## ORIGINAL

**AANS** M NELSON SEGEL, CHARTERED M NELSON SEGEL, ESQUIRE

Nevada Bar No. 0530 624 South 9th Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 4 Telephone: (702) 385-5266

Attorneys for Defendants Larry Hahn

TED R. BURKE; MICHAEL R and LAURETTA

C.A. MURFF; GERDA FERN BILLBE, BOB and ROBYN TRESKA; MICHAEL RANDOLPH, and

Plaintiffs.

LARRY L. HAHN, individually, and as President of and Treasurer of Kokoweef, Inc., and former

Incorporated of Nevada; HAHN'S WORLD OF

Defendants,

Nominal Defendants.

L. KEHOE; JOHN BERTOLDO; PAUL BERNARD; EDDY KRAVETZ; JACKIE

LISA A. FREEMANLEON GOLDEN:

President and Treasurer of Explorations

SURPLUS, INC., a Nevada corporation; PATRICK C. CLARY, an individual;

KOKOWEEF, INC., a Nevada corporation;

EXPLORATIONS INCORPORATED OF NEVADA, a dissolved Nevada corporation;

DOES 1 through 100, inclusive;

FREDERICK WILLIS.

vs.

and

and FRED KRAVETZ; STEVE FRANKS;

PAULA MARIA BARNARD: PETE T. and

and Hahn's World of Surplus, Inc.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

RECONVED

MAR218 2009

FILED

Mar 16 3 41 PM '09

DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA

COUNTY OF CLARK

CASE NO. A558629

DEPT. XIII

**AMENDED** ANSWER TO AMENDED VERIFIED DERIVATIVE

**COMPLAINT** 

Defendants LARRY HAHN ("HAHN") and HAHN'S WORLD OF SURPLUS, INC

CLERK OF THE COURT

("SURPLUS")(HAHN and SURPLUS sometimes collectively referred to herein as "ANSWERING DEFENDANTS") hereby responds to Plaintiffs' so-called Amended Verified Derivative Complaint ("COMPLAINT") filed herein and admit, deny and otherwise pleads to the allegations set forth in the COMPLAINT as follows:

- 1. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 2. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit Explorations Incorporated of Nevada ("EIN") was incorporated on or about October 24, 1984, but deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 3. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a believe as to the meaning "all times relevant herein" and; therefore, deny same, but admit the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 4. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 5. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 6. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 7. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 8. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 9. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 10. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the

Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.

11. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.

- 12. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 13. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit that on or about September 18, 2007, BURKE was invited to attend a meeting with Defendant HAHN, CLARY and others, admit that CLARY made the statements set forth in the last sentence of said paragraph regarding the Securities & Exchange Commission, but deny the remaining allegations in said paragraph.
- 14. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 15. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 16. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit CLARY was general counsel for KOKOWEEF, INC and did not represent HAHN, that BURKE had issues with which he addressed at the meeting but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
- 17. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 18. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
- 19. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit BURKE is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
  - 20. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the Nature of the Action

and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit
Plaintiffs Michael R. Kehoe and Lauretta L. Kehoe are residents of Clark County, Nevada, but deny
the remaining allegations of said paragraph.

21. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the Nature of the Action

- 21. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit BERTOLDO is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
- 22. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit BERNARD is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
- 23. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit KRAVETZ is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
- 24. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 24 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit KRAVETZ is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
- 25. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 25 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit FRANKS is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
- 26. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit BARNARD is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.

- - 27. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and; therefore, deny same.
  - 28. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 28 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit MURFF is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
  - 29. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 29 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit BILLBE is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
  - 30. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit TRESKAS is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
  - 31. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 31 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit RANDOLPH is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
  - 32. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 32 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit WILLIS is a resident of Clark County, Nevada, but deny the remaining allegations of said paragraph.
  - 33. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit the allegations contained in paragraph 33 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 34. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 34 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny EIN was incorporated in 2984, but admit the remaining allegations contained therein.

- - 35. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit the allegations contained in paragraph 35 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 36. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 36 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit SURPLUS is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Nevada, that it conducts business in North Las Vegas, Nevada, and that HAHN has previously been the President of said corporation; but deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph.
  - 37. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 38. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the Nature of the Action and Factual Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 39. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 39 of the Derivative and Demand Excused Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 40. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the Derivative and Demand Excused Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 41. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the Derivative and Demand Excused Allegations section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 42. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 42 of the Derivative and Demand Excused Allegations section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS admit Plaintiffs did not make any demand upon the KOKOWEEF board of directors prior to commencing this action, but deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph.
  - 43. The Court has dismissed the First Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 43 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 44. The Court has dismissed the First Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 44 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 45. The Court has dismissed the First Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 45 of the COMPLAINT.

