Exhibit L

Exhibit L

				mate a CII FII e
1	JASON D. WOODI	BURY		REC'D & FILED
	Nevada Bar No. 68	6!		014 APR 21 PM 3: 48
2	KAEMPFER CRO	I []	2	014 APR 21 TH S
	510 West Fourth \$			ALANGLOVER CLERK
3	Carson City, Neva	la 89703		ALAN CLERK
	Telephone: (775) 8	84-8300		BY MEPUTY
4	Facsimile: (775)	82-0257		Dieto.
	JWoodbury@kcny	<u>law.com</u>		ν
5	Attorneys for R	eza Zandian		
		10000		
6		IN THE FIRST JUDIC		
		OF THE STATE OF N		ND FOR
7		CARSC	N CITY	
1		The state of the s		
8		The state of the s		
"		Comments of the Comments of th		
9	JED MARGOLIN,	an individual,		
		20 To 10 To		
10	ļ Ţ	laintiff,		
		5. C.	Case No.	09OC00579 1B
11	vs.			
11		A SECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF T	Dept. No.	I
12	OPTIMA TECHNO	LOGY CORPORATION,	-	
12	a California corpor			
12		DRPORATION, a Nevada		
13	corporation, REZA			
	GOLAMREZA ZA	IDIANJAZI aka		
14		ANDIAN aka REZA		
4.5		JAZI aka G. REZA JAZI		
15		ZANDIAN JAZI, an		
		ompanies 1-10, DOE		
16	Corporations 11-20	, and DOE Individuals		
	21-30,			
17	21 30,			
		efendants.		
18				
19				
	OPP	SITION TO MOTION	FOR WRIT	OF EXECUTION
20		John To Mad To M	1011,1111	
	COMES N	W Defendant REZA ZA	ANDIAN ("Z.	ANDIAN"), by and through his
21	COMIES IN	yv, peremant rezzr zz	HIDHHI (Za	11.2.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.
	attorneye Kaemn	fer Crowell and hereby	opposes the	Motion for Writ of Execution
22	attorneys, Kacinp	ici ciowcii, and neicby	opposes the	
	("Motion") come	by mail on April 2 20	014. This O	pposition is made pursuant to
23	TATOLIOIL) SELVED	by man on ripin 2, 20	, IIII 0]	Lander Lander

FJDCR 15(3) and is based on the attached memorandum of points and authorities, all

Case 17-05016-btb Doc 47-12 Entered 05/02/18 15:05:58 Page 3 of 7 papers and pleadings on file in this matter and any evidence received and arguments

DATED this 21st day of April, 2014.

entertained by the Court at any hearing on the Motion.

KAEMPFER CROWELL

Jason D. Woodbury Nevada Bar No. 6870

Facsimile:

510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703

Telephone: (775) 884-8300

Attorneys for Reza Zandian

JWoodbury@kcnylaw.com

(775) 882-0257

5

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ARMPER CROWELL 10 West Fourth Street ion City, Nevada 89703

Page 2 of 6

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. Procedural Background

On June 24, 2013, this Court entered default judgment in the amount of \$1,495,775.74 in this case.¹ On April 2, 2014, Plaintiff served the instant *Motion*. Attached to the *Motion* are two exhibits. The first, Exhibit 1, is a document entitled "First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees." The second, Exhibit 2, is actually a series of documents each entitled "Writ of Execution" some of which purport to be issued to the Sheriff of Washoe County and some of which purport to be issued to the Constable of Clark County.

On April 9, 2014, ZANDIAN filed a Motion to Retax and Settle Costs ("Motion to Retax") in response to the First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees.² The Motion to Retax is pending and has not been addressed at this time.

II. Argument

A. This Court should deny Plaintiff's *Motion* to issue the proposed *Writs* because they include fees and costs which this Court has not granted.

