

1 Matthew D. Francis  
Nevada Bar No. 6978  
2 Arthur A. Zorio  
Nevada Bar No. 6547  
3 Samantha J. Reviglio  
Nevada Bar No. 14258  
4 BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP  
5371 Kietzke Lane  
5 Reno, NV 89511  
Telephone: 775-324-4100  
6 Facsimile: 775-333-8171  
Email: [mfrancis@bhfs.com](mailto:mfrancis@bhfs.com)  
7 [azorio@bhfs.com](mailto:azorio@bhfs.com)  
[sreviglio@bhfs.com](mailto:sreviglio@bhfs.com)

8 *Attorneys for JED MARGOLIN*

11 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
12 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

13 IN RE:  
14 PATRICK CANET AND JAZI  
15 GHOLAMREZA ZANDIAN,  
16 Debtors.

Case No. BK-N-16-50644-BTB

Chapter 15

**MOTION TO DISMISS CHAPTER 15 CASE**

Hearing Date: October 1, 2019  
Hearing Time: 2:00 PM  
Estimated Time for hearing: 1 hour

19 Jed Margolin (“Mr. Margolin”), by and through his attorneys Brownstein Hyatt Farber  
20 Schreck, LLP hereby files the following Motion to Dismiss Chapter 15 Case. As grounds, Mr.  
21 Margolin asserts as follows:

22 **I. INTRODUCTION**

23 Pursuant to Section 1515(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, Patrick Canet (“Canet”) filed a  
24 Petition for Recognition of a Foreign Proceeding on May 19, 2016. ECF No. 1. A Verified  
25 Petition for Recognition and Chapter 15 Relief was subsequently submitted on May 26, 2016  
26 alleging that Canet was appointed in 1993 as a representative and judicial liquidator for the  
27 benefit of creditors in a French Action involving a debtor entity named “COMPUTER WORLD.”  
28 ECF No. 5. The Verified Petition alleged that Iranian citizen Jazi Gholamreza Zandian

1 (“Zandian”) was the chairman and general manager of COMPUTER WORLD and in 1998, a  
2 judgment was entered against him in Paris, France in the amount of (up to) 20,000,000 francs.  
3 ECF No. 5, ¶¶ 2-3. The Verified Petition does not identify Zandian as the debtor in the French  
4 Action involving Computer World. *Id.* Rather, Mr. Zandian is identified as someone the French  
5 Courts are pursuing sanctions against due to his numerous illegal acts: such sanction being to pay  
6 Computer World’s liabilities from Zandian’s own personal assets (not assets of the debtor  
7 Computer World).<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 5, p. 11, ¶¶ 5-7.

8 The Verified Petition also alleged that a French Court allegedly established that Zandian  
9 was insolvent as of October 3, 1996, and that Canet was seeking recognition of the alleged French  
10 Action to protect Zandian and his assets against “any and all enforcement actions against Zandian  
11 and any of his assets in the United States.” ECF No. 5, ¶¶ 2-3.

12 Interestingly, Canet’s Verified Petition was filed shortly after Mr. Margolin filed a Motion  
13 to Void Deeds, Assigned Property, for Writ of Execution and to Convey in the underlying Nevada  
14 State Court case on May 3, 2016, which sought to set aside fraudulent deeds filed for the benefit  
15 of Zandian and his insiders, and brought to the Court’s attention Zandian’s attempt to bribe Mr.  
16 Margolin’s counsel. *See* ECF No. 13, Ex. B.

17 On June 16, 2016, Mr. Margolin, who had and has a judgment against Zandian for an  
18 amount in excess of \$2,044,694, filed an Objection to Petition for Recognition and Chapter 15  
19 Relief, objecting to recognition on numerous grounds including: (A) the Petition is inconsistent  
20 with the purposes of Chapter 15; (B) the Petition does not satisfy the requirements of Section  
21 1515; (C) the timing of the filing of the Petition was (and is) extremely suspicious in light of the  
22 fact that after 18 years, someone purporting to be the liquidator for a defunct company was trying  
23 to protect Zandian and his assets after Mr. Margolin was closing in on those fraudulently  
24 conveyed assets; and (D) the Petition failed to meet the requirements of Bankruptcy Rule  
25 1007(a)(4). *See* ECF No. 13.