46. The Court has dismissed the First Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 46 of the COMPLAINT.

- 47. The Court has dismissed the First Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 47 of the COMPLAINT.
- 48. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 48 of the COMPLAINT.
- 49. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 49 of the COMPLAINT.
- 50. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 50 of the COMPLAINT.
- 51. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 51 of the COMPLAINT.
- 52. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 52 of the COMPLAINT.
- 53. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 53 of the COMPLAINT.
- 54. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 54 of the COMPLAINT.
- 55. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 55 of the COMPLAINT.
- 56. The Court has dismissed the Second Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 56 of the COMPLAINT.
- 57. The Court has dismissed the Third Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 57 of the COMPLAINT.
- 58. The Court has dismissed the Third Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 58 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 59. The Court has dismissed the Third Cause of Action; therefore, no response is

necessary to paragraph 59 of the COMPLAINT. 2 60. 3 necessary to paragraph 60 of the COMPLAINT. 4 61. 5 necessary to paragraph 61 of the COMPLAINT. 6 62. 7 necessary to paragraph 62 of the COMPLAINT. 8 63. necessary to paragraph 63 of the COMPLAINT. 10 64 11 necessary to paragraph 64 of the COMPLAINT. 12 65. 13 14 15 66. 16 17 67. 18 19 68. 20 21 69. 22 23 70. 24 25 71. 26 27 72.

The Court has dismissed the Third Cause of Action; therefore, no response is The Court has dismissed the Third Cause of Action; therefore, no response is The Court has dismissed the Third Cause of Action; therefore, no response is The Court has dismissed the Third Cause of Action; therefore, no response is The Court has dismissed the Third Cause of Action; therefore, no response is In response to paragraph 65 of the Fourth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS repeat and reallege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 38 of the COMPLAINT as though fully set forth herein. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 66 of the Fourth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 67 of the

Fourth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.

- ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 68 of the Fourth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 69 of the Fourth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 70 of the Fourth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 71 of the Fourth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
  - The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is

necessary to paragraph 72 of the COMPLAINT. 2 73. The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 3 necessary to paragraph 73 of the COMPLAINT. The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 4 74. 5 necessary to paragraph 74 of the COMPLAINT. 6 75. The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 75 of the COMPLAINT. 8 76. The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 76 of the COMPLAINT. The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 10 77. 11 necessary to paragraph 77 of the COMPLAINT. The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 12 78. 13 necessary to paragraph 78 of the COMPLAINT. 79. necessary to paragraph 79 of the COMPLAINT. 80. necessary to paragraph 80 of the COMPLAINT. 81.

The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 14 15 The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 16. 17 The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 18 19 necessary to paragraph 81 of the COMPLAINT. 20 The Court has dismissed the Fifth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 82. necessary to paragraph 82 of the COMPLAINT. 21 22 The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 83. 23 necessary to paragraph 83 of the COMPLAINT. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is 24 84. necessary to paragraph 84 of the COMPLAINT. 25 26 85. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 85 of the COMPLAINT. 27 28 - 9 -

- - 86. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 86 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 87. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 87 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 88. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 88 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 89. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 89 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 90. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 90 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 91. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 91 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 92. The Court has dismissed the Sixth Cause of Action; therefore, no response is necessary to paragraph 92 of the COMPLAINT.
  - 93. In response to paragraph 93 of the Seventh Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS repeat and reallege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 38 of the COMPLAINT as though fully set forth herein.
  - 94. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 94 of the Seventh Cause of Action, ANSWERING DEFENDANT admit that HAHN, as an officer or director of KOKOWEEF and EIN, owed a corporate fiduciary duty to the shareholders of each corporation but deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph.
  - 95. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 95 of the Seventh Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 96. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 96 of the Seventh Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
  - 97. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 97 of the Seventh Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.

98. In response to paragraph 98 of the Eight [sic] Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS repeat and reallege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 38 of the COMPLAINT as though fully set forth herein.

