1	TRAN	
2		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
3	$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{O}$	May 23 11 32 AM '08
4		CLERK OF THE COURT
5	DISTRIC	CLERA OF THE COOM
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
7		
8)
9	TED R. BURKE, et al.,)) CASE NO. A558629
10	Plaintiffs,)) DEPT. XIII
11	VS.))
12	LARRY L. HAHN, et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14	BEFORE THE HONORARI E MARK E) P DENTON DISTRICT COURT HIDGE
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK R. DENTON, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MONDAY, MAY 19, 2008	
16		
17	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY FROM PLAINTIFFS/DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR ORDER EXTENDING	
18		
19		E/PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISQUALIFY / FIRM
20	APPEARANCES:	
21	For the Plaintiffs: NEI	L J. BELLER, ESQ.
22		NELSON SEGEL, ESQ.
23		TRICK C. CLARY, ESQ. RTIS W. CANNON, ESQ.
24		
25	RECORDED BY: CYNTHIA GEORGILAS, COURT RECORDER	

2	
3	THE COURT: All right. Burke versus Hahn on page five. All right, your
4	appearances please.
5	MR. BELLER: Yes, Neil Beller, on behalf of the plaintiffs. Good morning,
6	Your Honor.
7	MR. SEGEL: M. Nelson Segel, on behalf of defendants Larry Hahn and Hahn
8	Surplus. Mr. Hahn is also present.
9	MR. CLARY: Patrick Clary, on behalf of so called nominal defendant,
10	Kokoweef, Inc.
11	MR. CANNON: Curtis Cannon, on behalf of Kokoweef, Inc.
12	THE CLERK: I'm sorry, sir, Curtis?
13	MR. CANNON: Curtis Cannon, C-A-double N-O-N.
14	THE CLERK: Thank you.
15	THE COURT: I'd like to first take the motion to disqualify; okay?
16	MR. CLARY: Your Honor, before you do that there has been no opposition
17	filed to that by me because I've taken the position that with the filing of the motion
18	to requires security from plaintiffs. The case has been stayed
19	THE COURT: Okay.
20	MR. CLARY: And therefore that motion should not be heard until the stay is
21	lifted.
22	THE COURT: Okay, so you want me to take up the defendant's motion to
23	require security from plaintiffs? But before that, there's okay.
24	MR. BELLER: Can I address the
25	THE COURT: Plaintiff's motion to strike. What does that pertain to?

MONDAY, MAY 19, 2008 at 12:21 p.m.

MR. BELLER: Can I address the Court on that, Your Honor?

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BELLER: I don't think the staying has anything to do with the disqualification; that is my thinking. And that's why we brought it and we're prepared to argue that, Your Honor, as well as discussing the case that was cited by the defendant.

THE COURT: All right. I'll take the motion to disqualify first then, that's a threshold motion.

MR. CLARY: In that connection, Your Honor, the -- I mean, I --

THE COURT: I consider that you oppose it and I understand why you didn't oppose it --

MR. CLARY: Yeah, but he's going to take up a case --

THE COURT: -- formerly.

MR. CLARY: -- that hasn't been cited to Your Honor and I did cite that to Counsel.

THE COURT: I don't think it's ripe anyway.

MR. BELLER: Well --

THE COURT: You're saying that Mr. Clary may have to be a witness or he may end up being a party but he's not now. So, as far as I'm concerned, that motion doesn't have any merit and I'd deny it without prejudice. If he becomes trial counsel or something and you think that he's going to be a witness, I'd consider it then.

MR. BELLER: And that is fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think that -- the fact that a lawyer may be a witness doesn't mean he can't participate in the case up to trial.