26 On August 3, 2016, Mr. Hartman filed a Status Report and Reply regarding the French  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> By submitting this Motion, Mr. Margolin does not concede that Mr. Zandian is a proper debtor in the French Action or this proceeding.

1 Action. ECF No. 18.

2 A Hearing on the Verified Petition for Recognition and Chapter 15 Relief took place on  
3 September 6, 2016. At this hearing, Canet’s counsel represented to the Court that he was going to  
4 proceed with either a proceeding against Zandian under Sections 303 or 301 and seek to have a  
5 trustee appointed. July 30, 2019 declaration of Matthew D. Francis, Exhibit A. Canet’s counsel  
6 specifically represented that “if the Court is to - - Court determines to grant our petition for  
7 foreign recognition, then under Section 1511 we would commence either an involuntary  
8 proceeding against Mr. Zandian under Section 303; or if he were to consent to being a debtor  
9 under Chapter 7, then we would proceed under Section 301. In either case, we would seek to  
10 have a trustee appointed to administer the assets that are located in the state of Nevada.” *Id.* at  
11 6:4-11.

12 Canet’s/Zandian’s counsel has done neither of these things, and has taken no action –  
13 none – for more than 2.5 years even though the Court relied on Canet’s counsel’s representations  
14 and anticipated that a Chapter 7 (voluntary or involuntary) proceeding where Mr. Zandian is an  
15 actual debtor would be commenced and a Chapter 7 trustee would be appointed shortly after the  
16 September 6, 2016 hearing.<sup>2</sup> As such, this proceeding should be dismissed. In addition to this  
17 failure to prosecute, the facts show that at the time Canet filed his Petition, the center of  
18 Zandian’s main interests (if Mr. Zandian is a proper debtor in the foreign proceeding) was not  
19 France, Canet is attempting to obtain double recovery, and this proceeding should be dismissed  
20 pursuant to Section 1517(d) of the Code.

## 21 II. ARGUMENT

22 A bankruptcy court can either suspend or dismiss a recognized Chapter 15 case if the  
23 purposes of Chapter 15 would be fulfilled by such dismissal or suspension. 11 U.S.C. §  
24 305(a)(2),(b). LR 7041 provides that “[a]ny proceeding that has been pending in this court for  
25 more than one (1) year without any activity of record may, after notice, be dismissed for want of  
26

27 <sup>2</sup> “I’m inclined to go ahead and recognize the cross-border insolvency which will result the appointment of a Chapter  
28 7 trustee *in the near term*. . .” ECF No. 29 at 15:16-18. “I’m going to recognize the insolvency proceeding, and Mr.  
Hartman can go forward and get a Chapter 7 filed and get a trustee appointed.” Transcript of Application Verified  
Petition for Recognition and Chapter 15 Relief, 16:5-7.

1 prosecution on motion by any party, or by the court. In addition, in appropriate circumstances, the  
2 court may issue an order to show cause why a proceeding should not be dismissed regardless of  
3 how long it has been pending.”

4 Additionally, Section 1517(d) of the Bankruptcy Code specifies that the court may modify  
5 or terminate recognition if the grounds for granting it were fully or partially lacking or have  
6 ceased to exist.

7 As discussed below, this proceeding should be dismissed for failure to prosecute and also  
8 pursuant to Section 1517(d) of the Code.

9 **A. THIS PROCEEDING SHOULD BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO**  
10 **PROSECUTE**

11 “Dismissal for lack of prosecution must be supported by a showing of unreasonable  
12 delay.” *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986). When determining whether  
13 to dismiss a case for lack of prosecution, the court must weigh several factors: “(1) the public’s  
14 interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the  
15 risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their  
16 merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions.” *In re Roessler-Lobert* 567 B.R. 560  
17 (2017) (citing *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423). A showing of bad faith is not required under the  
18 court’s inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). *Id.* These  
19 factors warrant dismissal of this Chapter 15 proceeding.

