11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MOT
PATRICK W. KANG, ESQ.
State Bar No.: 010381
KANG & ASSOCIATES, PLLC.
6480 W. Spring Mountain Road, Suite 1
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
P: 702.333.4223
F: 702.507.1468

Attorneys for Defendant
Elsie Peladas-Brown.

RECEIVED AND FILED S 2015 DEC 21 AM 10 52

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT MARY A. SOL'OTT, CLEPK

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

#### **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

In Re:

AMERI-DREAM REALTY, LLC,

Debtor.

VICTORIA NELSON, In Her Capacity As The, Chapter 7 Trustee of AMERI-DREAM REALTY, LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ELSIE PELADAS-BROWN,

Defendant.

## **DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT AND REOPEN AND RECONSIDER**

COMES NOW, Defendant, ELSIE PELADAS-BROWN. ("Ms. Peladas"), by and through her attorney of record, PATRICK W. KANG, ESQ. of the law firm KANG AND ASSOCIATES, and hereby submits its Motion To Set Aside Judgment and Reopen and Reconsider pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 55 and 60 and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy

pleadings on file herein, as well as any oral argument deemed necessary.

DATED this 10 day of December, 2015.

This Motion is made based upon the attached points and authorities, paper, and

8

10

11

12

13

14

2

Procedure 7055 and 9024.

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Respectfully Submitted,

**KANG & ASSOCIATES** 

/s/ Patrick Kang

PATRICK W. KANG, ESQ. State Bar No. 010381 6480 W Spring Mountain Road Ste. 1 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146 702.333.4223 Attorneys for Defendant POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION

## 

## INTRODUCTION

The complaint in this matter was filed on May 5, 2015, subsequently, the Plaintiff's filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on August 28, 2015, and that motion was granted on October 27, 2015. Defendant Elsie Peladas-Brown ("Ms. Brown") has been out of the country during the entirety of this litigation. Ms. Brown was only recently made aware of the lawsuit, and subsequent judgment that has been entered against her. Upon notification of such judgment Ms. Brown immediately retained counsel and now brings this motion.

It is not Ms. Brown's intent to dispute the wrongdoing which has occurred, however, the judgment that has been entered against her is in significant excess of the amounts that Ms. Brown withdrew from the accounts in question. Ms. Brown is unsure how the Plaintiffs came to the conclusion that Ms. Brown is responsible for the \$1,174,373.63 amount that has been represented by Plaintiffs to the court in its previous motions. All the documents and exhibits that have previously been submitted by the Plaintiffs only show losses amounting to \$495,598.00. Under the current judgment Ms. Brown is being held responsible in excess of two times the losses which were incurred by the company through the alleged wrongful conduct of Ms. Brown. Therefore, Ms. Brown brings this motion to set aside the previous judgment and reopen and reconsider the matter.

## II. RELEVANT PROCEDURAL FACTS

The crux of this case results from this courts reliance on certain administrative proceedings which took place with the Nevada Real Estate Commission on September 16, 2015. Ms. Brown, although out of the country, was aware of that proceeding and had

10l

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

previously obtained counsel to represent her in that matter. Her counsel had authorization to provide certain representations and admissions to the Real Estate Commission. Part of those representations included the admission of the transfer of funds from the security deposit account of the Plaintiffs.

The Plaintiffs provided the transcript of these administrative proceedings as Exhibit C in support of its motion for summary judgment. They are attached herein as Exhibit A-Transcript of Real Estate Commission Hearing. No other proof was submitted by the Plaintiff to substantiate the monetary amount in question.

The Plaintiffs, both in its Complaint, and its Motion for Summary Judgment, state that the Company, Ameri-Dream Realty, held in excess of \$1,200,000 in its security deposit account. Further, Plaintiffs quote the breakdown of the dates of each and every transfer which Ms. Brown allegedly committed in their findings of fact supplied to the court. However, the total of these transfers only comes to a sum of \$495,598.00. Plaintiffs provided no other proof to substantiate the remaining \$678,775.63 which they claim Ms. Brown had wrongfully transferred.