The proposed *Writs* presented to this Court by Plaintiff include the following amounts as "sums [which] have accrued since the entry of judgment." Two of these items, \$34,787.50 in attorney's fees and \$1,022.59 in "accrued costs" reflect the costs

¹ See Default J. at 2:19 – 3:3 (June 24, 2013). This Court's Default Judgment reflects that the judgment includes "damages, along with pre-judgment interest, attorney's fees and costs." Id. at 2:21-22. However, the Default Judgment does not itemize the amount of each category and only reflects a lump sum of \$1,495,775.74. Plaintiff's proposed Writ of Execution does itemize these categories and sums as follows: "\$900,000.00 principal," "\$83,761.25 attorney's fees", "\$488,545.89 interest, and" "\$24,021.96 costs, making a total amount of \$1,495,775.74". Exhibit 2 to Motion for Writ of Execution at 2:1-5 (hereinafter referred to as "proposed Writs"). Adding to the confusion, the sums of the categories listed in Plaintiff's proposed writs do not equal what is reported as the "total amount." (\$900,000 + \$83,761.25 + \$488,545.89 + \$24,021.96 = \$1,497,329.10 not \$1,495,775.74). Plaintiff, however, offers no explanation for the discrepancy between the categories and total and, to date, has made no effort to correct any error. For this reason alone, this Court should deny the Motion and require clarification by Plaintiff. A writ of execution must be precise.

² See Motion to Retax and Settle Costs (April 9, 2014).

and fees requested in the First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees. Those fees and costs are disputed and this Court has yet to resolve any dispute as to their amount. Indeed, there is significant doubt that Plaintiff has any legal basis to recover post-judgment fees in this case. In any event, however, the proposed Writs do not accurately reflect the previous orders of this Court and should be rejected.

More egregious, Plaintiff's proposed Writs reflect a higher sum than this Court has actually awarded—even assuming the adoption of the First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees. The proposed Writs would have this Court authorize execution for the total sum of \$1,592,091.22.4 One would assume that this sum consists of the amount previously awarded by this Court, \$1,495,775.74, added to the sum requested in the First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees, \$93,315.40. However, those two figures add up to 1,589,091.14, \$3,000.08 less than the sum reflected in the proposed Writs. No explanation for this is provided in the Motion. Simply, the proposed Writs are erroneous on their face and this Court should decline their issuance.

|| ////

₇ ||\\\\

8 | ////

19 || \\\\

////

////

////

20 |

21 \\\\

22

23

24

3 Proposed Writs at 2:7.

⁴ Proposed Writs at 2:17-19.

	Case 17-05016-otb Doc 47-12 Entered 05/02/18 15:05:58 Page 6 of 7				
1	III. Conclusion				
2	For all these reasons explained herein, it is respectfully requested that this Court				
3	deny the <i>Motion</i> .				
4	DATED this 215th day of April, 2014.				
5	KAEMPFER CROWELL				
6					
7					
8	Jason D. Woodbury Nevada Bar No. 6870				
9	510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703				
10	Telephone: (775) 884-8300 Facsimile: (775) 882-0257 JWoodbury@kcnvlaw.com				
11	Attorneys for Reza Zandian				
12	AFFIRMATION pursuant to NRS 239B.030				
13	The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not				
14	contain the social security number of any person.				
15	DATED this 21st day of April, 2014.				
16	KAEMPFER CROWELL				
17					
18	400-				
19	Jason D. Woodbury Wevada Bar No. 6870				
20	510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703				
21	Telephone: (775) 884-8300 Facsimile: (775) 882-0257				
22	JWoodbury@kcnvlaw.com Attorneys for Reza Zandian				
23					
24					

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that service of the foregoing

OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR WRIT OF EXECUTION was made this date by

depositing a true copy of the same for mailing at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to each

of the following:

Matthew D. Francis Adam P. McMillen

WATSON ROUNDS 5371 Kietzke Lane

Reno, NV 89511

DATED this 21st day of April, 2014.

an employee of Kaempfer Crowell