20 **1. Public Interest**

21 The public has an interest in the prompt resolution of litigation. Thus, this factor  
22 ordinarily weighs in favor of dismissal. *In re Roessler-Lobert*, 567 B.R. 560, 568 (9th Cir. 2017)  
23 (citing *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 1999)). In *Henderson*, the Court  
24 found that despite a “seemingly short delay,” a pattern of dilatory actions existed that warranted  
25 dismissal. 779 F.2d at 1424. The court must find unreasonable delay. *Id.* at 1423. Here, nothing  
26 has happened in this proceeding since September 6, 2016, over 2.5 years ago, despite Canet’s  
27 counsel representations to this Court that either a Chapter 303 or 301 proceeding would be  
28 immediately instituted to bring Mr. Zandian to this Court in the capacity as a debtor and that a

1 Chapter 7 trustee would be appointed. There is absolutely no rational or reasonable basis for this  
2 delay, and the first factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

### 3 **2. The Court's Docket-Management Needs**

4 “[J]udges are best situated to decide when delay in a particular case interferes with docket  
5 management and the public interest.” *Yourish*, 191 F.3d at 990. In the present case, the Court  
6 relied on Canet’s counsel’s representations that Mr. Zandian would be hauled into this Court as a  
7 Chapter 7 debtor and that a Chapter 7 trustee would be appointed shortly after the September 6,  
8 2016 hearing, but those representations were false. Mr. Margolin submits that Canet’s counsel’s  
9 representations and failure to act have interfered with the Court’s docket management and the  
10 public interest of resolving cases in a just and speedy manner.

### 11 **3. Risk of Prejudice to Defendants**

12 For this element, courts consider “whether the plaintiff’s actions impair the defendant’s  
13 ability to go to trial or threaten to interfere with the rightful decision of the case.” *In re Eisen*, 31  
14 F.3d at 1453. Here, Canet convinced this Court to recognize an alleged French Action that was  
15 allegedly filed in the early 1990’s based on a judgment allegedly entered against Computer World  
16 on April 3, 1998. This Court’s action was based solely on a *presumption* that a few vague  
17 documents presented to this Court supported recognizing a foreign proceeding under Section  
18 1516. No other evidence of the status of that alleged proceeding has been introduced by Canet  
19 and Canet has not personally appeared in this case. Mr. Margolin has a judgment against Zandian  
20 in an amount in excess of \$2,044,694, and has been waiting for over 2.5 years for action to be  
21 taken on this proceeding. The only explanation for the filing of this proceeding was to delay Mr.  
22 Margolin’s ability to collect on his judgment from Zandian, who has engaged in attempted  
23 bribery, still has a warrant for his arrest, and has already been adjudicated guilty of acts causing  
24 the French Courts to demand he pay the liabilities of Computer World. Simply put,  
25 Canet/Zandian has achieved his stated goal of protecting Zandian and his assets against “any and  
26 all enforcement actions against Zandian and any of his assets in the United States” by doing  
27 nothing. The bottom line is that Mr. Margolin has been prejudiced and will continue to be  
28 prejudiced based on Canet/Zandian’s dilatory actions and failure to prosecute this proceeding.

1           **4. Public Policy**

2           Mr. Margolin acknowledges that public policy normally favors disposition of the case on  
3 the merits and therefore generally weighs against dismissal. *In re Roessler-Lobert*, 567 B.R. at  
4 570 (internal citations omitted). However, this factor lends little support to a party whose  
5 responsibility it is to move a case toward disposition on the merits but whose conduct impedes  
6 progress in that direction. *In re Phenylpropanolamine(PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217,  
7 1228 (9th Cir. 2006). The latter is the case here. Canet has done *nothing* to make Mr. Zandian a  
8 debtor in this action and has done nothing to advance this case for over 2.5 years. This factor  
9 weighs in favor of dismissal.