- 99. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 99 of the Eight [sic] Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- 100. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 100 of the Eight [sic] Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- 101. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 101 of the Eight [sic] Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- 102. In response to paragraph 102 of the Ninth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS repeat and reallege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 38 of the COMPLAINT as though fully set forth herein.
- 103. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 103 of the Ninth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- 104. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 104 of the Ninth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- 105. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 105 of the Ninth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- 106. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 106 of the Ninth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- 107. In response to paragraph 107 of the Tenth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS repeat and reallege their responses to paragraphs 1 through 38 of the COMPLAINT as though fully set forth herein.
- 108. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 108 of the Tenth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
- 109. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 109 of the Tenth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.

1	110. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 110 of
2	the Tenth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
3	111. ANSWERING DEFENDANTS deny the allegations contained in paragraph 111 of
4	the Tenth Cause of Action section of the COMPLAINT.
5	112. It has been necessary for ANSWERING DEFENDANTS to retain attorneys to defend
6	this matter and they are entitled to a reasonable sum as and for their attorneys' fees herein.
7	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
8	The COMPLAINT fails to state a claim against ANSWERING DEFENDANTS upon which
9	relief can be granted.
10	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
11	The damages, if any, sustained by PLAINTIFFS is due to their own actions and
12	ANSWERING DEFENDANTS are not liable to them.
13	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
14	PLAINTIFFS have failed to name a necessary party.
15	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
16	PLAINTIFFS have unclean hands and are barred from recovery herein.
17	<u>FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>
18	PLAINTIFFS failed to mitigate their damages and may not recover from ANSWERING
19	DEFENDANTS herein.
20	SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
21	PLAINTIFFS' damages, if any, were caused by the actions of third parties over whom
22	ANSWERING DEFENDANTS had no control.
23	SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
24	PLAINTIFFS assumed the risk that is the basis of their claim of damages and may not
25	recover their damages, if any, from ANSWERING DEFENDANTS herein.
26	EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
27	PLAINTIFFS are estopped from asserting a claim against ANSWERING DEFENDANTS
28	

herein. 1 2 NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 3 PLAINTIFFS have a waived any right to a claim against ANSWERING DEFENDANTS that may have existed. 4 5 **TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE** б The negligence of PLAINTIFFS is greater than that of ANSWERING DEFENDANTS: therefore, they may not recover their damages, if any, from ANSWERING DEFENDANTS. S **ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE** 9 PLAINTIFFS are guilty of laches in bringing their claims against ANSWERING 10 DEFENDANTS. 11 TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE PLAINTIFFS' action is barred by the applicable statute of limitations. 12 13 THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 14 PLAINTIFFS' action is an abuse of process. 15 **FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE** 16 ANSWERING DEFENDANTS did not make any material misstatements nor did they 17 omit any material statements related to the purchase or sale of any security herein and did not 18 commit any securities fraud herein. 19 FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 20 PLAINTIFFS claims may be barred by additional affirmative defenses as set forth in NRCP 8(c). However, because discovery has not yet been completed, the applicability of those 21 defenses is, as yet, unknown. Therefore, under NRCP 11, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS 22 23 reserve the right to supplement this list of affirmative defenses at a later date. 24 WHEREFORE, ANSWERING DEFENDANTS pray for relief as follows: 25 1. That the COMPLAINT be dismissed: 26 2. That they be awarded the costs of suit; 27 3. That they be awarded a reasonable attorneys' fee for having to defend this action;

4. That the funds being held by the Court as security be disbursed to ANSWERING 1 2 DEFENDANTS as reimbursement of a portion of their attorneys' fees herein; and 5. 3 For such other and further relief that the Court deems just and proper in the premises. 4 DATED this 16th day of March, 2009. 5 M NELSON SEGEL, CHARTERED 6 S M NELSON SEGEL, ESQUIRE Nevada Bar No. 0530 624 South 9th Street 9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 10 Attorneys for Defendants 11 12 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 16th day of March, 2009, she served the 13 1-4 foregoing AMENDED ANSWER TO AMENDED VERIFIED DERIVATIVE COMPLAINT by causing a true and correct copy to be placed in the United States Mail, postage fully prepaid thereon 15 and addressed as follows: 16 17 Jennifer Taylor, Esquire 401 North Buffalo Drive 18 Suite 202 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 19 Patrick C. Clary, Esquire 20 7201 West Lake Mead Suite 410 21 Las Vegas, Nevada 89128 22 23 An employee of M Nelson Segel, Chartered 2-1 25 26

27