Page 1 of 10

1	Firm of Clary Cannon LLP, or in the alternative, for an Order Disqualifying Patrick C. Clary, Esq.
2	from representation of Nominal Defendant, Kokoweef, Inc.
3	This Motion is made and based on the pleadings and papers on file herein, the Points and
4	Authorities, the attached Affidavits, and Exhibits, and any argument of counsel at the time of the
5	hearing of this motion.
6	This Motion is being filed concurrently with Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Motion to Require
7	Security from Plaintiffs.
8	DATED this 28 day of April, 2008.
9	NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.
10	
11	By: ////////
12	NEIL J. BELLER, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 2360
13	7408 W. Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
14	(702)368-7767 Attorney for Plaintiffs
15	ORDER SHORTENING TIME
16	It appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, and good cause appearing therefor, IT IS
17	HEREBY ORDERED that the foregoing MOTION TO DISQUALIFY CLARY CANNON LLP,
18	or in the alternative MOTION TO DISQUALIFY PATRICK C. CLARY, ESQ. shall be heard on
19 20	the 12 day of May, 2008, at the hour of 9.0 9. m. in Department XIII.
21	
22	DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
23	~
24	J
25	
26	
27	
20	

l	AFFIDAVIT OF NEIL J. BELLER, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF ORDER SHORTENIING TIME
2	STATE OF NEVADA)
3	COUNTY OF CLARK) ss:
4	
5	NEIL J. BELLER, ESQ., being first duly sworn, states that:
6	1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada and counsel for
7	Plaintiffs and I have personal knowledge of the matters in this action except for those matters stated
8	upon information and belief, and as to those matter, I believe them to be true.
9	2. There is insufficient time to hear this motion prior to the hearing date set for May
10	19, 2008 for Nominal Defendant Kokoweef's Motion to Require Security from Plaintiffs submitted
11	by Patrick C. Clary, Esq.
12	3. Based on the information obtained from Plaintiffs and from the attached Transcript
13	of the September 19, 2007 meeting (Exhibit 1 to Motion) regarding Mr. Clary's knowledge of the
14	activities of both Nominal Defendants EIN and Kokoweef, Inc., Plaintiffs will be naming Mr. Clary
15	not only as a witness, but it is anticipated he will be named as a Defendant in this action.
16	4. The anticipated testimony of Mr. Clary does not relate to an uncontested issue; nor
17	will it relate to the nature or value of legal services rendered in this case.
18	5. The anticipated testimony of Mr. Clary relates to his close relationship with
19	Defendant Larry Hahn and the allegations being brought by the Plaintiffs against Mr. Hahn.
20	6. Because Mr. Clary will be named as a witness and the probability of his being named
21	as a Defendant, pursuant to NRPC 3.7, he should be disqualified from representation of the
22	Nominal Defendant Kokoweef, Inc. in this action.
23	111
24	///
25	///
26	111
27	///

28 ///

7. This Motion is not brought for the purpose of delay but to provide justice to the Plaintiffs.

NEILJ. BELLEKLESO

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me

this 28 day of April, 2008



POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. History of EIN and Kokoweef

EIN was incorporated on October 24, 1984 for the purpose of exploration and continuing the search for the underground caverns and Kokoweef River of Gold. The subject mine is located 11 miles south of Stateline.

On November 10, 2005, EIN and Kokoweef entered into an Agreement and Plan of Reorganization, which provides that EIN agrees to sell and assign to Kokoweef, inter alia, and Kokoweef agrees to acquire from EIN, all of EIN's assets and liabilities, except for liabilities of EIN stockholders, in exchange for voting shares of Kokoweef's common stock.

On August 31, 2006, the Closing Agreement, Assignment and Receipt was made between EIN and Kokoweef whereby EIN assigned, transferred to Kokoweef all of EIN's assets, trademarks, trade names, franchises, intellectual property rights, licenses, leases, contracts, goodwill, name, and business and Kokoweef assumed all of the liabilities of EIN except liability of EIN to its stockholders. Once Kokoweef received EIN's stockholders certificates, Kokoweef was to issue new certificates for the same number of shares of Kokoweef.

Patrick C. Clary, Esq. as corporate counsel for EIN and Kokoweef sent a letter dated October 12, 2006 to the stockholders of EIN advising them to send their stock certificate to Kokoweef at

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

Kokoweef stock certificate. A copy of the letter is attached as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated herein by reference.