10           **5. Less Drastic Sanctions**

11           Although a court generally considers whether less drastic sanctions exist before  
12 dismissing a case, “[t]he court need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally  
13 dismissing a case.” *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. An explicit discussion of alternatives is not  
14 mandatory. *In re Eisen*, 31 F.3d at 1454-55. Canet’s 2.5 year delay is simply inexplicable and  
15 inexcusable. Mr. Margolin submits that the only reason for the delay is simply to delay having to  
16 provide concrete evidence of the alleged French Action, delay having Mr. Zandian actually  
17 hauled before this Court as a debtor, and to prevent Mr. Margolin from recovering the millions of  
18 dollars he is owed by Zandian.

19           After weighing all of the relevant factors, the court should dismiss this proceeding for  
20 failure to prosecute for the past 2.5 years, and also dismiss Adversary Proceeding No. 17-05016-  
21 BTB (the “Adversary Proceeding”) and the September 20, 2018 Order entered therein. *See Adv.*  
22 *No. 61*; 11 U.S.C. §349(b).

23           **B. THIS PROCEEDING SHOULD BE DISMISSED PURSUANT TO SECTION**  
24           **1517(d) OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE**

25           In the event the Court is not inclined to dismiss this proceeding based on Canet’s failure to  
26 prosecute – which it should – this proceeding should be dismissed pursuant to Section 1517(d) of  
27 the Code because: (1) Zandian’s center of main interests (if Zandian is the debtor in the French  
28 Action) was not France at the time Canet’s Petition for Recognition was filed; (2), Canet is

1 attempting to violate Bankruptcy Code § 1532; and (3), Canet has produced no evidence that  
 2 Zandian is currently insolvent, and has failed to file an involuntary petition for or have Zandian  
 3 consent to a Chapter 7 proceeding in this Court.

4 **1. Canet’s Center of Main Interests (“COMI”) Was Not France at the Time**  
 5 **Canet Filed His Petition for Recognition**

6 Bankruptcy Code § 1517(b)(1) states in pertinent part:

7 (b) Such foreign proceeding shall be recognized—

8 (1) as a foreign main proceeding if it is pending in the country where the debtor has the  
 9 center of its main interests ....

10 The District of Nevada has acknowledged that COMI must be analyzed on the date the  
 11 petition for recognition is filed. *See* 2 Collier Bankruptcy Practice Guide P 19.32 (2019), citing  
 12 *In re Betcorp Ltd.*, 400 B.R. 266, 292 (Bankr. D. Nev. 2009). Factors to consider when  
 13 determining COMI include the debtor’s location and the location of debtor’s primary assets,  
 14 among others. *In re Betcorp*, 400 B.R. at 287-288, quoting *In re Bear Stearns High-Grade*  
 15 *Structured Credit Strategies Master Fund, Ltd.*, 389 B.R. 325, 336 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).

16 On May 19, 2016, Canet filed a Petition for Recognition of a Foreign Proceeding, and  
 17 listed the proceeding as a foreign main proceeding. ECF No. 1. However, on April 12, 2016,  
 18 Zandian informed Margolin’s counsel (whom he tried to bribe), that he was living in Iran.  
 19 Francis Decl., Exhibit B. Specifically, Zandian states in part:

20 **I am currently living in Iran** and wish to keep this conversation absolutely  
 21 confidential and as you confirmed earlier I have no attorney to represent me ....  
 22 The vacant land in Nevada that I got as sweat equity has not value and I am  
 23 planning to pay you out of other resources. *Id.* (emphasis added).

24 This admission shows that Canet was not living in France at the time Canet’s filing. What  
 25 it does show is that Zandian was in Iran, Zandian’s assets were located in Nevada, and that  
 26 Zandian was not insolvent. Again, the location of the debtor as well as his or her assets are  
 27 crucial considerations for a COMI determination. *In re Betcorp*, 400 B.R. at 287-288.<sup>3</sup>

28 <sup>3</sup> Again, it should be noted that the French Action does not identify Mr. Zandian as a debtor and Canet has admitted  
 that Mr. Zandian is not a debtor in this proceeding unless an involuntary Chapter 7 were initiated, or Mr. Zandian  
 consented to a Chapter 7. Francis Decl., Exhibit A at 6:4-11.

1 With regard to assets, when Canet filed the list of Zandian's assets it was clear that all of  
2 Zandian's assets are in Nevada. *See* Adversary Proceeding, ECF No. 55. While Iran (or Nevada)  
3 may have been Zandian's COMI at the time Canet filed his Petition, it was certainly not France.

4 Because France was not Zandian's COMI at the time the Petition was filed, Canet's  
5 Chapter 15 Petition does not meet the requirement of Bankruptcy Code § 1517(b)(1), and this  
6 proceeding must be dismissed with prejudice.

7 **2. Canet Has Already Collected Enough Money From Zandian to Pay the**  
8 **Approved Creditors From the 1998 French Action and Double Dipping is**  
9 **Prohibited by Bankruptcy Code § 1532**

10 Canet stated in his Verified Petition For Recognition and Chapter 15 Relief filed May 16,  
11 2016 that in the 1998 French bankruptcy of Zandian's company Zandian was ordered by the  
12 French Court to personally pay the debts of the company of 20M francs. ECF No. 5, p. 2, ¶ 3  
13 (emphasis added). However, the French Court ordered Zandian to pay "up to the amount of  
14 20,000,000 francs." ECF No. 5, Exhibit 3 (emphasis added). Canet left out the "up to" verbiage  
15 and misled this Court into believing that there was a judgment against Zandian in the amount of  
16 20M francs instead of "up to" 20M francs with the actual amount to be determined at a later time.  
17 Canet still has not provided evidence of the exact alleged debt. As the Court is previously aware,  
18 during discovery in the Adversary Proceeding, Canet refused to respond to discovery requests, let  
19 alone provide any documents regarding the status of the debt in the French Action and the money  
20 he had already received from Zandian in the French Action. Adversary Proceeding ECF No. 26,  
21 Exhibit D, Request Nos. 23 and 26; *see also* Adversary Proceeding ECF No. 34, p. 12 (Canet  
22 admits - "Hartman acknowledges that he did not respond to the First Set of Interrogatories and  
23 Request for Production of Documents propounded by Margolin").

24 While Canet refused to provide any documentation relating to the French action or  
25 otherwise comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Margolin obtained and produced  
26 documents from the French Court showing that Canet has recovered more than what he is entitled  
27 to from Zandian. Specifically, documents from the French Court show that of the potential debt  
28 of 20M francs (3,048,980.34 euros), 19M francs (2,896,531.32 euros) was claimed by Bank Melli



1 of Iran. Francis Decl., Exhibit C. This left 1M francs (152,449.02 euros) owed to other creditors.  
 2 Although Canet refused to answer Margolin's interrogatories and requests for production during  
 3 the Adversary Proceeding, he responded to Margolin's requests for admissions, in which he  
 4 admitted that Bank Melli not an approved creditor. Francis Decl., Exhibit D, p. 4, Request No.  
 5 2.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the debt owed to all approved creditors in the French Action is only approximately  
 6 1M francs (152,449.02 euros).

7 Zandian's debt was not the 20M francs as Canet asserted when he filed his Chapter 15  
 8 Petition, only 1M francs (152,449.02 euros). Canet admitted that he has collected at least  
 9 150,000 euros from Zandian. Francis Decl., Exhibit D, p. 4, Request No. 3. However,  
 10 information from the French Court in a document dated November 28, 2011 appears to show that  
 11 Canet has collected at least 300,000 euros from Zandian and may have collected as much as  
 12 450,000 euros from him. (Canet appears to have sold a Zandian property for 300,000 euros and  
 13 Zandian deposited 150,000 euros in a CARPA account.) Francis Decl., Exhibit E.

14 Because it appears that Canet has collected more than the 1M francs available to approved  
 15 creditors in the French Action, Canet and the alleged creditors in the French Action have been  
 16 made whole and Canet is now attempting to obtain more money/assets in this proceeding than he  
 17 is entitled to. Again, the Bank Melli debt is unrecognized or approved and payment of money to  
 18 Bank Melli/Iran would violate federal law. The bottom line is that Canet is attempting to "double  
 19 dip" in this proceeding to obtain more money than what he is entitled to in violation of  
 20 Bankruptcy Code § 1532, and for this reason, this proceeding should be dismissed with prejudice.