Ms. Brown was unaware of Plaintiffs claims in bankruptcy court, and had not retained counsel to defend herself in the matter. Service of this suit was completed via publication in the Las Vegas Review Journal; however, Ms. Brown was out of the country and had no reasonable way of being notified through such publication.

Based on the lack of appearance by Ms. Brown the court granted Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment on October 27, 2015. Judgment was entered against Ms. Brown for the full amount of Plaintiffs claim, \$1,174,373.63. As soon as Ms. Brown became aware of this judgment she contacted and retained counsel.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

Ms. Brown now provides legal argument and evidence that support her position, that the sum provided by Plaintiffs is incorrect and the judgment should be set aside. Therefore, this court should grant Defendant's Motion to Set Aside the Judgment and Reopen and Reconsider.

III.

### **LAW AND ARGUMENTS**

#### A. STANDARD FOR MOTION TO RECONSIDER

This Honorable Court has the wide discretion to set aside a final judgment and reopen and reconsider the matter. F. R. Bank. P. 9024 adopts F. R. Civ. P. 60, which provides that:

- (b)On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:
  - (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;
  - (6) any other reason that justifies relief.

## B. Under F. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1) and 60(b)(6) Ms. Brown is entitled to relief

In this matter, the court in its discretion should grant this Motion to Set Aside the Judgment and Reopen and Reconsider because Ms. Brown has provided the court with sufficient evidence to show that the judgment currently entered from this court, incorrectly holds Ms. Brown accountable for losses which are well in excess of the losses which were allegedly caused by her wrongful transfers.

Specifically, the damage calculations provided by the Plaintiffs in this matter do not substantiate their claim for entitlement to the judgment amount. It appears that the relevant document that was cited in determining losses incurred by Ms. Brown was the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

transcript of the Real Estate Commissioner Hearing. **See** Exhibit A. The court relies on the exact same dates and dollar amounts which account for the losses that were allegedly incurred by Ms. Brown's conduct. The Findings of Fact state the following:

- 8. Specifically, on the following dates, Brown transferred money from the Company's general account at JP Morgan Chase Bank and/or security deposit account at JP Morgan Chase Bank to Unibank, Inc. Metro Philippines (the "Philippines Bank"):
- a. On February 27, 2013, Brown transferred \$25,000 from the general account to the Philippines Bank;
- b. On May 14, 2013, Brown transferred \$50,000 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- c. On April 10, 2013, Brown transferred \$49,263 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- d. On April 17, 2013, Brown transferred \$24,600 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- e On May 17, 2013, Brown transferred \$97,930 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- f. On May 24, 2013, Brown transferred \$49,000 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- g. On June 25, 2013, Brown transferred \$71,500 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- h. On July 18, 2013, Brown transferred \$35,000 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- i. On September 10, 2013, Brown transferred \$7,670 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- j. On September 23, 2013, Brown transferred \$18,700 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- k. On September 27, 2013, Brown transferred \$23,255 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
  - l. On October 9, 2013 Brown transferred \$10,020 from the

10

11

12

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;

- On October 22, 2013, Brown transferred \$13,960 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- On October 24, 2013, Brown transferred \$11,700 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- On December 20, 2013, Brown transferred \$8,000 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;

In total, the entire damage amount only comes to a total of \$495,598. That represents less than half the total that was ultimately entered by the court. The Plaintiffs do not supply any other evidence to account for the remaining \$678,775.63 in its calculation of losses. Exhibit B- Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law.

"Rule 60(b)(6) has been used sparingly as an equitable remedy to prevent manifest injustice." United States v. Alpine Land & Reservoir Co., 984 F.2d 1047, 1049 (9th Cir. 1993). "The rule is to be utilized only where extraordinary circumstances prevented a party from taking timely action to prevent or correct an erroneous judgment." Id.

As indicated, Ms. Brown was unrepresented, and out of the country. Service by publication was effected in Nevada, and Ms. Brown had no way reasonable way of receiving notice. Finally, there is a substantial difference in provable losses provided by the Plaintiffs, compared to the judgment amount that Plaintiffs provided to this court. Therefore, the court should set aside judgment and reopen and reconsider the matter. This would give Ms. Brown an opportunity to be held accountable for the losses that she is responsible for and not simply some arbitrary figure that the Plaintiffs have supplied to the court.