MR. BELLER: I do agree. But based upon the allegations, based upon the

transcript of the statements of Mr. Clary, we feel, subject to how this progresses, -- I don't know if the Court has had an opportunity to review the transcript between Mr. Burke and Mr. Clary regarding statements that Mr. Clary made. I do not believe the case that was cited and Judge Vega and Mr. Singer took into consideration what I believe to be glaring potential problems -THE COURT: Potential, but not actual.
MR. BELLER: Your Honor, I have no --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELLER: -- problem. I just wanted --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BELLER: -- to call it to your attention --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELLER: -- now than later.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CLARY: Your Honor, just to complete the record, may I approach the bench and give you a copy of the letter which I sent to Mr. Beller which cites the case on which we relied that the motion should be denied so the record is complete?

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CLARY: Now, again -- go ahead, Your Honor, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: No, that's fine.

MR. CLARY: You want to take up the motion to --

THE COURT: I'm denying the motion to disqualify without prejudice to renewal when and if it becomes ripe.

MR. CLARY: Do you want, then, to take up the motion to require security

from plaintiff?

THE COURT: Yeah. I think the next would be -- let's see, defendants also had a motion for an order extending time to file the request for security.

MR. CLARY: That's Mr. --

MR. SEGEL: That was -- yes, Your Honor, on behalf of Hahn's Surplus and Mr. Hahn, I asked for sixty days extension of time. There was no opposition to that.

THE COURT: As to those parties?

MR. SEGEL: To that -- as to those parties.

THE COURT: Any objection to that? I can't remember.

MR. BELLER: Sixty days -- yes, Your Honor. We -- far based upon the last time we were here, all matters that were going to be decided for --

THE COURT: But, the motion is before me today. The motion is, the subject of the motion is a request for an order extending the time to file a request for security and the motion stayed on calendar. I didn't continue that motion.

MR. BELLER: Okay. Very good, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, is sixty days unreasonable?

MR. BELLER: Well, yes in this regard; it stays everything else, Your Honor. There is a Board Meeting coming up. We believe Mr. Hahn has acted -- I don't know if that's Mr. Hahn, illegally, improperly. Without going in to what was done in terms of --

THE COURT: Why is a motion for an order extending time to file a request for security staying anything?

MR. BELLER: Based upon --

THE COURT: I think the stay takes place once the request for security is made; right?

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, and I'll concede to the Court that it is my interpretation of 41.5203, which I cited in my motion, that we had the right within three days, either bring the motion which would impose a stay, or seek an extension of sixty days to bring that motion. Since we have not yet brought the motion, I do not believe --

THE COURT: And the extension --

MR. SEGEL: I do not believe --

THE COURT: -- seeking -- if I grant the extension it's not staying anything; right?

MR. SEGEL: I do not believe so as to --

THE COURT: Okay, with that understanding --

MR. SEGEL: To bring the motion, yes.

THE COURT: Okay, with that understanding, I'll extend the time for those moving parties to --

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- file a request for security. But that, as far as I'm concerned, does not stay anything.

MR. SEGEL: It would have to -- the statute says -- say you can do it for sixty days. It doesn't -- it's not clear so I'm not sure if you can extend it sixty days beyond today or sixty days from the 12th or -- when our answer was due so --

MR. CLARY: We [indiscernible] do it from the 12th.

MR. BELLER: The problem, Your Honor, as you asked Mr. Clary and Mr. Nelson last time, are you not going to move forward with anything substantive. I did receive a letter from Mr. Segel saying that. We are very seriously concerned about what is going on and we believe that this is just an exercise to get more time to harm

22

23

24

25

a multitude of these plaintiffs. So, with that being said, Your Honor, as long as we can proceed with the litigation, get a response from both defendants, if you will, then we have no problem. Right now nothing is happening. They have removed several members of the Board which we believe were done improperly.

THE COURT: I don't think that a motion for an order extending time to file a request for security stays the case; okay? So, I'm not going to stay it but I'll grant your motion. You can have an additional sixty days from the --

MR. SEGEL: 4/11, Your Honor. So whatever sixty days is after 4/11 should be -- would be July 10th, unless it's a holiday.

THE COURT: 4/11?

MR. SEGEL: 4/11 is the day I filed the motion.

MR. CLARY: 5/7

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEGEL: So sixty days --

MR. CLARY: How about June.

MR. SEGEL: -- after that. So --.