### 21 3. Canet Has Not Produced Any Evidence that Zandian is Insolvent

22 During the Adversary Proceeding, Margolin asked Canet in a request for admission to  
 23 admit that he had not produced any evidence that Zandian was or is insolvent. Francis Decl.,  
 24 Exhibit D, p. 7, Request No. 16. Canet evasively responded to this request by referring back to  
 25 the 1998 French Action. *Id.* Canet also refused to provide information and documents in

26 <sup>4</sup> If any part of the amount Canet is currently claiming is for the benefit of Bank Melli, he would be committing a  
 27 criminal act under 31 CFR § 560 and Executive Order 13599. It is a criminal act under 31 CFR § 560 and Executive  
 28 Order 13599 to send money to the Government of Iran, which owns and operates Bank Melli. *See Bennett v. Islamic*  
*Rep (In re Estate of Bennett)*, 825 F.3d 949 (9th Cir. 2016); *see also* Francis Decl., Exhibits F-G.

1 discovery and provide a list of the approved creditors and amounts owed arising from the 1998  
2 French Action even when he was asked for it during discovery. Adversary Proceeding ECF No.  
3 26, Exhibit D, Request Nos. 23 and 26.

4 Canet should be compelled to provide detailed accounting statements for the period from  
5 the 1998 French Action to the present time to determine insolvency. If Canet cannot produce  
6 evidence of insolvency, then this action should be dismissed based on that ground as well.<sup>5</sup>

7 **III. CONCLUSION**

8 For all of the foregoing reasons, Mr. Margolin’s Motion to Dismiss Chapter 15 Case  
9 should be granted in the manner requested.

10 DATED: This 30<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2019.

11  
12 BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP

13 By: /s/Matthew D. Francis

14 Matthew D. Francis  
15 Arthur A. Zorio  
16 Samantha J. Reviglio  
17 5371 Kietzke Lane  
18 Reno, NV 89511  
19 Telephone: 775-324-4100  
20 Facsimile: 775.333.8171

21 *Attorneys for JED MARGOLIN*

22  
23  
24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>5</sup> If Zandian is not insolvent then this case does not belong in U.S. Bankruptcy Court. While Canet could have  
28 attempted to assert his April 3, 2013 foreign-money judgment against Zandian under the Nevada Recognition of  
Foreign-Country Money Judgments Act NRS 17.700 - 17.790, such an action would have been barred under the 15  
year limitation period under NRS 17.800.

BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP  
5371 Kietzke Lane  
Reno, NV 89511  
775.324.4100

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP, and on this 30<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2019, I served the document entitled **MOTION TO DISMISS CHAPTER 15 CASE** on the parties listed below via the following:

Dana Jonathon Nitz, Esq.  
Yanxiong Li, Esq.  
Wright, Finlay & Zak, LLP  
7785 W. Sahara Avenue., Suite 200  
Las Vegas, NV 89117  
[yli@wrightlegal.net](mailto:yli@wrightlegal.net)

Jeffrey L. Harman, Esq.  
HARMAN & HARTMAN  
510 West Plumb Lane, Suite B  
Reno, NV 89509  
[notices@bankruptcyreno.com](mailto:notices@bankruptcyreno.com)

**VIA FIRST CLASS U.S. MAIL:** by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Reno, Nevada, addressed to the foregoing parties.

**BY PERSONAL SERVICE:** by personally hand-delivering or causing to be hand delivered by such designated individual whose particular duties include delivery of such on behalf of the firm, addressed to the individual(s) listed, signed by such individual or his/her representative accepting on his/her behalf. A receipt of copy signed and dated by such an individual confirming delivery of the document will be maintained with the document and is attached.

**VIA COURIER:** by delivering a copy of the document to a courier service for over-night delivery to the foregoing parties.

**VIA ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** by electronically filing the document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which served the foregoing parties electronically.

/s/ Jeff Tillison  
Employee of Brownstein Hyatt Farber  
Schreck, LLP