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

23

25

## C. Ms. Brown's Request is Brought in a Timely Manner

Further, Ms. Brown has brought this motion and her request in a timely manner. F. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1) requires that a motion under rule 60(b) be made within a reasonable time. In the instant matter, the judgment was entered against Ms. Brown on October 27 of this year. It has been just over a month since the judgment was entered. Ms. Brown was both unrepresented, out of the country, and unaware of the proceedings against her. As soon as she became aware, Ms. Brown retained counsel to address this matter.

The request is made in good faith and would not cause undue delay. Additionally, Ms. Brown's request is simply to make sure she is not held accountable for excess losses which have not been accounted for by the Plaintiff.

## D. The Ruling is Effectively a Default Judgment and Ms. Brown is Entitled to Relief

Finally, the Motion for Summary Judgment, was in effect, a default judgment due to the fact that Ms. Brown was unaware of the proceedings and did not respond in the matter. As such, the rules for a default judgment are applicable in this matter. F. R. Civ. P. 55(c), incorporated into bankruptcy proceedings by F. R. Bankr. P. 7055, allows a court to set aside entry of default for "good cause," and allows the court to set aside default pursuant to F. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Under this rule and its applicable counter-part F. R. Bankr. P. 9024, the court may grant relief from a final judgment or order for mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. This is allowed so long as such a motion is brought within a reasonable time of the court's entry of default.

Ms. Brown has in all times acted in good faith to make open and accurate representations regarding her situation. Despite being out of the country Ms. Brown obtained counsel to represent her in the administrative proceedings before the Real Estate

proceedings since she is now aware of their existence.

Whenever possible a case should be determined on the merits. See TCI Group Lit

Commissioner, and likewise, has now retained counsel to represent her in these

Whenever possible, a case should be determined on the merits. *See TCI Group Life Insurance Plan v. Knoebber*, 244 F.3d 691, 696 (9th Cir. 2001). Given the short length of time since the final judgment was entered by the court, and excusable neglect by Ms. Brown the court should allow this case to be heard on the merits.

In this matter, the court in its discretion, should grant this Motion to Reconsider because Ms. Brown has provided the court with sufficient evidence to show that Plaintiffs are not entitled to the amount which has been entered against her through the summary judgment ruling. Had Ms. Brown been aware of the proceedings, she would have made these representations and provided an appropriate and timely response; however, due to the fact that she was out of the country, Ms. Brown was not aware of such proceedings. Additionally, Ms. Brown was unrepresented, again, due to her lack of knowledge of the proceedings, so no response was provided in this matter.

12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

22

21

24

23

25

IV.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, this court should grant Ms. Brown's Motion to Set Aside the Judgment and Reopen and Reconsider. In light of the law, facts, and evidence presented in this case there is no just reason to deny Defendant's request for reconsideration. Therefore, Defendant respectfully requests the court to set aside the judgment that has been entered, and reopen and reconsider the matter, and grant any further relief that the court may deem just and proper.

DATED this 10 day of December, 2015.

Respectfully Submitted,

## **KANG & ASSOCIATES, PLLC**

/s/ Patrick Kang

PATRICK W. KANG, ESQ.
State Bar No. 010381
6480 W Spring Mountain Road
Ste. 1
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
702.333.4223
Attorneys for Defendant

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

> 24 25

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 

I hereby certify that I am an employee of KANG & ASSOCIATES, PLLC., over the age of 18, neither a party to nor interested in this matter; that on this 16 day, of December, 2015, I served a copy of **DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT AND** REOPEN AND RECONSIDER was sent via REGULAR MAIL on December \_\_\_, 2015 to the following:

TO:

SCHWARTZ FLANSBURG PLLC. Samuel A. Schwartz, Esq. 6623 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 300 Las Vegas, NV 89119 Attorneys for Plaintiff Chapter 7 Trustee, Victoria L. Nelson

