) 295-8261
17 hsteinsollod@hollandhart.com

18 *Attorneys for Richard D. Moritz,*
19 *Bradley J. Blacketor, Timothy Haddon,*
20 *Richard Sawchak, John W. Sheridan,*
21 *Frank Yu, Roger A. Newell and*
22 *Rodney D. Knutson.*

23 **DISTRICT COURT**

24 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

25 DANIEL E. WOLFUS,

26 Plaintiff,

27 v.

28 KENNETH A. BRUNK; RICHARD D.
MORITZ; BRADLEY J. BLACKETOR;
TIMOTHY HADDON; MARIN M. HALE, JR.;
TREY ANDERSON; RICHARD SAWCHAK;
FRANK YU; JOHN W. SHERIDAN; ROGER
A NEWELL; RODNEY D. KNUTSON;
NATHANIEL KLEIN; INV-MID, LLC; a
Delaware Limited Liability Company; EREF-
MID II, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability
Company; HCP-MID, LLC, a Delaware Limited
Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 25.

Defendants.

CASE NO. : A-17-756971-B
DEPT. NO.: XXVII

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
MOTIONS TO DISMISS SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Electronic Filing Case

On March 16, 2018, Defendants Richard D. Moritz, Bradley J. Blacketor, Timothy Haddon, Richard Sawchak, John W. Sheridan, Frank Yu, Roger A. Newell and Rodney D. Knutson (collectively, the “D&O Defendants”) filed D&O Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint (the “Motion”), Defendants Martin M. Hale, Jr., Trey Anderson, Nathaniel Klein, INV-MID, LLC, EREF-MID II, LLC and HCP-MID, LLC (collectively, the “Hale Defendants”) Motion to Dismiss and Joinder thereto (the “Hale Joinder”) and Defendant Kenneth A. Brunk (“Brunk”) Motion to Dismiss and Joinder thereto (the “Brunk Joinder”) (collectively, the Motion, Brunk Joinder, and Hale Joinder will be referred to as “Defendants’ Motions”), wherein the D&O Defendants, Hale Defendants and Brunk (collectively, the “Defendants”) moved the Court to dismiss the Second Amended Complaint for Damages filed by Plaintiff Daniel E. Wolfus (“Wolfus” or “Plaintiff”) on February 5, 2018 (the “Second Amended Complaint” or “SAC”).

The Defendants’ Motions came before this Court for hearing on May 9, 2018 at 10:30 a.m. Robert J. Cassity, Esq. and David J. Freeman, Esq., of the law firm HOLLAND & HART LLP, appeared on behalf of the D&O Defendants. Mark E. Ferrario, Esq. and Christopher R. Miltenberger, Esq., of the law firm GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP, appeared on behalf of the Hale Defendants. Eric B. Liebman, Esq., of the law firm MOYE WHITE LLP, and Jason D. Smith, Esq., of the law firm SANTORO WHITMIRE, appeared on behalf of Brunk. James R. Christensen, Esq., of the law firm JAMES R. CHRISTENSEN PC, and Samuel T. Rees, Esq. appeared on behalf of Plaintiff.

On June 6, 2018, the Court entered an Order Regarding Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss. On June 12, 2018, Defendants filed a Petition for Writ of Prohibition or, Alternatively, Mandamus (the “Writ Petition”) with the Nevada Supreme Court, which was assigned Case No. 76052. In the Writ Petition, Defendants challenged the Court’s Order Regarding Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss. On July 26, 2018, the Nevada Supreme Court issued an Order Directing an Answer to the Writ Petition. On September 26, 2018, Plaintiff filed an Answer to the Writ Petition. On October 29, 2018, Defendants filed a Reply in Support of the Writ Petition. On April 2, 2019, the Nevada Supreme Court, sitting *en banc*, held oral argument on Defendants’

1 Writ Petition. On October 11, 2019, the Nevada Supreme Court issued an Order Granting
2 Petition for Writ of Prohibition, and the Supreme Court issued a Writ of Prohibition, instructing
3 this Court to vacate its Order Regarding Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and to enter an order
4 granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss. A Notice of Lieu of Remittitur was issued on
5 November 5, 2019.

6 The Court having carefully considered the D&O Defendants' Motion, Hale Joinder, Brunk
7 Joinder, Plaintiff's Consolidated Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to
8 Motions to Dismiss, the Defendants' respective reply briefs filed in support of the Motion,
9 together with all declarations filed in support of and opposition to the Motion and Joinders,
10 including the exhibits to the declarations, the oral argument of counsel presented at the hearing
11 on this matter, and having reviewed the Nevada Supreme Court's Order Granting Petition for
12 Writ of Prohibition, having been served with the Writ of Prohibition, and in accordance with the
13 requirements of the Writ of Prohibition, issues the following Order Granting Defendants' Motions
14 to Dismiss:

15 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

16 1. Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway") was a publicly traded Canadian Corporation
17 incorporated under the Company Act of British Columbia, with its principal executive offices
18 located in Englewood, Colorado. *See* Pl.'s Second Am. Compl. ("SAC") ¶ 23.

19 2. Midway was engaged in the business of exploring and mining gold, primarily from
20 mines located in Nevada and Washington (*see id.* ¶¶ 24, 30), including the Pan Mine located at
21 the northern end of the Pancake mountain range in Western Pine County, Nevada (*see id.* ¶ 32).

22 3. Defendants are alleged to be former directors, officers and/or controlling persons
23 of Midway. SAC ¶¶ 8-20.

24 4. Defendants INV-MID, LLC, EREF-MID II, LLC, and HCP-MID, LLC are each
25 Delaware limited liability corporations with their principal places of business in New York. SAC
26 ¶ 20.

1 5. Plaintiff, a California resident, became an outside director of Midway in
2 November 2008 and began purchasing Midway common stock in the open market in February
3 2008. *Id.* ¶¶ 7, 26 and 29.

4 6. In 2009, Plaintiff became Chairman of the Board and the Chief Executive Officer
5 of Midway, serving in both capacities until May 18, 2012 when he was replaced by Brunk. *Id.* ¶
6 27.

7 7. Plaintiff also received stock option grants pursuant to Midway's qualified
8 employee stock option plan on January 7, 2009 and September 10, 2009. *See* Mot. Exs. H, I.

9 8. At the time Plaintiff became Chairman of the Board and CEO, Midway had
10 properties in the exploratory stage where gold mineralization had been identified (*see* SAC ¶ 30),
11 including the Pan Mine (*see id.* ¶ 32).

12 9. Prior to May 2010, Midway made the decision to convert from a purely exploration
13 company into a gold mining production company using the Pan Mine as its initial production
14 mine. *Id.* ¶ 35.

15 10. In late 2011, when Plaintiff was still Midway's Chairman and CEO, an
16 independent contractor, Gustavson Associates, completed a feasibility study on the Pan Mine,
17 which predicted over 1 million ounces of gold existed at the mine, and could be commercially
18 mined (the "2011 Pan Mine Study"). *Id.* ¶ 44; *Id.* Ex. 1 at 9.

19 11. Midway disclosed the study to the public in December 2011 (*see id.* ¶ 45), and
20 stated it was converting to a production company to bring the Pan Mine online as a profitable
21 revenue stream.

22 12. Plaintiff alleges that, by either mid or late 2013, Midway's management and its
23 board (including the D&O Defendants) knew the Pan Mine was being built and operated in ways
24 that were materially different from those assumed in the 2011 Pan Mine Study, but the Defendants
25 did not inform investors of the material impact on cash flows as a result of those differences. *Id.*
26 ¶ 65.

27 13. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges the Defendants failed to disclose that Midway (a)
28 was unable to raise sufficient cash to complete the Pan Mine project in the manner set forth in the

2011 Pan Mine Study, as well as fund on-going operations until the Pan Mine project produced sufficient revenues to cover these expenses, and (b) did not seek the proper permits and did not have the necessary facilities to process the gold solution once leaching was completed, and there would be a considerable delay before the facilities were constructed and permitted for operations. *Id.* ¶¶ 65, 86.

14. On January 23, 2014, Plaintiff exercised stock options to acquire 200,000 shares at \$0.56/share for \$112,000 Canadian Dollars (\$100,636 USD). *Id.* ¶ 69.

15. On September 19, 2014, Plaintiff exercised his stock option to acquire 1,000,000 shares at \$0.86/share for \$860,000 Canadian Dollars (\$783,778 USD). Plaintiff's acquisition of shares was also a result of his exercising certain of his qualified employee stock options. *Id.* ¶¶ 87, 88, 89.

16. Plaintiff has asserted claims against Defendants arising out of the Defendants' alleged failure to disclose certain facts regarding the progress (or lack thereof) of the Pan Mine project prior to Plaintiff's stock option exercises in 2014.

17. Plaintiff alleges that had he known these undisclosed facts, he would not have exercised his stock options in either January 2014 or September 2014. Plaintiff also alleges that he and his family were induced to hold their stock when, had they known the material facts, they would have sold their stock when Midway's stock price reached its peak on February 28, 2014. *See* SAC ¶¶ 106, 111, 114, 117, 124, 130, 131, 144-145.

18. Plaintiff alleged that he relied on these allegedly misleading statements in exercising his stock options, which were subsequently rendered worthless by Midway's bankruptcy. *See* SAC ¶¶ 95-96.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

19. When a plaintiff fails to "state a claim upon which relief can be granted," the Court must dismiss the claim upon motion under NRCP 12(b)(5). "In considering a motion to dismiss pursuant to NRCP 12(b)(5) the court accepts a plaintiff's factual allegations as true, but the allegations must be legally sufficient to constitute the elements of the claims asserted." *Sanchez ex rel. Sanchez v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 125 Nev. 818, 823, 221 P.3d 1276, 1280 (2009) (citation

1 omitted). “To survive dismissal, a complaint must contain some ‘set of facts, which, if true, would
2 entitle the plaintiff to relief.’” *In re Amerco Derivative Litig.*, 127 Nev. 196, 211, 252 P.3d 681,
3 692 (2011) (citation omitted). “Dismissal is proper where the allegations are insufficient to
4 establish the elements of a claim for relief.” *Stockmeier v. Nevada Dep’t of Corr.*, 124 Nev. 313,
5 316, 183 P.3d 133, 135 (2008) (citations omitted).

6 20. Plaintiff’s first cause of action is for Securities Fraud under the California
7 Corporate Securities Act. Cal. Corp. Code § 25401 provides: “It is unlawful for any person to
8 offer or sell a security in this state, or to buy or offer to buy a security in this state, by means of
9 any written or oral communication that includes an untrue statement of a material fact or omits to
10 state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances
11 under which the statements were made, not misleading.”

12 21. Cal. Corp. Code § 25017(a) provides: “Sale or sell includes every contract of sale
13 of, contract to sell, or disposition of, a security or interest in a security for value. Sale or sell
14 includes any exchange of securities and any change in the rights, preferences, privileges, or
15 restrictions of or on outstanding securities.”

16 22. Further, Cal. Corp. Code § 25017(e) provides: “Every sale or offer of a warrant or
17 right to purchase or subscribe to another security of the same or another issuer, as well as every
18 sale or offer of a security which gives the holder a present or future right or privilege to convert
19 the security into another security of the same or another issuer, includes an offer and sale of the
20 other security only at the time of the offer or sale of the warrant or right or convertible security;
21 but neither the exercise of the right to purchase or subscribe or to convert nor the issuance of
22 securities pursuant thereto is an offer or sale.”

23 23. After review of the plain language of Cal. Corp. Code § 25017(e), the Court
24 concludes that neither the exercise of the right to purchase shares nor the issuance of securities
25 pursuant thereto is an offer or sale. The sale or offer is deemed to occur at the time of the offer
26 or sale of the right to purchase the share.

1 24. Although Plaintiff contends this provision relates to stock warrants, stock warrants
2 are listed separately from rights to purchase and is separated by the word “or,” implying that the
3 provision applies to both warrants and rights to purchase shares.

4 25. Plaintiff claims the alleged misrepresentations, namely the 2013 and 2014 Material
5 Facts impose liability on Defendants under Cal. Corp. Code § 25401 for the alleged misleading
6 sale. However, the application of Cal. Corp. Code § 25017(e) indicates that the sale occurred in
7 2009 when the stock options were issued, and there are no allegations that the sale in 2009 was
8 based upon any untrue statement of a material fact or an omission of the same. Accordingly, the
9 California Securities Fraud cause of action fails as a matter of law and is subject to dismissal with
10 prejudice as to all Defendants.

11 26. With regard to Plaintiffs’ claims, “[t]he question whether a suit is derivative by
12 nature or may be brought by a shareholder in his own right is governed by the law of the state of
13 incorporation” *Kennedy v. Venrock Assocs.*, 348 F.3d 584, 589-90 (7th Cir. 2003); *see also*
14 *Kepley v. Lanz*, 715 F.3d 969, 972-73 (6th Cir. 2013).

15 27. As Midway Gold is a British Columbian corporation, the test British Columbian
16 courts apply when evaluating whether a claim is direct or derivative is whether “the gravamen of
17 the cause of action alleged [arises] as a result of wrongs done to the company. . . . If the damage
18 that flows is a direct result of the wrongs done to the company, then those damages can only be
19 claimed by the company.” *Robak Indus. Ltd. v. Gardner*, 2006 CarswellBC 2533, para. 5 (Can.
20 B.C.S.C.) (WL).

21 28. In making this determination, the courts in that jurisdiction examine “the nature of
22 the damages suffered as alleged in the pleadings.” *Id.* at para. 13; *see also Luft v. Ball*, 2013
23 CarswellBC 820, para. 34 (Can. B.C.S.C.) (WL) (“In order for a complaining shareholder to
24 maintain a personal action for breach of duties owed to the company, that shareholder must show
25 that he or she has suffered damage or loss in a manner distinct from other shareholders.”).

26 29. The Nevada Supreme Court recently adopted Delaware’s “direct harm” test for
27 distinguishing between derivative and direct shareholder claims in *Parametric Sound*, 133 Nev.
28 at 427, 401 P.3d at 1108. In order to determine whether a shareholder claim is direct or derivative,

1 the court must consider: “(1) who suffered the alleged harm (the corporation or the suing
2 stockholders, individually); and (2) who would receive the benefit of any recovery or other
3 remedy (the corporation or the stockholders, individually)?” *Id.* (quoting *Tooley*, 845 A.2d at
4 1033).

5 30. Pursuant to the direct harm test, the relevant inquiry in addressing who suffered
6 the alleged harm is: “Looking at the body of the complaint and considering the nature of the
7 wrong alleged and the relief requested, has the plaintiff demonstrated that he or she can prevail
8 without showing an injury to the corporation. *Parametric Sound*, 133 Nev. at 426, 401 P.3d at
9 1107-08 (quoting *Tooley*, 845 A.2d at 1036). Applying the direct harm test as set forth in
10 *Parametric Sound*, Wolfus’s fiduciary duty claims are derivative because he has not demonstrated
11 a harm that is independent of the injury to Midway as a corporation.

12 31. The gravamen of Wolfus’s Second Amended Complaint is the Directors’ alleged
13 mismanagement of Midway, specifically, mismanagement in the form of failing to secure
14 sufficient capital for the Pan project, deciding not to sell assets to create necessary capital, and
15 purportedly allowing a certain Director to “tak[e] effective control of Midway and the Pan project
16 even though” Wolfus contends that Director “lacked the ability to manage the Pan project.”
17 Wolfus also alleges the Directors failed to appropriately employ supervisory staff for the Pan
18 project, which delayed production. Further, Wolfus alleges the Pan project failed because the
19 Directors, rather than cut costs to purchase necessary equipment, “decided not to purchase this
20 necessary equipment” and instead purchased equipment for which the company had not secured
21 the appropriate permits. These alleged acts of mismanagement and imprudent investment
22 decisions impaired or prevented what Wolfus describes in his Second Amended Complaint as the
23 “two major events” required for the Pan project to succeed: Midway securing necessary permits
24 and securing necessary financing for the project. SAC ¶ 46.

25 32. The Court concludes, based on the body of his Second Amended Complaint and
26 the nature of his claims, that Wolfus’s breach of fiduciary duty claims describe a derivative action
27 based on the Directors’ alleged mismanagement of Midway. His Second Amended Complaint
28 merely reflects an unavailing attempt to characterize the derivative claim as a direct claim

1 personal to him. Such an effort does not alter the nature of his claims. *See Kramer v. W. Pac.*
2 *Indus., Inc.*, 546 A.2d 348, 352-53 (Del. 1988) (holding that where the gravamen of a
3 stockholder's complaint is director mismanagement, the cause of action is derivative in nature).
4 Notwithstanding his attempt to characterize his claims as direct, the essence of Wolfus's claims
5 allege harm to Midway from which injury resulted indirectly to each of Midway's shareholders.
6 Accordingly, Wolfus's breach of fiduciary duty claims are derivative and he lacks standing to
7 pursue them.

8 33. Wolfus argues that California common law, as set forth in *Small v. Fritz Cos.*, 65
9 P.3d 1255 (Cal. 2003), permits him to assert claims for fraud and negligent misrepresentation
10 directly. Regardless of how Wolfus purports to characterize these claims, however, he has simply
11 repackaged his fiduciary duty claims under different labels. Here, Wolfus attempts to frame his
12 cause of action as one for fraud and negligent misrepresentation, but the claims are based on what
13 the Directors purportedly should have disclosed about their management of Midway. The
14 underlying nature of Wolfus's fraud and negligent misrepresentation claims are derivative as they
15 are dependent on alleged injuries to Midway.

16 34. Wolfus's Second Amended Complaint alleges that, had he known of the
17 purportedly undisclosed facts the Directors withheld, Wolfus "would have sold all of his Midway
18 shares . . . in February 2014 when Midway's stock price began to fall from its peak." The nature
19 of the harm alleged here cannot be understood apart from the decline in Midway's stock value
20 which ostensibly resulted from the Directors' purported mismanagement. The decline in
21 Midway's stock value did not result from any misrepresentation or omission, but from the
22 Directors' alleged failure to successfully manage the Pan project. Generally, such an allegation
23 will sustain a derivative action, not an action for direct injury to the shareholder. *See, e.g., Rivers*
24 *v. Wachovia Corp.*, 665 F.3d 610, 614-15 (4th Cir. 2011) ("The well-established general rule is
25 that shareholders cannot pursue individual causes of action against third parties for wrongs or
26 injuries to the corporation that result in the diminution or destruction of the value of their stock."
27 (internal quotation marks omitted); *Smith v. Waste Mgmt., Inc.*, 407 F.3d 381, 384-85 (5th Cir.
28 2005) (concluding a shareholder's claims for fraud and negligent misrepresentation were

1 derivative because alleged corporate misrepresentations that “caus[e] a decline in the company’s
2 share price when the truth is revealed,” injure the corporation directly and the shareholders only
3 indirectly.); *Pareto v. FDIC*, 139 F.3d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1998) (concluding a shareholder’s
4 allegations of breach of fiduciary duty and corporate mismanagement “describe[d] a direct injury
5 to the bank, not the individual stockholders,” and allegations of “depreciation of stock value
6 [were] an indirect result of the injury to [the bank] which resulted in its closure”).

7 35. Even if the Court were to entertain Wolfus’s argument that his claims for fraud
8 and misrepresentation allege direct harm personal to him, his pleading would be inadequate
9 pursuant to the very authority upon which he relies, specifically, the decision in *Small v. Fritz*
10 *Cos.*, 65 P.3d 1255, 1265 (Cal. 2003).

11 36. Having determined that Wolfus’s claims against the Directors are derivative in
12 nature, as allegations of mismanagement which harmed Midway directly, the Court concludes the
13 law of British Columbia, where Midway was incorporated, controls Wolfus’s claims. *Vaughn v.*
14 *Le nnt’l, Inc.*, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 166, 175 (Ct. App. 2009) (“Under the internal affairs doctrine, the
15 rights of shareholders in a foreign company, including the right to sue derivatively, are determined
16 by the law of the place where the company is incorporated.” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

17 37. British Columbia law requires a corporate shareholder to apply for leave of the
18 court of that jurisdiction before filing a derivative action, and requires the shareholder to provide
19 notice of such application to the company and demand that the directors take remedial action prior
20 to commencement of the suit. Business Corporations Act, R.S.B.C. 2002, c. 57 §§ 232(2)(a) &
21 233(1)(a)-(b). The failure to obtain leave of court is fatal under British Columbia common law.
22 *Bruneau v. Irwin Indus. (1978) Ltd.*, 2002 CarswellBC 1107, para. 19 (Can. B.C.S.C.) (WL)
23 (“[W]here an action [is] in fact a derivative action but commenced without leave, the appropriate
24 remedy [is] to strike it as disclosing no reasonable claim.”).

25 38. Wolfus concedes that if his claims are derivative, they are also subject to an
26 effective pre-suit demand requirement which he failed to satisfy. Failure to comply with such a
27 requirement is equally fatal to his complaint. *Vaughn*, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d at 171-72 (holding a pre-
28

1 suit demand requirement imposed by the British Virgin Islands Business Companies Act of 2004
2 imposed a substantive requirement determining whether a shareholder had standing to sue).

3 39. Wolfus also lacks standing to pursue derivative claims on behalf of Midway as a
4 result of Midway's bankruptcy, over which the estate's trustee has exclusive standing to litigate.
5 11 U.S.C. §§ 323, 541; *Estate of Spirtos v. One San Bernardino Cty. Superior Court Case No.*
6 *SPR 02211*, 443 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2006) ("The bankruptcy code endows the bankruptcy
7 trustee with the exclusive right to sue on behalf of the estate."); *Delgado Oil Co. v. Torres*, 785
8 F.2d 857, 860 (10th Cir. 1986) (explaining that the bankruptcy estate of a corporate debtor
9 includes any derivative right of action the corporation may have to recover damages for
10 misconduct, mismanagement, or neglect of duty by a corporate officer or director).

11 ORDER

12 Based on the foregoing, and good cause appearing,

13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Court's Order Regarding Defendants' Motion to
14 Dismiss dated June 6, 2018 is VACATED;

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
16 Claim for Securities Fraud, which is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
18 Claim for Breach of Fiduciary Duty, which is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
20 Claim for Aiding and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty, which is hereby DISMISSED with
21 prejudice.

22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
23 Claim for Fraud, which is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89134
Phone: (702) 222-2500 ♦ Fax: (702) 669-4650

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions are GRANTED as to Plaintiff's
2 Claim for Negligent Misrepresentation, which is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED this 9 day of Jan 2020 ~~December 2019~~.

5
6 Nancy L. Alf
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

7 JD

8 Respectfully submitted by:


9 Robert J. Cassity

10 Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779)
11 David J. Freeman, Esq. (10045)
12 HOLLAND & HART LLP
13 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

14 Holly Stein Sollod, Esq. (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
15 HOLLAND & HART LLP
16 555 17th Street, Suite 3200
Denver, CO 80202

17 *Attorneys for Richard D. Moritz,*
18 *Bradley J. Blacketer, Timothy Haddon,*
19 *Richard Sawchak, John W. Sheridan,*
Frank Yu, Roger A. Newell and
Rodney D. Knutson

20 13844471_v1
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



1 ACOM
2 JAMES R. CHRISTENSEN ESQ.
3 Nevada Bar No. 3861
4 James R. Christensen PC
5 601 S. 6th St.
6 Las Vegas NV 89101
7 (702) 272-0406
8 (702) 272-0415 fax
9 jim@jchristensenlaw.com
10 Attorney for Plaintiff, DANIEL E. WOLFUS

11 **EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

12 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

13 DANIEL E. WOLFUS,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

CASE NO.: A-17-756971-B
DEPT NO.: 10

**SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

16 KENNETH A. BRUNK; RICHARD
17 D. MORITZ; BRADLEY J.
18 BLACKETOR; TIMOTHY
19 HADDON; MARTIN M. HALE,
20 JR.; TREY ANDERSON;
21 RICHARD SAWCHAK; FRANK
22 YU; JOHN W. SHERIDAN;
23 ROGER A. NEWELL; RODNEY
24 D. KNUTSON; NATHANIEL
25 KLEIN; INV-MID, LLC, a
26 Delaware Limited Liability
27 Company; EREF-MID II, LLC, a
28 Delaware Limited Liability
Company; HCP-MID, LLC, a
Delaware Limited Liability
Company; and DOES 1 through 25.

Defendants.

1 COMES NOW Plaintiff DANIEL E. WOLFUS ("Wolfus") by and through his
2 counsel of record and hereby alleges, as follows:

3
4 **NATURE OF THE CASE**

5 1. Defendants caused Midway Gold Corp. ('Midway') to make material
6 misstatements of fact and to omit material facts necessary to make the statements
7 made, in the light of the circumstances under which the statements were made, not
8 misleading. Defendants did so in public filings and press releases which were relied
9 upon by Wolfus and which caused Wolfus to purchase Midway's common stock and
10 to hold and not sell Midway's common stock.
11

12 2. Wolfus seeks only his own damages. Wolfus does not seek damages for
13 harm suffered by Midway or any other shareholder of Midway. All recoveries sought
14 belong solely to Wolfus, not to Midway or any other shareholder of Midway.
15

16 3. Wolfus brings only his own personal claims and those belonging to his
17 assignors. Wolfus does not bring any claim that could be brought against any of the
18 Defendants by Midway.
19

20 4. Wolfus brings direct claims, which belong to solely to Wolfus and not
21 Midway or any other shareholder of Midway as found in: *Parametric Sound Corp. v.*
22 *Eighth Judicial District Court Of The State Of Nevada*, 133 Nev. Advance Opinion 59
23 (September 14, 2017); *Tooley v. Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc.*, 845 A.2d 1031
24 (Del.2004); *Citigroup Inc., v. AHW Investment Partnership*, 140 A.3d 1125 (Del.
25
26
27
28

1 2016); *American Master Lease LLC v. Idanta Partners, Ltd.*, 225 Cal.App.4th 1451
2 (2014); and, *Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc.*, 30 Cal.4th 167 (2003).

3
4 5. Wolfus alleges five causes of action.

5 A. The First Cause of Action is for violation of California's Corporate
6 Securities Act of 1968, *California Corporations Code* §§ 25000 *et seq*, (the
7 "Act"). Section 25401 makes it unlawful for Midway to sell its common stock in
8 California "by means of any written or oral communication that includes an
9 untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact necessary to
10 make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which the
11 statements were made, not misleading." Section 25501 states Wolfus may
12 recover personally, "the price at which the security was bought plus interest at
13 the legal rate from the date of purchase." Wolfus purchased shares from
14 Midway on January 23, 2014 and again on September 19, 2014 for \$100,636 and
15 \$783,778. Defendants are liable to Wolfus for these damages pursuant to
16 Sections 25403 and 25504 of the Act. Only Wolfus is entitled to recover
17 damages for the two transactions.