THE COURT: That would be June 11th.

MR. CLARY: How about June.

MR. SEGEL: Oh, right. Yeah, sorry.

MR. SEGEL: That was bad.

THE COURT: It's not ninety days.

MR. CLARY: That's coming up real soon.

MR. SEGEL: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEGEL: And so, it -- it is a short time.

THE COURT: All right. But that's without -- you know that doesn't bar the plaintiff from proceeding.

MR. SEGEL: Right. There's no stay as far as I interpret that.

THE COURT: If I grant your request for security, if you make one --

MR. SEGEL: Right.

THE COURT: Then that may have an impact, but at this point, just 'cause you're seeking additional time to do it doesn't mean that the case is stayed.

MR. BELLER: They have filed no answer; no one has filed an answer, Your Honor. So, subject to that -- I mean, originally I gave Mr. Segel some time. Then all of a sudden we got the motion.

THE COURT: Well let's be clear about what we're talking about. Staying the whole case is one thing; giving an extension to answer is another; okay? Are you saying that you perceive what I'm doing to still call for an answer to be filed by Mr. Segel's client before June 11th?

MR. BELLER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. What's your response to that?

MR. SEGEL: I don't discr -- my motion -- as I interpret the statute, if I haven't filed a motion, there's no stay. If in fact I've filed that motion, it will stay my obligation of further pleading. But at this stage, it does not.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEGEL: And the only reason I didn't do it is that under the statute, as I interpret it, their allegation in the complaint that if they could prove it, might prevent you from granting it --

THE COURT: So in other words --

MR. SEGEL: -- as to my client.

1	MR. CLARY: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MR. CLARY: So it's stayed.
4	THE COURT: Well we maybe
5	MR. CLARY: He doesn't have to file an answer.
6	THE COURT: Okay we may just be discussing academics.
7	MR. SEGEL: Okay.
8	THE COURT: Let me turn to your
9	MR. CLARY: Yeah, you shouldn't even be talking about when he should
10	file his answer.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. Let me hear your motion.
12	MR. CLARY: Now, first, on a little housecleaning matter. We before I went
13	up to the democratic convention on Sat on Friday, I prepared, and early in the
14	afternoon, put out for service and filing an affidavit. Did you receive that?
15	THE COURT: Let's see here.
16	MR. CLARY: I don't think you did 'cause it's not on Blackstone and I think
17	something happened in the
18	THE COURT: What was it again?
19	MR. CLARY: It's entitled Affidavit of Patrick C. Clary
20	THE COURT: I have it.
21	MR. CLARY: In Support of Motion
22	THE COURT: I have it.
23	MR. CLARY: May I file that
24	THE COURT: Filed May 16 th at 11:58 a.m.
25	MR. SEGEL: He has it now.

MR. CLARY: You have it?

MR. SEGEL: He has it.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CLARY: And it does have a file stamp on it?

THE COURT: Right; May 16th, 11:58.

MR. CLARY: Very good.

MR. CLARY: All right. Thank you.

All right. With respect to the motion, the Kokoweef's motion to require security from plaintiffs, the Kokoweef needs, as I understand it under the statute that Mr. Segel has cited, the Kokoweef needs to show that there is no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the case will benefit the corporation or its security holders, and that security should be posted by the plaintiffs in an amount following a determination of the Court of the possible reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees of Kokoweef incurred in the defense of this case and also including the expenses which the company may incur by reason of the obligation which may have to indemnify its Officers and Directors pursuant to Section 78. Sub 7502 of Nevada Revised Statutes or otherwise. That's what our obligation is here today.

And I do believe, Your Honor, with the -- having -- with the filing of the affidavit last week late by the plaintiffs of their, as yet, unqualified expert, by the filing of the accounting -- of the affidavit that Mr. Segel prepared Friday afternoon and submitted after I left town, of the accounting person for Kokoweef who was selected by one of the plaintiffs, Mr. Burke, to serve in that capacity and who expressed approval of her work, and by the filing of my affidavit just prior to that, that we met all those burdens.