**PEARL Insurance Group** c/o The Corporation Trust Company of Nevada 311 S. Division Street Carson City, NV 89703

**Greenwich Insurance Company** c/o Lee Santos XL Select Professional 100 Constitutional Plaza 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103

An Employee of KANG & ASSOCIATES

Case 15-01087-led Doc 24 Entered 12/22/15 16:05:36 Page 12 of 32

KANG & ASSOCIATES, PLLC. 6480 W. SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD, SUITE 1 LAS VEGAS, NV 89446

## **EXHIBIT A**

Brown MTR- 12 - of 13

## In The Matter Of:

Joseph Decker, et al. vs. Elsie P. Brown

Real Estate Commission Hearing September 16, 2015



depo international worldwide deposition services

Min-U-Script® with Word Index

Joseph Decker, et al. vs. Elsie P. Brown Page 1 Page 3 BEFORE THE REAL ESTATE COMMISSION Las Vegas, Nevada; Wednesday, September 16, 2015 STATE OF NEVADA 2 1:44 p.m. -oOo-3 JOSEPH R. DECKER, Administrator, REAL ESTATE DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS & INDUSTRY, **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:** This is would be the 4 time and place for the Nevada Real Estate Division STATE OF NEVADA, versus Elsie P. Brown. Petitioner. MR. KIZER: Keith Kizer, Deputy Attorney ) CASE NO: RES 14-05-80-1060 7 vs. General, on behalf of the Division. 8 ELSTE P. BROWN. MR. MANINGO: Good afternoon, 9 Respondent. 10 Commissioners. Lance Maningo on behalf of the Respondent, Elsie Brown. 11 12 MR. KIZER: Commissioners, this is sort of a companion case of the John Brown case you heard REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS yesterday. 14 Taken at Grant Sawyer Building 555 East Washington Avenue Room 4401 Maybe, in the interest of time, it would 15 be okay not to read all the transactions, or do you 16 Las Vegas, Nevada want me to read the abbreviated version? 17 on Wednesday, September 16, 2015 1:44 p.m. 18 **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:** No. I think -- it's two separate cases. 19 MR. KIZER: Okay. I'll do that, then. 20 21 Ms. Brown, salesperson under S.0069366 22 since January 23, 2006, currently in inactive status, subject to the jurisdiction of the Division Depo International - Las Vegas Reported by: Andrea Martin, C Certified Realtime Reporter and the Commission. She was associated with Broker CSR, RPR, NV CCR 887 25 John M. Brown Jr. Ameri-Dream Realty. Page 2 Page 4 1 APPEARANCES: 1 Ameri-Dream Realty had a general account RICHARD JOHNSON 2 PRESIDENT: at JPMorgan Chase Bank and a security deposit COMMISSIONERS: NEIL SCHWARTZ 3 SHERRI CARTINELLA NORMA JEAN OPATIK DEVIN REISS REBECCA HARDIN account at JPMorgan Bank. On the following dates, I'll read, she COMMISSION COORDINATOR: 5 transferred the money I'll mention to -- all, COMMISSION COUNSEL: ROSE MARIE REYNOLDS 6 DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL obviously -- Unibank Inc. Metro Philippines. 7 CHIEF INVESTIGATOR: JAN HOLLEY 7 So on February 27th, she transferred 8 \$25,000 from the general account to that bank; 8 FOR PETITIONER: 9 9 May 14th, 2013, \$50,000 from the NEVADA ATTORNEY GENERAL 10 KEITH KIZER security deposit account to that bank; 10 DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL Suite 3900 11 April 10th, 2013, \$49,263 from the 11 555 East Washington Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89101-6011 TEL: (702) 486-3326 FAX: (702) 486-3416 12 12 security deposit account to that bank; 13 13 April 17, 2013, transferred \$24,600 from 14 the security deposit account to that bank; 14 FOR RESPONDENT: 15 15 May 17th, '13, transferred \$97,930 from BELLON & MANINGO BY: LANCE MANINGO, ESQ. 16 the security deposit account to that bank; 16 BY: LANCE Suite 102 732 South Sixth Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101-6011 TEL: (702) 452-6299 FAX: (702) 452-6298 17 17 May 24th, 2013, transferred \$49,000 from the security deposit to that bank; 18 18 19 June 25, 2013, transferred \$71,500 from 19 LAM@bellonandmaningo.com 20 20 the security deposit account to that bank; July 18, 2013, transferred \$35,000 from 21 21 the security deposit account to that bank. 22 22 23 September 10, 2013, transferred \$7,670 23 24 from the security deposit account to that bank;