2908 East Lake Mead Blvd., North Las Vegas, Nevada and it would be exchanged for a new

B. Shareholders' Request for Audit

Sometime in June, 2007, Burke and several other shareholders became aware of the existence of the By-Laws of Kokoweef and had reason to believe that Kokoweef's operating procedures as a mining operation were in conflict with several areas of the By-Laws. Burke inquired of Hahn whether or not an annual audit of Kokoweef's books had ever been done. Hahn objected to the audit subject being discussed. Burke made repeated efforts to request that Hahn produce the When Plaintiffs finally received the corporate books, the audi books for an audit to no avail. was confined to include only the Kokoweef books and only for a period of eight months.

C. Meeting of September 19, 2007

On September 18, 2007, Burke was invited to attend a meeting with Hahn, corporate counsel, and an investor that was a friend of Hahn's. What occurred at that meeting pertaining to corporate counsel, Patrick C. Clary is summarized as follows:

When the question was asked as to why Kokoweef was formed, the answer was that it was for cleaning up the securities violations of EIN. Page 11, lines 5 - 19 of the Transcript of the September 18, 2007 meeting attached as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by reference. Corporate counsel stated that probably 90% of the securities transactions weren't conducted lawfully in EIN, but the statute of limitations had run. (Page 20, lines 20 to page 21, line 3 of Transcript.) Burke then suggested he might go to the SEC to report what he believed to be improper operations. Derogatory comments were made regarding the SEC by corporate counsel, and that the idea of going to the SEC was insane. (Page line 9 - page 13, line 20 of the Transcript) Corporate counsel stated they did a Rule 504 Regulation D because the stock that was exchanged isn't worth more than a million dollars to the aggregate in a 12 month period and this was done subsequent to the reorganization and also they had to find a state exemption and they are limited to 25 Nevada residents. (Page 24, line 19 - page 25, line 14 of the Transcript.) Corporate counsel stated they need to do some clean up work on the out of state ones, but that most states have an exemption for

28 ///

isolated transactions. (Page 26, line 11 - 23 of the Transcript.) Hahn stated they have 1200 shareholders. Corporate counsel said Nevada had an exemption for reorganizations and that is what he filed. The discussion then turned to shareholders suing the corporation and its officers and directors for securities fraud. Corporate counsel stated that would be an uphill battle because of the provision in the agreement with the shareholders that they acknowledge they have complied with the securities rules. (Page 27, line 5 - page 28, line 3 of the Transcript.)

Burke expressed concern that something may be in the books that may be found and would result in being sued. The answer given was that if something is wrong it would be corrected or make it go away. That is being done for Kokoweef and the statute of limitations has expired for EIN. Burke was told that his only concern would be for the past two years. (Page 30, line 12 - page 31, line 23 of the Transcript.)

The discussion turned to the matter of money being collected under Kokoweef and that representations were made that the money was used for investment and it was actually used for something else. When they were taking money in for Kokoweef, they were also taking in money for EIN and Burke was concerned of the EIN transactions and that's why he wants the EIN books. (Page 34, line 9 - page 37, line 19 of the Transcript.)

D. Sale of Unregistered Securities

During the time period of October 1984 and November 2007, when EIN was a corporation in good standing with the State of Nevada and was the corporation conducting mining explorations and seeking investors to purchase stock in EIN, based on information and belief, Defendant Hahn was engaged, directly and indirectly in the offer and sale of securities to the general public in Nevada (and other states) in violation of the Nevada and other state statutes, if any, regarding the registering of securities.

Based on the summary of the September 19, 2007 meeting provided above and the attached Transcript of the meeting among Plaintiff Burke, Defendant Hahn, corporate counsel Patrick C. Clary, and other officers, it is obvious that corporate counsel Clary was aware of these securities sales.

E. Failure to Give Notice to All Directors

The Complaint in this matter was filed on March7, 2008 and served on Larry Hahn on March 12, 2008, Sometime after mid-March, Defendant Hahn sent a letter to certain stockholders advising of the filing of the complaint against him and his business and stated:

...I am asking you to join with other stockholders representining not less than two-thirds of the issued and outstanding shares of the common stock of Kokoweef to remove summarily the directors of Kokoweef who instigated these damaging actions, whereon a special meeting of the board of directors will be held to deal with these matters.

A copy of Defendant Hahn's letter is attached as **Exhibit 3** and incorporated herein by reference.

None of the Plaintiffs in this instant action who were Directors were notified of this special board meeting. At a board meeting unknown to Plaintiffs, Directors Ted R. Burke, Michael R. Kehoe, and Richard V. Dutchik were removed as directors of Kokoweef.