There is -- the complaint alleges certain defalcations on the part of Mr.

 Hahn in his capacity as President and Treasurer of Kokoweef, and his individual capacity, otherwise and in his capacity as the President of his company, the other Hahn defendant [indiscernible] to do that. And there has been no proof whatsoever submitted.

If you look at the so called experts affidavit -- incidentally, let me say, Your Honor, by way of background, I have covered this in my affidavit but let me just repeat it quickly. This controversy all began -- well, began early with some discussions without the stockholders that have filed the lawsuit here and filed this derivative action, the -- but it progressed to the point, or regressed to the point where they hired counsel and they requested, under the appropriate statute, records by which, from Kokoweef, by which they could perform an audit. And I would represent, and I believe I stated in my affidavit, those records were provided. And we never received any complaint after those records were provided and we presumed that the audit was going forward. And we were waiting the outcome of the audit; and no audit occurred. Instead, this complaint occurred, this derivative action was filed. If there had been an audit, and the audit had determined that there were defalcations of -- in connection with the finances of the corporation, then that would be before Your Honor, and you would be able to make a determination with respect to this motion; that was never done.

We were then promised after the case was filed, Mr. Segel was promised, a report from their expert. We never received a report. It's not -- the affidavit that was filed is not a report. It's merely an affidavit making further allegations without any substantial evidentiary support. In fact, the affiant in that affidavit states that the most that he's been able to see are red flags; all right? So, they've produced nothing of substance, the plaintiffs, have produced nothing of

substance.

On the other hand, the defendants have produced an affidavit from the person who, as I said, plaintiff Burke had obtained to act as bookkeeper for the company on more than one occasion. And she expressly states in her affidavit that there were no defalcations as alleged in the compliant, and she goes through some detail on that.

So, you have before you a situation where I believe that you have the necessary facts before you to find that there is no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the above captioned case will benefit a corporation of security holders. And you can then find that security should be posted.

And in my affidavit, I've indicated my opinion that the way this case is going and the amount -- I indicated the amount of attorney's fees with respect to my firm that have been incurred thus far, as of that date at least, and I've indicated an estimate of what I think would be reasonable of what I can expect that's going to be incurred given the way -- the direction this case is taking. And that number is \$150,000.

I also stated in my affidavit, Your Honor, that, as provided in the statute that I just referred to based upon -- which this motion is made, expressly talks about that you may also consider not only the attorney's fees of the defendant corporation which is the subject of the derivative action, but you may consider security for the corporation's indemnification of Officers of the corporation. In this case, Mr. Hahn, who is required to defend himself personally for alleged defalcations that they haven't proved one iota of evidence, given one iota of evidence in support of. And, Mr. Hahn, I've estimated, having worked with Mr. Segel before, that his attorney's fees are going to be in the nature of \$100,000. And the corporation, very properly

under the statute, the indemnity statute, under the Articles of Incorporation of Kokoweef and its by-laws, at a duly called Board Meeting, have provided a resolution that indemnifies Mr. Hahn.

So we respectfully request, Your Honor, that you grant this motion to

So we respectfully request, Your Honor, that you grant this motion to require security from plaintiffs and that you order them to post a bond of \$250,000.

MR. BELLER: Your Honor, let me --

THE COURT: First address the motion to strike. You have a motion to strike this request; right?

MR. BELLER: That is correct, Your Honor.

MR. SEGEL: Isn't that moot, Your Honor?

THE COURT: What's that?

MR. SEGEL: I thought that was moot since -- Mr. Beller asked for is -- got an order shortening time to have that motion heard a week before this one and when Mr. Clary sought to --

THE COURT: It's on calendar today, so --

MR. SEGEL: Okay. Well I just thought --

MR. BELLER: I've heard everything.

MR. SEGEL: -- the issue was moot but --

MR. BELLER: Your Honor, I'm -- I'm sorry Counsel.

MR. SEGEL: That's not a problem. Go ahead.

MR. BELLER: Okay. I'm going to try and combine both -- issues here if I may.