18
19 B. The Second Cause of Action is for California common law breach
20 of fiduciary duty owed by Midway's officers and directors directly to Wolfus as
21 held in *Meister v. Mensinger*, 230 Cal.App.4th 381 (2014). This cause of action
22 belongs solely to Wolfus and he is entitled to keep all recoveries thereon. While
23 Midway also breached its fiduciary duties owed to Wolfus, Midway has not been
24
25
26
27
28

1 joined because of the bankruptcy stay. *Meister* provides that Wolfus may
2 recover the market value of the stock owned by Wolfus in February 2014 and the
3 amount paid for the shares purchased on September 19, 2014, with interest at
4 10% per annum.
5

6 C. The Third Cause of Action is for California common law aiding
7 and abetting a breach of fiduciary duty owed by Midway directly to Wolfus as
8 held in *American Master Lease LLC v. Idanta Partners, Ltd.*, 225 Cal.App.4th
9 1451 (2014). This cause of belongs solely to Wolfus and he may keep all
10 recoveries thereon. *American Master Lease* provides that Wolfus may recover
11 the market value of the stock owned by Wolfus in February 2014 and the amount
12 paid for the shares purchased on September 19, 2014, with interest thereon at
13 10% per annum.
14
15
16

17 D. The Fourth Cause of Action is for California common law fraud
18 committed both by Defendants for inducing Wolfus to purchase shares in
19 January and September 2014, and inducing Wolfus to hold and not sell the
20 shares in February 2014, as held in *Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc.*, 30 Cal.4th
21 167 (2003). This cause of action belongs solely to Wolfus and he is entitled to
22 keep all recoveries thereon. *Small* provides that Wolfus is entitled to recover the
23 market value of the stock owned by Wolfus in February 2014 and the amount
24 paid for the shares purchased on September 19, 2014, with interest thereon at
25 10% per annum.
26
27
28

E. The Fifth Cause of Action is for California common law negligent misrepresentation committed both by Defendants for inducing Wolfus to purchase shares in January and September 2014 and inducing Wolfus to hold and not sell the shares in February 2014, as held in *Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc.*, 30 Cal.4th 167 (2003). This cause of action belongs solely to Wolfus and he is entitled to keep all recoveries thereon. *Small* provides that Wolfus may recover the market value of the stock owned by Wolfus in February 2014 and amount paid for the shares purchased on September 19, 2014, with interest thereon at 10% per annum.

6. Wolfus does not claim injury from a diminution of value of Midway's common stock, or any equity dilution, caused by issuance of additional shares of stock for inadequate consideration.

PARTIES

7. Wolfus is an individual who all relevant times resides or resided in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, California. Wolfus brings this action in his own capacity and as assignee of the rights and claims of The Wolfus Revocable Trust, Christine Wolfus and Daniel Wolfus (JTWROS), Devoney Wolfus, and Stephanie Wolfus. Wolfus is the owner of all claims asserted in this action and is entitled to receive and retain all recoveries sought in this action. Wolfus does not assert any claim belonging to Midway and does not assert any claim for mismanagement of Midway.

1 8. Defendant Kenneth A. Brunk (“Brunk”) is an individual who Wolfus is
2 informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of Colorado.
3
4 While with Midway, Brunk's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and systematic
5 as to render him at home in Nevada.

6 9. Defendant Richard D. Moritz (“Moritz”) is an individual who Wolfus is
7 informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of Colorado.
8
9 While with Midway, Moritz's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and
10 systematic as to render him at home in Nevada.

11 10. Defendant Bradley J. Blacketor (“Blacketor”) is an individual who
12 Wolfus is informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of
13 Colorado. While with Midway, Blacketor's contacts with Nevada were so continuous
14 and systematic as to render him at home in Nevada.
15
16

17 11. Defendant Timothy J. Haddon (“Haddon”) is an individual who Wolfus
18 is informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of Colorado.
19
20 While with Midway, Haddon's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and
21 systematic as to render him at home in Nevada.

22 12. Defendant Martin M. Hale, Jr., (“Hale”) is an individual who Wolfus is
23 informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of New York.
24
25 While with Midway, Hale's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and systematic
26 as to render him at home in Nevada.
27
28

1 13. Defendant Trey Anderson ("Anderson") is an individual who Wolfus is
2 informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of New York.
3
4 While with Midway, Anderson's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and
5 systematic as to render him at home in Nevada.

6 14. Defendant Richard Sawchak ("Sawchak") is an individual who Wolfus is
7 informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of Virginia.
8
9 While with Midway, Sawchak's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and
10 systematic as to render him at home in Nevada.

11
12 15. Defendant Frank Yu ("Yu") is an individual who Wolfus is informed and
13 believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of Clark County, Nevada.

14 16. Defendant John W. Sheridan ("Sheridan") is an individual who Wolfus is
15 informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of Vancouver,
16 Canada. While with Midway, Sheridan's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and
17 systematic as to render him at home in Nevada.
18

19 17. Defendant Roger A. Newell ("Newell") is an individual who Wolfus is
20 informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of Colorado.
21
22 While with Midway, Newell's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and
23 systematic as to render him at home in Nevada.
24

25 18. Defendant Rodney D. Knutson ("Knutson") is an individual who Wolfus
26 is informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of Colorado.
27
28

1 While with Midway, Knutson's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and
2 systematic as to render him at home in Nevada.

3
4 19. Defendant Nathaniel E. Klein ("Klein") is an individual who Wolfus is
5 informed and believes and thereon alleges was and now is a resident of New York.

6 While with Midway, Klein's contacts with Nevada were so continuous and systematic
7 as to render him at home in Nevada.
8

9 20. INV-MID, LLC; EREF-MID II, LLC and HCP-MID, LLC (collectively
10 "Hale Investors") are each Delaware limited liability companies with their principal
11 places of business in New York.
12

13 21. The true names, identities and capacities of defendants DOES 1 through
14 25, inclusive are presently unknown to Wolfus who is informed and believes and
15 thereon alleges that such defendants are liable to Wolfus in some manner presently
16 undetermined as a result of the matters complained of herein. Wolfus will seek leave
17 of Court, if necessary, to amend this First Amended Complaint when the true names,
18 identities and capacities of said fictitiously-named defendants are identified.
19
20

21 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

22 22. Among other reasons, jurisdiction and venue are proper in the District
23 Court of Nevada, County of Clark in that Defendants, or at least one of them, at all
24 relevant times resided in and still resides in Clark County, Nevada.
25
26
27
28

COMMON ALLEGATIONS

23. Midway is a Canadian corporation incorporated under the Company Act of British Columbia on May 14, 1996 under a prior name which was changed to its current name on July 10, 2002. Midway became a reporting issuer in the Province of British Columbia on May 16, 1997 and shortly thereafter its common shares were listed on the Vancouver Stock Exchange, the predecessor of the TSX Venture Exchange. Midway subsequently became a reporting issue in the Province of Alberta and at all relevant times, Midway was a reporting company under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"). Also during all relevant times, Midway's common shares were listed on both the NYSE Amex exchange and Tier 1 of the TSX.V under the symbol. As a reporting company under the Exchange, Midway has been required to file periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Committee (the "SEC"). Those reports are public documents which may be accessed over the internet at <https://www.sec.gov/cgi-bin/browse-edgar?company=midway+gold&owner=exclude&action=getcompany>. This website is commonly called Edgar. At all relevant times, Midway's principal executive offices were in Englewood, Colorado; but virtually all of Midway's business operations were in Nevada where its principal mining claims were located.

24. Prior to 2008, Midway was an exploration stage company engaged in the acquisition, exploration, and, if warranted, development of gold and silver mineral properties primarily in Nevada. As an exploration stage company, Midway had no

1 revenues from operations. Instead, Midway relied on capital raised by the sale of its
2 common shares to fund its operations.

3 25. Prior to November 2008, Midway created its Disclosure Committee
4 comprised of members of its Board of Directors. Midway reported in public filings
5 that the purpose of the Disclosure Committee was to ensure that Midway complies
6 with its timely disclosure obligations as required under applicable Canadian and
7 United States securities laws. No other formal charter for this committee was ever
8 publicly disclosed.
9

10 26. In November 2008, Wolfus became a director of Midway. At the time,
11 Wolfus had 28 years of experience as a banker and investment banker with substantial
12 experience in the capital markets. As an outside director, Wolfus was appointed to
13 several committees of the Board.
14

15 27. In 2009, Wolfus became the Chairman of the Board and the Chief
16 Executive Officer of Midway, serving in both capacities until May 18, 2012 when he
17 was replaced by Brunk. As an officer of Midway, Wolfus ceased to be a member of
18 any of the Board's committees.
19

20 28. At some time prior to April 2011, Midway decided to expand its
21 membership to include both the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Operating
22 Officer, at which time Wolfus again became a member of the Disclosure Committee.
23 Brunk at all relevant times was a member of the Disclosure Committee.
24
25
26
27
28

1 29. Wolfus began purchasing common stock of Midway in the open market
2 in February 2008. As of May 1, 2012, Wolfus and his assignors owned 1,629,117
3 shares of Midway common stock. In January 2014, Wolfus and/or his assignors
4 acquired an additional 200,000 shares of Midway common stock. In September 2014,
5 Wolfus and/or his assignors acquired an additional 1,000,000 shares of common stock
6 and as of December 23, 2014, and after the sale of some shares, the combined
7 shareholdings of Wolfus and/or his assignors were 2,402,251 shares of Midway
8 common stock. Certain of these share purchases were made directly from Midway
9 after Wolfus ceased to be an officer or director of Midway and were made pursuant to
10 the exercise of stock options previously granted to Wolfus.
11

12 30. At the time Wolfus became Chairman of the Board and CEO, Midway
13 had the following properties in the exploratory stage where gold mineralization had
14 been identified: Spring Valley, Pan, The Midway and Golden Eagle properties.
15 Midway's Thunder Mountain, Roberts Creek, Gold Rock (formerly the Monte) Creek
16 and Burnt Canyon projects were then in the early stage of gold and silver exploration.
17 Of these projects, all are in Nevada except the Golden Eagle property in Washington.
18

19 31. In October 2008, Midway entered into an exploration agreement and
20 possible joint venture agreement with a subsidiary of Barrick Gold Corporation for its
21 Spring Valley project. The Spring Valley project was located 20 miles northeast of
22 Lovelock, Nevada.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 32. Of its remaining properties, Midway's Pan Gold Project ("Pan") appeared
2 to be the most promising. The Pan Gold property was located at the northern end of
3
4 the Pancake mountain range in western White Pine County, Nevada, approximately 22
5 miles southeast of Eureka, Nevada, and 50 miles west of Ely, Nevada.

6 33. Yu became a director of Midway also in November 2008 and served in
7
8 that capacity at least up through June 2015. During that entire period, Yu served as a
9 member or chairman of Midway's Disclosure Committee and Audit Committee.

10 34. Newell became a Director of Midway in December of 2009 and
11
12 continued in that capacity until August of 2014. During a portion of his tenure as a
13 director, Newell served as a member of Midway's Disclosure Committee and Audit
14 Committee.

15 35. Prior to May, 2010, and based in part on substantial exploration of the
16
17 Pan project, Midway made the decision to convert from a purely exploration company
18 into a gold mining production company using the Pan project as its initial production
19 mine.
20

21 36. In May, 2010, Brunk was hired by Midway as its President and Chief
22 Operating Officer with the primary assignment to bring the Pan project into
23 production. In that capacity, Brunk was required to personally oversee both mining
24 activities in Nevada and permitting activities in Nevada and frequently was in Nevada
25 to perform these duties. Brunk served in that capacity until May of 2012, at which
26
27 time he also became the Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of
28

1 Midway, replacing Wolfus in those positions. Brunk continued as Chairman of the
2 Board until August 2014 and as Chief Executive Officer and President until December
3 2014. At all times Brunk was a director of Midway, he was also a member of
4 Midway's Disclosure Committee. Midway reported in public filings that Brunk holds
5 a degree in Metallurgical Engineering from Michigan Technological University and
6 throughout his career had conducted numerous feasibility studies and has been
7 responsible for designing, constructing, staffing and operating multiple mining
8 operations and improving process efficiencies around the world as well. Brunk was
9 hired by Midway to take its Pan project, discussed below, into production.
10
11

12 37. On July 20, 2010, Midway publicly announced the results of a favorable
13 preliminary economic assessment ("PEA") for the Pan project. The PEA included an
14 independent audit of an updated mineral resource estimate prepared by the Midway.
15 The PEA was prepared by Gustavson Associates, LLC ("Gustavson") and was
16 publicly available.
17
18

19 38. Moritz was the Senior Vice President of Operations at Midway from July
20 2010 to May 2014. Moritz was hired to primarily oversee the Pan project. To perform
21 these duties, Moritz was frequently in Nevada to directly oversee mining operations.
22
23

24 39. On February 3, 2011, Midway filed an 8-K and Press Release with the
25 SEC in which Midway reported that it was moving forward with its Pan project with
26 "possible production as early as 2013" and that Midway was working on a
27 Prefeasibility Study for the Pan project. In its Annual Report filed on Form 10-K with
28

1 the SEC at the same time, Midway stated that it was "currently transitioning itself
2 from an exploration company to a gold production company with plans to advance the
3 Pan gold deposit located in White Pine County, Nevada through to production by as
4 early as 2013."

6 40. On April 4, 2011, Midway issued a press release filed with the SEC in
7 which it reported that it had secured a "positive Prefeasibility Study" for the Pan
8 project. Midway also described in significant detail the method and manner by which
9 Midway intended to mine the gold using conventional heap leaching methods prior to
10 which the ore would be crushed by the primary in-pit mobile jaw crusher and
11 secondary and tertiary cone crushers to a nominal 0.5 inches. Barren solution would
12 then be distributed on the leach pad with drip tube emitters. The entire Prefeasibility
13 Study performed by Gustavson was filed with SEDAR and the SEC and was publicly
14 available on Edgar.
15

18 41. In a September 12, 2011 press release filed with the SEC, Midway
19 reported its engineering team was in the process of completing a mine plan and a
20 Feasibility Study for the Pan project and that the environmental team was working to
21 complete a plan of operations for the proposed mine that will be submitted to the
22 Bureau of Land Management ("BLM") for evaluation and development of an
23 Environmental Impact Statement.
24

26 42. On October 6, 2011, Midway reported in a Press Release that Midway
27 was negotiating with potential lenders to secure necessary funds for the Pan project.
28

1 Several major lenders had expressed interest in providing the necessary funds required
2 for the Pan project.

3
4 43. On November 1, 2011, Midway filed with the SEC a favorable Updated
5 Mineral Resource Estimate for the Pan project prepared by Gustavson.

6
7 44. On November 15, 2011, Midway reported by press release filed with the
8 SEC the results of the Feasibility Study for the Pan project prepared by Gustavson
9 ("Feasibility Study"). Midway stated that its mining plan would be to crush,
10 agglomerate and place the ore on a heap leach pad with recoveries estimated to
11 average 75%. Midway also reported that the capital costs to build the mine were
12 estimated to be \$99 million, including \$8.2 million in working capital and \$6.8 million
13 contingency funds with total production costs projected to be \$824/oz. of gold
14 recovered. At that time, the price of gold was ~\$1,700/oz.
15

16
17 45. On December 20, 2011, Midway filed the Feasibility Study with the SEC.
18 Excerpts of that Feasibility Study are attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated
19 herein by this reference. Among other items, this Study provides a detailed history of
20 the mineral exploration of the Pan project, estimated gold deposits, an extremely
21 detailed mining plan, a budget of ~\$100 million for the project along with an
22 extremely detailed breakdown of the needed equipment, and a projection of
23 anticipated revenues at different levels of gold prices. Midway participated in the
24 creation of the Feasibility Study. The Feasibility Study was never publicly updated or
25 amended and this study formed the basis on which all necessary permits were sought.
26
27
28

1 46. In order to bring the Pan project into production, two major events
2 needed to occur.

3 A. First, Midway needed to secure necessary permits, primarily
4 environmentally related. The most difficult of these permits was the "Record of
5 Decision" on a Final Environmental Impact Statement processed through the
6 BLM. Additional environmental permits were also required to be issued by the
7 State of Nevada. No assurances could be made in 2011 that these permits
8 would be issued but the issuance of the permits would add significant value to
9 Midway even if Pan was not taken into production. By year-end 2011, Midway
10 had begun the permitting process for both the BLM and the Nevada Department
11 of Environmental Protection ("NDEP"). These permits would be issued
12 approving a specific mining plan and material changes to the plan would require
13 modification or amendment of the environmental permits received. At all
14 times, Midway sought these permits based upon the detailed mining plan set
15 forth in the Feasibility Study, which required the three-stage crushing and
16 agglomeration of the ore before it is placed on the heap leaching pad to a height
17 not to exceed 30'. Generally, the heap leaching process required allowing a
18 cyanide solution to percolate through the ore allowing the gold to attach to the
19 cyanide. The resulting gold enriched solution then would go through another
20 process where the gold was then separated from the cyanide solution after
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 which further processing would take place. Most of the permitting process
2 occurred in Nevada.

3
4 B. The other event was that Midway would need to generate the
5 necessary capital not only to fund the plan set forth in the Feasibility Study but
6 also to fund Midway's other projects and general overhead. At the time,
7 Midway believed that it would need ~\$120 million in capital to fund the
8 foregoing up until the time that the Pan project was generating revenues.
9
10 Midway was exploring raising this capital both by securing loans and through
11 the sale of its common stock, which was the way Midway had historically
12 raised capital.
13

14 47. On January 9, 2012, Midway issued a Press Release in which it
15 announced that it qualified as a Development Stage Entity under SEC guidelines and
16 that it had submitted a mine plan of operations to the BLM and the NDEP. The mine
17 plan followed the plan set forth in the Feasibility Study with capital costs of ~\$100
18 million.
19

20
21 48. Sheridan became a Director of Midway in February 2012 and continued
22 in that capacity until June 2015. During a portion of his tenure as a director, Sheridan
23 served as a member or Chairman of Midway's Disclosure Committee and Audit
24 Committee.
25

26 49. Prior to May 2012, Midway was approached by Hale, who was the CEO
27 and Portfolio Manager of Hale Capital Partners, LP who was seeking to negotiate
28

1 what became a \$70 million private placement of preferred stock with investors who
2 Hale would secure. At the time these negotiations commenced, Wolfus was the CEO
3 and Chairman of the Board of Midway and was the officer primarily involved in
4 securing capital for Midway to fund its present and future operations. Moreover,
5 Wolfus had been spending substantial time locating sources to fund the projected costs
6 of both the Pan project and Midway's other on-going operations. Wolfus was opposed
7 to the transaction proposed by Hale and Brunk was an ardent supporter of the
8 transactions.
9

10 50. In May 2012, Midway's Board of Directors decided to terminate Wolfus
11 as its Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer and replace him with Brunk.
12 This change of control was effective May 18, 2012, and publicly reported by Brunk
13 and Midway on May 21, 2012. Wolfus continued as a director of Midway until its
14 next annual meeting of shareholders; and, while Wolfus also remained a member of
15 the Disclosure Committee, he was effectively excluded from all management
16 decisions, excluded from all negotiations involving the proposed Hale transaction,
17 never provided with any anticipated public disclosures for review and excluded from
18 information he would need to review to perform any Disclosure Committee duties.
19 Wolfus did receive board packages consisting of information provided to all directors
20 in anticipation of a quarterly Board of Directors meeting and did participate in Board
21 of Director's meetings which occurred prior to June 2013. From and after May 18,
22 2012, Wolfus carefully read and considered all press releases by Midway and the
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 public filings made by Wolfus usually within a day or two following their release.
2 Wolfus relied on this material in making all investment decisions concerning Midway
3 including purchasing additional shares of Midway and whether to continue holding his
4 and his assignors' Midway shares even though he was no longer involved with the
5 management of Midway. Wolfus' share holdings were a material part of his
6 investment portfolio in equity securities. As part of Wolfus' transition out of the
7 management of Midway, Wolfus and Midway entered into a consulting arrangement
8 primarily for the purpose of allowing certain of his stock options to vest. Each of the
9 Defendants then with Midway knew of this purpose and knew that Wolfus' services as
10 a consultant would never be utilized by Midway.
11

12 51. On August 2, 2012, the Board of Directors of Midway voted to increase
13 the size of the Board from 5 to 6 members and appoint Klein as a director. Klein at
14 the time was a Vice President of Hale Capital Partners. At the time of this
15 appointment, Hale and Hale Capital Partners, LP were continuing to negotiate the
16 terms of the proposed Hale transaction, which at the time had not been publicly
17 disclosed. Klein's directorship provided Hale and Hale Capital Partners, LP with
18 access to Midway's books and records and staff.
19

20 52. By press release dated August 16, 2012, Midway and Brunk reported that
21 engineering and permitting for the Pan project was advancing at a "rapid pace."
22

23 53. By press release dated September 10, 2012, Midway and Brunk reported
24 that it was on schedule for "start-up of production in mid-2014" on the Pan project.
25
26
27
28

1 54. By 8-K filed with the SEC and by Press Release also filed with the SEC
2 and both dated November 21, 2012, Midway announced that agreements had been
3 signed for the private placement of \$70 million in Series A Preferred Shares of
4 Midway to the Hale Investors and generally described the terms and conditions of that
5 sale. True and correct copies of that 8-K and Press Release are attached hereto as
6 Exhibits 2 and 3, respectively, and incorporated herein by this reference. Wolfus is
7 informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times the Hale Investors
8 were controlled by Hale. Moreover, one of the terms of the forgoing transaction was
9 the creation of a budget and work program committee, on which Hale or another
10 director selected solely by the Hale Investors were required members. The purpose of
11 this committee was to review and approve Midway's annual business and financing
12 plans and capital and operating budgets or modifications thereto and its decisions had
13 to be unanimous. Wolfus is informed and believes and thereon alleges that once this
14 committee was formed, Hale and the Hale Investors acquired effective control of
15 Midway and the Pan project.
16

17 55. On December 13, 2012, Midway filed an 8-K and Press Release with the
18 SEC, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 4 and incorporated
19 herein by this reference. Exhibit 4 reports that the Hale transaction had closed, that
20 Hale had become a director of Midway, and that Klein had resigned as a director,
21 although he continued to attend Board meetings thereafter. In addition, Midway
22 reported the formation of the "Budget Work Plan Committee as alleged above with
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Brunk, Hale, Newell and Sheridan as its members. At all relevant times thereafter,
2 Hale remained a director and a member of the Budget Work Plan Committee of
3 Midway.
4

5 56. On March 22, 2013, Midway announced that a draft environmental
6 impact statement was available for public comment. Wolfus is informed and believes
7 and thereon alleges that this statement was based on the mining plan set forth in the
8 Feasibility Study.
9

10 57. On April 19, 2013, Midway issued its Definitive Proxy Statement which
11 was filed with the SEC. This statement disclosed that the Board had not nominated
12 Wolfus as a director but had nominated Knutson as a director and had nominated
13 Klein as a director selected by the Hale Investors.
14
15

16 58. On June 20, 2013, Midway held its annual meeting of shareholders.
17 Brunk, Hale, Newell, Sheridan, Yu, Knutson and Klein were each elected as directors.
18 Wolfus ceased to be a director at this time, although Wolfus last participation with
19 Midway's Board ceased some time before.
20

21 59. On July 30, 2013, Midway issued and filed with the SEC a Press Release
22 dated July 30, 2013, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 5
23 and incorporated herein by this reference. In that release, Midway reported that it was
24 exploring ways to reduce costs for the Pan project, expected to issue a revised
25 Feasibility Study in the third quarter of 2013, had made significant progress in
26 permitting, was pursuing a combination of project and equipment financing
27
28

1 alternatives, had received proposals from several major commercial funding sources to
2 secure the necessary capital to fund the Pan project until a positive cash flow had been
3 achieved, and expected to pour gold in August 2014.
4

5 60. On November 17, 2013, Midway issued and filed with the SEC a Press
6 Release dated September 17, 2013, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto
7 as Exhibit 6 and incorporated herein by this reference. In this release, Midway
8 reported that it had conducted tests of ore from South Pan and determined that it did
9 not need to be crushed prior to leaching, and that a 92% recovery rate could be
10 achieved after 58 days of leaching the ore at a height of 15'. This height is half of the
11 30' height which the Feasibility Study called for. Midway stated that leaching
12 uncrushed ore, called Run of Mine, would avoid the need to secure crushing
13 equipment until operations moved to other areas of the Pan project. Midway also
14 reported that it had retained Sierra Partners to assist it in finding the necessary capital
15 to fund operations.
16
17
18
19

20 61. At year-end 2013 and in addition to Pan, Midway was moving forward
21 with its Gold Rock project, also in White Pine County Nevada, as its second operating
22 gold mine. Midway's Spring Valley project was also progressing primarily funded by
23 Barrick.
24

25 62. On December 5, 2013, Blacketor became the Chief Financial Officer and
26 Senior Vice President of Midway. Blacketor was also a member of the Disclosure
27 Committee.
28

1 63. On December 20, 2013, Midway issued and filed with the SEC a Press
2 Release, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 7 and
3
4 incorporated herein by this reference. In this release, Midway announced that it had
5 received its Record of Decision for the Pan project which completes the BLM
6 permitting process.

7
8 64. As of December 31, 2013, Brunk, Hale, Newell, Sheridan, Yu, Knutson
9 and Klein were each directors of Midway; Brunk was the Chairman, President and
10 Chief Executive officer of Midway; Blacketor was a Senior Vice President and Chief
11 Financial Officer of Midway; Moritz was the Senior Vice President of Operations of
12 Midway; Brunk, Blacketor, Newell, Yu and Klein were each members of the
13 Disclosure Committee of Midway; Sheridan, Yu and Knutson were each members of
14 the Audit Committee of Midway; Brunk, Hale, Sheridan, Yu and Klein were each
15 members of the Budget/Work Plan Committee; and Newell, Sheridan and Yu were
16 each members of the Environment, Health and Safety Committee. In those capacities,
17 each was responsible for insuring that Midway publicly disclosed all material
18 information concerning the Pan project and that all publicly disclosed information
19 concerning the Pan project was true and complete, was not misleading and did not
20 omitted material facts. The foregoing defendants are collectively referred to as the
21 "2013 Control Defendants."
22
23

24 65. As of December 13, 2013, the 2013 Control Defendants knew each of the
25 following facts ("2013 Undisclosed Facts") to be true, knew that each of the following
26
27
28

1 facts would be material to any reasonable investor in Midway including Wolfus, and
2 knew that none of those facts had been disclosed to the public generally or to Wolfus:

3
4 A. Midway had been unable to raise sufficient cash either in the form
5 of equity or debt to allow it to complete the Pan project in the manner set forth
6 in the Feasibility Study as well as fund on-going operations until the Pan project
7 produced sufficient revenues to cover those expenses;

8
9 B. Hale and the Hale Investors had blocked any consideration of the
10 sale of either Midway's interest in the Spring Valley project or the Gold Rock
11 project or any other material assets to generate additional revenues;

12
13 C. The environmental and other permits secured by Midway for the
14 Pan project were based upon and required Midway to conduct mining
15 operations in accordance with the mining plan submitted which called for the
16 crushing and agglomeration of ore before it was placed on the leach pads and
17 Midway had taken no steps to cause those permits to be modified to allow
18 Midway to proceed using Run of Mine for the South Pit of the Pan project; and
19

20
21 D. Modifying the permits to permit Run of Mine would have been
22 time consuming delaying the time when Midway could start the leaching
23 process.
24

25 66. In late December and in early January 2014, Wolfus needed to decide
26 whether to exercise some of his Midway stock options which would soon be expiring.
27 In order to make this investment decision, Wolfus carefully reviewed and considered
28

1 Midway's press releases and public filings, primarily those which were issued after he
2 ceased to be Midway's Chief Executive Officer. At the time, Wolfus had no reason to
3 believe that any of the factual statements contained therein were false or that Midway
4 had failed to omit material facts. In reliance thereon and on January 7, 2014, Wolfus
5 notified Midway of his intention to exercise some of his stock options. Wolfus is
6 informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, were
7 aware of this exercise. At the time Wolfus exercised these options he was not aware
8 of any of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts, had no way of learning the 2013 undisclosed
9 facts except from the 2013 Control Defendants, would not have exercised any of his
10 options and would instead have sold his and his assignors' remaining Midway
11 common shares when Midway's stock peaked in February 2014.
12

13 67. On January 15, 2014, Midway issued and filed with the SEC a Press
14 Release, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 8 and
15 incorporated herein by this reference. In that release, Midway reported that the Pan
16 project was "fully permitted and construction is underway with completion estimated
17 for Q3 2014."
18

19 68. Between January 7 and January 23, 2014, neither Midway nor any of the
20 defendants provided Wolfus with any information not contained in Midway's then
21 public filings, including the 2013 Undisclosed Facts.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 69. On January 23, 2014, Wolfus consummated his stock option exercise
2 purchasing 200,000 shares for \$112,000 Canadian dollars which was then \$100,636
3 US dollars.
4

5 70. Wolfus thereafter and on a daily basis checked on the market price of
6 Midway's stock. When Midway's stock peaked on or about February 14, 2014, at
7 \$1.39¹, Wolfus decided to continue to hold his Midway shares and his assignors made
8 the same decision based upon Wolfus advice. At the time Wolfus and his assignors
9 made this decision to hold and not sell their Midway stock, Wolfus remained unaware
10 of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and also the fact that the Pan project was not fully
11 permitted. Had Wolfus known any of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts or that the Pan
12 project was not fully permitted, he and his assignors would have sold all of the
13 Midway shares.
14
15
16

17 71. In its March 13, 2014, Annual Report on form 10-K, Midway reported
18 that ore from the South Pan pit would be process Run of Mine and would not be
19 crushed or agglomerated as provided in the Feasibility Study or the mining plan
20 submitted to secure the necessary permits for the Pan project.
21

22 72. In a Press Release issued the same day, Midway again reported that the
23 Pan project was fully permitted and that construction was underway.
24

25 73. On March 19, 2014, Midway announced in a Press Release that it has
26 selected Ledcor CMI, Inc. as its mining contractor for the Pan project.
27

28 _____
¹ The high at market closing per Bloomberg.