Then, on April 12, 2008 corporate counsel, Patrick C. Clary, faxed a memo to Director Gary Hewitt advising of a special meeting of the Board of Directors set for April 14, 2008, at his office and included a waiver of notice which began: "We, the undersigned, being all of the remaining directors of KOKOWEEF, INC. . . ." The signature lines were for the remaining four directors, once of which was Larry Hahn. A copy of Mr. Clary's fax is attached as **Exhibit 4** and incorporated herein by reference.

II. ARGUMENT

Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 3.7 provides:

- (a) A lawyer shall not act as advocate at a trial in which the lawyer is likely to be a necessary witness unless:
- (1) The testimony relates to an uncontested issue:
- (2) The testimony relates to the nature and value of legal services rendered in the case; or
- (3) Disqualification of the lawyer would work substantial hardship on the client.
- (b) A lawyer may act as advocate in a trial in which another lawyer in the lawyer's firm is likely to be called as a witness unless precluded from doing so by Rule 1.7 or Rule 1.9.

Mr. Clary has been the counsel for EIN and now for Kokoweef. He has intimate knowledge of the ongoing activities of both entities from the time they were formed. As is evident from the

reading of the Transcript of the September 19, 2007 meeting, not only will Mr. Clary be called as a necessary witness in the trial of this matter, but the probability exists Mr. Clary will be named as a Defendant.

Additionally, his involvement in calling a special meeting of the remaining board of directors after the three directors, being Plaintiffs in this litigation, were removed without notice, creates an appearance of close involvement regarding the allegations stated against Defendant Hahn in the Complaint.

For these reasons, Mr. Clary will positively be called as a witness and based on his apparent close involvement in the recent actions taken by Defendant Hahn, Plaintiffs anticipate he will be named as a Defendant in this action.

The testimony sought from Mr. Clary does not relate to an uncontested issue, nor the nature and value of legal services rendered n this matter. His disqualification and/or that of his law firm will not work any substantial hardship on the Kokoweef corporation because it has been named only as a Nominal Defendant and no claims for relief have been alleged against it. This action is only in the initial stages of litigation and no Defendant has yet filed an answer.

The issue here is more than the possibility of Mr. Clary being a witness in this action. He is a witness to some of the facts alleged in Plaintiffs' Complaint.

Where the public defender allegedly witnessed events relating to a statement made by petitioner to the police, the court determined SCR 185 authorized the withdrawal of the public defender. Koza v. Eighth Judicial District Court ex rel., 99 Nev. 535, 665 P.2d 244 (1983). NRCP 3.7 is similar to the former Supreme Court Rule 185.

Thus, as a result of Mr. Clary's intimate knowledge and the high probability he will be named as a Defendant in this matter, pursuant to NRPC 3.7, he should not act as advocate representing the nominal Defendant Kokoweef, Inc., this matter. Additionally, because it is anticipated he will be named as a defendant, and not just a witness, the firm of Clary Cannon LLP should also be disqualified.

///

28 | ///

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiffs respectfully request their MOTION TO DISQUALIFY LAW FIRM OF CLARY CANNON LLP, or in the alternative, MOTION TO DISQUALIFY PATRICK C. CLARY, ESQ., AND ORDER SHORTENING TIME be granted.

DATED this 29 day of April, 2008.

NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.

By:

Nevada Bar No. 002360 7408 W. Sahara Avenug Las Vegas, Nevada 89 (17 (702)368-7767

Attorney for Plaintiffs

1 HEREBY CERTIFY that on the day of April, 2008, service of the foregoing Plaintiffs' 2 MOTION TO DISQUALIFY LAW FIRM OF CLARY CANNON, LLP, OR IN THE 3 ALTERNATIVE MOTION TO DISQUALIFY PATRICK C. CLARY, ESQ., AND ORDER 4 5 SHORTENING TIME, was made this date by depositing a true copy of the same for mailing, first 6 class mail, postage pre-paid, at Las Vegas, Nevada addressed as follows: 7 M. Nelson Segel, Chartered M. Nelson Segel, Esq. 8 NBN 000530 9 624 South 9th Street Las Vegas, NV 89101 Attorneys for Defendant Larry Hahn 10 and Hahn's World of Surplus, Inc. Telephone: 702-385-5266 11 12 CLARY CANNON, LLP Patrick C. Clary, Esq. 13 NBN 000053 Curtis W. Cannon, Esq. 14 NBN 010535 15 7201 West Lake Mead Boulevard, Suite 503 Las Vegas, NV 89129 16 Attorneys Defendant Kokoweef, Inc. Telephone: 702-382-0813 17 18 19 20 An employee of Neil J. Beller, Ltd 21 22 23 24 25 26

1

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE