ORIGINAL

RPLY/OPPS
Neil J. Beller, Esq.
NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.
Nevada Bar No. 002360
7408 W. Sahara Ave.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
(702) 368-7767
(702) 368-7720 Facsimile
Attorney for Plaintiffs

FILED

2008 JUN 23 A 9-46

CLEIU. SIRT

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

TED R. BURKE; MICHAEL R and LAURETTA L. KEHOE; JOHN BERTOLDO; PAUL BARNARD; EDDY KRAVETZ; JACKIE and FRED KRAVETZ; STEVEN FRANKS; PAULA MARIA BARNARD; PETER T. and LISA A FREEMAN; LEON GOLDEN; C.A. MURFF; GERDA FERN BILLBE; BOB and ROBYN TRESKA; MICHAEL RANDOLPH, and FREDERICK WILLIS,

Case No. A558629 Dept. XIII

Plaintiffs,

VS.

LARRY L. HAHN, individually, and as President and Treasurer of Kokoweef, Inc., and former President and Treasurer of Explorations Incorporated of Nevada; HAHN'S WORLD OF SURPLUS, INC., a Nevada corporation; DOES I - X, inclusive; DOE OFFICERS, DIRECTORS and PARTICIPANTS I - XX,

PLAINTIFFS' REPLY TO DEFENDANT KOKOWEEF, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' RENEWED MOTION TO STRIKE RENEWED MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY FROM PLAINTIFFS AND OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

Defendants,.

and

KOKOWEEF, INC., a Nevada corporation; EXPLORATIONS INCORPORATED OF NEVADA, a dissolved Nevada corporation;

Date of Hearing: June 26, 2008

Time of Hearing: 9:00 a.m.

Nominal Defendants.

COMES NOW the Plaintiffs, by and through their attorney of record, NEIL J. BELLER, ESQ., of the law firm of NEIL J. BELLER, LTD, and submits their REPLY TO DEFENDANT

KOKOWEEF, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' RENEWED MOTION TO STRIKE RENEWED MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY FROM PLAINTIFF'S AND OPPOSITION TO COUNTERMOTION FOR SANCTIONS as follows:

I. REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION

Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion to Strike Renewed Motion to Require Security is not frivolous, unnecessary and unwarranted. The Renewed Motion to Strike was filed for the sole purpose to correct the wrong dates that were presented in Mr. Beller's Declaration in support of its Motion to Strike Renewed Motion to Require Security and to have their Renewed Motion heard on an order shortening time prior to June 27, 2008.

Counsel for Kokoweef, Inc. filed its Renewed motion on June 12, 2008. Because Kokoweef, Inc.'s Renewed Motion does not contain any new evidence, and additionally, does not contain any affidavits in its support, AND this Court had previously ruled that it was not persuaded that Defendant has met the requirements of NRS 41.520 (30 (a), why would this Court now grant Defendant's Renewed Motion when it presented no new evidence.

Plaintiffs have clearly cited the applicable rules of procedure in its Motion to Strike.

Defendant's Motion is defective and not meritorious.

The citation, State ex re. Office of Att'y Gen., Bureau of Consumer Prot. V. NOS Comm.Inc., 120 Nev 65, 84 P.3d 1052 (2004), was stated in Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike and Renewed Motion to Strike to substantiate the defect in Defendant's Renewed Motion that evidence submitted in support of a motion must be presented in the motion or memorandum. Defendant has presented no new evidence to support its Renewed Motion.

Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion to Strike should be granted.

II. OPPOSITION TO COUNTER-MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

As previously stated, with the exception of counsel's Declaration in support of order shortening time, Plaintiff's Renewed Motion to Strike has the same content as their Motion to Strike Defendant's Renewed Motion for Security.

EDCR 7.60 (b), which does relates to sanctions specifically provides in pertinent part that the court may impose sanctions when an attorney "without just cause" (emphasis added) presents

an obviously frivolous, unnecessary or unwarranted motion. Plaintiffs had just cause to file their Renewed Motion to Strike when it was discovered the dates in counsel's Declaration as to when he was leaving for vacation were incorrect.

There was no ruling by this Court that would prevent Plaintiffs from filing a second motion to strike. The Court stated that if and when a motion for security is filed, the Court will conduct an evidentiary hearing.

The fact that the Court will conduct an evidentiary hearing does not justify Defendant filing a motion that does not present evidence or facts to support that motion. If this Court was not persuaded by Defendant's original motion for security, then how could this court be persuaded that Defendant's Renewed Motion complied with the statutory requirements for requiring security.

Plaintiffs had just cause to file their Renewed Motion to Strike. It was not frivolous; its was not unnecessary; it was not unwarranted. Thus, no sanctions should be imposed against Plaintiffs.

Based on the foregoing, Defendant's Counter-motion for Sanctions should be denied.

NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.

By: NEIL ABELLER ESC

Nevada Bar No. 2360 7408 W. Sahara Avenue

Las Vegas, Nevada 89117 (702)368-7767

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Page 3 of 4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 23 day of June, 2008, service of the foregoing

PLAINTIFFS' REPLY TO DEFENDANT KOKOWEEF, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' RENEWED MOTION TO STRIKE RENEWED MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY FROM PLAINTIFFS AND OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

was made this date by serving via facsimile a true copy of the same addressed as follows:

M. Nelson Segel, Chartered
 M. Nelson Segel, Esq., NBN 000530
 624 South 9th Street

Las Vegas, NV 89101

Hahn and Hahn's World of Surplus, Inc.

Telephone: 702-385-5266 Fax No.: 702 - 382-2967

CLARY CANNON, LLP

Patrick C. Clary, Esq., NBN 000053 Curtis W. Cannon, Esq., NBN 010535

13 7201 West Lake Mead Boulevard, Suite 503

Las Vegas, NV 89129

14 Attorneys Defendant Kokoweef, Inc.

Telephone: 702-382-0813 Fax No.: 702 - 382-7277

An imployee of Neil J. Beller, Ltd.

17

15

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28