1 74. On April 24, 2014, Midway issued a Press Release. But for the hand
2 interlineations, Exhibit 9 attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference is a
3 true and correct copy of that release. In that release, Midway announced its intention
4 to reduce the capital costs for the Pan project as set forth in the Feasibility Study by
5 using contract miners to mine the ore and by proceeding Run of Mine on the South Pit
6 of the Pan project. Midway stated that Moritz had approved the release and that
7 Midway was "well-funded."
8

9
10 75. On May 16, 2014, Midway reported that Moritz had resigned.
11

12 76. Midway's intention to use contract mining and Run of Mine was repeated
13 in its May 21, 2014, quarterly report filed on Form 10-Q with the SEC.
14

15 77. On May 22, 2014, Midway issued and filed with the SEC a Press
16 Release, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 10 and
17 incorporated herein by this reference. This release announced the execution of a \$55
18 million credit facility with Commonwealth Bank of Australia for the Pan project.
19

20 78. On May 30, 2014, Midway filed with the SEC a prospectus for the sale of
21 ~\$25 million worth of common stock in a prearranged sale. The prospectus updated
22 an earlier registration statement. The funds were to be used in substantial part for the
23 Pan project. Under applicable securities laws, this prospectus was required to disclose
24 all material facts related to the Pan project, among other disclosures. However, this
25 prospectus failed to disclose any of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts or any of the 2014
26
27
28

1 Undisclosed Facts alleged below. In June 2014, Midway reported in a Press Release
2 filed with the SEC that it completed this sale transaction.

3
4 79. On June 19, 2014, Sawchak became a director of Midway and Knutson
5 ceased to be a director of Midway. During a portion of his tenure as a director,
6 Sawchak served as Chairman of Midway's Audit Committee.

7
8 80. On July 21, 2014, Midway issued and filed with the SEC a Press Release
9 announcing that it had closed on its Credit Facility from Commonwealth Bank of
10 Australia. Wolfus is informed and believes and thereon alleges that this Credit
11 Facility was the largest loan Midway was able to secure.
12

13 81. In July 2014, there was a flood at the Pan project which delayed the
14 project. The flood was not reported until Midway's September 15, 2014, press release
15 filed with the SEC.
16

17 82. In its August 6, 2014, quarterly report filed on Form 10-Q with the SEC,
18 Midway reported that it had made a 5-year contract mining deal with Ledcor and had
19 paid a \$500,000 mobilization fee. On September 15, 2014, Midway reported in a
20 Press Release filed with the SEC that Ledcor had in fact mobilized on site on July 21,
21 2014. At no time did Midway disclose what control, if any, it had over the timing of
22 Ledcor's mining operations or the control that it had over Ledcor's loading ore on the
23 leach pads. Loading of the ore on the leach pads according to the applicable permits
24 then effect had to be carefully monitored and supervised by qualified individuals and
25 only after the ore had been crushed and agglomerated in the manner described in the
26
27
28

1 Feasibility Study and the mining plan. Even if the ore was to be loaded on the leach
2 pads Run of Mine, it still had to be carefully monitored and supervised by qualified
3 individuals and only to a height not exceeding 15'. Additional ore could not be loaded
4 on the leach pad until the approximately 2 month leaching process had occurred.
5
6 Wolfus was not aware of these facts until after June 2015.

7
8 83. By Press Release dated August 6, 2014, and filed with the SEC, Midway
9 announced that Brunk would be leaving Midway but he remained with Midway until
10 December 2014.

11
12 84. By Press Release dated August 19, 2014 and filed with the SEC, Midway
13 announced the "retirement" of Newell and the appointment of Haddon as Chairman of
14 the Board, replacing Brunk in that role. Haddon also became a member of the
15 Environment, Health and Safety Committee of Midway.
16

17 85. As of August 31, 2013, Brunk, Hale, Sawchak, Sheridan, Yu, Haddon
18 and Klein were each directors of Midway; Haddon was Chairman of the Board, Brunk
19 was the President and Chief Executive officer of Midway; Blacketor was a Senior
20 Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Midway; Brunk, Blacketor, Yu and
21 Klein were each members of the Disclosure Committee of Midway; Sheridan, Yu and
22 Sawchak were each members of the Audit Committee of Midway; Brunk, Hale,
23 Sheridan, Yu and Klein were each members of the Budget/Work Plan Committee; and
24 Haddon, Sheridan and Yu were each members of the Environment, Health and Safety
25 Committee. In those capacities, each was responsible for insuring that Midway
26
27
28

1 publicly disclosed all material information concerning the Pan project and that all
2 publicly disclosed information concerning the Pan project was true and complete, was
3 not misleading and did not omitted material facts. The foregoing defendants are
4 collectively referred to as the "2014 Control Defendants."

6 86. As of August 31, 2014, the 2014 Control Defendants knew each of 2013
7 Undisclosed Facts and the following addition facts ("collectively the 2014
8 Undisclosed Facts") to be true, knew that each of those facts would be material to any
9 reasonable investor in Midway including Wolfus, and knew that none of those facts
10 had been disclosed to the public generally or to Wolfus:
11

13 A. Ledcor was poised to commence mining operations at Pan loading
14 ore directly on the leach pads but Midway did not have either a "qualified"
15 person or a knowledgeable employee on site to supervise the loading of the ore
16 on the leach pads;
17

18 B. Midway had not sought or received modified permits to allow it to
19 deviate from the mining plan submitted for the permits and as contained in the
20 Feasibility Study; and
21

22 C. Midway did not have the necessary facilities to process the gold
23 solution once the leaching had been completed and it would be a considerable
24 period before those facilities were constructed and permitted for operation.
25

26 87. In late August and early September 2014, Wolfus needed to decide
27 whether or not to exercise some of his Midway stock options which would soon be
28

1 expiring. In order to make this investment decision, Wolfus carefully reviewed and
2 considered Midway's press releases and public filings, primarily those which were
3 issued after he purchase shares in January 2014. At the time, Wolfus had no reason to
4 believe that any of the factual statements contained therein were false or that Midway
5 had failed to omit material facts. In reliance thereon and on September 5, 2014,
6 Wolfus notified Midway of his intention to exercise some of his stock options.
7
8 Wolfus is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendants and each of them
9 were aware of this exercise. At the time Wolfus exercised these options he still was
10 not aware of any of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts or the 2014 Undisclosed Facts, had no
11 way of learning those facts except from the 2014 Control Defendants, would not have
12 exercised any of his options had he known those facts.
13
14

15 88. Between September 5 and 19, 2014, neither Midway nor any of the
16 defendants provided Wolfus with any information not contained in Midway's then
17 public filings, including the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and the 2014 Undisclosed Facts.
18
19

20 89. On September 19, 2014, Wolfus consummated his stock option exercise
21 purchasing 1,000,000 shares for \$860,000 Canadian dollars which was then \$783,778
22 US dollars.
23

24 90. On September 15, 2014, Midway announced by Press Release filed with
25 the SEC that Ledcor had commenced mining operations. The release further
26 suggested that the facilities to process the mine would be ready by the end of
27 September.
28

1 91. On October 14, 2014, Midway announced that William Zisch would
2 become President and Chief Executive Officer of Midway on or about December 10,
3 2014 and that Brunk would depart Midway on Mr. Zisch's start date.
4

5 92. By Current Report filed on form 8-K with the SEC and dated November
6 4, 2014, Midway announced the resignation of Klein and the appointment of
7 Anderson as a director by the Hale Investors. Anderson also became a member of the
8 Budget/Work Plan Committee of Midway.
9

10 93. In its November 16, 2014, quarterly report on Form 10-Q filed with the
11 SEC, Midway again provided only favorable information concerning the Pan project.
12

13 94. By Press Release dated December 1, 2014 and filed with the SEC,
14 Midway reported that it had begun receiving funds on its Credit Facility.
15

16 95. On June 22, 2015, Midway announced that it was filing a voluntary
17 petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code and shortly thereafter filed
18 for bankruptcy.
19

20 96. As a result of the Midway Bankruptcy, all or virtually all of Midway's
21 assets have been sold and there are no funds or recoveries by common shareholders of
22 Midway.
23

1 97. Following the bankruptcy filing, Wolfus has learned or is otherwise
2 informed and believed and thereon alleges that the following facts are true:
3

4 A. As of the end of 2013, Midway lacked sufficient resources in the
5 form of capital or debt financing to bring the Pan project to a successful mining
6 operation;
7

8 B. Hale and the Hale Investors blocked Midway from selling assets to
9 create necessary capital;
10

11 C. In late 2013 or early 2014, material disagreements arose between
12 Brunk and Hale, which resulted in Hale taking effective control of Midway and
13 the Pan project even though Hale lacked the ability to manage the Pan project;
14

15 D. The ore in the entire Pan project was extremely clayey and would
16 need to be crushed and agglomerated prior to leaching in order to profitable and
17 timely extract gold; but rather than cut other costs so that the crushing and
18 agglomeration equipment could be acquired, defendants, and each of them,
19 decided not to purchase this necessary equipment;
20

21 E. Costly equipment was purchased by Midway which was not
22 permitted to be used on the Pan project resulting in costly delays;
23

24 F. Midway never received the appropriate permits for Run of Mine
25 operations;
26
27
28

1 G. Midway allowed Ledcor to overload the leach pads in a manner
2 which violated its operating permits and resulted in an inability to successfully
3 leach the gold from the ore;
4

5 H. Midway allowed Ledcor to begin loading the leach pads before it
6 was capable of either performing the necessary heap leaching or capable of
7 processing and refining for sale the resulting gold solution.
8

9 98. Effective June 2, 2016, Wolfus, Brunk, Moritz, Blacketor, Haddon, Hale,
10 Anderson, Sawchak, Yu, Sheridan, Newell, Knutson and Klein entered into a tolling
11 agreement, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 11 and
12 incorporated herein by this reference. This agreement tolled the statute of limitations
13 on all claims from June 2, 2016 through September 25, 2016.
14

15
16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
17 **(SECURITIES FRAUD AGAINST**
18 **THE 2013 AND 2014 CONTROL DEFENDANTS)**
19

20 99. Wolfus realleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 98 as
21 though fully set forth herein.
22

23 100. This is a claim for securities fraud based upon the California Corporate
24 Securities Law of 1968, California *Corporations Code* § 25000, *et seq.* (the "Act").
25 Section 25401 of the Act makes it unlawful for Midway to sell its common stock in
26 California "by means of any written or oral communication that includes an untrue
27 statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact necessary to make the
28

1 statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which the statements were
2 made, not misleading." Section 25501 Act creates a private right of action for a
3 purchaser and makes Midway, as the seller, liable to Wolfus, as the purchaser, for "the
4 price at which the security was bought plus interest at the legal rate from the date of
5 purchase." Wolfus purchased shares from Midway on January 23, 2014 and again on
6 September 19, 2014 for \$100,636 US dollars and \$783,778, respectively and the legal
7 rate of interest thereon is at 10% per annum. In addition to Midway, Defendants, and
8 each of them, are liable for these damages pursuant to Sections 25403 and 25504.
9 Only Wolfus is entitled to recover these damages for these two transactions.
10 Defendants, and each of them, knew that at the time of purchase, Wolfus was a
11 California resident entitled to pursue relief under the Act. All purchases of Midway's
12 common stock were made by Wolfus in California.

13 101. Midway's common shares are securities as defined in California
14 *Corporations Code* § 25019.

15 102. On January 23, 2014, Wolfus purchased in California 200,000 shares of
16 Midway's common stock directly from Midway at a purchase price of \$.56 Canadian
17 dollars per share or approximately \$.50 US dollars per share. At that time, Midway's
18 common stock was selling on the NYSE Amex exchange at \$1.27 US dollars per share
19 and its price was rising.

20 103. Midway was the issuer of the 200,000 shares purchased by Wolfus and as
21 such was liable for any written or oral communication contained in its public filings
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 that included any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact
2 necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which the
3 statements were made, not misleading.
4

5 104. Each of the 2013 Control Defendants are jointly and severally liable to
6 Wolfus with Midway because of their positions as officers, directors and committee
7 members of Midway and as such are deemed to be "controlling persons" under the
8 Act. Moreover, each of the 2013 Control Defendants controlled Midway and had the
9 ability and duty to ensure that its public filings were true, correct and complete, were
10 not misleading and did not fail to disclose material facts.
11
12

13 105. In violation of California *Corporations Code* § 25401, the 2013 public
14 filings by Midway which discussed the Pan project were materially false and
15 misleading by failing to timely disclose each of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and the
16 failure by the 2013 Control Defendants to disclose the 2013 Undisclosed Facts was
17 intentional and was done to encourage investors to retain and purchase Midway's
18 common stock.
19
20

21 106. In purchasing the 200,000 shares in January 2014, Wolfus had carefully
22 read and reviewed and relied on the public filings of Midway and was unaware of the
23 2013 Undisclosed Facts. Had Wolfus known any of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts,
24 Wolfus would not have purchased any shares in January 2014 or would have sold both
25 his and his assignors common stock when the stock reached its peak in February 2014.
26
27
28

1 107. On September 19, 2014, Wolfus purchased in California 1,000,000 shares
2 of Midway's common stock directly from Midway at a purchase price of \$.86
3
4 Canadian dollars per share, which was approximately \$.78 US dollars per share.

5 108. Midway was the issuer of the 1,000,000 shares purchased by Wolfus and
6 as such was liable for any written or oral communication contained in its public filings
7 that included any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact
8 necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which the
9 statements were made, not misleading.
10

11 109. Each of the 2014 Control Defendants are jointly and severally liable to
12 Wolfus with Midway because of their positions as officers, directors and committee
13 members of Midway and as such are deemed to be "controlling persons" under the
14 Act. Moreover, each of the 2014 Control Defendants controlled Midway and had the
15 ability and duty to ensure that its public filings were true, correct and complete, were
16 not misleading and did not fail to disclose material facts.
17

18 110. In violation of California *Corporations Code* § 25401, the pre-September
19 2014 public filings by Midway which discussed the Pan project were materially false
20 and misleading by failing to timely disclose each of the 2014 Undisclosed Facts and
21 the failure by the 2014 Control Defendants to disclose the 2014 Undisclosed Facts was
22 intentional and was done to encourage investors to retain and purchase Midway's
23 common stock.
24
25
26
27
28

1 111. In purchasing shares in September 2014, Wolfus carefully reviewed and
2 relied on the public filings of Midway and was unaware of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts
3 or any of the 2014 Undisclosed Facts. Had Wolfus known any of the 2014
4 Undisclosed Facts or any of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts, Wolfus would not have
5 purchased any shares in September 2014.
6

7
8 112. As a result, Wolfus has been damaged in an amount of \$884,414.00 plus
9 interest thereon at 10% per annum from date of purchase and reasonable attorney fees.
10

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY**

13 **AGAINST THE 2013 AND 2014 CONTROL DEFENDANTS)**

14 113. Wolfus realleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 98,
15 102, 103, 105 through 107 and 111, as though fully set forth herein.
16

17 114. This is a claim for breach of fiduciary duty against the 2013 Control
18 Defendants arising out of their failure to disclose the 2013 Undisclosed Facts prior to
19 Wolfus stock purchase in January 2014 and against the 2014 Control Defendants for
20 their failure to disclose the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and the 2014 Undisclosed Facts
21 prior to Wolfus stock purchase in September 2014. This claim is based on California
22 common law arising out of breaches of fiduciary duty owed by Midway's officers and
23 directors directly to Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors as so held in *Meister v. Mensinger*,
24 230 Cal.App.4th 381 (2014). This is a cause of action which belongs solely to Wolfus
25 and Wolfus' assignors who are entitled to keep all recoveries thereon. While Midway
26
27
28

1 also breached its fiduciary duties owed to Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors, Midway has
2 not been joined as a culpable defendant because of the bankruptcy stay precluding
3 Wolfus from doing so. California law, as set forth in *Meister*, provides that Wolfus is
4 entitled to recover all damages proximately caused by the breach which is the market
5 value of the stock then owned by Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors in February 2014 and
6 the consideration paid by Wolfus for the shares purchased on September 19, 2014,
7 together with interest thereon at 10% per annum.
8

9 115. Each of the 2013 Control Defendants and 2014 Control Defendants were
10 fiduciaries and owed Wolfus the fiduciary duty of full disclosure of all material facts
11 then existing prior to Wolfus' exercise of his stock options in 2014.
12

13 116. Each of the 2013 Control Defendants and 2014 Control Defendants
14 breached their fiduciary duties to Wolfus by failing to disclose the 2013 Undisclosed
15 Facts prior to January 1, 2014 and by failing to disclose the 2014 Undisclosed Facts
16 prior to September 2014.
17

18 117. Had Wolfus known any of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts, Wolfus would
19 have sold all of his shares of Midway and all of his assignors' shares of Midway in
20 February 2014, when Midway's stock reached its peak and would not have purchased
21 any additional shares in January or September 2014.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 118. As a result of defendants' breach of their fiduciary duties to Wolfus,
2 Wolfus has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, but no event less than
3 \$3,000,000. Wolfus is entitled to interest at 10% per annum.
4

5 119. Defendants conduct was fraudulent entitling Wolfus to an award of
6 punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.
7

8 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(AIDING AND ABETTING A BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY**

10 **AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

11
12 120. Wolfus realleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 98,
13 102, 103, 105 through 107, 111, 115, 117 and 119, as though fully set forth herein.
14

15 121. This is a claim for California common law aiding and abetting a breach
16 of fiduciary duty owed by Midway directly to Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors for which
17 Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted as so held in *American Master Lease*
18 *LLC v. Idanta Partners, Ltd.*, 225 Cal.App.4th 1451 (2014). This is a cause of action
19 which belongs solely to Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors who are entitled to keep all
20 recoveries thereon. While Midway also breached its fiduciary duties owed to Wolfus
21 and Wolfus' assignors, Midway has not been joined as a culpable defendant because of
22 the bankruptcy stay precluding Wolfus from doing so. California law, as set forth in
23 *American Master Lease*, provides that Wolfus is entitled to recover all damages
24 proximately caused by the breach which is the market value of the stock then owned
25 by Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors in February 2014 and the consideration paid by
26
27
28

1 Wolfus for the shares purchased on September 19, 2014, together with interest thereon
2 at 10% per annum.

3 122. Wolfus is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Does 1 through
4
5 20 are the underlying beneficial owners of the Hale Investors and as such indirectly
6 through Hale controlled the Pan project and Midway at all times from and after June
7 2013.
8

9 123. Midway at all times after Wolfus ceased to be a member of Midway's
10 Board of Directors owed Wolfus of full disclosure of all relevant facts related to the
11 Pan project prior to selling 1,200,000 shares of Midway's common stock to Wolfus in
12 2014.
13

14 124. Midway breached its fiduciary duties to Wolfus in 2014 by failing to
15 disclose the 2013 Undisclosed Facts prior to January 2014 and by failing to disclose
16 the 2014 Undisclosed Facts prior to September 2014.
17

18 125. Defendants, and each of them, knew of Midway's fiduciary duties to
19 Wolfus and materially aided and abetted Midway in breaching its fiduciary duties.
20

21 126. Wolfus has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, but no event
22 less than \$3,000,000. Wolfus is entitled to interest at 10% per annum.
23
24
25
26
27
28

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(FRAUD AGAINST THE 2013 AND 2014 CONTROL DEFENDANTS)

127. Wolfus realleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 98, 102, 103, 105 through 107, 111 and 109, as though fully set forth herein.

128. This is a claim for California common law and statutory fraud committed both by Midway and Defendants, and each of them, for inducing Wolfus to purchase shares in January and September 2014 and inducing Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors to hold and not sell their shares in February 2014. This claim is based on the holding in *Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc.*, 30 Cal.4th 167 (2003). This is a cause of action which belongs solely to Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors who are entitled to keep all recoveries thereon. While Midway also defrauded Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors, Midway has not been joined as a culpable defendant because of the bankruptcy stay precluding Wolfus from doing so. California law, as set forth in *Small*, provides that Wolfus is entitled to recover all damages proximately caused by the fraud which is the market value of the stock then owned by Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors in February 2014 and the consideration paid by Wolfus for the shares purchased on September 19, 2014, together with interest thereon at 10% per annum.

129. In late December and in early January, Wolfus carefully reviewed all public filings and press releases of Midway issued after he ceased to be Midway's Chief Executive Officer in order to decide whether he should purchase additional shares of Midway or whether he should not make any further purchases and instead

1 sell both his Midway shares and those of his assignors. Wolfus' assignors are
2 immediate family members who totally relied on Wolfus' investment decisions.
3
4 Wolfus was primarily concerned with the status of the Pan project and the likelihood
5 that this project would begin profitably mining gold and be revenue positive. Wolfus
6 determined from those public statements and the absence of the 2013 Undisclosed
7 Facts that profitable mining operations would result in a substantial increase in the
8 value of their combined Midway shares.
9

10 130. Following Wolfus' share purchases in January 2014, Wolfus continued to
11 review and rely upon Midway's public filings and press releases and closely monitored
12 the market price of Midway's shares. When the market price of those shares peaked in
13 February 2014, Wolfus was again called upon to decide whether to hold his shares and
14 those of his assignors or whether to sell those shares. Wolfus determined from the
15 publicly available information from Midway that he and his assignors should continue
16 to hold their Midway shares. Had Wolfus learned of any of the 2013 Undisclosed
17 Facts, he would have sold all of his Midway shares and his assignor's Midway shares
18 in February 2014 when Midway's stock price began to fall from its peak.
19
20
21

22 131. In late August or early September, 2014, Wolfus again needed to make a
23 decision as to whether to purchase additional Midway shares or refrain from making
24 any further purchases and instead sell his shares and those of his assignors. Wolfus
25 again carefully reviewed all public filings and press releases issued by Midway since
26 December 2013. Had Wolfus learned of any of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts or any of
27
28

1 the 2014 Undisclosed Facts at that time, he would have sold all of his Midway shares
2 and his assignor's Midway shares in October 2014 when Midway's stock price began
3 to fall from its peak.
4

5 132. Wolfus' reliance on the statements of fact contained in Midway's public
6 filings and press releases and the absence of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and the 2014
7 Undisclosed Facts in those filings was reasonable.
8

9 133. The 2013 Control Defendants intentionally defrauded Wolfus by failing
10 to disclose or causing Midway to disclose the 2013 Undisclosed Facts.
11

12 134. The 2014 Control Defendants intentionally defrauded Wolfus by failing
13 to disclose or causing Midway to disclose the 2014 Undisclosed Facts.
14

15 135. Wolfus was ignorant of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts in January 2014, had
16 no ability to learn the 2013 Undisclosed Facts prior to January 2014, and relied upon
17 the absence of any disclosure of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts in exercising his stock
18 options in January 2014 and in not selling all of his and his assignors' shares of
19 Midway common stock prior to March, 2014.
20

21 136. Wolfus was ignorant of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and the 2014
22 Undisclosed Facts in September 2014, had no ability to learn any of those facts prior
23 to September 2014, and relied upon the absence of any of any disclosure of those facts
24 in exercising his stock options in September 2014 and in not selling all of his and his
25 assignors' shares of Midway common stock prior to November, 2014.
26
27
28

1 137. Wolfus first learned of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and the 2014
2 Undisclosed Facts after June 2015.

3
4 138. Wolfus has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, but no event
5 less than \$3,000,000. Wolfus is entitled to interest at 10% per annum.

6
7 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
8
9 **(NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION**
10 **AGAINST THE 2013 AND 2014 CONTROL DEFENDANTS)**

11 139. Wolfus realleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 98,
12 102, 103, 105 through 107, 111, 109, 129 through 132 and 135 through 137, as though
13 fully set forth herein.

14 140. This is a claim for California common law and statutory negligent
15 misrepresentation committed both by Midway and Defendants, and each of them, for
16 inducing Wolfus to purchase shares in January and September 2014 and inducing
17 Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors to hold and not sell their shares in February 2014. This
18 claim is brought pursuant to the holding in *Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc.*, 30 Cal.4th
19 167 (2003). This is a cause of action which belongs solely to Wolfus and Wolfus'
20 assignors who are entitled to keep all recoveries thereon. While Midway also made
21 negligent misrepresentations and omissions to Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors, Midway
22 has not been joined as a culpable defendant because of the bankruptcy stay precluding
23 Wolfus from doing so. California law, as set forth in *Small*, provides that Wolfus is
24 entitled to recover all damages proximately caused by the negligent misrepresentation
25
26
27
28

1 which is the market value of the stock then owned by Wolfus and Wolfus' assignors in
2 February 2014 and the consideration paid by Wolfus for the shares purchased on
3
4 September 19, 2014, together with interest thereon at 10% per annum.

5 141. The 2013 Control Defendants negligently failed to disclose or cause
6 Midway to disclose the 2013 Undisclosed Facts to Wolfus prior to his exercise of
7
8 stock options in January 2014.

9 142. The 2014 Control Defendants negligently failed to disclose or cause
10 Midway to disclose the 2014 Undisclosed Facts to Wolfus prior to his exercise of
11
12 stock options in September 2014.

13 143. Because of their status, the 2013 Control Defendants and the 2014
14 Control Defendants owed Wolfus a duty of full disclosure of all relevant facts related
15
16 to the Pan project prior to causing or allowing Midway to sell common stock to
17 Wolfus.

18 144. Wolfus was ignorant of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts in January 2014, had
19
20 no ability to learn the 2013 Undisclosed Facts prior to January 2014, and relied upon
21 the absence of any disclosure of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts in exercising his stock
22 options in January 2014 and in not selling all of his and his assignors' shares of
23
24 Midway common stock prior to March, 2014.

25 145. Wolfus was ignorant of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and the 2014
26 Undisclosed Facts in September 2014, had no ability to learn any of those facts prior
27
28 to September 2014, and relied upon the absence of any of any disclosure of those facts

1 in exercising his stock options in September 2014 and in not selling all of his and his
2 assignors' shares of Midway common stock prior to November, 2014.

3
4 146. Wolfus first learned of the 2013 Undisclosed Facts and the 2014
5 Undisclosed Facts after June 2015.