First of all, the nominal defendant issue that the Court raised last time, if I may approach the bench, in terms of this is why we effectively labeled it the way it is. But this is the research --

MR. CLARY: Do I get one too? MR. BELLER: I'm sorry, Counsel. And I believe, without taking the Court's time because I know the Court's had a long morning, regarding that particular issue. Secondly, Your Honor, in terms of Mr. Clary and some of the issues as it relates to EIN Kokoweef posting security, part of what we filed, Your Honor, in terms of the motion to strike, was a transcribed, if you will, discussion between some of the members of the Board. And I'm not going to take a lot of time to belabor this but some of the language in here, Mr. Clary: I've been doing this for forty years --MR. CLARY: Your Honor, I object to Counsel's quoting from this unproven document that's not been offered as evidence. Its not been sworn to by anybody. It's -- when the case is not stayed at some point, we intend to take action with respect to this document. This is --THE COURT: Let's confine ourselves to the items that are in the record as formulated before --MR. BELLER: And it is in the record. THE COURT: -- I convened; okay? MR. CLARY: Well it's in the record only as --MR. BELLER: And it is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You're saying it's in the record?

MR. BELLER: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. CLARY: It's in the record as attached to their complaint but it's not -- been substantiated.

MR. BELLER: Your Honor, if --

THE COURT: Well he can refer to it -- the pleading, the complaint --

MR. BELLER: I'm going to be short, Your Honor.

25

MR. BELLER: Okay.

THE COURT: -- and your position relative to the --

MR. BELLER: My position --

THE COURT: -- security.

MR. BELLER: -- Your Honor, is, we believe the Kokoweef and the parties are proper named plaintiffs. We believe Kokoweef --

THE COURT: Okay, but why would that -- assuming they are, why can't I entertain a motion to strike? Or why -- I mean why can't I entertain the motion for security?

MR. BELLER: Because we believe Mr. Hahn, Mr. Clary, and others, by removing some of these Board members, are aggregately perpetrating a fraud and are using this mechanism to avoid having to file an answer and to basically make them post a security so that they --

THE COURT: I'll consider the motion for security on the merits. I'm denying the motion to strike. Now, let me hear your opposition to the motion. I know you've taken an alternative stance. You've made a motion to strike the request but then in the alternative, you've offered your opposition to it. Why shouldn't I provide security, or order security?

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, one comment I'd like to make. Mr. Beller just attacked my client by saying he did things improperly and illegally. If he's going make -- and he made this representation at the last hearing, if he's going to make representations of actions we did that were improper, my client did that were improper, I would like him to specify what he did and why --

THE COURT: Okay, but --

MR. SEGEL: -- it was improper.

THE COURT: I don't really want to get in to all that right now.

MR. SEGEL: I appreciate that but I don't --

THE COURT: Okay?

MR. SEGEL: -- appreciate the attacks on my client that I think -- nothing -- since I've been involved in this case, we have dotted our i's and crossed our t's --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEGEL: -- including the letter to Mr. Beller to allow us to drill which is ordinary course of business for the company.

THE COURT: Okay. Now.

MR. BELLER: Basically, Your Honor, the Board members, we believe, have been improperly removed. Mr. Hahn is moving forward to effectively have a new election to basically keep these people off the Board and they are attempting to have them post a bond so effectively — these are working people, these are people who don't have the wherewithal to post anywhere near the kind of money that Mr. Clary is suggesting. They represent — they are a group of a representative class and we believe, based upon what Mr. Hahn — and keeping in mind, Your Honor, in the complaint and the exhibits that were attached, there are numerous, numerous violations, Your Honor, which we believe — and we believe Mr. Hahn has perpetrated a fraud on Kokoweef, both in terms of issuing stock improperly, taking money for stock that went into his pocket, and paid back the company on loans from the company. All of this has been attached as an exhibit that Mr. Kehoe did to the complaint.

Now, in terms of our expert, if you will, we don't have all of the records.

I mean, this is a very preliminary, embryonic stage of this proceeding and all we want to do is proceed, but at every step of the way, we're being obstructed by these

24

MR. CLARY: Yes. Your Honor --

THE COURT: Want to wrap it up?

25

MR. CLARY: That is not true. They have not -- there's been no fraud

perpetrated. And they have not proved it up.

THE COURT: Well I'm not here today to decide whether it has --

MR. CLARY: I understand that.

THE COURT: -- or hasn't been.

MR. CLARY: But to make that allegation that they've provided sufficient evidence to show that he's perpetrated a fraud, let me just say that we have provided evidence that has refuted that. If you look at the bookkeeper's affidavit, and you can compare it with their expert's affidavit, we're the only ones that have provided any proof that there is -- there have been no defalcations, period. This is all a story that's made up. And therefore, we are entitled to security and we're entitled --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CLARY: -- in to a significant amount.

THE COURT: Now, it's your view, again to reiterate here, that the filing of your motion has stayed proceedings in the case until it's ruled on; right?

MR. CLARY: Yes, that's what the statute says.

THE COURT: Okay. I now have heard from you both and I've ruled on the motion to disqualify, I've ruled on the motion to strike, I've ruled on the motion for order extending time, although that may be unripe depending on what I do on the other motion, but I can't rule on the defendant's motion right now until I've looked at it a little bit further. Particularly, I want to look at the statute and look at the record and I'll have the matter under advisement; that's the defendant's motion to require security from plaintiffs; okay?

MR. SEGEL: Very good, Your Honor.

MR. BELLER: Your Honor, can I ask this one --

THE COURT: In the meantime, further proceedings will remain stayed and I will get my decision out as quickly as I can. But I want to look --

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, may I make --

THE COURT: -- at that statute, I want to look at its purpose, I want to see what, you know, what is deemed to be reasonable security in other cases that have construed it or statutes that are similar in other jurisdictions; okay?

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, I just want to address one item, Your Honor, very, very, very briefly. I got these by-laws from Mr. Beller this morning I think, yes. And on Section 10 of Article 3, which talks about Directors -- it's a section talks about removal of Directors, these allegations in the fairest [indiscernible] of my -- by client, the whole total section says: Anyone or more of the Directors may be removed either with or without cause at any time by the vote or written consent of stockholders representing not less than two-thirds of the issued and outstanding capital stock entitled to vote. Mr. Beller has underlined the provision that says: unstockholders representing not less than two-thirds of the issue. I will represent to this Court that we have more than two-thirds of the shareholders vote in favor to move with the three Directors.

MR. BELLER: Your Honor, two things, if I may?

MR. CLARY: And Your Honor, I'd like to --

MR. BELLER: -- very briefly.

MR. CLARY: -- supplement that by --

THE COURT: Well, you know, Mr. Beller had sought my attention first so, go ahead Mr. Beller.

MR. BELLER: Okay, thank you. If I may, I'd like to supplement. The wrong exhibit was attached and I called your department. If I may file this, Your Honor?

24

25

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELLER: But, the other issue, Your Honor, is the Court last time stayed any further proceedings. Mr. Segel wrote me a letter saying can they do certain things; I wrote him back that was fine. But there is an intended additional Board Meeting, Your Honor, and I know how busy this Court is. But I am concerned that they are going to move forward in very short order and does your order saying everything is stayed means everything is stayed?

THE COURT: I think the stay, by statute, applies to the legal proceedings.

MR. SEGEL: Your Honor, I think what Mr. Beller --

MR. BELLER: Well that's my concern, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The litigation.

MR. SEGEL: What Mr. Beller is referring to -- and I don't want to put words in his mouth, he was concerned for the last hearing because we -- Mr. Clary was going to be out of town, we wanted to do this hearing for two weeks, that we would do something nefarious in the interim and the Judge admonished everyone not do anything nefarious. The --

THE COURT: Did I say anything about equity and clean hands and --

MR. SEGEL: Yes; you did.

MR. BELLER: Yes; you did.

THE COURT: -- me looking --

MR. SEGEL: Yes; you did.