24

25

September 23rd, 2013, transferred

Page 5

1 \$18,700 from the security deposit account to that 2 bank;

September 27th, 2013, transferred \$23,255 3 4 from the security deposit account to that bank;

October 9th, 2013, respondent

6 transferred \$10,020 from the security deposit account to that bank:

October 22, 2013, transferred \$13,960

from the security deposit account to that bank.

October 24, '13, transferred \$11,700 from 10 11 the security deposit account to that bank.

On December 20th, '13, Respondent 12

13 transferred \$8,000 from the from the security

deposit account to that bank;

18

8

11

And on May 16, 2014, John M. Brown Jr. 15

16 filed a statement of fact with the Division,

complaining about Respondent's conduct. 17

Based thereon, we're alleging 16 different

19 violations: One violation for violating

20 NRS 645.630(1)(h) by converting money from the

21 general account to her use; 14 violations of

22 645.630(1)(h) by converting money from the security

23 deposit account to her use; and then, last, violated

24 NRS 645.633(1)(i), pursuant to NAC 645.605(1), by

25 failing to do her utmost to product the public

1 need there, and immediately replaced those funds

2 when available.

3 I offer that by way of explanation, not excuse. She acknowledges what she did is wrong, and

Page 7

Page 8

I represent that the Attorney General.

With that, my client has agreed to the 6 revocation and surrender of her license immediately.

She would, however, ask that the Commission take

into consideration what I've just told you all and

not impose fees and costs, nor impose any monetary

fine in excess of, what I would suggest, a \$10,000

12 fine.

13 I don't ask that only to lessen the burden 14 on my client but also to give her the opportunity to 15 make whole those that were actually victimized in

16 this situation. This is her ultimate intent. I'm

17 not sure of the time frame by which she's going to

be able to do that, but she has expressed to me her

want to make reparation to those that were hurt

20 financially.

21 So, with that, again, I will just

22 summarize. She will surrender/agrees to revocation

of her license and asks that there not be fines and

24 fees imposed and asks for a fine no more

25 than \$10,000.

Page 6

1

5

8

1 against fraud, misrepresentation, or unethical 2 practices related to real estate.

Mr. Miningo and I have spoken, and there's 3

4 agreement to Ms. Brown to agree to the facts and 5 violations in the complaint and to agree to a

6 revocation of her license and whatever other

discipline the commission feels is appropriate.

**CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:** Comments?

MR. MANINGO: Yes, sir. Thank you, 9 Commission. 10

I have the authority from my client, who 12 is not present but is situated in the Philippines

13 now to submit to the jurisdiction of this commission

14 to acquiesce to the factual allegations contained in

15 the complaint and to offer, by way of mitigation, just some facts and circumstances that relate to the

17 allegations.

Specifically, I've spoken to Mr. Kizer 18

19 about this. Specifically, Ms. Brown has asked me to 20 represent to this commission that the money was not

21 specifically taken for her personal use. The

22 transfer of the funds was in relation to a

23 catastrophic event that happened in the Philippines,

24 a hurricane, followed by earthquake, and her hope

25 was to provide temporary funds and help to those in

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I'm a little concerned 2 on where we're headed, because we technically don't

have a stipulation, if I'm understanding you right.

MR. KIZER: Well, we have a -- I guess in

terms of -- a "guilty plea," would be the proper terminology. 7

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Right.

MR. KIZER: So it would be up to you to 9 determine, in addition -- first of all, that you'd

be willing to accept our agreement to a revocation

12 and then additional penalties that you have. So 13 it's completely in your discretion.

14 You can have Chief Holle come up and tell 15 you all --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: -- recommendation --16 17 MR. KIZER: -- recommendation, in addition to the agreed-upon revocation.

CHIEF INVESTIGATOR HOLLE: Jan Holle, 19 20 Chief Investigator.

There's a total of 16 violations. The

22 Division would recommend the maximum fine for each 23 violation of \$10,000, for a total of \$160,000, plus

24 the costs of the hearing investigation, payable

25 within 90 days, and also the revocation that

	Joseph Decker, et al. vs. Elsie P. Brown			
1	Page 9		Page 11	
1	Mr. Kizer talked about.	1	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I just wanted to	
2	Thank you.	2		
3	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And if I'm	3	COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS:	
-	understanding right, the offer is no fines. In	4	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. All right.	
4		5	COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS:	
- 1	other words, where we're headed, if we don't	2	to make it clear, we should have a first why	
	accept	7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
7	MR. KIZER: No, no, no. COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: No.	7	J 1 1 "	
8	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: No?	0	to the facts and liabilities that she's agreed to,	
9	MR. KIZER: This is a lot like the Linda	9	and separate that from the penalty?  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Somebody want to make	
10		10	that motion?	
11				
12	Ms. Brown is basically throwing herself on	12	COMMISSIONER OPATIK: You just want	
	your mercy. She's agreed to the revocation, and		acceptance of the proving of facts?  COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS:	
	then throwing herself on your mercy to fine her as	14	· ·	
· l	little as possible. We're asking to fine her as		a motion to accept the stipulation that Ms. Brown	
1	much as possible.		has agreed that the facts have been proven and the	
17	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Right.	1	violations have been proven as well.  COMMISSIONER OPATIK: I move that this	
18	MR. KIZER: It's your call. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And you have the	18		
19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Commission accept the stipulation, facts, and	
20	authority to accept whatever  MR. MANINGO: I do.	4	violations as stated and that Ms. Brown, Ms. Elsie	
21	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: we come up with?	1	Brown, has agreed to the revocation and has agreed	
23	MR. MANINGO: I do. I think so.	1	to has agreed to admitting the facts as true and	
24	COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS:	24	proven.  Will that work? No? She's not sure.	
_	acceptance. There's no stipulation to anything	25	COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS:	
23	acceptance. There's no supmention to anything	23	COMMISSION COURSEL RETNOLDS.	
-	Page 10	-	Page 12	
1	beyond revocation.		will.	
2	MR. MANINGO: Yes.	2	COMMISSIONER REISS: And I'll second.	
3	COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: The	3	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We have a motion and a	
			1	
4	Commission is determining the penalty. They've	4	1	
5	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the	5	Discussion?	
5	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as	5 6	Discussion? (No response.)	
5 6 7	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the	5 6 7	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those	
5 6 7 8	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of	5 6 7 8	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye."	
5 6 7 8 9	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the	5 6 7 8 9	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously:	
5 6 7 8 9	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses	5 6 7 8 9	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.")	
5 6 7 8 9 10	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision,	5 6 7 8 9 10	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed?	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.)	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried.	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS:	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties.	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we decide. We're not it's like a stipulation: If	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties. COMMISSIONER REISS: I'll make a motion	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we decide. We're not it's like a stipulation: If we don't accept it, we go back to a full hearing.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties. COMMISSIONER REISS: I'll make a motion if I could, Mr. President?	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we decide. We're not it's like a stipulation: If we don't accept it, we go back to a full hearing.  That is not the case here or is it?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties. COMMISSIONER REISS: I'll make a motion if I could, Mr. President? CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes.	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we decide. We're not it's like a stipulation: If we don't accept it, we go back to a full hearing.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties. COMMISSIONER REISS: I'll make a motion if I could, Mr. President? CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER REISS: that we impose	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we decide. We're not it's like a stipulation: If we don't accept it, we go back to a full hearing.  That is not the case here or is it?  MR. KIZER: That is not	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties. COMMISSIONER REISS: I'll make a motion if I could, Mr. President? CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes.	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we decide. We're not it's like a stipulation: If we don't accept it, we go back to a full hearing.  That is not the case here or is it?  MR. KIZER: That is not  COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS:	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties. COMMISSIONER REISS: I'll make a motion if I could, Mr. President? CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER REISS: that we impose a fine of we impose a hundred based on the	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we decide. We're not it's like a stipulation: If we don't accept it, we go back to a full hearing.  That is not the case here or is it?  MR. KIZER: That is not  COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: not the case here	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties. COMMISSIONER REISS: I'll make a motion if I could, Mr. President? CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER REISS: that we impose a fine of we impose a hundred based on the 16 allegations, the \$160,000 plus costs, if we could	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	stipulated to the facts; they've stipulated to the liability. They've agreed to that, but as far as the appropriate punishment, that's up to the Commission to decide. He's agreed to one part of that punishment, which is the revocation of the license. But whether or not the Commission chooses to do anything else is the Commission's decision, and you've heard two two positions, what the Division wants and then what Ms. Brown, through her counsel, has asked for.  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So what I'd really being cautious about is whatever we decide, we decide. We're not it's like a stipulation: If we don't accept it, we go back to a full hearing.  That is not the case here or is it?  MR. KIZER: That is not  COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: not the case here  CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye." (Board Commission responds simultaneously: "Aye.") CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. Now its up for discussion as to COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: penalties. COMMISSIONER REISS: I'll make a motion if I could, Mr. President? CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER REISS: that we impose a fine of we impose a hundred based on the 16 allegations, the \$160,000 plus costs, if we could have that determined, and that a application for	