6 147. Wolfus has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, but no event
7 less than \$3,000,000. Wolfus is entitled to interest at 10% per annum.
8

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 **WHEREFORE**, Wolfus prays judgment against Defendants, as follows:
11

- 12 1. For damages in excess of \$10,000.00, according to proof;
13 2. For exemplary or punitive damages, according to proof;
14 3. For interest thereon at 10% per annum;
15 4. For attorneys' fees;
16 5. For costs of suit; and
17 6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
18

19 Dated this 5th day of February, 2018.
20

21 */s/ James R. Christensen*

22 James R. Christensen Esq.
23 Nevada Bar No. 3861
24 James R. Christensen PC
25 601 S. 6th Street
26 Las Vegas NV 89101
27 (702) 272-0406
28 (702) 272-0415 fax
jim@jchristensenlaw.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b), I certify service of the foregoing
SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT was made this date via Odyssey to all parties
currently shown on the e-service list of recipients.

DATED this 5th day of February, 2018.

/s/ Dawn Christensen
an employee of JAMES R. CHRISTENSEN
Attorney for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

NI 43-101 TECHNICAL REPORT
Feasibility Study
for the
PAN GOLD PROJECT
White Pine County, Nevada

PREPARED FOR MIDWAY GOLD CORP.



Effective date: November 15, 2011

Signature date: December 19, 2011

Prepared by
William J. Crawl, R.G. QP MMSA
Donald E. Hulse, P.E.
Terre A. Lane, QP MMSA
Donald J. Baker, PhD QP MMSA
Jennifer J. Brown, P.G. Registered Member SME



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 SUMMARY	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND OWNERSHIP	1
1.3 GEOLOGY AND MINERALIZATION	2
1.4 CONCEPT AND STATUS OF EXPLORATION	2
1.5 MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATE	2
1.5.1 North Pan	3
1.5.2 Central and South Pan	3
1.6 MINERAL RESERVE ESTIMATE	6
1.6.1 Whittle Optimization	6
1.6.2 Calculation Parameters	6
1.6.3 Cutoff Grade Equations	7
1.6.4 Mineral Reserve Estimate	7
1.7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
2 INTRODUCTION	10
2.1 PURPOSE	10
2.2 QUALIFIED PERSONS	10
2.3 SITE VISIT OF QUALIFIED PERSON	10
2.4 SOURCES OF INFORMATION	11
2.5 UNITS OF MEASURE	11
3 RELIANCE ON OTHER EXPERTS	12
4 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION	13
4.1 LOCATION	13
4.2 MINERAL TENURE, AGREEMENTS, AND EXPLORATION PERMITS	14
4.2.1 Mineral Rights	14
4.2.1.1 Newark Valley Mining Agreement	15
4.2.1.2 Additional Claims	16
4.3 ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITIES	16
4.4 EXPLORATION PERMITS AND JURISDICTIONS	17
5 ACCESSIBILITY, CLIMATE, LOCAL RESOURCES, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND PHYSIOGRAPHY	19
5.1 ACCESSIBILITY, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND LOCAL RESOURCES	19
5.2 TOPOGRAPHY, ELEVATION, VEGETATION, AND CLIMATE	19
6 HISTORY	21
6.1 EXPLORATION HISTORY	21
6.2 HISTORICAL RESOURCE AND RESERVE ESTIMATES	22
7 GEOLOGICAL SETTING AND MINERALIZATION	23
7.1 REGIONAL GEOLOGY	23
7.2 PROPERTY GEOLOGY	26

7.2.1	<i>Lithological Units</i>	26
7.2.1.1	Simonson Dolomite (Ds) - Devonian.....	26
7.2.1.2	Devils Gate Limestone (Dd) - Late Devonian.....	26
7.2.1.3	Pilot Shale (MDp) - Late Devonian to Early Mississippian.....	26
7.2.1.4	Joana Limestone (Mj) - Mississippian.....	26
7.2.1.5	Chainman Shale (Mc) - Mississippian.....	27
7.2.1.6	Diamond Peak Formation (Md) - Mississippian.....	27
7.2.1.7	Ely Limestone (Pe) - Pennsylvanian.....	27
7.2.1.8	Rib Hill Siltstone - Permian.....	27
7.2.1.9	Kaibab Limestone - Permian.....	27
7.2.1.10	Intrusives - Cretaceous.....	27
7.2.1.11	Volcanic Units (Tv) - Tertiary.....	28
7.2.2	<i>Structural Geology</i>	28
7.3	MINERALIZATION	28
7.3.1	<i>Alteration</i>	29
7.3.2	<i>Geometry of Mineralization</i>	30
8	DEPOSIT TYPES	33
9	EXPLORATION	34
9.1	PREVIOUS OPERATORS EXPLORATION WORK.....	34
9.2	MIDWAY EXPLORATION WORK.....	34
9.2.1	<i>Surface Geochemistry</i>	34
9.2.2	<i>Rock Samples</i>	34
9.2.3	<i>Geologic Mapping</i>	35
9.2.4	<i>Geophysical Surveys</i>	35
10	DRILLING	36
10.1	INTRODUCTION.....	36
10.2	DRILLING BY MIDWAY GOLD CORP.	36
10.2.1	<i>Drilling Procedures and Conditions</i>	39
10.2.2	<i>Drill hole Collar Surveys</i>	39
10.2.3	<i>Down hole Surveys</i>	39
10.2.4	<i>Extent of Drilling</i>	40
10.2.5	<i>MIDWAY Data Compilation and Grid Conversion</i>	40
10.3	SAMPLING METHOD AND APPROACH.....	40
11	SAMPLE PREPARATION, ANALYSES, AND SECURITY	42
11.1	SAMPLE PREPARATION AND ANALYSIS PROCEDURES.....	42
12	DATA VERIFICATION	43
12.1	CHECK ASSAYS.....	43
12.2	MIDWAY GOLD CORP. QA/QC PROGRAMS.....	45
12.3	TWIN HOLE STUDY.....	46
13	MINERAL PROCESSING AND METALLURGICAL TESTING	49
13.1	ORE SAMPLING AND TEST WORK.....	49
13.2	ONGOING METALLURGICAL TEST WORK.....	49
13.2.1	<i>Head Assays</i>	50
13.2.2	<i>XRF Analyses</i>	51

13.2.3	XRD Analysis	52
13.2.4	ICP Analysis	52
13.2.5	Crushability Work and Abrasion Index	55
13.2.6	Static Bucket Leach Tests for Surface Samples	56
13.2.7	Bottle Roll Leach Tests	57
13.2.8	Column Leach Tests	60
13.2.8.1	Assay-by-Size Fraction for Gold	60
13.2.8.2	Test Results	62
13.2.8.3	Percent Slump	64
13.2.8.4	Drain Down and Maximum Percolation Rate	64
13.2.8.5	Tailing Analysis	65
13.2.8.6	Pregnant Solution Analysis	65
13.2.9	Coarse Ore Bottle Roll Leach Tests on North Pan Samples	68
13.2.10	Agglomeration Tests	68
13.2.11	Carbon Loading Tests	69
13.2.12	Metallurgical Testing Conclusions	70
14	MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATES	71
14.1	DATA USED FOR THE GOLD GRADE ESTIMATION	71
14.2	DENSITY	71
14.3	METHODOLOGY	72
14.4	ESTIMATION DOMAINS	73
14.4.1	Creation of Domains	73
14.4.1.1	North Pan	75
14.4.1.2	Central Pan	75
14.4.1.3	South Pan	75
14.4.2	Grade Shell Estimation	77
14.4.2.1	North Pan	77
14.4.2.2	Central and South Pan	77
14.5	COMPOSITING	79
14.6	CAPPING OF ASSAYS	79
14.7	VARIOGRAPHY	80
14.8	ESTIMATION METHODOLOGY	82
14.8.1	North Pan	82
14.8.2	Central and South Pan	82
14.9	ESTIMATE VALIDATION	84
14.10	MINERAL RESOURCE CLASSIFICATION	86
14.11	MINERAL RESOURCE TABULATION	86
15	MINERAL RESERVE ESTIMATES	89
15.1.1	Whittle Pit Optimization	89
15.1.2	Calculation Parameters	89
15.1.2.1	Cutoff Grade Equations	89
15.1.3	Mineral Reserve Estimate	90
16	MINING METHODS	93
16.1	OPEN PIT MINE PLAN	93
16.1.1	Pit Design	95
16.1.1.1	Geotechnical Pit Slope Evaluation	98

16.1.2	Waste Dumps.....	100
16.1.3	Annual Mine Plans.....	100
16.1.4	Geotechnical Design- Heap Leach Pad, Ponds, Stormwater Diversions.....	109
16.1.5	Site Scale Hydrology.....	109
16.1.5.1	Deep Bedrock Aquifer.....	111
16.1.5.2	Water Quality.....	113
16.1.5.3	Alluvial Aquifer.....	113
16.1.6	Mining Equipment.....	115
16.1.7	Support Equipment.....	115
16.2	PREPRODUCTION DEVELOPMENT.....	116
16.3	PRODUCTION SCHEDULE.....	116
16.3.1	Pit Design Schedule Sequence.....	117
16.3.2	Production Schedule Parameters.....	118
16.3.3	Drill and Blast Parameters.....	119
16.3.4	Load and Haul Parameters.....	120
17	RECOVERY METHODS.....	122
17.1.1	Process Description.....	122
17.1.2	Production Rate and Products.....	122
17.1.3	Primary Crushing.....	124
17.1.4	Secondary Crushing.....	126
17.1.5	Agglomeration.....	128
17.1.6	Conveying and Stacking.....	130
17.1.7	Heap Leach.....	132
17.1.8	ADR Gold Recovery Plant.....	132
18	PROJECT INFRASTRUCTURE.....	135
18.1	FACILITIES.....	135
18.1.1	Office Building.....	135
18.1.2	Warehouse and Laboratory.....	135
18.1.3	Truck Shop & Maintenance.....	135
18.1.4	Guard House.....	135
18.1.5	Process Building.....	135
18.2	ROADS.....	140
18.3	SECURITY.....	140
18.4	SEPTIC SYSTEMS.....	140
18.5	WATER.....	140
18.6	POWER.....	141
18.7	FUEL DEPOT.....	143
18.8	COMMUNICATIONS.....	143
19	MARKET STUDIES AND CONTRACTS.....	144
20	ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES, PERMITTING AND SOCIAL OR COMMUNITY IMPACT.....	145
20.1	PERMITS REQUIRED.....	145
21	CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS.....	148
21.1	CAPITAL COST ESTIMATE.....	148
21.1.1	Basis.....	148
21.1.2	Mine Development.....	148

21.1.3	Mine Equipment	149
21.1.4	Mine Buildings	149
21.1.5	Facilities and Infrastructure	150
21.1.6	Primary Crushing and Coarse Ore Storage	152
21.1.7	Secondary Crushing, Agglomeration and Stacking	153
21.1.8	Leaching	155
21.1.9	Process Ponds	155
21.1.10	Storm Water Diversions	156
21.1.11	Gold Recovery	156
21.1.12	Owner's Costs	158
21.1.13	EPCM	159
21.1.14	Working Capital	159
21.1.15	Sustaining Capital	160
21.1.16	Contingency	161
21.2	OPERATING COST ESTIMATE	162
21.2.1	Project Cost and Basis	162
21.2.2	Project Manpower	164
21.2.3	Mine Operating Costs	167
21.2.4	Mine Equipment Costs	168
21.2.5	Mine Operating Cost Statistics	168
21.2.6	Plant Operating Costs	169
21.2.7	Plant Equipment Costs	170
21.2.8	Plant Operating Cost Statistics	171
21.2.9	General and Administration Costs	171
21.2.10	General and Administration Cost Statistics	172
21.2.11	Insurance	172
21.2.12	Net Proceeds of Mines/Property Tax	172
21.2.13	Contingency	173
21.2.14	Income Tax	173
22	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS	174
22.1	FINANCIAL ANALYSIS	174
22.2	COMMODITY PRICE(S)	174
22.3	ROYALTIES AND TAXES	174
22.4	CASH FLOW ANALYSIS	174
22.5	ECONOMIC PROJECTION	175
22.6	SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	175
22.6.1	Price	175
22.6.2	Operating Cost, Capital Cost and Gold Grade	176
23	ADJACENT PROPERTIES	178
24	OTHER RELEVANT DATA AND INFORMATION	179
25	INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS	180
26	RECOMMENDATIONS	181
27	REFERENCES	182

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 4-1 Property Location	13
Figure 4-2 Claim Boundary	14
Figure 7-1 Regional Geology, Pancake Range Local Geology	24
Figure 7-2 Pan Stratigraphy	25
Figure 7-3 East-West Section across North Pan, Looking North	31
Figure 7-4 East-West Section across South Pan, Looking North	32
Figure 10-1 Pan Project MIDWAY Drill Hole Distribution	38
Figure 12-1 MIDWAY Rig Duplicates	44
Figure 12-2 Grade vs. Depth Comparison 1	47
Figure 12-3 Grade vs. Depth Comparison 2	48
Figure 14-1 Estimation Domains	74
Figure 14-2 South and Central Pan Grade Shells at Bench 6600	76
Figure 14-3 A Spherical Variogram for the Major Axis the South Pan Breccia Domain	81
Figure 14-4 Block Model Gold Content of Bench Elevation 6600	85
Figure 16-1 General Site Layout	94
Figure 16-2 Final Pits, Heap and Waste Dumps	97
Figure 16-3 Mine Plan – Year 1	101
Figure 16-4 Mine Plan – Year 2	102
Figure 16-5 Mine Plan – Year 3	103
Figure 16-6 Mine Plan – Year 4	104
Figure 16-7 Mine Plan – Year 5	105
Figure 16-8 Mine Plan – Year 6	106
Figure 16-9 Mine Plan – Year 7	107
Figure 16-10 Mine Plan – Year 8	108
Figure 16-11 Conceptual Cross Section of the Pan Project Proposed Mine Area	110
Figure 16-12 Deep Borehole Locations	112
Figure 16-13 Existing Wells in Alluvial Aquifer	114
Figure 17-1 General Process Flow	123
Figure 17-2 Primary Jaw Crusher	125
Figure 17-3 Secondary and Tertiary Crushing	127
Figure 17-4 Agglomerator	129
Figure 17-5 Teletacker	131
Figure 17-6 ADR Processing Facility General Arrangement	133
Figure 18-1 Office Building	136
Figure 18-2 Lab and Warehouse Facility	137
Figure 18-3 Truck and Maintenance Shop	138
Figure 18-4 Guard House	139
Figure 18-5 Powerline Alignment	142
Figure 21-1 Contingency Calculation	161
Figure 22-1 Gold Price Sensitivity	176
Figure 22-2 Economic Sensitivities	177

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 1-1 North Pan Mineral Resource	4
Table 1-2 Central Pan Mineral Resource	4
Table 1-3 South Pan Mineral Resource	5
Table 1-4 Total Pan Mineral Resource	5
Table 1-5 Pan Project Mineral Reserves Estimate	7
Table 4-1 Pan Royalty Schedule	15
Table 10-1 Midway Drilling Exploration Summary	36
Table 10-2 2011 Drill Hole Summary	37
Table 11-1 Drill Data by Analytical Method	42
Table 12-1 Descriptive Statistics of MIDWAY Duplicate Rig Samples	45
Table 13-1 Lithology of Composite Samples	49
Table 13-2 Head Analyses of Composite Samples	50
Table 13-3 XRF Analyses	51
Table 13-4 XRD Test Results	52
Table 13-5 ICP Analyses of Composite Samples	53
Table 13-6 Crushability and Abrasion Test Results	56
Table 13-7 Static Bucket Leach Test Results	57
Table 13-8 Bottle Roll Cyanidation Test Results – Composite Sample, 6-mesh	58
Table 13-9 Bottle Roll Cyanidation Test Results – Composite Sample, 200-mesh	59
Table 13-10 Assay-by-Size Fraction Data	61
Table 13-11 Summary of Column Leach Test Results for North Pan Samples	62
Table 13-12 Summary of Column Leach Test Results for South Pan Samples	63
Table 13-13 Percolation Test Results	64
Table 13-14 Residue Assay-by-Size Data	65
Table 13-15 A and B, Pregnant Solution Analyses	66
Table 13-16 Bottle Roll Cyanide Leach Test Results	68
Table 13-17 Agglomeration Test Results	69
Table 14-1 Core Sample Density Test Results	72
Table 14-2 Pan Project Raw Assay Summary Statistics Au \geq 0.001 opt	78
Table 14-3 Domain Composite Data	79
Table 14-4 Pan Variogram Parameters	81
Table 14-5 Pan Estimation Parameters	83
Table 14-6 Pan Estimation Parameters	83
Table 14-7 Pan Estimation Parameters	83
Table 14-8 North Pan Mineral Resource	86
Table 14-9 Central Pan Mineral Resource	87
Table 14-10 South Pan Mineral Resource	87

Table 14-11 Total Pan Mineral Resource	88
Table 15-1 Calculated Cutoffs	90
Table 15-2 North and Central Pan Mineral Reserves	91
Table 15-3 South Pan and Total Pan Project Mineral Reserves	92
Table 16-1 Pit Design Criteria	95
Table 16-2 Slope Design Recommendations	99
Table 16-3 Initial Mine Equipment	115
Table 16-4 Additional Mine Equipment	115
Table 16-5 Mine Support Equipment	116
Table 16-6 Pan Project Mine Development	116
Table 16-7 Yearly Production Schedule	117
Table 16-8 Leach Pad Construction Materials	118
Table 16-9 Production Schedule by Pit Design	118
Table 16-10 Mine Schedule Parameters	119
Table 16-11 Equipment Availabilities/Utilization	119
Table 16-12 Drill and Blast Parameters	120
Table 16-13 Load and Haul Parameters	121
Table 17-1 Estimated Reagent Consumption	130
Table 17-2 ADR Plant Equipment List	134
Table 18-1 Maximum Water Usage	141
Table 18-2 Pan Project Estimated Electrical Load	143
Table 20-1 Major Permits and Authorizations Required for Project Development	145
Table 21-1 Pan Project Capital Cost Estimate	148
Table 21-2 Pan Project Mine Development	149
Table 21-3 Mine Mobile Equipment	149
Table 21-4 Mine Buildings	150
Table 21-5 Pan Project Infrastructure, Facilities, and Buildings	152
Table 21-6 Primary Crushing and Material Handling	153
Table 21-7 Secondary Crushing and Stacking	154
Table 21-8 Secondary Tertiary Crusher	155
Table 21-9 Leach Pad Cost Estimate	155
Table 21-10 Process Pond Cost Estimate	156
Table 21-11 Storm Water Diversions	156
Table 21-12 Gold Recovery Process	157
Table 21-13 Plant Mobile Equipment	158
Table 21-14 Owner's Costs	159
Table 21-15 Working Capital Costs	160
Table 21-16 Additional Mine Equipment	160
Table 21-17 Mine Sustaining Capital Major Rebuilds	161
Table 21-18 Pan Operating Cost Summary by Cost Type	162

Table 21-19 Pan Operating Cost Summary by Cost Center	163
Table 21-20 Pan Summary Average Yearly Manpower Costs	164
Table 21-21 Mine Manpower	165
Table 21-22 Processing Department Manpower	166
Table 21-23 General and Administration Department Manpower	167
Table 21-24 Pan Yearly Mine Operating Costs	167
Table 21-25 Yearly Equipment Hourly Cost	168
Table 21-26 Mine Operating Cost Statistics	169
Table 21-27 Pan Yearly Plant Operating Costs	170
Table 21-28 Yearly Plant Equipment and Non-Equipment Costs	170
Table 21-29 Yearly Plant Operating Cost Statistics	171
Table 21-30 Pan Yearly General and Administration Costs	171
Table 21-31 Yearly Plant Operating Cost Statistics	172
Table 22-1 Economic Projection	175

1 SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

Gustavson Associates, LLC (Gustavson) was commissioned by Midway Gold Corp. to complete a Feasibility Study for the Pan Gold Project in White Pine County, Nevada, based on the Updated Mineral Resource Estimate dated September 1, 2011. The Feasibility Study is intended to provide a comprehensive technical and economic analysis of the selected development option for the mineral project. This study includes detailed assessments of realistically assumed mining, processing, metallurgical, economic, legal, environmental, social, and other relevant considerations which have successfully demonstrated the economic viability of the project. The purpose of this report is to document the results of the Feasibility Study in compliance with Canadian National Instrument 43-101 Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects.

The Pan gold deposit is a sediment-hosted, bulk tonnage Carlin-type gold deposit along the prolific Battle Mountain-Eureka gold trend in east-central Nevada. Midway Gold US Inc. (hereafter referred to as MIDWAY) has drilled, sampled, and mapped the Pan deposit since acquiring the project in 2007. MIDWAY completed 61,875 ft of drilling in 162 holes in 2007 and 2008, and released an updated mineral resource estimate in December 2009. Gustavson performed an independent audit of the 2009 mineral resource estimate as part of a Preliminary Economic Assessment in 2010, and MIDWAY conducted a 14-hole (5774 ft) diamond core drilling program to obtain additional metallurgical and geotechnical data during the latter half of that same year. Gustavson completed a mineral reserve and mine plan as part of the March 2011 Preliminary Feasibility Study, which included an updated geologic model and mineral resource based on data obtained through February 28, 2011. MIDWAY has since completed an additional 33 holes totaling 27,795 ft.

1.2 Property Description and Ownership

The Pan Project is located in White Pine County, Nevada, approximately 22 miles southeast of Eureka and 50 miles west of Ely. The project area consists of 10,373 acres on 550 contiguous, unpatented federal mining claims controlled by MIDWAY. The property is located in the rolling hills of the Pancake Range in the Basin and Range physiographic province. Terrain is gentle to moderate throughout most of the project area, with no major stream drainages. Elevation of the property ranges from 6,400 to 7,500 ft above mean sea level.

At present, no infrastructure or power is in place at the Pan site. A relatively low voltage distribution line crosses the valley floor near a local ranch approximately 5 miles away. A higher voltage transmission line, 69 kV, with capacity suitable for mining and processing operations, is located approximately 14 miles from the project site and six miles north of US 50. Water to support exploration drilling is available from ranch wells approximately 3 miles to the west of the property. Logistical support is available in Eureka, Ely, and Elko, all of which currently

support large open pit mining operations. Mining personnel and resources for operations at Pan are expected to be available from Eureka, White Pine, and Elko Counties.

1.3 Geology and Mineralization

The geology of the Pan property is dominated by Devonian to Permian carbonate and clastic sedimentary rocks cut by the Pan fault, a steeply west dipping fault that trends north-south. The Pan fault juxtaposes gently west dipping sedimentary units on the west side of the fault with steeply northeast dipping sedimentary units on the east side. Post-mineral Tertiary volcanic rocks nonconformably overlie the faulted Devonian-Permian sedimentary units.

Gold mineralization at Pan occurs in a Carlin-style, epithermal, disseminated, sediment-hosted system. The distribution of the mineralization is controlled by structure, particularly with regard to the development of breccias, and by sedimentary bedding and alteration along unit contacts. Gold deposits within the project area generally occur as elongate bodies associated with structures and dissolution/hydrothermal breccia bodies hosted by the Pilot Shale and, to a lesser extent, the Devils Gate Limestone. Gold deposits also occur in a more tabular fashion within altered and mineralized sedimentary horizons.

1.4 Concept and Status of Exploration

MIDWAY's exploration program includes core and reverse circulation drilling, geologic mapping, geochemical sampling, and geophysical surveys at the Pan property. This comprehensive program has helped to define the geologic occurrence of gold mineralization and identify additional exploration targets on the Pan property. The level of exploration in individual target areas varies from rock and soil sampling with anomalous results to drill holes which reveal anomalous to ore-grade gold values, as determined during the February 2011 Preliminary Feasibility Study. Geochemical and geophysical targets merit additional work, primarily drilling, to test anomalous rock and soil geochemical results. Additional drilling is needed in portions of the deposit to expand and better understand existing drill intercepts.

1.5 Mineral Resource Estimate

Gustavson completed an updated mineral resource estimate for the Pan Project in November 2011. As part of that study, Gustavson created a model to estimate the mineral resources at Pan based on data provided by MIDWAY as of September 1, 2011. No new drilling occurred at North Pan and the February 2011 resource model was not modified during the current study. Gold mineralization in Central and South Pan was re-evaluated during the course of this resource update. Drill hole data including collar coordinates, MIDWAY surveys, sample assay intervals, and geologic logs were provided in a secure Microsoft Access database. Surficial geology maps and cross-sections detailing alteration and lithology were also provided in electronic format. The database has been updated to include the additional 33 reverse circulation drill holes completed by MIDWAY in 2011.

Gustavson modeled and estimated the mineral resource by constructing geologic, alteration, and mineral domains from the MIDWAY cross sections, and by geostatistically analyzing the drill data to define the parameters required to estimate gold grades in the 3-Dimensional (3D) block model. Leapfrog 3D® geological modeling software was used to create 3D stratigraphic, alteration, and mineral domain solids. MicroModel® software was used to estimate gold grades.

MIDWAY defined the structure, stratigraphy, and alteration of the North, Central, and South Pan zones on 1 inch = 50 ft cross-sections spaced 200 feet apart and oriented east to west. Gustavson combined the MIDWAY subsurface interpretations with surface geology to create 3D stratigraphic and alteration models.

A block model was created for the Pan Deposit using blocks that are 20 feet wide, 20 feet long, and 20 feet high. Each of the blocks was assigned attributes of gold grade, mineral resource classification, rock density, tonnage factor, lithology, alteration, and a grade classification. The blocks were then assigned to a domain as appropriate to assist in estimation.

1.5.1 North Pan

All of the domains were estimated in 3 passes and each block was assigned a classification of measured, indicated, or inferred. The resource classification of each block was based on a factor of the average sample distance in an anisotropic direction as established by the second structure range from the variogram model for the domain being estimated. The measured class utilized a ½ ellipsoid variogram search distance. Indicated was set at a full variogram search distance and inferred was set at 2 times the variogram distance. As an additional requirement, Gustavson limited the measured and indicated estimation data to include only the fire assay intervals. Inferred resource was estimated using all available assay data. Ordinary Kriging was used to estimate grade for all domains.

1.5.2 Central and South Pan

All of the domains were estimated by using large search ellipses oriented in the direction of maximum continuity to provide an estimation of the gold grade within every block inside of the grade shells. The resource classification of each block was based on a factor of the closest sample distance in an anisotropic direction as established by the second structure range from the variogram model for the domain being estimated. The measured class utilized a ½ ellipsoid variogram search distance. Indicated resource was set at a full variogram search distance and inferred resource was set at 2 times the variogram distance. Each domain was estimated using a minimum of 5 composites with no more than 4 composites from a single drill hole. A maximum of 12 composites was allowed to better represent the local variability. Ordinary Kriging was used to estimate grade for all domains.

The mineral resource estimate is summarized in Tables 1-1 through 1-4. This mineral resource estimate includes all drill data obtained as of September 1, 2011, and has been independently verified by Gustavson.