THE COURT: -- at the cleanliness

MR. BELLER: Yes; you did.

THE COURT: -- of hands --

MR. BELLER: Yes; you did.

24

25

THE COURT: -- of the parties. MR. SEGEL: I just -- just to make sure the record is totally clear, Your Honor --MR. CLARY: Yes. MR. SEGEL: The by-laws provide, and these are the by-laws Mr. Beller gave us as well, and there all the -- Mr. -- the by-laws provide for meeting of the shareholders, the annual meeting to be held on the first Sunday of June. We will be holding the --THE COURT: I'll have my decision before that. MR. SEGEL: Right. Well, no, I'm just --THE COURT: Well before that. MR. SEGEL: -- saying, but we're going --THE COURT: Yeah. MR. BELLER: It does require --MR. SEGEL: Anything that happens, we're going to continue to run this business. We're going to continue to drill, we're going to continue to comply with the by-laws and we will hold the shareholders meeting, Directors meeting, on the first of June as required by the by-laws. MR. BELLER: And it does require notice and --MR. SEGEL: It will be done. MR. BELLER: -- and then --

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Clary, you had something you wanted to say.

MR. CLARY: Yes. Well, first of all I wanted to say my recollection of the last hearing was, I used -- Your Honor, I said we're not going to do anything that the -- I believe Mr. Beller's concerned about, other than in the ordinary course of business.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. That's fine.

MR. CLARY: Those words were also said. Now Mr. Beller has submitted to you the by-laws and Mr. Segel has read you that provision and Mr. Bell -- that says about removal of Directors, Mr. Beller claims that was illegal. And I ask you to look at that provision of the by-laws that Mr. Segel read to you and I'd also like to provide to you and Counsel a copy of the form that was used to remove those Directors which complies with that by-law provision, it complies with the statute. And this, Your Honor, was done long before this hearing was held. This appeared in the -- contains the date on which it occurred. I'd like to provide a copy of that if I may.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right --

MR. CLARY: And with that, Your Honor, I think that pretty much completes the record in terms of what's -- has been recorded today.

THE COURT: Okay. Again, I do want to review NRS 41.520 Subsection 3 and any other applicable statute. Actually, also NRS 78.7502 relative to the security issue. I want to see how cases have construed that. I don't think the purpose of those statutes is to keep people from their day in Court; coming in and seeking to proceed with what they believe to be viable and appropriate claims. But by the same token, I know that there are provisions that do require that security, to a certain extent, be posted. So, that's what I'm going to be reviewing.

MR. BELLER: Can I give the Court some additional research on that additional issue, Your Honor?

THE COURT: What is --

MR. BELLER: This is the notice to stockholders, some of the things that the Court is talking about.

THE COURT: Okay. Well.

'	IVIR. CLARY: As long as we get a copy.
2	MR. BELLER: [Indiscernible].
3	MR. SEGEL: I have. Your Honor
4	MR. CLARY: No, no, I don't have a copy.
5	THE COURT: This seems to be going way beyond
6	MR. SEGEL: It is. And Your Honor, I now have to make another comment.
7	There's a comment in here that the by-laws that I provided to Mr. Beller were the
8	wrong by-laws. We concede that. In fact, we don't know where they came from.
9	We agree with Mr. Beller. The by-laws that he's submitted are the proper by-laws.
10	We got the originals with us today and I'm find out where those by-laws came tha
11	I submitted but they were not the correct ones.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MR. SEGEL: They're substantially identical but they were not
14	THE COURT: Okay. The matter will stand submitted. I'll decide it as quickly
15	as I can on the
16	MR. SEGEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: On the one item that I took UA.
18	MR. SEGEL: Shall we provide I can't talk today, shall we prepare an order
19	for the three motions the Court has ruled on?
20	THE COURT: Yes, would you please?
21	MR. SEGEL: Very good, Your Honor. Thank you.
22	THE COURT: Thanks.
23	* * * * *
24	* * * * *
25	* * * * *

MR. BELLER: Thank you, Your Honor.