Table 1-1 North Pan Mineral Resource

North Pan Measured Resource			
Opt	Tons	Au Opt	oz
0.008	13,994,415	0.0168	234,844
0.006	15,592,007	0.0158	245,850
0.004	18,597,319	0.0140	260,404
North Pan Indicated Resource			
0.008	10,565,126	0.0146	154,540
0.006	12,702,959	0.0133	169,135
0.004	17,006,845	0.0112	189,823
North Pan Measured plus Indicated Resource			
0.008	24,559,541	0.0159	389,384
0.006	28,294,966	0.0147	414,985
0.004	35,604,164	0.0126	450,228
North Pan Inferred Resource			
0.008	122,858	0.0112	1,376
0.006	233,476	0.0091	2,129
0.004	511,402	0.0067	3,427

Table 1-2 Central Pan Mineral Resource

Central Pan Measured Resource			
Opt	Tons	Au Opt	oz
0.008	2,329,227	0.0146	33,991
0.006	2,837,448	0.0132	37,482
0.004	3,802,537	0.0111	42,192
Central Pan Indicated Resource			
0.008	1,895,266	0.0122	23,216
0.006	2,524,520	0.0109	27,623
0.004	4,053,056	0.0086	34,885
Central Pan Measured plus Indicated Resource			
0.008	4,224,493	0.0135	57,207
0.006	5,361,968	0.0121	65,105
0.004	7,855,593	0.0098	77,077
Central Pan Inferred Resource			
0.008	240,912	0.0103	2,470
0.006	290,465	0.0096	2,802
0.004	722,079	0.0066	4,741

Table 1-3 South Pan Mineral Resource

South Pan Measured Resource			
Opt	Tons	Au Opt	oz
0.008	13,826,998	0.0182	251,350
0.006	15,584,480	0.0169	263,423
0.004	18,297,337	0.0151	276,641
South Pan Indicated Resource			
0.008	17,440,794	0.0158	275,596
0.006	20,764,856	0.0144	298,599
0.004	26,469,130	0.0123	325,863
South Pan Measured plus Indicated Resource			
0.008	31,267,792	0.0169	526,946
0.006	36,349,336	0.0155	562,022
0.004	44,766,467	0.0135	602,504
South Pan Inferred Resource			
0.008	1,588,716	0.0184	29,274
0.006	1,933,540	0.0164	31,651
0.004	3,096,599	0.0120	37,093

Table 1-4 Total Pan Mineral Resource

Pan Total Measured Resource			
Opt	Tons	Au Opt	oz
0.008	30,150,640	0.0173	520,186
0.006	34,013,935	0.0161	546,756
0.004	40,697,193	0.0142	579,238
Pan Total Indicated Resource			
0.008	29,901,186	0.0152	453,351
0.006	35,992,335	0.0138	495,357
0.004	47,529,031	0.0116	550,571
Pan Total Measured plus Indicated Resource			
0.008	60,051,826	0.0162	973,537
0.006	70,006,270	0.0149	1,042,112
0.004	88,226,224	0.0128	1,129,809
Pan Total Inferred Resource			
0.008	1,952,486	0.0170	33,120
0.006	2,457,481	0.0149	36,581
0.004	4,330,080	0.0105	45,261

1.6 **Mineral Reserve Estimate**

The February 2011 Prefeasibility Study demonstrated that the Pan Project is economically viable, and this Feasibility Study has strengthened that conclusion. Based on the results of the Feasibility Study, Measured and Indicated Mineral Reserves within the designed pits are considered Proven and Probable Reserves as defined by the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy, and Petroleum. The final reserves are reported using a 0.008 Au opt cutoff for the North and Central pits, and a 0.006 Au opt cutoff for the South pit. Cutoffs were chosen to maximize the NPV of the project and do not necessarily represent the minimum economic cutoff. Pit designs are based on geologic criteria provided in the April 2011 Pit Slope Evaluation report produced by Golder Associates. Geologic solids created for each lithological unit were used as a guide during the pit design process. The limestone units were designed with a 50° inter-ramp wall angle assuming pre-split blasting in these units; all other lithological units were designed with a 45° inter-ramp wall angle.

1.6.1 Whittle Optimization

Gustavson generated a series of optimization shells on the South and North resource blocks, ranging from \$236/oz to \$2360/oz. Forty six shells were generated separately for the North and South resource areas. Heap leach recoveries of 65% and 85%, for North and South Pan, respectively, were used in the optimization runs. The general parameters were based on preliminary estimates of operating cost, and incorporated recommendations from the April 2011 Pit Slope Evaluation report. Mining costs were estimated to be \$1.09/ton of material moved for the pit optimization. Crushing, agglomeration, leaching, general and administration, and gold recovery costs were estimated at \$3.71/ton of ore. Only Measured and Indicated Resources were considered in the evaluation; Inferred resources were treated as waste.

1.6.2 Calculation Parameters

The series of pit optimizations were graphed and evaluated to compare cash flows, net present values (NPV's) and internal rates of return (IRR's). The final South pit and the North pit optimizations are based on shells at a cost less than the three year trailing average price of

\$1200/oz in order to achieve a higher NPV and overall lower cash cost per ounce. The option of mining the entire South Pan pit before the North Pan pit was evaluated during the scheduling process. Although the South Pan pit has a 20% higher recovery factor, mining the South Pan in phases results in a higher IRR by delaying the high strip of the Phase 2 South Pit until the end of the mine life. The option of mining the North pit first was also evaluated, but the higher recovery from the South Pan pit (85%, compared to 65% from North Pan) and shorter estimated leach times render the South pit the more favorable option to mine first.

1.6.3 Cutoff Grade Equations

The mineral reserve estimate for the Pan Project is based on designed open pits with maximized revenues at a gold price of \$1180 per ounce. Cutoff grades of 0.006 Au opt (0.21 gpt) in the South pit and 0.008 Au opt (0.27 gpt) in the North & Central pits provide the highest NPV for the project.

1.6.4 Mineral Reserve Estimate

Using the NI 43-101 Updated Mineral Resource Estimate filed in November 2011, Proven and Probable Reserves of 53,254,000 tons at a grade of 0.016 opt are contained in the mineral resource at Pan. A total of 864,000 oz of gold are contained in the Pan Project mineral reserves. Estimated mineral reserves for the Pan Project are presented in Table 1-5.

Table 1-5 Pan Project Mineral Reserves Estimate

North and Central Pan Cutoff Grade: 0.008 opt / 0.274 g/tonnes	Tons	Gold	
	(x 1000)	opt	ounces (x 1000)
North Pan			
Proven Reserves	12,625	0.018	223.30
Probable Reserves	10,993	0.015	162.66
Proven & Probable Reserves	23,618	0.016	385.95
Inferred within Designed Pit	351	0.012	4.29
Waste within Designed Pit	27,823		
Total tons within Designed Pit	51,791		
Central Pan			
Proven Reserves	1,799	0.015	27.78
Probable Reserves	1,125	0.013	15.00
Proven & Probable Reserves	2,924	0.015	42.78
Inferred within Designed Pit	75	0.010	0.77
Waste within Designed Pit	5,387		
Total tons within Designed Pit	8,386		
Sub Total - North + Central			
Proven Reserves	14,423	0.017	251.08
Probable Reserves	12,119	0.015	177.66
Proven & Probable Reserves	26,542	0.016	428.74
Inferred within Designed Pit	426	0.012	5.06
Waste within Designed Pit	33,210		
Total tons within Designed Pit	60,177		

Table 1-5 cont.

South Pan - Phases 1 and 2 Cutoff Grade: 0.006 opt / 0.206 g/tonnes	Tons	Gold	
	(x 1000)	opt	ounces (x 1000)
South Pan - Phase 1			
Proven Reserves	11,856	0.018	215.44
Probable Reserves	7,593	0.016	119.26
Proven & Probable Reserves	19,449	0.017	334.70
Inferred within Designed Pit	56	0.010	0.55
Waste within Designed Pit	31,887		
Total tons within Designed Pit	51,392		
South Pan - Phase 2			
Proven Reserves	1,548	0.014	21.01
Probable Reserves	5,716	0.014	79.80
Proven & Probable Reserves	7,263	0.014	100.81
Inferred within Designed Pit	212	0.016	3.39
Waste within Designed Pit	29,485		
Total tons within Designed Pit	36,961		
Sub Total - Phase 1 + 2			
Proven Reserves	13,404	0.018	236.46
Probable Reserves	13,308	0.015	199.05
Proven & Probable Reserves	26,713	0.016	435.51
Inferred within Designed Pit	269	0.015	3.94
Waste within Designed Pit	61,372		
Total tons within Designed Pit	88,353		
Total Reserves			
	(x 1000)	opt	ounces (x 1000)
Proven Reserves	27,827	0.018	487.51
Probable Reserves	25,427	0.015	376.71
Proven & Probable Reserves	53,254	0.016	864.22
Inferred within Designed Pit	695	0.013	9.0
Waste within Designed Pit	94,582		
Total tons within Designed Pit	148,531		

1.7 Conclusions and Recommendations

As a result of the work done as part of and resulting from this Feasibility Study, Gustavson concludes:

- The Pan deposit now contains over 1.1 million ounces of gold in Measured and Indicated Mineral Resource categories using a 0.004 opt cutoff.
- There continues to be good potential for the discovery of additional Mineral Resources at Pan.
- There is a proven and probable Mineral Reserve of 53,254,000 tons, containing 864,000 ounces of gold.
- The Pan project is an economic mining project generating approximately \$122 million net present value, and an internal rate of return of 32.4% at a gold price of \$1200.

Based on the results of this Feasibility Study, Gustavson recommends:

- Continuation of drilling to fill-in areas that are promising development areas, specifically between the North and South pits. MIDWAY is planning on \$ 1.5 million in drilling for the next two years.
- Finalization of engineering for infrastructure, buildings, mining, and site facilities. This is currently estimated at \$0.86 million (included in capital costs in the Feasibility Study)
- Support for the EIS and permitting, estimated to be \$ 0.4 million over the next 2 years.
- Construction of the access road which is estimated at \$ 1.7 million.
- Drilling and testing of a water well, estimated at \$0.1 million.
- Purchase of long-lead equipment estimated at approximately \$ 2.0 million.

6 HISTORY

6.1 Exploration History

Mr. Lyle Campbell discovered the Pan deposit while prospecting in 1978, when he encountered gold-bearing jasperoid, now referred to as Campbell Jasperoid. Mr. Campbell staked 147 original unpatented mining claims, and transferred ownership of the claims to the LFC Trust in 1986. The LFC Trust was bought out in 2008 and is now owned by NVMC.

Several companies have conducted exploration on the property since 1978. The following paragraphs summarize exploration activities at Pan based on information provided in previously issued technical reports:

- Mr. Campbell leased his claims to Amselco in 1978. The majority of drilling exploration carried out by Amselco took place in North Pan.
- In 1986, Hecla conducted a drilling exploration program in the central portion of the Pan property.
- Echo Bay leased the claims in 1987 and completed an exploration drilling program that resulted in the discovery of gold mineralization at South Pan.
- The Pan property was explored under a joint venture between Alta Gold and Echo Bay from 1988 through 1991. Drilling was conducted in both North and South Pan, in conjunction with geologic mapping, geochemical sampling, and an induced polarization geophysical survey. The Alta Bay joint venture initiated studies in support of mining development, including an archaeological survey, additional metallurgical test work, and preliminary mineral reserve calculations and mine designs.
- Alta Gold retained ownership of the Pan Project after dissolution of the joint venture until 1992. Drilling exploration was reported, but the associated holes have not been validated and are not included in the modern day resource database.
- In 1993, Southwestern Gold Corporation completed drilling exploration on a small section of claims that they held at that time west of North Pan. The associated drill hole collars have been identified in the field, but no other information has been validated and these holes are not included in the modern resource database.
- The Pan Project was dormant from 1993 until 1999, when Latitude leased the property from LFC Trust. Between 1999 and 2001, Latitude explored the property as part of a joint venture with Degerstrom. Geologic mapping and outcrop and soil sampling were completed under the joint venture, as was drilling and metallurgical testing.
- Latitude drilling focused primarily on North and South Pan mineralization, but also resulted in the discovery of mineralization in the modern day Syncline and Black

Stallion target areas of Central Pan. Latitude terminated the joint venture with Degerstrom in mid-2001, and joint ventured the project to Metallica later that year. From LFC Trust files, it appears that Metallica focused on thermal imagery and lineament study of satellite data over the Pan area. No additional subsurface exploration work was completed. The LFC Trust terminated the lease agreement with Latitude in 2002, citing Latitude's inability to meet financial obligations.

- Castleworth Ventures, Inc. leased the Pan claims in January 2003. The company completed drilling exploration and conducted geologic mapping, sampling, metallurgical test work, and resource estimation. On April 16, 2007, Pan Nevada Gold Corporation (formerly Castleworth Ventures, Inc.) was acquired by MIDWAY.
- Since acquiring the Pan Project in 2007, MIDWAY has completed 209 holes, of which 195 were reverse circulation and 14 diamond core drill holes for a total of 95,394 ft. Drilling efforts have generally focused on expanding known mineralization, but also include confirmation drilling and exploration drilling in several potential target areas on the Pan property. In addition to drilling exploration, MIDWAY has completed geologic mapping, soil and outcrop sampling, and gravity survey.

6.2 Historical Resource and Reserve Estimates

Historical resource and reserve estimates are described in detail in the 2005 report produced by Mine Development Associates (MDA). These resource and reserve estimates have not been verified, are not considered reliable, are not relevant to the updated mineral resource presented in this report, and are mentioned here for historical completeness only.

16 MINING METHODS

16.1 Open Pit Mine Plan

The Pan gold deposit contains mineralization at or near the surface and spatially distributed in a manner that is ideal for open pit mining methods. Gold grade distribution and the results of preliminary mineral processing testing indicate that ore from the Pan deposit can be processed by conventional heap leaching methods. The method of material transport evaluated for this study is open pit mining using a 21.6-yd³ front end shovel as the main loading unit with a 16-yd³ front end loader as a backup loading unit. The ore will be loaded into 150-ton haul trucks and transported to the primary jaw crusher, which will be set up at the mouth of the pit. The primary jaw crusher is a semi-mobile unit mounted on skids that will be moved to the mouth of whichever pit is being mined. The crushed ore material will be conveyed to the secondary crushing site, crushed to P80 ½-inch (North) and P80 1½-inch (South), agglomerated, and conveyed to the heap leach pad. The waste material will be loaded into the 150-ton haul trucks and hauled directly to the waste dump. The truck haul method was chosen over in-pit mobile crushers and mobile conveyors in order to simplify waste dump construction and allow for more flexibility in day to day mining activities.

MIDWAY will own, operate, and maintain all equipment. The general site layout, including pits, waste dumps, the secondary crusher site, infrastructure, ponds, and heap leach pads, is shown on Figure 16-1.

December 19, 2011

93



Midway Gold Corp.
Pan Gold Project Feasibility Study

Mining Methods
NI 43-101 Technical Report




Figure 16-1 General Site Layout

Ore production is planned at a nominal rate of 17,000 tons per day (tpd), equivalent to 6.2 million tons per annum with a 8.8 year mine life. Mining is planned on a 7 day per week schedule, with two 12 hour shifts per day. Peak ore and waste production is estimated at 67,000 tpd. The average life of mine stripping ratio is 1.79:1 waste-to-ore, using a 0.006 Au oz/ton cutoff for the South Pan pit and a 0.008 Au oz/ton cutoff on the North and Central pits. The change in cutoffs from one pit to the next are a result of the metallurgical recovery testing which showed the South pit has an expected average recovery of 85% and the North pit has an expected recovery of 65%. Other cutoff scenarios were evaluated using 0.004, 0.006 and 0.008 Au oz/ton, but the scenario presented here provides the best IRR and NPV at a 5% discount rate.

161.1.1 Pit Design

Whittle-generated pit surfaces, which maximized revenue based on the estimated average of \$1,180 per ounce gold, were used in conjunction with the Pan block model to design the open pits with haul roads and catch benches for North Pan, Central Pan, and South Pan. Pit designs are based in part on geologic criteria provided in the April 2011 Prefeasibility Level Pit Slope Evaluation report produced by Golder Associates. Geologic solids created for each lithological unit were used as a guide during the pit design process. The limestone units were designed with a 50° inter-ramp wall angle assuming pre-split blasting in these units, all other lithological units were designed at a 45° inter-ramp wall angle. Haul roads are designed at a width of 90 ft, which provides a safe truck width (23 feet) to running surface width ratio of 3.9. Maximum grade of the haul roads is 10%, except for the lowermost three to five benches where the grade is increased to 12% and the ramp width is narrowed to 50 feet to minimize excessive waste stripping. The pit design criteria are presented in Table 16-1.

Table 16-1 Pit Design Criteria

Mine Design Criteria		
Pit Design Criteria	Limestone Units	All Other Rock Units
Inter-Ramp Angles	50 Degrees	45 Degrees
Face Angles	70 Degrees	63 Degrees
Catch Bench Berm	30 ft.	30 ft.
Catch Bench Vertical Spacing	60 ft.	60 ft.
Minimum Turning Radius	90 ft.	90 ft.
Road Widths	90 ft.	90 ft.
Road Grade	10%	10%
Road Widths Pit Bottom	50 ft.	50 ft.
Road Grade Pit Bottom	12%	12%


Design of the North Pan pit has not changed considerably from the design considered during the Prefeasibility Study, but the size of the final South Pan pit has approximately doubled. The increase in size of the South Pan pit is based on the positive results of recent drilling in the Wendy target area. The Central Pan pits, which were not considered during the Prefeasibility Study, are located very close to the leach pad and will also provide suitable over-liner material for pad construction. The Central Pan pits will be mined first and then backfilled with waste from the South Pan pit. Design of the South Pan pit includes two phases of construction in order to account for a strip ratio that is considerably higher than the other pit designs. An intermediate pit was also designed near the south end of the North Pan pit to provide a borrow source for over-liner material. The final pit designs are shown in Figure 16-2

Study, are located very close to the leach pad and will also provide suitable over-liner material for pad construction. The Central Pan pits will be mined first and then backfilled with waste from the South Pan pit. Design of the South Pan pit includes two phases of construction in order to account for a strip ratio that is considerably higher than the other pit designs. An intermediate pit was also designed near the south end of the North Pan pit to provide a borrow source for over-liner material. The final pit designs are shown in Figure 16-2

December 19, 2011

96





December 19, 2011

17 RECOVERY METHODS

17.1.1 Process Description

Material from the North, Central, and South Pan pits will be processed using conventional heap leaching methods. Ore will be mined and processed first from the Central pit, then the South pit (phase I), from the North pit, and finally from the South pit (phase II).

Ore will be crushed by the primary edge-of-pit mobile jaw crusher and secondary and tertiary cone crushers prior to leaching. Screening at secondary and tertiary crushing stations will control the crush size. The crushed ore will be agglomerated and conveyed to the heap leach pad. Crush size, leach kinetics, and recoveries are based on current metallurgical testing.

17.1.2 Production Rate and Products

The Pan mine and material handling system is designed for a throughput of 17,000 tons of ore per day, or 6.2 million tons of ore per year. The ADR plant is designed at 5,000 gpm, and is expected to produce approximately 80,000 ounces of gold per year. The entire mine and process flow is depicted in Figure 17-1.

Typical for most Carlin type ores, the reagent consumption is relatively low (Table 17-1). Based on the metallurgical test work, RDI recommended using 0.4 to 0.6 lbs sodium cyanide per ton. 0.50 lbs per ton sodium cyanide consumption at a P80 ½-inch crush size has been used in the economic model.

Table 17-1 Estimated Reagent Consumption

LIME	1.8 Pounds per ton
CEMENT	5 pounds per ton
CYANIDE 1 ½" Crush	0.27 pounds per ton
CYANIDE ½" Crush	0.50 pounds per ton

Tests were completed on both the South and North Pan materials to support these estimates.

Agglomeration equipment includes:

- Cement Storage Silo package
- Lime Storage Silo package
- Agglomerator Unit

1.7.1.6 Conveying and Stacking

Agglomerated ore is delivered to the short overland conveyor, which feeds a series of grasshopper conveyors and ultimately the telestacker conveyor (Figure 17-5). The telestacker conveyor distributes the crushed and agglomerated ore evenly across the leach pad, in 30 foot lifts.

- Agglomerator Discharge Conveyor 400-CV1
- Flat Grade Jump Conveyor 400-JC1-29
- Feed Conveyor 400-CV3
- IC Conveyor 400-CV4
- Telestacker Conveyor

21 CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS

21.1 Capital Cost Estimate

The capital cost estimate for the Pan Project includes all quoted equipment costs, quoted installation costs, and quantity takeoffs for major components. A breakdown of the total estimated initial capital cost is presented in Table 21-1.

Table 21-1 Pan Project Capital Cost Estimate

Feasibility Capital Costs	Estimated Cost
Mine Mobile Equipment	\$ 25,614,600
Mine Development	\$ 2,000,000
Mine Buildings	\$ 1,903,800
Primary Crushing - Edge of Pit to Stockpile	\$ 5,604,700
Ore Circuit - From Stockpile to Leach Pad	\$ 10,762,800
Gold Recovery Plant	\$ 7,290,500
Plant Mobile Equipment	\$ 281,600
Leach Pad Installation	\$ 6,737,000
Process Ponds	\$ 3,623,000
Storm Water Diversion	\$ 1,497,200
Infrastructure	\$ 13,603,500
Owner's Costs	\$ 4,768,800
Reclamation Bond, Facilities	\$ 500,000
Subtotal	\$ 84,187,500
Contingency	\$ 6,765,800
Working Capital	\$ 8,214,400
Total Initial Capital	\$ 99,167,700

21.1.1 Basis

The capital cost estimates were generated primarily from quotes from equipment suppliers and contractors. Excluding contingency and working capital, 73% of the estimated costs are from quotes. In-house take-offs and estimated costs from previous construction projects were used for the remaining items. All individual costs include the appropriate sales tax component.

21.1.2 Mine Development

Gustavson has included an allowance for pioneering, clearing, grubbing, and initial haul road construction in the capital cost estimate. The estimated quantities and costs associated with mine development tasks are presented in Table 21-2.

applied to the appropriate capital asset and income categories to calculate the regular income tax burden. Alternative minimum tax provisions were applied to those years in which the regular tax was below the minimum allowable level.

Projected economic outcomes were prepared on an annual basis, including the internal rate of return and utilizing a 5% discount factor for net present value calculations. An analysis of the years required for payback of initial capital and the payback multiple (the positive cash flows as a multiple of the total capital investment) were also generated.

22.5 Economic Projection

The project is projected to have a total lifespan of 9.75 years: one year of construction and pre-production, 8.25 years of full operations and one-half year of residual gold production. Approximately 864,000 ounces of gold are projected to be mined and 649,000 ounces of gold recovered and produced for sale. An initial capital investment of \$99.168 million, including contingency and working capital, is expected to be required with a total of \$154.904 million over the life-of-mine, including reclamation, contingency and all sustaining capital. Following the Gold Institute (GI) guidelines, cash operating cost is projected to be \$537 per ounce of gold. The GI total cash cost (including royalties) would be \$585 per ounce and the GI total production cost is expected to be \$824 per ounce. The economic projection for the Pan Project is presented in Table 22-1.

Table 22-1 Economic Projection

Gold Price	Net Present Value @ 5%	Internal Rate of Return	Payback Period	Payback Multiple
\$855	\$4,100,000	6.0%	7.22	1.30
\$1,200	\$122,600,000	32.4%	2.59	2.88
\$1,550	\$235,100,000	55.7%	1.70	4.53
\$1,900	\$344,400,000	79.1%	1.20	6.30

22.6 Sensitivity Analysis

22.6.1 Price

Consistent with almost all gold projects, the Pan Project is very responsive to changes in the price of gold. For this study, an increase in the average gold price to \$1550 per ounce increases the NPV-5 by 92% to approximately \$235 million. An increase to \$1900/oz in the gold price results in an NPV-5 of \$344 million, an increase of 181% (Figure 22-1).

EXHIBIT 2

8-K 1 midway8k_11262012.htm

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549**

FORM 8-K

CURRENT REPORT

Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the
Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Date of Report: November 21, 2012
(Date of earliest event reported)

MIDWAY GOLD CORP.
(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Charter)

British Columbia, Canada
(State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation)

001-33894
(Commission File Number)

98-0459178
(IRS Employer Identification No.)

8310 South Valley Highway, Suite 280
Englewood, Colorado
(Address of principal executive offices)

80112
(Zip Code)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: **(720) 979-0900**

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the registrant under any of the following provisions:

- ☐ Written communications pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425)
 - ☐ Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 14a-12 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14a-12)
 - ☐ Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 14d-2(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14d-2(b))
 - ☐ Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 13e-4(c) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13e-4(c))
-

Item 1.01 Entry into Material Definitive Agreements

On November 21, 2012, Midway Gold Corp. (the “**Registrant**” or “**Midway**”) announced a US\$70,000,000 private placement of Series A Preferred Shares (the “**Series A Preferred Shares**”) to institutional accredited investors, including INV-MID, LLC (as “**Lead Investor**”), EREF-MID II, LLC, and HCP-MID, LLC (collectively, with the Lead Investor, the “**Investors**”). The Private Placement is expected to close on or before December 13, 2012.

In connection with the private placement, Midway entered into Share Purchase Agreements, a Registration Rights Agreement and a Side Letter with the Investors, each effective November 21, 2012, and agreed to the terms of the Series A Preferred Amendment to Midway’s Articles of Incorporation. Hale Capital Partners, L.P. participated as part of the Investors in the private placement. Nathaniel Klein, a current director, is Vice President of Hale Capital Partners, L.P. and abstained from approving the private placement and the transactions contemplated thereunder.

Share Purchase Agreement

Under the terms of the Share Purchase Agreements, Midway agreed to sell and the Investors agreed to purchase 37,837,838 Series A Preferred Shares at a price of US\$1.85 per Series A Preferred Share, for aggregate purchase consideration of US\$70,000,000. The proceeds will be used for working capital and general corporate purposes.

The Share Purchase Agreements contain customary representations and warranties, including Midway representations related to availability of securities law exemptions, due authorization, financial statements, capitalization, property (title, permits, environmental), employee, insurance, tax compliance and regulatory matters and Investor representations related to accredited investor status, authorization and securities law matters. The Share Purchase Agreements contain customary closing conditions, including closing opinion delivery, execution of a Registration Rights Agreement, filing of amendments to Midway’s Articles of Incorporation to authorize the issuance of Series A Preferred Shares, no material changes, no litigation, delivery of consents and certificates and other customary closing conditions, indemnification undertakings, Investors’ expense reimbursement and other obligations. The Share Purchase Agreements are governed by New York law.

Neither the Series A Preferred Shares nor the Common Shares issuable upon conversion or paid as dividends have been registered under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the “**U.S. Securities Act**”), or any state securities laws. The Series A Preferred Shares will be issued only to institutional “accredited investors: (as defined in Rule 501(a) of Regulation D) pursuant to exemptions from such registration requirements and will be deemed “restricted securities” as defined in Rule 144(a)(3) of the U.S. Securities Act.

No underwriting discounts, fees or commissions are payable in connection with the private placement.

The Private Placement is expected to close on or before December 13, 2012.

Series A Rights

In connection with the private placement, Midway will amend its Articles of Incorporation to authorize Series A Preferred Shares in the capital of Midway with certain terms, conditions, and rights (the “**Series A Rights**”). Material provisions of the Series A Rights are as follows:

Voting: Series A Preferred Shares will have the following voting rights:

Voting at Shareholder Meetings: Series A Preferred Shares will be entitled to vote, on an as converted basis, at all meetings of Midway’s shareholders, except as otherwise required by law or in the amended Articles of Incorporation.

- (a) **Approval of Certain Corporate Actions:** The consent or affirmative vote of the Preferred Super Majority (initially the Lead Investor until the Lead Investor owns less than 3,783,784 Series A Preferred Shares, then the holders of a majority of the Series A Preferred Shares) is required for Midway to effect any of the following:

- (b) create a new class or series of shares equal or superior to the shares of such class;
- (c) redeem or repurchase any shares of the Company except for purchases at cost upon termination of employment;
- (d) a voluntary or involuntary liquidation, dissolution or winding-up of the affairs of the Company;
- (e) change the special rights or restrictions attached to the Series A Preferred Shares;
- (f) amend or repeal of any provision of the Company's Notice of Articles or Articles in a manner adverse to the holders of Series A Preferred Shares; or
- (g) issue any additional Common Shares or common share equivalents for less than the Conversion Price (initially US\$1.85) applicable to the Series A Preferred Shares; except for any of the following:
 - (i) Common Shares pursuant to a Stock Split;
 - (ii) securities issued upon exercise, conversion or exchange of existing and outstanding Securities Equivalents on the date hereof;
 - (iii) options to acquire Common Shares (and Common Shares issuable upon exercise of such options) issued in accordance with any employee incentive stock option plan, or any amendment to a stock option plan, of the Company approved by the shareholders of the Company for the Company's management, directors and employees where the exercise price or conversion price of such Options is below the Conversion Price, but is not less than the Closing Price of the Common Shares at the time of such grant or issuance; provided, further, that the aggregate of such grants, issuances or sales per calendar year shall not exceed five percent (5%) of the issued and outstanding shares of Common Shares as of December 31 of such calendar year;
 - (iv) Common Shares issued for the purpose of redeeming in full the Series A Preferred Shares in cash; or
 - (v) up to a maximum of 756,757 Common Shares to be used exclusively for real property acquisitions, including by way of a joint venture.

Director Appointment: Upon approval of a majority of the holders of Common Shares of Midway who cast votes at a meeting of Common Shareholders, the Preferred Governance Majority (initially the Lead Investor until the Lead Investor owns less than 7,567,568 Series A Preferred Shares, then the holders of a majority of the Series A Preferred Shares) has the right to nominate one (1) director nominee for election to the Board to be elected by the Preferred Holders (the “**Preferred Director**”), voting as a separate series at each annual or special meeting of shareholders of the Company or action by written consent of shareholders at which directors will be elected. If Midway’s board of directors is increased beyond seven (7) members, increases shall occur in increments of two (2) and the Preferred Governance Majority will have the right to designate one (1) additional director nominee for election or appointment as director. The Preferred Governance Majority has the right to fill any vacancy of the Preferred Director position. The director appointment rights terminates if there are less than 7,567,568 Series A Preferred Shares issued and outstanding. These rights are subject to approval of the holders of a majority of the Common Shares.

Dividend Rights: Series A Preferred Shares will be entitled to an annual 8% dividend, compounded monthly and payable quarterly in cash or, at the option of Midway and subject to certain conditions, in common shares. Dividends are payable beginning on April 1, 2013, and thereafter be paid on the first business day of each following quarter, beginning July 2, 2013. Midway may elect to pay dividends in Common Shares based on the closing price on NYSE MKT the day before the dividend is paid; provided that the issuance is an exempt purchase pursuant to Section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. No dividend or other distribution greater than the Series A Preferred Dividend will be paid, declared or set apart for payment in respect of any Common Shares or shares of any other class ranking junior to the Series A Preferred Shares in

respect of dividends (and the Series A Preferred Shares are deemed to rank senior to each class of shares that is created before it).

Liquidation Preference: Series A Preferred Shares shall have a liquidation preference equal to 125% of the initial issue price of the Series A Preferred Shares (initially US\$1.85) plus any accrued dividends in connection with certain liquidation events, including:

- (a) a voluntary or involuntary liquidation, dissolution or winding-up of the Registrant's affairs;
- (b) any merger, amalgamation, reorganization, arrangement, acquisition or other similar transaction of Midway with another person or entity, pursuant to which the holders of voting securities of Midway immediately prior to the transaction hold (assuming an immediate and maximum exercise/conversion of all derivative securities issued in the transaction), immediately after such transaction, directly or indirectly, less than 50% of the voting power to elect directors of Midway resulting from the transaction (unless not deemed a liquidation event as provided in the Series A Rights);
- (c) a sale, lease, conveyance or other disposition of all or substantially all of the property or business of the Registrant (directly or through a subsidiary) or the sale of substantially all of the properties, title, or rights related to the properties owned by Midway's U.S. subsidiary or U.S. affiliate in White Pine County, Nevada (unless not deemed a liquidation event as provided in the Series A Rights); or
- (d) the Common Shares are no longer listed or traded on any of the Toronto Stock Exchange, the TSX Venture Exchange, the New York Stock Exchange, Inc., the NYSE MKT LLC, the NASDAQ Global Select Market, the NASDAQ Capital Market or the OTC Bulletin Board.

Conversion Rights: Series A Preferred Share have the following conversion terms:

Conversion: Each Series A Preferred Share is convertible into one Midway Common Share, subject to adjustment for stock splits and recapitalizations, at any time by the holder of Series A Preferred Shares.

Mandatory Conversion: Midway has the option to the right to force the conversion of the Series A Preferred Shares after 1 year, subject to certain conditions, including, but not limited to: (a) the Common Shares trade on the NYSE MKT or other eligible market above \$3.70, as adjusted for stock splits and recapitalizations, for 20 consecutive trading days; (b) the Common Shares are registered for resale under the U.S. Securities Act or can be resold under Rule 144 without volume limitations; (c) no public announcement has been made of a pending or proposed liquidation event; (d) holders are not in possession of non-public material information; (e) no black-out period restricting the sale of Common Shares; (f) the issuance is an exempt purchase pursuant to Section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; and (g) the number of Series A Preferred Shares subject to the mandatory conversion will be calculated as of the date of the conversion based on the product of (i) the aggregate number of common shares issuable by Midway to all holders of Series A Preferred Shares upon such conversion multiplied by (ii) the average of the dollar volume-weighted average price for such common shares on NYSE MKT during the period beginning at 9:30:01 a.m., New York time and ending at 4:00:00 p.m., New York time, as reported by Bloomberg through its "Volume at Price" function for each of the twenty (20) consecutive trading days immediately prior to the conversion shall not exceed 30% of the average of the aggregate dollar trading volume of common stock traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange, the TSX Venture Exchange, the New York Stock Exchange, Inc., the NYSE MKT LLC, the NASDAQ Global Select Market, the NASDAQ Capital Market and the OTC Bulletin Board for the five (5) consecutive trading days for each of the twenty (20) consecutive trading days immediately preceding the applicable conversion.

Mandatory Redemption: Five (5) years after the date of issuance the Series A Preferred Shares are redeemable by either Midway or the holders of Series A Preferred Shares for cash at US\$1.85 per share, as adjusted for stock splits and recapitalizations. The redemption payment is payable in legal available funds within 30 days after a redemption notice. If Midway is prohibited from redeeming Series A Preferred Shares, then the Registrant shall distribute all of the legally available funds to the holders of the Series A Preferred Shares and repay any amounts otherwise due in equal quarterly payments for a period of two (2) years from the date that is five (5) years after the date of issuance of the Series A Preferred Shares.

If the redemption is not completed during the two year period, the Preferred Super Majority may (i) voting as a single class (to the exclusion of the holders of all other securities and classes of capital stock of the Company), vote to elect such number of additional directors which shall constitute a majority of Midway's Board of Directors, and the number of directors constituting the Company's Board of Directors shall automatically be increased as necessary, and (ii) in the event it is not permitted, the Preferred Super Majority may sell, as may be permitted by applicable law, on behalf of the Company the assets of the Company, in its discretion, that are sufficient to redeem the remaining Series A Preferred Shares. The director appointment rights are subject to approval of the holders of a majority of the Common Shares.

Registration Rights Agreement

In connection with the Private Placement, Midway entered into a Registration Rights Agreement with the Investors, under which Midway will register the Common Shares issued or issuable upon conversion of the Series A Preferred Shares and upon payment of a dividend in kind. Under the Registration Rights Agreement, Midway has agreed, within 90 days after closing, to use all commercially reasonable efforts to prepare and file with the SEC a registration statement on Form S-3 (or such other form as available if Form S-3 is not available) and a Canadian prospectus covering the resale of all of the common shares common shares issued or issuable upon conversion of the Series A Preferred Shares. Midway will maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement until all Common Shares have been sold or may be sold without registration under Rule 144 of the U.S. Securities Act without any limitation as to volume or manner of sale requirements. The Registration Rights Agreement contains customary terms and conditions and does not provide for any specific cash settlement or liquidated damage payments.

Side Letter

In connection with the Private Placement, Midway entered into a side letter with the Investors providing for certain board nomination and committee appointment rights, including the following:

Nomination Right: The Lead Investor has the right to the right to nominate one (1) director nominee for election to the Midway's board of directors to stand for election at each annual or special meeting of shareholders of the Registrant or action by written consent of shareholders at which directors will be elected. Nathaniel Klein, a current director and Vice President of Hale Capital Partners, L.P., shall be nominated as the initial director to stand for election to Midway's board of directors at the next annual shareholders meeting.

Nomination and Election Right: The side letter also provides for Series A Preferred Share director nomination and election rights consistent with the Series A Rights. These rights are subject to approval of the holders of Common Shares.

Director Vacancy and Observation Right: At closing of the Private Placement, Nathaniel Klein will resign as a director and Martin Hale will be appointed as a director by the board in his place. Nathaniel Klein shall maintain observation rights to the board until his election to the board at the next annual general meeting of the Registrant.

Common Share Approval: Midway has agreed to seek Common Shareholder approval of the Series A Preferred Share director nomination and appointment rights at the next annual or special meeting of the shareholders and at each meeting thereafter until such approval is obtained.

Committee Appointments: Midway has agreed to appoint Martin Hale, President of Hale Capital Partners, L.P., or his nominee to Midway's nominating committee and compensation committee of the Board of Directors. In addition, Midway has agreed to form a budget and work program committee, consisting of three non-executive directors, one of whom will be either Martin Hale or upon his election to the board the Preferred Director, and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), whose mandate shall be to review and approve the annual business and financing plans and capital and operating budgets (and any modifications of, or deviations from such plans or budgets). Any and all approvals of the committee relating to such plans and budgets must be unanimous; provided that Martin Hale or the Preferred Holder Director, as the case may be, and the CEO of the Company shall cooperate and work together in good faith to resolve any issues that the committee has identified as an impediment to their unanimous approval.

The foregoing summary of certain aspects of the Private Placement is qualified in its entirety by reference to the Share Purchase Agreement, Registration Rights Agreement, Side Letter, and Series A Rights, copies of which are filed as, respectively, Exhibits 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 and 3.1 to this Current Report on Form 8-K and which are hereby incorporated by reference into this Item 1.01.

Item 3.02 Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities

The offer and sale of the Series A Preferred Shares is anticipated to be exempt from registration under Section 4(a)(2) and Regulation D Rule 506 of the U.S. Securities Act. The Private Placement will be conducted with limitations on resale and no general solicitation, and each purchaser of the Series A Preferred Shares will be an “Accredited Investor” as defined under Rule 501(a) of Regulation D.

Item 9.01. Exhibits

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
3.1	Form of Series A Preferred Rights (Amendment)
10.1	Share Purchase Agreement
10.2	Registration Rights Agreement
10.3	Side Letter

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned hereunto duly authorized.

MIDWAY GOLD CORP.

DATE: November 26, 2012

By: /s/ Kenneth A. Brunk
Kenneth A. Brunk
Chairman, President and CEO

EXHIBIT INDEX

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
3.1	Form of Series A Preferred Rights (Amendment)
10.1	Share Purchase Agreement
10.2	Registration Rights Agreement
10.3	Side Letter

EXHIBIT 3



Midway Gold Announces US\$70 Million Strategic Financing

November 21, 2012

Denver, Colorado – Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway" or the "Company") (TSX VENTURE:MDW) (NYSE MKT:MDW) is pleased to announce that it has arranged a US\$70 million private placement financing of five year 8% convertible Series A Preferred shares at a price of US\$1.85 per share ("Preferred Shares").\

Kenneth A. Brunk, Midway's Chairman, President and CEO said, "Midway is pleased to welcome lead investor Hale Capital Partners, L.P. as a key strategic financial partner in the pursuit of the Company's goal of becoming a Nevada gold producer in the near term. This is a very important step forward for Midway as we have dramatically reduced financing risk in uncertain times, and have done so without incurring hedging on our future gold production or committing to any security over our assets, all while seeking to minimize equity dilution to our shareholders."

Martin Hale, CEO and Portfolio Manager of Hale Capital Partners, L.P., said, "We have been investors in Midway since 2010 and that history, the quality of the team and properties, and management execution have given us great confidence in supporting the Company."

The conversion price of the Preferred Shares represents a significant premium of 37% to the closing price of the Company's shares on November 20th, 2012.

The primary use of proceeds from the private placement will be to advance the Pan heap leach gold project towards production, including the ordering of long-lead time capital equipment, as well as engineering studies to advance the Gold Rock project.

The Private Placement is subject to customary closing conditions and deliverables. Midway anticipates executing final documentation and closing the private placement on or before December 13th, 2012.

Key Terms of the Preferred Shares:

- US\$70 million Offering at a price of US\$1.85 per Preferred Share.
- Each Preferred Share is convertible into Common Shares of the Company on a 1 to 1 basis.
- Holders of the Preferred Shares are entitled to receive an annual, cumulative preferred 8% dividend payable quarterly in cash or common shares, at the Company's option.
- Preferred Shares are redeemable by either the Company or the holders after five years from the date of issuance for cash equal to the conversion price, initially US\$1.85.
- After a period of one year, subject to certain price and volume conditions, the Company may force the conversion of the Preferred Shares to common shares on a 1 to 1 basis.
- Preferred Shares have a liquidation preference equal to 125% of the issue price of the Preferred Shares in connection with certain liquidation events.
- Except as otherwise required by law, the holders of Preferred Shares will be entitled to vote their shares, on an as converted basis, at meetings of the shareholders of the Company.

- Upon common shareholder approval at the next annual general meeting of the Company, the holders of Preferred Shares shall be entitled to nominate and elect a Director of the Company.
- The issuance of common shares below a price of US\$1.85 or repurchase any common shares, requires the consent of a designated Preferred Shareholder.
- No fees or commissions are payable in connection with this placement.
- The investors have been granted registration rights under a Registration Rights Agreement and other rights related to board and committee appointments under a side letter.

Neither the Preferred Shares nor the Common Shares issuable upon exercise of the Preferred Shares or in lieu of cash dividend payments have been registered under the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or the securities laws of any state. The securities may be offered or sold only under exemptions from these registration requirements. This press release does not constitute an offer of securities.

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD

"Kenneth A. Brunk"

Kenneth A. Brunk, Chairman, President and CEO

About Midway Gold Corp.

Midway Gold Corp. is a precious metals company with a vision to explore, design, build and operate gold mines in a manner accountable to all stakeholders while assuring return on shareholder investments. For more information about Midway, please visit our website at www.midwaygold.com or contact R.J. Smith, Vice President of Administration, at (877) 475-3642 (toll-free).

Neither the TSX Venture Exchange, its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX Venture Exchange) nor the NYSE MKT accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release.

This press release contains forward-looking statements within the meaning of Canadian and United States securities laws about the Company and its business which may include, but is not limited to, the intended terms of the private placement, closing of the private placement and use of proceeds. Such forward-looking statements and forward-looking information reflect our current views with respect to future use of proceeds and are subject to certain risks, uncertainties and assumptions, including but not limited to risks related to delays in closing, the receipt of regulatory approvals and changes in market conditions. Forward looking statements are statements that are not historical facts and include, but are not limited to, statements about the Company's intended work plans and resource estimates and potential offering of common shares of the Company from time to time. The forward-looking statements in this press release are subject to various risks, uncertainties and other factors that could cause the Company's actual results or achievements to differ materially from those expressed in or implied by forward looking statements. These risks, uncertainties and other factors include, without limitation, risks related to the timing and completion of the Company's intended work plans, risks related to fluctuations in gold prices; uncertainties related to raising sufficient financing to fund the planned work in a timely manner and on acceptable terms; changes in planned work resulting from weather, logistical, technical or other factors; the possibility that results of work will not fulfill expectations and realize the perceived potential of the Company's properties; uncertainties involved in the interpretation of drilling results and other tests and the estimation of gold resources and reserves; the possibility that required permits may not be obtained on a timely manner or at all; the possibility that capital and operating costs may be higher than currently estimated and may preclude commercial development or render operations uneconomic; the possibility that the estimated recovery rates may not be achieved; risk of accidents, equipment breakdowns and labor disputes or other unanticipated difficulties or interruptions; the possibility of cost overruns or unanticipated expenses in the work program; and other factors identified in the Company's SEC filings and its filings with Canadian securities regulatory authorities. Forward-looking statements are based on the beliefs, opinions and expectations of the Company's management at the time they are made, and other than as required by applicable securities laws, the Company does not assume any obligation to update its forward-looking statements if those beliefs, opinions or expectations, or other circumstances, should change.

EXHIBIT 4

8-K 1 midway8k_121212.htm

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549**

FORM 8-K

CURRENT REPORT

Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the
Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Date of Report: December 13, 2012
(Date of earliest event reported)

MIDWAY GOLD CORP.
(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Charter)

British Columbia, Canada
(State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation)

001-33894
(Commission File Number)

98-0459178
(IRS Employer Identification No.)

8310 South Valley Highway, Suite 280
Englewood, Colorado
(Address of principal executive offices)

80112
(Zip Code)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: **(720) 979-0900**

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the registrant under any of the following provisions:

- ☐ Written communications pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425)
 - ☐ Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 14a-12 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14a-12)
 - ☐ Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 14d-2(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14d-2(b))
 - ☐ Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 13e-4(c) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13e-4(c))
-

Item 1.01 Entry into Material Definitive Agreements

On December 13, 2012, Midway Gold Corp. (“*Midway*”) closed the private placement of Series A Preferred Shares pursuant to the terms of the Share Purchase Agreements, Registration Rights Agreement and Side Letter, each dated November 21, 2012. The material terms of the agreements are described in Item 1.01 of Midway’s Form 8-K filed on November 26, 2012 and are incorporated herein by reference.

Item 3.02 Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities

On December 13, 2012, Midway closed a US\$70,000,000 private placement of Series A Preferred Shares (the “*Series A Preferred Shares*”) to institutional accredited investors, including INV-MID, LLC, EREF-MID II, LLC and HCP-MID, LLC (the “*Investors*”).

Midway offered and sold 37,837,838 Series A Preferred Shares at a price of US\$1.85 per share. The Series A Preferred Shares are convertible into common shares of Midway on a one-for-one share basis. An eight percent (8%) annual dividend, compounding monthly, payable quarterly, is payable on the Series A Preferred Shares, the first payment commencing on April 1, 2013 and each dividend payment payable thereafter on the first business day of each quarter commencing on July 2, 2013. The quarterly dividend is payable in cash or in-kind in common shares of Midway at the option of Midway, subject to certain conditions. The Series A Preferred Shares and common shares issuable upon conversion or for in-kind dividend payments are or will be “restricted securities” as defined in Rule 144(a)(3) of the U.S. Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the “*U.S. Securities Act*”).

Neither the Series A Preferred Shares nor the common shares issuable upon conversion of or payable as dividends on the Series A Preferred Shares have been registered under the U.S. Securities Act or any state securities laws. The offer and sale of the Series A Preferred Shares was exempt from registration under Section 4(a)(2) and Regulation D Rule 506 of the U.S. Securities Act. The private placement was conducted with limitations on resale and no general solicitation. The Series A Preferred Shares were offered and sold to institutional “accredited investors” (as defined in Rule 501(a) of Regulation D) pursuant to exemptions from such registration requirements.

In connection with the private placement, Midway entered into a Registration Rights Agreement with the Investors, under which Midway will register the Midway common shares issued or issuable upon conversion of the Series A Preferred Shares and upon payment of an in-kind dividend for resale under the U.S. Securities Act. Under the Registration Rights Agreement, Midway has agreed, within 90 days after closing, to use all commercially reasonable efforts to prepare and file with the SEC a registration statement on Form S-3 (or such other form as available if Form S-3 is not available) and a Canadian prospectus covering the resale of all of the common shares issued or issuable upon conversion of the Series A Preferred Shares. Midway will maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement until all such common shares have been sold or may be sold without registration under Rule 144 of the U.S. Securities Act without any limitation as to volume or manner of sale requirements. The Registration Rights Agreement contains customary terms and conditions and does not provide for any specific cash settlement or liquidated damage payments.

Item 5.02 Departure/Election of Director

In connection with the provisions of the Side Letter, Nathaniel Klein, a member of Midway’s Board of Directors (the “*Board*”) and Vice President of Hale Capital Partners, L.P., resigned from the Board effective December 13, 2012.

Midway appointed Martin Hale, President of Hale Capital Partners, L.P., as a director to fill the vacancy on the Board resulting from Nathaniel Klein’s resignation. Midway appointed Martin Hale to serve on the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee, the Compensation Committee and the Budget/Work Plan Committee of Midway’s Board.

In connection with the private placement of the Series A Preferred Shares, Midway entered into a Side Letter which provides for the following:

Nomination Right: Upon approval of a majority of the holders of common shares of Midway, the Preferred Governance Majority (initially HCP-MID, LLC until the Investors own less than 7,567,568 Series A Preferred Shares, then the holders of a majority of the Series A Preferred Shares) has the right to nominate one (1) director nominee (the “***Preferred Holder Director***”) for election to Midway’s Board to stand for election at each annual or special meeting of shareholders or action by written consent of shareholders at which directors will be elected. Nathaniel Klein will be nominated as the initial the Preferred Holder Director to stand for election to Midway’s Board at the next annual shareholders meeting in 2013. Mr. Klein shall maintain observation rights to the Board until his election to the Board at the next annual general meeting of Midway.

Budget/Work Plan Committee: Midway formed a Budget/Work Plan Committee (the “***Budget Committee***”). The Budget Committee consists of three non-executive directors, one of whom is the Preferred Holder Director or appointed by the Preferred Governance Majority, and the Chief Executive Officer (“***CEO***”) of Midway. CEO Kenneth Brunk, Martin Hale, Roger Newell and John Sheridan were appointed to the Budget Committee. The mandate of the Budget Committee is to review and approve the annual business and financing plans and capital and operating budgets (and any modifications of, or deviations from, such plans or budgets). The Budget Committee chair is the CEO. A majority of the members of the Budget Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the unanimous vote of all members shall be required for all acts and approvals of the Budget Committee. In the event that unanimous approval of the Budget Committee is not obtained for any matter with which the Budget Committee is authorized under its charter, the Preferred Holder Director and the CEO shall cooperate and work together in good faith to resolve any issues that the Budget Committee has identified as an impediment to their unanimous approval. Budget Committee members shall serve until the successors shall be duly designated and qualified. Except with respect to the Preferred Holder Director, any member may be removed at any time, with or without cause, by a majority of the Board then in office. Any vacancy in the Budget Committee occurring for any cause may be filled by a majority of the Board then in office; provided however, that any vacancy created by the death, resignation, removal or disqualification of any Preferred Holder Director shall be filled by an eligible person designated by the Preferred Super Majority (initially, HCP-MID, LLC until the Investors own less than 3,783,784 Series A Preferred Shares, then the holders of a majority of the Series A Preferred Shares) as the Preferred Holder Director standing member of the Budget Committee.

Committee Appointments: Martin Hale was appointed to Midway’s Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee, the Compensation Committee and the Budget Committee of Midway’s Board.

Item 5.03 Amendments to Articles of Incorporation

Midway amended its Notice of Articles and Articles by filing a Notice of Alteration with the British Columbia Registry of Corporations on December 13, 2012.

The amended Articles authorize the Series A Preferred Shares in the capital of Midway with certain terms, conditions, and rights (the “***Series A Rights***”). (Terms not defined in this Item 5.03 have the meaning ascribed to them in the Series A Rights.) Material provisions of the Series A Rights are as follows:

Voting: Series A Preferred Shares will have the following voting rights:

Voting at Shareholder Meetings: Series A Preferred Shares will be entitled to vote, on an as converted basis, at all meetings of Midway’s shareholders, except as otherwise required by law.

- (a) **Approval of Certain Corporate Actions:** The consent or affirmative vote of the Preferred Super Majority (initially HCP-MID, LLC until the Investors own less than 3,783,784 Series A Preferred Shares, then the holders of a majority of the Series A Preferred Shares) is required for Midway to effect any of the following:
 - (i) create a new class or series of shares equal or superior to the shares of such class;

- (ii) redeem or repurchase any shares of Midway except for purchases at cost upon termination of employment;
- (iii) a voluntary or involuntary liquidation, dissolution or winding-up of the affairs of Midway;
- (iv) change the special rights or restrictions attached to the Series A Preferred Shares;
- (v) amend or repeal of any provision of Midway's Notice of Articles or Articles in a manner adverse to the holders of Series A Preferred Shares; or
- (vi) issue any additional Midway common shares or common share equivalents for less than the Conversion Price (initially US\$1.85) applicable to the Series A Preferred Shares; except for any of the following:
 - 1. common shares pursuant to a Stock Split;
 - 2. securities issued upon exercise, conversion or exchange of existing and outstanding securities equivalents on the date hereof;
 - 3. options to acquire common shares (and common shares issuable upon exercise of such options) issued in accordance with any employee incentive stock option plan, or any amendment to a stock option plan, of Midway approved by the shareholders of Midway for Midway's management, directors and employees where the exercise price or conversion price of such options is below the Conversion Price, but is not less than the closing price of the common shares at the time of such grant or issuance; provided, further, that the aggregate of such grants, issuances or sales per calendar year shall not exceed five percent (5%) of the issued and outstanding shares of common shares as of December 31 of such calendar year;
 - 4. common shares issued for the purpose of redeeming in full the Series A Preferred Shares in cash; or
 - 5. up to a maximum of 756,757 common shares to be used exclusively for real property acquisitions, including by way of a joint venture.

Director Appointment: Upon approval of a majority of the holders of common shares of Midway, the Preferred Governance Majority (initially HCP-MID, LLC until the Investors own less than 7,567,568 Series A Preferred Shares, then the holders of a majority of the Series A Preferred Shares) have the right to nominate the Preferred Holder Director, to be elected by holders of the Series A Preferred Shares voting as a separate series at each annual or special meeting of shareholders of Midway or action by written consent of shareholders at which directors will be elected. If Midway's Board is increased beyond seven (7) members, increases shall occur in increments of two (2) and the Preferred Governance Majority will have the right to designate one (1) director nominee for election or appointment as director. The Preferred Governance Majority has the right to fill any vacancy of the Preferred Holder Director position. The director appointment rights terminate if there are less than 7,567,568 Series A Preferred Shares issued and outstanding. These rights are subject to approval of the holders of a majority of the common shares of Midway.

Dividend Rights: Series A Preferred Shares will be entitled to an annual 8% dividend, compounded monthly and payable quarterly in cash or, at the option of Midway and subject to certain conditions, in Midway common shares. Dividends are payable beginning on April 1, 2013, and thereafter be paid on the first business day of each following quarter, beginning July 2, 2013. Midway may elect to pay dividends in Midway common shares based on the closing price on NYSE MKT the day before the dividend is paid; provided that the issuance is an exempt purchase pursuant to Section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. No dividend or other distribution greater than the Series A Preferred Dividend will be paid, declared or set apart for payment in respect of any common shares or shares of any other class ranking junior to the Series A Preferred Shares in respect of dividends (and the Series A Preferred Shares are deemed to rank senior to each class of shares that is created before it).

Liquidation Preference: Series A Preferred Shares shall have a liquidation preference equal to 125% of the initial issue price of the Series A Preferred Shares in connection with certain liquidation events, including:

- (a) a voluntary or involuntary liquidation, dissolution or winding-up of Midway's affairs;
- (b) any merger, amalgamation, reorganization, arrangement, acquisition or other similar transaction of Midway with another person or entity, pursuant to which the holders of voting securities of Midway immediately prior to the transaction hold (assuming an immediate and maximum exercise/conversion of all derivative securities issued in the transaction), immediately after such transaction, directly or indirectly, less than 50% of the voting power to elect directors of Midway resulting from the transaction (unless not deemed a liquidation event as provided in the Series A Rights);
- (c) a sale, lease, conveyance or other disposition of all or substantially all of the property or business of Midway (directly or through a subsidiary) or the sale of substantially all of the properties, title, or rights related to the properties owned by Midway's U.S. subsidiary or U.S. affiliate in White Pine County, Nevada (unless not deemed a liquidation event as provided in the Series A Rights); or
- (d) Midway common shares are no longer listed or traded on any of the Toronto Stock Exchange, the TSX Venture Exchange, the New York Stock Exchange, Inc., the NYSE MKT LLC, the NASDAQ Global Select Market, the NASDAQ Capital Market or the OTC Bulletin Board.

Conversion Rights: Series A Preferred Share have the following conversion terms:

Conversion: Each Series A Preferred Share is convertible into one Midway common share, subject to adjustment for stock splits and capital reorganizations, at any time by the holder of Series A Preferred Shares.

Mandatory Conversion: Midway has the right to force the conversion of the Series A Preferred Shares after 1 year, subject to certain conditions, including, but not limited to: (a) Midway common shares trade on the NYSE MKT or other eligible market above \$3.70, as adjusted for stock splits and recapitalizations, for 20 consecutive trading days; (b) Midway common shares are registered for resale under the U.S. Securities Act or can be resold under Rule 144 without volume limitations; (c) no public announcement has been made of a pending or proposed liquidation event; (d) holders are not in possession of non-public material information; (e) no black-out period restricting the sale of Midway common shares; (f) the issuance is an exempt purchase pursuant to Section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; (g) issuance of the common shares would not violate the rules of the NYSE MKT; and (h) the number of Series A Preferred Shares subject to the mandatory conversion will be calculated as of the date of the conversion based on the product of (i) the aggregate number of common shares issuable by Midway to all holders of Series A Preferred Shares upon such conversion multiplied by (ii) the average of the dollar volume-weighted average price for such common shares on NYSE MKT during the period beginning at 9:30:01 a.m., New York time and ending at 4:00 p.m., New York time, as reported by Bloomberg through its "Volume at Price" function for each of the twenty (20) consecutive days immediately prior to the conversion shall not exceed 30% of the average of the aggregate dollar trading volume of common stock traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange, the TSX Venture Exchange, the New York Stock Exchange, Inc., the NYSE MKT LLC, the NASDAQ Global Select Market, the NASDAQ Capital Market and the OTC Bulletin Board for the five (5) consecutive trading days for each of the twenty (20) consecutive trading days immediately preceding the applicable conversion.

Mandatory Redemption: Five (5) years after the date of issuance, Series A Preferred Shares are redeemable by either Midway or the holders of Series A Preferred Shares for cash at US\$1.85 per share, as adjusted for stock splits and recapitalizations. The redemption payment is payable in legal available funds within 30 days after a redemption notice. If Midway is prohibited from redeeming Series A Preferred Shares, then Midway shall distribute all of the legal available funds to the holders of the Series A Preferred Shares and repay any amounts otherwise due in equal quarterly payments for the period of two (2) years from date on which redemption is demanded.

If the redemption is not completed during the two year period, the Preferred Super Majority may (i) voting as a single class (to the exclusion of the holders of all other securities and classes of capital stock of Midway),

vote to elect such number of additional directors which shall constitute a majority of Midway's Board of Directors, and the number of directors constituting Midway's Board shall automatically be increased as necessary, and (ii) in the event it is not permitted, the Preferred Super Majority may sell, as may be permitted by applicable law, on behalf of Midway the assets of Midway, in its discretion, that are sufficient to redeem the

Item 7.01 Regulation FD

On December 13, 2012, Midway issued a press release announcing the closing of the private placement. A copy of the press release is attached to this Current Report on Form 8-K as Exhibit 99.1. In accordance with General Instruction B.2 of Form 8-K, the information set forth herein and in the press release is deemed to be "furnished" and shall not be deemed to be "filed" for purposes of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. In accordance with General Instruction B.6 of Form 8-K, the information set forth in herein and in the press release shall not be deemed an admission as to the materiality of any information in this Current Report on Form 8-K that is required to be disclosed solely to satisfy the requirements of Regulation FD.

Item 9.01. Exhibits

- 10.1 Share Purchase Agreement*
- 10.2 Registration Rights Agreement*
- 10.3 Side Letter*
- 3.1 Articles and Notice of Alteration for Series A Rights
- 99.1 Press Release

* Previously filed on Form 8-K dated November 26, 2012, and incorporated by reference.

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned hereunto duly authorized.

MIDWAY GOLD CORP.

DATE: December 13, 2012

By: /s/ Kenneth A. Brunk
Kenneth A. Brunk
Chairman, President and CEO

EXHIBIT INDEX

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
10.1	Share Purchase Agreement*
10.2	Registration Rights Agreement*
10.3	Side Letter*
3.1	Articles and Notice of Alteration for Series A Rights
99.1	Press Release

* Previously filed on Form 8-K dated November 26, 2012, and incorporated by reference.



Midway Gold Closes US\$70 Million Strategic Financing

December 13, 2012

Denver, Colorado – Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway" or the "Company") (TSX VENTURE: MDW) (NYSE MKT:MDW) is pleased to announce that it has closed its previously announced US\$70 million private placement financing (the "Transaction") of five year 8% convertible Series A Preferred shares at a price of US\$1.85 per share ("Preferred Shares"). Kenneth A. Brunk, Midway's Chairman, President and CEO commented, "Midway is pleased to have reached this significant funding milestone, which allows the Company to focus on finalizing our construction plans for the Pan project and to continue development of the Gold Rock project."

Concurrent with closing, Nathaniel E. Klein, Vice President of Hale Capital Partners, LP ("HCP") has resigned from the Company's board of directors and Martin M. Hale, Jr., CEO and Portfolio Manager of HCP, was appointed to fill the resulting vacancy. Mr. Hale was also appointed to the Company's Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee, Compensation Committee, and Budget/Work Plan Committee.

Prior to founding HCP in 2007, Martin was a founding member of Pequot Ventures (now known as FirstMark Capital) where he served as a member of the General Partner. From 2002 to 2007, Martin was a Managing Director and a Member of the Operating & Investment Committees helping to lead 7 funds with approximately US\$2.2 billion under management. Prior to Pequot Ventures, Martin was an Associate at Geocapital Partners and an Analyst at Broadview International. He currently serves as Chairman of Telanetix, Inc. and is a board member of United Silver Corporation and Adept Technology. He received his B.A. cum laude from Yale University.

In connection with the Transaction, EREF-MID II, LLC ("EREF-MID II") and HCP-MID, LLC ("HCP-MID"), both funds managed by an affiliate of HCP, acquired 17,837,838 Preferred Shares pursuant to share purchase agreements entered into with Midway on November 21, 2012. Midway has been advised by HCP that after giving effect to the Transaction, EREF-MID II, HCP-MID and their respective affiliates, acquired control or direction over a total of 17,837,838 Preferred Shares of Midway, representing approximately 47% of the outstanding Preferred Shares of Midway and further, upon conversion of the Preferred Shares into common shares of Midway (the "Common Shares"), and together with common share purchase warrants currently held by HCP and its affiliates, HCP and its affiliates would hold 27,949,522 Common Shares, representing approximately 15.5% of the issued and outstanding Common Shares on a fully diluted basis (calculated as if all outstanding warrants and options to purchase Common Shares were exercised).

In connection with the Transaction, INV-MID, LLC ("INV-MID") acquired 20,000,000 Preferred Shares pursuant to a share purchase agreement entered into with Midway on November 21, 2012. Midway has been advised by INV-MID that after giving effect to the Transaction, INV-MID acquired control or direction over a total of 20,000,000 Preferred Shares of Midway, representing approximately 53% of the outstanding Preferred Shares of Midway, and further, upon conversion of the Preferred Shares into Common Shares, INV-MID would hold 20,000,000 Common Shares, representing approximately 11% of

the issued and outstanding Common Shares on a fully diluted basis (calculated as if all outstanding warrants and options to purchase Common Shares were exercised).

The primary use of proceeds from the private placement will be to advance the Pan heap leach gold project towards production, including the ordering of long-lead time capital equipment, as well as engineering studies to advance the Gold Rock project.

The Preferred Shares and Common Shares issuable upon conversion of the Preferred Shares are subject to a customary Canadian hold period until April 14, 2013 and are restricted securities under the U.S. Securities Act of 1933, as amended.

Neither the Preferred Shares nor the Common Shares issuable upon conversion of the Preferred Shares or in lieu of cash dividend payments have been registered under the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or the securities laws of any state. Each Preferred Share is convertible into Common Shares of the Company on a 1 to 1 basis. Midway granted the investors registration rights in connection with the offering. The securities may be offered or sold only under exemptions from these registration requirements. This press release does not constitute an offer of securities.

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD

"Kenneth A. Brunk"

Kenneth A. Brunk, Chairman, President and CEO

About Midway Gold Corp.

Midway Gold Corp. is a precious metals company with a vision to explore, design, build and operate gold mines in a manner accountable to all stakeholders while assuring return on shareholder investments. For more information about Midway, please visit our website at www.midwaygold.com or contact R.J. Smith, Vice President of Administration, at (877) 475-3642 (toll-free).

About Hale Capital Partners

Based in New York City, Hale Capital Partners has established itself as a leading private equity firm focused on strategic investments in public companies and their subsidiaries. Hale Capital Partners' team is comprised of seasoned private equity veterans and entrepreneurs, who bring not only deep domain expertise but also hands-on operating experience to help build highly successful companies. Hale Capital Partners' mining portfolio spans all stages of mine development from exploration to commercial production.

Neither the TSX Venture Exchange, its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX Venture Exchange) nor the NYSE MKT accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release.

This press release contains forward-looking statements within the meaning of Canadian and United States securities laws about the Company and its business which may include, but is not limited to, the Company's intended use of proceeds, the ability to complete construction plans for the Pan Project, the plans for development of the Gold Rock Project and other statements that are not historical fact. Such forward-looking statements and forward-looking information reflect our current views with respect to future use of proceeds and are subject to certain risks, uncertainties and assumptions, including but not limited to risks related to delays in closing, the receipt of regulatory approvals and changes in market conditions. The forward-looking statements in this press release are subject to various risks, uncertainties and other factors that could cause the Company's actual results or achievements to differ materially from those expressed in or implied by forward looking statements. These risks, uncertainties and other factors include, without limitation, risks related to the timing and completion of the Company's intended work plans, risks related to fluctuations in gold prices; uncertainties related to raising sufficient financing to fund the planned work in a timely manner and on acceptable terms; changes in planned work resulting from weather; logistical, technical or other factors; the possibility that results of work will not fulfill expectations and realize the perceived potential of the Company's properties; uncertainties involved in the interpretation of

drilling results and other tests and the estimation of gold resources and reserves; the possibility that required permits may not be obtained on a timely manner or at all; the possibility that capital and operating costs may be higher than currently estimated and may preclude commercial development or render operations uneconomic; the possibility that the estimated recovery rates may not be achieved; risk of accidents, equipment breakdowns and labor disputes or other unanticipated difficulties or interruptions; the possibility of cost overruns or unanticipated expenses in the work program; and other factors identified in the Company's SEC filings and its filings with Canadian securities regulatory authorities. Forward-looking statements are based on the beliefs, opinions and expectations of the Company's management at the time they are made, and other than as required by applicable securities laws, the Company does not assume any obligation to update its forward-looking statements if those beliefs, opinions or expectations, or other circumstances, should change.

EXHIBIT 5

EX-99.1 2 newsrelease.htm PRESS RELEASE, DATED JULY 30, 2013



Midway Updates Progress at Pan Project, Nevada

July 30, 2013

Denver, Colorado – Midway Gold Corp. (TSX and NYSE-MKT: MDW) (the “Company”) reports that the Company’s Pan heap leach gold project (“Pan”) is on schedule for construction in Q4 2013 and production in 2014. Permitting, financing, and engineering optimization continue to advance on schedule. For the financing discussions, an updated feasibility study will incorporate optimization and detailed engineering conducted after the November 2011 Feasibility. The revised FS with updated costs is expected in Q3.

A Message from Ken Brunk – Chairman, President and CEO of Midway

Time flies when one is busy! It has been several months since we have updated our shareholders and other interested followers of Midway on our activities and progress. We have been extremely busy permitting, updating the Pan project technical and financial information, evaluating details within the heap leach operating parameters, conducting a trial blast to get rock breakage and powder factor confirmation, performing additional large scale, 25-ton leach tests, optimizing the mine plan and dig plans, re-evaluating the operating costs, re-visiting the capital costs, improving the construction plan and schedule, performing in-depth risk analyses of every aspect of the project and examining financing alternatives for the balance of funding needed to bring the project to production in August of 2014.

You might ask, “Why all this activity for a project with already impressive economics?” The answer is simple; it is our goal to optimize our cost parameters in order to deliver better returns to our shareholders, especially in the current environment.

The most significant event for Midway will be the creation of profitable cash flow from the Pan Mine. Planning for the creation of this cash flow stream began over three years ago with the design of a plan to develop the Pan project into a producing facility. We have been operating on that plan since April 2010. We are within three

weeks of that original schedule and production for Pan is within six weeks of the original target. That does not mean that every internal segment of the schedule has seen no variance; it does mean that the overall schedule has been managed such that we expect to pour gold in August of 2014. I believe that such performance speaks well for the team.

We will issue an updated feasibility study and an updated 43-101 Technical Report on the results of our work in the coming weeks. I am confident that the update will provide a level of comfort that Pan remains a good project. The attributes of nearby infrastructure, easy mining, simple metallurgy, solid engineering, a seasoned operating team and 60 plus million dollars in the bank all contribute toward the project's success. Let's discuss some of the aspects of the project in a bit more detail.

Permitting

We are still on our schedule for the achievement of a favorable record of decision in September of this year. That schedule allows construction to commence in October. The BLM's third party contractor is currently addressing comments and responses received from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) public comment period. These comments will be included in the Final EIS. Major permits received to date include the *Water Pollution Control* permit and the *Class I Air Quality Operating Permit to Construct*. While Midway anticipates no Mercury emissions, a *Class I Operating Permit to Construct: Mercury* is required and is expected to be complete in the near future.

Metallurgical Test Work & First Blast at Pan

Post-feasibility metallurgical test work at Pan has focused on ways to reduce the number of stages of crushing needed thereby delaying the crusher capital expenditures. Large column tests on bulk samples showed excellent gold recoveries from coarse materials. The preliminary results indicate that gold recoveries are less sensitive to crush size than was outlined in the 2011 Feasibility Study. In June of this year, the Company conducted the first blast at Pan to obtain material for tests of Run of Mine potential. This also provided a test of the blast pattern, powder factor, and sampling procedures planned for use during initial mining. The Run of Mine metallurgical testing is still in progress.

Pan Project Financing Update

Midway is pursuing a combination of project and equipment financing alternatives, and has received proposals from several major commercial funding sources. The Company has been working with its financial advisors to assess the amount of financing needed and the various options available in the current market to secure the remaining capital necessary to fund Pan to cash flow. The current finance plan does not consider issuing additional equity that would dilute current shareholders. Accordingly, Midway terminated the September 23, 2011 "At-the-Market" share issuance program effective July 29, 2013.

Pan Updated Feasibility

The company is updating the 2011 Pan Feasibility Study for use in financing negotiations and in forward planning for internal purposes. The update will incorporate post-feasibility optimization changes to the mine plan and will bring feasibility costs up to date. The project timeline for Pan is still on track for Q4 construction and production in 2014.

This release has been reviewed and approved for Midway by William S. Neal (M.Sc., CPG), Vice President of Geological Services of Midway, a "qualified person" as that term is defined in NI 43-101.

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD

"Kenneth A. Brunk"

Kenneth A. Brunk, Chairman, President and CEO

About Midway Gold Corp.

Midway Gold Corp. is a precious metals company with a vision to explore, design, build and operate gold mines in a manner accountable to all stakeholders while assuring return on shareholder investments. For more information about Midway, please visit our website at www.midwaygold.com or contact Jaime Wells, Investor Relations Analyst, at (877) 475-3642 (toll-free).

Neither the TSX, its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX) nor the NYSE MKT accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release.

This press release contains forward-looking statements about the Company and its business. Forward looking statements are statements that are not historical facts and include, but are not limited to, statements about the Company's intended work plans and resource estimates and potential offering of common shares of the Company from time to time. The forward-looking statements in this press release are subject to various risks, uncertainties and other factors that could cause the Company's actual results or achievements to differ materially from those expressed in or implied by forward looking statements. These risks, uncertainties and other factors include, without limitation, risks related to the timing and completion of the Company's intended work plans, risks related to fluctuations in gold prices; uncertainties related to raising sufficient financing to fund the planned work in a timely manner and on acceptable terms; changes in planned work resulting from weather, logistical, technical or other factors; the possibility that results of work will not fulfill expectations and realize the perceived potential of the Company's properties; uncertainties involved in the interpretation of drilling results and other tests and the estimation of gold resources and reserves; the possibility that required permits may not be obtained on a timely manner or at all; the possibility that capital and operating costs may be higher than currently estimated and may preclude commercial development or render operations uneconomic; the possibility that the estimated recovery rates may not be achieved; risk of accidents, equipment breakdowns and labor disputes or other unanticipated difficulties or interruptions; the possibility of cost overruns or unanticipated expenses in the work program; and other factors identified in the Company's SEC filings and its filings with Canadian securities regulatory authorities. Forward-looking statements are based on the beliefs, opinions and expectations of the Company's management at the time they are made, and other than as required by applicable securities laws, the Company does not assume any obligation to update its forward-looking statements if those beliefs, opinions or expectations, or other circumstances, should change.

Cautionary note to U.S. investors concerning estimates of reserves and resources: This press release and the documents referenced in this press release use the terms "reserve" and "mineral resource", which are terms defined under Canadian National Instrument 43-101 and the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy Classification system. Such definitions differ from the definitions in U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") Industry Guide 7. Under SEC Industry Guide 7 standards, a "final" or "bankable" feasibility study is required to report reserves, the three-year historical average price is used in any reserve or cash flow analysis to designate reserves and the primary environmental analysis or report must be filed with the appropriate governmental authority. Mineral resources are not mineral reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability. The SEC normally only permits issuers to report mineralization that does not constitute SEC Industry Guide 7 compliant "reserves" as in-place tonnage and grade without reference to unit measures. The references to a "resource" in this press release and the documents referenced in this press release are not normally permitted under the rules of the SEC. It cannot be assumed that all or any part of mineral deposits in any of the above categories will ever be upgraded to Guide 7 compliant reserves. Accordingly, disclosure in this press release and in the technical reports referenced in this press release may not be comparable to information from U.S. companies subject to the reporting and disclosure requirements of the SEC.

EXHIBIT 6

EX-99.1 2 newsrelease.htm PRESS RELEASE, DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2013



MIDWAY GOLD

IMPRESSIVE RUN-OF-MINE TEST RESULTS AT MIDWAY'S PAN PROJECT, NEVADA

September 17, 2013

Denver, Colorado – Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway" or the "Company") (MDW:TSX, MDW:NYSE-MKT) reports positive preliminary results from metallurgical test work on run-of mine (ROM) bulk samples at Pan. Observed gold recoveries of 92% after 58 days indicate gold recovery of the South Pan ore is not sensitive to crush size. These metallurgical results suggest the South Pan ore can be processed with ROM leaching and that a crusher installation and spend at Pan can be deferred for at least 18 to 24 months.

Ken Brunk, President and CEO of Midway states, "We are very excited by these new ROM test results. We saw indications in the 2010 pre-feasibility and 2011 feasibility column testing of South Pan ores that gold recovery seemed insensitive to crush size. However, due to permitting constraints we were unable to begin comprehensive ROM test work. Therefore, we elected to include crushers in the initial project, as we will need them for the North Pit ore regardless of South Pit design factors.

Since the November 2011 feasibility, we have continued to permit and test bulk samples of larger and larger particle size with favorable results. Our permitting team obtained permission from the BLM to conduct a trial blast in July at South Pan from which we could obtain true ROM ore for testing. Representative samples of the blasted ore were sent to Kappes-Cassidy & Associates (KCA) laboratories in Reno for leaching in large columns to simulate a ROM leaching operation. The duplicate 4 feet diameter columns are stacked with approximately 20,000 pounds of ROM ore each to a height of 15 feet and have already resulted in a gold recovery of 92% at 58 days. These excellent leaching results and leach kinetics are due to the fact that the rock is porous and permeable. In other words, the rock readily allows the leach solution to flow through the ore and to easily dissolve the gold.

The results of the large column tests lead the project team and management to conclude that ROM leaching is a viable option for South Pan. The excellent extraction of gold from the large-scale bulk sample also supports retaining the 85% recovery that is now confirmed by all the detailed test work to date. The size analysis of the large column test feed material is consistent with, and perhaps a bit coarser, than that from my experience with other ROM leaches on Carlin style formations. Midway will work with these large column results and use them to further refine our Pan project. Continued optimization of the mine plan will occur to ultimately dictate when the crushers will be needed."

Test Details

Figure 1 below is a graph showing the gold recoveries from feasibility study and pre-feasibility study metallurgical test work. It shows that the percent gold recovery is essentially the same for particle sizes from one-half inch in size to 7 inches in size. These results were obtained from column leaching of drill core and from bulk samples gathered from backhoe-dug trenches on site.

Figure 2 shows the current in-progress gold recovery from the ROM tests that are being run at KCA labs. These tests are still leaching and will remain for approximately another 60 days to allow for the collection of additional design information. The particle size of the ore in the test columns ranges from 24 inches to less than 0.1 inches. The P-80 is 7.3 inches. This means that 80% of the ore is 7.3 inches or less in size. Also, only 15% the rock in the test columns is less than 0.1 inches. Test results are preliminary and final results could vary once final tailings are assayed.

Other Project Updates

The Pan project is in the final stages of the NEPA process. A Record of Decision is expected before year-end, which will be followed 30 days later by construction. Midway is targeting startup of operations in the third quarter of 2014.

Midway has engaged Sierra Partners as a financial advisor to evaluate and guide the Company in putting in place the balance of the financing needed to construct the Pan project. At the end of the second quarter the Company had a cash position of \$65.8M and expects to have the remaining financing in place by year-end.

Figure 1. Pan South Area Gold Recoveries vs. Crush Size





Figure 2. Recovery vs. Leach Cycle in Days

Pan Gold Project, Nevada

The Pan project is an oxidized, Carlin-style gold deposit mineable by shallow open pit methods and treatable by heap leaching. A Feasibility Study was completed in November 2011. It shows the NPV of the project is robust at a range of gold prices, ranging from \$123 million at \$1,200/oz gold to \$344 million \$1,900/oz gold. The IRR grows from 32% to 79% using the same gold price range. Both are after-tax figures (see press release dated November 15, 2011.)

This release has been reviewed and approved for Midway by Deepak Molhatra (PhD Mineral Economics, MS Metallurgical Engineering), President of Resource Development, Inc., and a "qualified person" as that term is defined in NI 43-101.

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD

"Kenneth A. Brunk"

Kenneth A. Brunk, Chairman, President and CEO

About Midway Gold Corp.

Midway Gold Corp. is a precious metals company with a vision to explore, design, build and operate gold mines in a manner accountable to all stakeholders while assuring return on shareholder investments. For more information about Midway, please visit our website at www.midwaygold.com or contact Jaime Wells, Investor Relations Analyst, at (877) 475-3642 (toll-free).

Neither the TSX Exchange, its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX Exchange) nor the NYSE MKT accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release.

This press release contains forward-looking statements about the Company and its business. Forward looking statements are statements that are not historical facts and include, but are not limited to, statements about the Company's intended work plans and resource estimates and potential offering of common shares of the Company from time to time. The forward-looking statements in this press release are subject to various risks, uncertainties and other factors that could cause the Company's actual results or achievements to differ materially from those expressed in or implied by forward looking statements. These risks, uncertainties and other factors include, without limitation, risks related to the timing and completion of the Company's intended work plans, risks related to fluctuations in gold prices; uncertainties related to raising sufficient financing to fund the planned work in a timely manner and on acceptable terms; changes in planned work resulting from weather, logistical, technical or other factors; the possibility that results of work will not fulfill expectations and realize the perceived potential of the Company's properties; uncertainties involved in the interpretation of drilling results and other tests and the estimation of gold resources and reserves; the possibility that required permits may not be obtained on a timely manner or at all; the possibility that capital and operating costs may be higher than currently estimated and may preclude commercial development or render operations uneconomic; the possibility that the estimated recovery rates may not be achieved; risk of accidents, equipment breakdowns and labor disputes or other unanticipated difficulties or interruptions; the possibility of cost overruns or unanticipated expenses in the work program; and other factors identified in the Company's SEC filings and its filings with Canadian securities regulatory authorities. Forward-looking statements are based on the beliefs, opinions and expectations of the Company's management at the time they are made, and other than as required by applicable securities laws, the Company does not assume any obligation to update its forward-looking statements if those beliefs, opinions or expectations, or other circumstances, should change.

Cautionary note to U.S. investors concerning estimates of reserves and resources: This press release and the documents referenced in this press release use the terms "reserve" and "mineral resource", which are terms defined under Canadian National Instrument 43-101 and the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy Classification system. Such definitions differ from the definitions in U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") Industry Guide 7. Under SEC Industry Guide 7 standards, a "final" or "bankable" feasibility study is required to report reserves, the three-year historical average price is used in any reserve or cash flow analysis to designate reserves and the primary environmental analysis or report must be filed with the appropriate governmental authority. Mineral resources are not mineral reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability. The SEC normally only permits issuers to report mineralization that does not constitute SEC Industry Guide 7 compliant "reserves" as in-place tonnage and grade without reference to unit measures. The references to a "resource" in this press release and the documents referenced in this press release are not normally permitted under the rules of the SEC. It cannot be assumed that all or any part of mineral deposits in any of the above categories will ever be upgraded to Guide 7 compliant reserves. Accordingly, disclosure in this press release and in the technical reports referenced in this press release may not be comparable to information from U.S. companies subject to the reporting and disclosure requirements of the SEC.

EXHIBIT 7

EX-99.1 2 newsrelease.htm PRESS RELEASE, DATED DECEMBER 20, 2013



MIDWAY GOLD COMPLETES PERMITTING – RECEIVES RECORD OF DECISION PAN PROJECT, NEVADA

December 20, 2013

Denver, Colorado – Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway" or the "Company") (MDW:TSX, MDW:NYSE-MKT) announces receipt of a December 20, 2013 signed Record of Decision (ROD) on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Pan gold project, White Pine County, Nevada. The ROD signifies full completion of the required NEPA and EIS process. The ROD represents the final step in the federal permitting process and allows construction to begin.

“We are permitted at Pan. This is truly a groundbreaking accomplishment for Midway Gold and a great Christmas present for all who have been a part of the Midway story over the past few years,” said Ken Brunk, Midway’s President & CEO. “We advanced from the Notice of Intent to the Record of Decision in a record 20 months. We would like to thank everyone here at Midway, especially our permitting team, for a job very well done. We respect the professionalism of the cooperating agencies and their effectiveness to complete the process in a timely manner. We would also like to thank the local communities and, of course, our shareholders for the endless support. We are very excited to have completed this permitting process and are ready to begin construction!”

What is the NEPA and the EIS Process?

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Pan project is required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The act sets up procedural requirements for all federal governmental agencies to prepare environmental assessments and environmental impact statements in response to proposed major activities on federal lands. The Pan project is on federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Therefore, NEPA requires the BLM to prepare an EIS to analyze potential environmental consequences of the planned project and any reasonable alternatives. Midway has advanced through baseline studies, the Draft EIS,

the Final EIS, and has now completed the process with the **Record of Decision**. Numerous state permits are also required and have been obtained from various state agencies.

Pan Gold Project, Nevada

The Pan project is a low cost, oxidized, Carlin-style gold deposit mineable by shallow open pit methods and treatable by heap leaching. A Feasibility Study was completed in November 2011. It shows the NPV of the project is robust at a range of gold prices, ranging from \$123 million at \$1,200/oz gold to \$344 million \$1,900/oz gold. The IRR grows from 32% to 79% using the same gold price range. Both are after-tax figures (see press release dated November 15, 2011.)

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD**"Kenneth A. Brunk"****Kenneth A. Brunk, Chairman, President and CEO****About Midway Gold Corp.**

Midway Gold Corp. is a precious metals company with a vision to explore, design, build and operate gold mines in a manner accountable to all stakeholders while assuring return on shareholder investments. For more information about Midway, please visit our website at www.midwaygold.com or contact Jaime Wells, Investor Relations Analyst, at (877) 475-3642 (toll-free).

Neither the TSX Exchange, its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX Exchange) nor the NYSE MKT accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release. This press release contains forward-looking statements about the Company and its business. Forward looking statements are statements that are not historical facts and include, but are not limited to, statements about the Company's intended work plans and resource estimates and potential offering of common shares of the Company from time to time. The forward-looking statements in this press release are subject to various risks, uncertainties and other factors that could cause the Company's actual results or achievements to differ materially from those expressed in or implied by forward looking statements. These risks, uncertainties and other factors include, without limitation, risks related to the timing and completion of the Company's intended work plans, risks related to fluctuations in gold prices; uncertainties related to raising sufficient financing to fund the planned work in a timely manner and on acceptable terms; changes in planned work resulting from weather, logistical, technical or other factors; the possibility that results of work will not fulfill expectations and realize the perceived potential of the Company's properties; uncertainties involved in the interpretation of drilling results and other tests and the estimation of gold resources and reserves; the possibility that required permits may not be obtained on a timely manner or at all; the possibility that capital and operating costs may be higher than currently estimated and may preclude commercial development or render operations uneconomic; the possibility that the estimated recovery rates may not be achieved; risk of accidents, equipment breakdowns and labor disputes or other unanticipated difficulties or interruptions; the possibility of cost overruns or unanticipated expenses in the work program; and other factors identified in the Company's SEC filings and its filings with Canadian securities regulatory authorities. Forward-looking statements are based on the beliefs, opinions and expectations of the Company's management at the time they are made, and other than as required by applicable securities laws, the Company does not assume any obligation to update its forward-looking statements if those beliefs, opinions or expectations, or other circumstances, should change.

EXHIBIT 8

EX-99.1 2 newsrelease.htm PRESS RELEASE, DATED JANUARY 15, 2014



MIDWAY BREAKS GROUND AT PAN GOLD PROJECT, NEVADA

January 15, 2014

Denver, Colorado – Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway" or the "Company") (MDW:TSX, MDW:NYSE-MKT) holds a formal groundbreaking ceremony at the site of the Pan Project, White Pine County, Nevada. The project is fully permitted and construction is underway with completion estimated for Q3 2014. A Record of Decision from the BLM signed on December 20, 2013 completed the EIS process. Bonding for construction and mining is in place. Equipment has been mobilized to site and earth works are in progress. The power line to site has been permitted and construction has begun.

"This groundbreaking ceremony is the kick off for building the Pan mine," said Ken Brunk, Midway's President & CEO. "It is an opportunity for us to acknowledge those who drove the process from exploration through permitting and development. Many times, we have expressed our thanks to our permitting team and today is one more valuable opportunity to do so. Without their hard work and commitment to both excellent science and schedule we would not be where we are today. Additionally, we are proud to recognize Mr. Alan Branham, former president and CEO of Midway, for his leadership in acquiring the Pan project for Midway and for his vision that Pan would one day become a mine."

Pan Gold Project, Nevada

The Pan project is a low cost, oxidized, Carlin-style gold deposit mineable by shallow open pit methods and treatable by heap leaching. A Feasibility Study was completed in November 2011. It shows the NPV of the project is robust at a range of gold prices, ranging from \$123 million at \$1,200/oz gold to \$344 million at \$1,900/oz gold. The IRR grows from 32% to 79% using the same gold price range. Both are after-tax figures (see press release dated November 15, 2011.)

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD

"Kenneth A. Brunk"

Kenneth A. Brunk, Chairman, President and CEO

About Midway Gold Corp.

Midway Gold Corp. is a precious metals company with a vision to explore, design, build and operate gold mines in a manner accountable to all stakeholders while assuring return on shareholder investments. For more information about Midway, please visit our website at www.midwaygold.com or contact Jaime Wells, Investor Relations Analyst, at (877) 475-3642 (toll-free).

Neither the TSX Exchange, its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX Exchange) nor the NYSE MKT accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release. This press release contains forward-looking statements about the Company and its

business. Forward looking statements are statements that are not historical facts and include, but are not limited to, statements about the Company's intended work plans and resource estimates and potential offering of common shares of the Company from time to time. The forward-looking statements in this press release are subject to various risks, uncertainties and other factors that could cause the Company's actual results or achievements to differ materially from those expressed in or implied by forward looking statements. These risks, uncertainties and other factors include, without limitation, risks related to the timing and completion of the Company's intended work plans, risks related to fluctuations in gold prices; uncertainties related to raising sufficient financing to fund the planned work in a timely manner and on acceptable terms; changes in planned work resulting from weather, logistical, technical or other factors; the possibility that results of work will not fulfill expectations and realize the perceived potential of the Company's properties; uncertainties involved in the interpretation of drilling results and other tests and the estimation of gold resources and reserves; the possibility that required permits may not be obtained on a timely manner or at all; the possibility that capital and operating costs may be higher than currently estimated and may preclude commercial development or render operations uneconomic; the possibility that the estimated recovery rates may not be achieved; risk of accidents, equipment breakdowns and labor disputes or other unanticipated difficulties or interruptions; the possibility of cost overruns or unanticipated expenses in the work program; and other factors identified in the Company's SEC filings and its filings with Canadian securities regulatory authorities. Forward-looking statements are based on the beliefs, opinions and expectations of the Company's management at the time they are made, and other than as required by applicable securities laws, the Company does not assume any obligation to update its forward-looking statements if those beliefs, opinions or expectations, or other circumstances, should change.

EXHIBIT 9



MIDWAY GOLD

CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS
8310 S Valley Highway, Suite 280, Englewood, CO 80112
720.979.0900

MIDWAY FORECASTS CAPITAL REDUCTIONS PAN PROJECT, NEVADA

April 24, 2014

Denver, Colorado – Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway" or the "Company") (MDW:TSX, MDW:NYSE-MKT) is pleased to provide an update on recent developments and scope changes at the Pan Project including potential reduction in pre-production capital requirements. Construction at Pan remains on-track for initial production in 2014.

"We are excited by our progress at Pan," said Ken Brunk CEO and President. "Our team has worked diligently during the last few months to advance our first project through construction while also finding ways to cut our costs. We believe we can significantly reduce our borrowing needs by employing two significant scope changes to the project—the utilization of a contract miner for early years of mining, and leaching the South Pan ore body by run-of-mine methods thereby deferring the purchase and installation of a crusher plant. We are also fortunate to have had our construction contracts that have been let to date come in at or very close to our feasibility estimates. With these recent reductions in initial capital requirements and our current strong cash balance, we look forward to completing project financing within the coming weeks. We are pleased that the third party engineers that have evaluated the project on behalf of potential lenders have found no "fatal flaws" in any of these approaches or with the project."

RECENT PROJECT SCOPE CHANGES

NYSE MKT: MDW TSX: MDW MIDWAYGOLD.COM

connect 720



Transition to Contract Mining

Midway has elected to pursue contract mining in the initial years at Pan. Midway had planned to pursue owner mining (as referenced in the 2011 Feasibility Study). However, conditions in the mining industry have led to an increasingly attractive price environment for contract mining. A mining contractor will provide all mining-related services, manpower and equipment for the Pan Project. They will be directly responsible for drilling, blasting, loading, and hauling ore to the leach pad for processing by Midway. Contract mining reduces the initial capital requirements for Pan by deferring purchase of the planned mine fleet. It also minimizes initial start-up and operational risks.

Elimination of Crushing in Initial Mine Years

The Company has elected to defer purchase and installation of crushers for the first 2-3 years of the mine life at Pan. The November 2011 Feasibility Study included a 2-stage crushing circuit at South Pan. Detailed metallurgical tests confirm this ore responds favorably to run-of-mine leaching. Deferral of crushing circuit equipment and installation is expected to reduce initial capital expenditures. There is also potential to lower operating costs associated with the deferral of the crushers. Midway is currently evaluating the extent of such potential savings.

PROJECT FINANCING

Midway is currently well funded with \$48M in cash as of December 31, 2013. Construction progress remains on track for 2014 gold production at Pan. Project financing is well advanced and expected to be complete in the second quarter of 2014. Financing is being designed to retain gold price upside for our shareholders. Midway is striving to maximize returns on capital invested and return on equity, and has evaluated a variety of debt financing alternatives, both traditional and non-



traditional. In depth, third party due diligence for the Pan project has resulted in a determination of no "fatal flaws" for prospective lenders.

Pan Gold Project, Nevada

The Pan project is a low cost, oxidized, Carlin-style gold deposit mineable by shallow open pit methods and treatable by heap leaching.

This release has been reviewed and approved for Midway by Rick Moritz a "qualified person" as that term is defined in NI 43-101.

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD

"Kenneth A. Brunk"

Kenneth A. Brunk, Chairman, President and CEO

About Midway Gold Corp.

Midway Gold Corp. is a precious metals company with a vision to explore, design, build and operate gold mines in a manner accountable to all stakeholders while assuring return on shareholder investments. For more information about Midway, please visit our website at www.midwaygold.com or contact Jaime Wells, Investor Relations Analyst, at (877) 475-3642 (toll-free).

EXHIBIT 10

EX-99.1 2 newsrelease.htm PRESS RELEASE, DATED MAY 22, 2014

**MIDWAY GOLD**

CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS
8310 S Valley Highway, Suite 280, Englewood, CO 80112
720.979.0900

 A NEW BENCHMARK

**MIDWAY EXECUTES COMMITMENT LETTER
FOR US\$55 MILLION PROJECT FINANCE FACILITY WITH COMMONWEALTH
BANK OF AUSTRALIA
PAN PROJECT, NEVADA**

May 22, 2014

Denver, Colorado – Midway Gold Corp. ("Midway" or the "Company") (MDW:TSX, MDW:NYSE-MKT) announces the signing of a binding commitment letter with Commonwealth Bank of Australia ("Commonwealth Bank") for a US\$55 million 3-year senior secured project finance facility (the "Loan Facility") for the development of the Company's 100%-owned Pan Gold Mine in White Pine County, Nevada. Closing is expected to occur by the end of June 2014.

The Loan Facility is comprised of two tranches, a project finance facility of US\$45 million plus a cost overrun facility of US\$10 million. Advances under the project finance facility will bear interest at LIBOR plus 3.5% to 3.75%, and advances under the cost overrun facility will bear interest at the project finance facility rate plus 2%.

Ken Brunk, President and CEO of Midway, states, "We are pleased to be able to announce this major milestone for our Company and to have Commonwealth Bank as a new financial partner as we work toward gold production and positive cash flow. Our progress to date through permitting and financing speaks to the high quality of our first project and we look forward to achieving the highest return we can for our shareholders. We would like to thank our employees for their continued hard work and our shareholders and local community members for their support through this extensive process. We have committed approximately \$21 million to project construction to date and the build out is about 20% complete."

NYSE MKT: **MDW** // TSX: **MDW** // **MIDWAYGOLD.COM**CONNECT   

May 19, 2014

**Additional Loan Facility Information**

The Loan Facility is subject to completion of loan and security documentation and customary conditions precedent to closing, and will be secured by substantially all of the assets of the borrower (MDW Pan LLP, which is comprised solely of the Pan Project) and its affiliates. Upon achieving economic completion and meeting certain other requirements, security will be limited to the assets of MDW Pan LLP and guarantees from the Company and an affiliate. Closing is expected to occur at the end of June 2014.

A condition precedent to draw on the loan is the establishment of an un-margined hedging program through Commonwealth Bank, which provides downside protection for the Company's debt. This program will cover a period of less than two years commencing approximately six months after the planned start of production and is expected to comprise an estimated 11% of the Project's anticipated life-of-mine production based on the current reserve base (See November 2011 Resource Estimate) assuming a spot gold price of approximately \$1300/oz.

About Pan

The Pan project is a low cost, oxidized, Carlin-style gold deposit mineable by shallow open pit methods and treatable by heap leaching. A feasibility study was completed in November 2011. The project is fully permitted (December 2013) and is currently under construction.

This release has been reviewed and approved for Midway by Dave Mosch, Corporate Mining Engineering at Midway and a "qualified person" as that term is defined in NI 43-101.

May 19, 2014



ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD

"Kenneth A. Brunk"

Kenneth A. Brunk, Chairman, President and CEO

About Midway Gold Corp.

Midway Gold Corp. is a precious metals company with a vision to explore, design, build and operate gold mines in a manner accountable to all stakeholders while assuring return on shareholder investments. For more information about Midway, please visit our website at www.midwaygold.com or contact Jaime Wells, Investor Relations Analyst, at 720-979-0900.

Neither the TSX Exchange, its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX Exchange) nor the NYSE MKT accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release.

This press release contains forward-looking statements about the Company and its business. Forward looking statements are statements that are not historical facts and include, but are not limited to, statements about the Company's intended work plans and resource estimates and potential offering of common shares of the Company from time to time. Forward-looking statements are typically identified by words such as: "may", "should", "plan", "believe", "predict", "expect", "anticipate", "intend", "estimate", "postulate" and similar expressions or the negative of such expressions or which by their nature refer to future events. The forward-looking statements in this press release are subject to various risks, uncertainties and other factors that could cause the Company's actual results or achievements to differ materially from those expressed in or implied by forward looking statements. These risks, uncertainties and other factors include, without limitation, risks related to the timing and completion of the Company's intended work plans, risks related to fluctuations in gold prices; uncertainties related to raising sufficient financing to fund the planned work in a timely manner and on acceptable terms; changes in planned work resulting from weather, logistical, technical or other factors; the possibility that results of work will not fulfill expectations and realize the perceived potential of the Company's properties; uncertainties involved in the interpretation of drilling results and other tests and the estimation of gold resources and reserves; the possibility that required permits may not be obtained on a timely manner or at all; the possibility that capital and operating costs may be higher than currently estimated and may preclude commercial development or render operations uneconomic; the possibility that the estimated recovery rates may not be achieved; risk of accidents, equipment breakdowns and labor disputes or other unanticipated difficulties or interruptions; the possibility of cost overruns or unanticipated expenses in the work program; changes in interest and currency exchanges rates; local and community impacts and issues; environmental costs and risks; and other factors identified in the Company's SEC filings and its filings with Canadian securities regulatory authorities. Forward-looking statements are based on the beliefs, opinions and expectations of the Company's management at the time they are made, and other than as required by applicable securities laws, the Company does not assume any obligation to update its forward-looking statements if those beliefs, opinions or expectations, or other circumstances, should change. Although the Company believes that such forward-looking statements are reasonable, it can give no assurance that such expectations will prove to be correct. For the reasons set forth above, investors should not attribute undue certainty to or place undue reliance on forward-looking statements.

EXHIBIT 11

TOLLING AGREEMENT

This Tolling Agreement (the "Agreement") is made and entered into as of June 2, 2016 (the "Effective Date"), by and between Daniel E. Wolfus and George Hawes, as well as the individuals and entities which have assigned their claims to Mr. Wolfus or Mr. Hawes, respectively (collectively referred to herein as "Plaintiffs") on the one hand, and Kenneth A. Brunk, Richard Moritz, Brad Blacketer, Timothy Haddon, Martin Hale, Trey Anderson, Richard Sawchak, Frank Yu, John Sheridan, Roger Newell, Rodney Knutson, and Nathaniel Klein (referred to jointly and/or severally as the "Midway Directors and Officers") on the other hand. The Plaintiffs and the Midway Directors and Officers are collectively referred to herein as the "Parties," or individually as a "Party."

WHEREAS, on March 29, 2016 counsel for the Plaintiffs sent a draft complaint to the Midway Directors and Officers setting forth a number of claims related to the public filings and management of Midway Gold (the "Draft Complaint"), and

WHEREAS, the Parties deem it to be in their mutual benefit that Plaintiffs' claims, including, but not limited to, those set forth in the Draft Complaint, and any counterclaims available against the Plaintiffs, not be asserted in litigation at the present time, and

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to encourage resolution and/or such further review or disposition of Plaintiffs' Claims and/or any Claims by the Midway Directors and Officers as may result in a confidential settlement and are willing to make the stipulations, covenants and agreements hereinafter set forth in order to defer and postpone the commencement of litigation, and

WHEREAS, the Parties desire that for the period of this Agreement, they should be able to consider issues relating to the possibility of settling disputes without regard to the time constraints that exist because of any future expiration of any applicable statute of limitations;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual agreements hereinafter set forth, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Parties do hereby covenant and agree as follows:

1. As used in this Agreement, the following terms shall have the following meanings:
 - a) "Claims" shall mean any and all claims and/or causes of action, if any, known or unknown, Plaintiffs may have against the Midway Directors and Officers in connection with their participation in the public filings by and the management and operation of Midway Gold and its affiliated entities including, but not limited to, those set forth in the Draft Complaint, and any claims and/or causes of action, if any, known or unknown, the Midway Directors and Officers may have against Plaintiffs in connection with Plaintiffs' conduct, management, operation, and/or purchases or sales or securities of Midway Gold and its affiliated entities.
 - b) "Tolling Period" shall mean the period from and including the Effective Date of this Agreement until and including the Expiration Date (as defined below) of this Agreement.
 - c) "Expiration Date" shall mean the earlier of **September 25, 2016**, or 30 days from the date that written notice of termination of this Agreement has been served by either of the Parties on the other in accordance with paragraph 10 of this Agreement.
 - d) "Timing Defenses" shall mean and include, and shall be limited to, any affirmative defenses to any Party's Claims that another Party may have to the extent based upon (1) any statute of limitations, (2) laches, and/or (3) any failure by a Party to institute or commence litigation or other legal proceedings within some specified period, before a specified date, or before the happening of a specified event.
2. The Plaintiffs and the Midway Directors and Officers stipulate, covenant and agree that Timing Defenses applicable to the Claims shall be tolled during the Tolling Period.
3. The Plaintiffs and the Midway Directors and Officers stipulate, covenant, and agree that this Agreement shall have no effect on any Timing Defenses that may have lapsed prior to the Effective Date, and that all time periods prior to the Effective Date and after the Expiration Date

(and prior to the filing of any lawsuit or other legal proceeding by Plaintiffs subject to paragraph 5 of this Agreement) shall be included in the calculation of and running of any applicable Timing Defenses. Nothing contained herein shall preclude any Party from asserting any Timing Defenses to the extent that such defenses already exist as of the Effective Date, and nothing herein shall be deemed to revive any Claims barred as of the Effective Date.

4. The Parties stipulate, covenant, and agree that, by executing and entering into this Agreement, the Parties are not waiving or otherwise impairing by estoppel or any other means, right and ability to raise any Timing Defenses available to them for the periods prior to the Effective Date and after the Expiration Date (and prior to the filing of any lawsuit or other legal proceeding by Plaintiffs subject to paragraph 5 of this Agreement).

5. The provisions of this Agreement comprise all of the terms, conditions, agreements and representations of the Parties respecting the tolling of the Timing Defenses. This Agreement may not be altered or amended except by written agreement executed by both the Plaintiffs and the Midway Directors and Officers. The Parties hereby agree that terms of this Agreement have not been changed, modified, or expanded by any oral agreements or representations entered into or made prior to or at the execution of this Agreement.

6. The Parties hereto acknowledge that each of them has had the benefit of counsel of their choice and has been offered an opportunity to review this Agreement with chosen counsel. The Parties hereto further acknowledge that they have, individually or through their respective counsel, participated in the preparation of this Agreement, and it is understood that no provision hereof shall be construed against any party hereto by reason of either party having drafted or prepared this Agreement.

7. This Agreement may be executed in one or more original, scanned or facsimile counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but also which together will constitute one and the same instrument.

8. This Agreement shall terminate on the Expiration Date as provided in paragraph 1(c) above, unless extended in writing by the parties to be bound.

9. This Agreement contains the entire agreement between the Parties with respect to its subject matter, and no statement, promise, or inducement made by any of the parties or agent of the parties that is not contained in this Agreement shall be valid or binding, and this Agreement shall not be enlarged, modified, or altered except in writing signed by the parties.

10. This Tolling Agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the parties, their predecessors, successors, and assigns, if any.

11. This Agreement shall be construed in accordance with and be governed by the internal laws, other than choice of laws, of the State of Nevada.

12. Either the Plaintiffs or the Midway Directors and Officers may terminate this Agreement, effective 30 days after the date of serving a written notice of termination, by serving notice of termination by letter to the other party. Such notice letter shall be served by email transmission, followed by the delivery of an original of the notice letter by United States certified mail, return receipt requested, to the following persons at the following addresses:

If to the Plaintiffs:

Justin T. Toth
RAY QUINNEY & NEBEKER P.C.
36 South State Street, Suite 1400
P.O. Box 45385
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0385
Email: jtoth@rqn.com

If to the Midway Directors and Officers:

Holly Stein Sollod
Holland & Hart LLP
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200
Denver, CO 80202-3979
Email: hsteinsollod@hollandhart.com

Eric B. Liebman
Moye White LLP
16 Market Square 6th Floor
1400 16th Street
Denver CO 80202
Email: eric.liebman@moyewhite.com

Mark Ferrario
Chris Miltenberger
Greenberg Traurig LLP
Suite 400 North
3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
Las Vegas NV 89134

13. On or after the Expiration Date of this Agreement, the Parties shall have the right to file and pursue any and all Claims and to seek any and all legal remedies against any other Party that may be available to them, if any, and any Party shall be entitled to assert any Timing Defenses or other defenses, if any, subject to the terms of this Agreement.

14. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as an admission or denial by any of the Parties as to the merits of any Party's Claims against any other Party or the merits of any Party's defenses to any Claims.

15. Neither the Parties nor any of their agents, witnesses, or attorneys will mention or allude to this Agreement, its terms, its execution, or the existence of any Tolling Period in any way, directly or indirectly, before a jury or any fact finder in any proceeding for any purpose. The terms of this paragraph will survive termination of this Agreement.

PLAINTIFFS:


Holly Stein Sollod
Holland & Hart LLP
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200
Denver, CO 80202-3979
Email: hsteinsollod@hollandhart.com

13. On or after the Expiration Date of this Agreement, the Parties shall have the right to file and pursue any and all Claims and to seek any and all legal remedies against any other Party that may be available to them, if any, and any Party shall be entitled to assert any Timing Defenses or other defenses, if any, subject to the terms of this Agreement.

14. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as an admission or denial by any of the Parties as to the merits of any Party's Claims against any other Party or the merits of any Party's defenses to any Claims.

15. Neither the Parties nor any of their agents, witnesses, or attorneys will mention or allude to this Agreement, its terms, its execution, or the existence of any Tolling Period in any way, directly or indirectly, before a jury or any fact finder in any proceeding for any purpose. The terms of this paragraph will survive termination of this Agreement.

PLAINTIFFS:


DANIEL E. WOLFUS, individually and as
assignee of The Wolfus Revocable Trust,
Christine Wolfus and Daniel Wolfus, and
Devoney Wolfus and Stephanie Wolfus

GEORGE HAWES, individually and as
assignee of Christina Hawes-Mohr,
Kathleen Hawes, Ian Hawes, and Brendan
Hawes

Holly Stein Sollod
Holland & Hart LLP
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200
Denver, CO 80202-3979
Email: hsteinsollod@hollandhart.com


13. On or after the Expiration Date of this Agreement, the Parties shall have the right to file and pursue any and all Claims and to seek any and all legal remedies against any other Party that may be available to them, if any, and any Party shall be entitled to assert any Timing Defenses or other defenses, if any, subject to the terms of this Agreement.

14. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as an admission or denial by any of the Parties as to the merits of any Party's Claims against any other Party or the merits of any Party's defenses to any Claims.

15. Neither the Parties nor any of their agents, witnesses, or attorneys will mention or allude to this Agreement, its terms, its execution, or the existence of any Tolling Period in any way, directly or indirectly, before a jury or any fact finder in any proceeding for any purpose. The terms of this paragraph will survive termination of this Agreement.

PLAINTIFFS:

DANIEL E. WOLFUS, individually and as
assignee of The Wolfus Revocable Trust,
Christine Wolfus and Daniel Wolfus, and
Devoney Wolfus and Stephanie Wolfus




GEORGE HAWES, individually and as
assignee of Christina Hawes-Mohr,
Kathleen Hawes, Ian Hawes, and Brendan
Hawes

**MIDWAY DIRECTORS AND
OFFICERS:**



KENNETH A. BRUNK



RICHARD SAWCHAK

RICHARD MORITZ

FRANK YU

BRAD BLACKETOR

JOHN SHERIDAN

TIMOTHY HADDON

ROGER NEWELL

MARTIN HALE

RODNEY KNUTSON

TREY ANDERSON

NATHANIEL KLEIN

**MIDWAY DIRECTORS AND
OFFICERS:**



KENNETH A. BRUNK


RICHARD SAWCHAK

RICHARD MORITZ

FRANK YU

BRAD BLACKETOR

JOHN SHERIDAN



TIMOTHY HADDON

ROGER NEWELL


MARTIN HALE

RODNEY KNUTSON

TREY ANDERSON

NATHANIEL KLEIN

**MIDWAY DIRECTORS AND
OFFICERS:**



KENNETH A. BRUNK

RICHARD SAWCHAK


RICHARD MORITZ

FRANK YU

BRAD BLACKETOR

JOHN SHERIDAN

TIMOTHY HADDON



ROGER NEWELL

MARTIN HALE

RODNEY KNUTSON

TREY ANDERSON

NATHANIEL KLEIN

**MIDWAY DIRECTORS AND
OFFICERS:**



KENNETH A. BRUNK



RICHARD MORITZ

RICHARD SAWCHAK

FRANK YU

BRAD BLACKETOR

JOHN SHERIDAN

TIMOTHY HADDON

ROGER NEWELL

MARTIN HALE

RODNEY KNUTSON

TREY ANDERSON

NATHANIEL KLEIN

**MIDWAY DIRECTORS AND
OFFICERS:**




KENNETH A. BRUNK

RICHARD SAWCHAK

RICHARD MORITZ

FRANK YU



BRAD BLACKETOR

JOHN SHERIDAN

TIMOTHY HADDON

ROGER NEWELL

MARTIN HALE

RODNEY KNUTSON

TREY ANDERSON

NATHANIEL KLEIN

MIDWAY DIRECTORS AND
OFFICERS:


KENNETH A. BRUNK

RICHARD SAWCHAK

RICHARD MORITZ

FRANK YU

BRAD BLACKETOR


JOHN SHERIDAN

TIMOTHY HADDON

ROGER NEWELL

MARTIN HALE

RODNEY KNUTSON

TREY ANDERSON


NATHANIEL KLEIN

**MIDWAY DIRECTORS AND
OFFICERS:**



KENNETH A. BRUNK

RICHARD SAWCHAK



RICHARD MORITZ

FRANK YU

BRAD BLACKETOR

JOHN SHERIDAN

TIMOTHY HADDON

ROGER NEWELL

MARTIN HALE

RODNEY KNUTSON

TREY ANDERSON

NATHANIEL KLEIN