Page 13 Page 15 COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: ... 1 that as an added precaution. 1 COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: To 2 not able to change the terms of the statutes. COMMISSIONER REISS: Okay. Then I'll have 3 commissioners are under the understanding that 4 that -- the \$160,000, plus costs --4 before a license would be able to be reissued, that 5 **COMMISSIONER OPATIK:** -- to be paid --5 the fine would have to be paid in full; is that **COMMISSIONER REISS:** -- terms to be paid 6 correct? 6 in 90 days. 7 CHIEF INVESTIGATOR HOLLE: Well, they (Discussion held off the record between would need to come before the Commission. Mr. Maningo and Mr. Kizer.) 9 COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: \_ COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: ... 10 10 have to come before the Commission --11 confused about what they're --11 **CHIEF INVESTIGATOR HOLLE: Right.** MR. MANINGO: Pardon my inexperience COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: \_ 12 12 13 before the Commission. 13 isn't anything in the statute that I'm aware of that I just asked the Attorney General if I was 14 requires the payment in full before a license would 14 15 able to be heard after a motion is made by a be issued. 15 16 commissioner. 16 CHIEF INVESTIGATOR HOLLE: Again, that COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: ... 17 could be a determination that was made before the 17 18 the deliberations. Commission ---MR. MANINGO: Thank you. 19 19 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: -- would follow through CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So a motion was made 20 20 on it. 21 and seconded. 21 COMMISSION COUNSEL REYNOLDS: ... MEMBER SCHWARTZ: Mr. President, I would CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. 22 22 23 vote in favor of that motion. I also would support the motion. 23 24 MR. KIZER: Was there a -- on the costs, The number I added up was 24 25 was there a time frame on payment? 25 495,000-and-some-odd dollars that was taken, for Page 14 Page 16 1 **COMMISSIONER REISS:** Ninety days. 1 whatever reason, and I do not think that the CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ninety days. 2 2 reason -- I mean, you can say reasons all day long. MR. KIZER: Okay. Thank you. 3 3 but how do you prove that? **COMMISSIONER REISS:** Further discussion? 4 So the bottom line, to me, was the offense CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes. was done. This is what I think is -- should be 5 **COMMISSIONER REISS:** Okay. 6 fined, and the fine is a fifth of what the crime The way I look at it, even with the 7 was. 8 admittance and the agreement -- or it's not even so 8 Anyone else want to comment? Any other 9 much an agreement, but a wish not to exceed \$10,000. discussion? 10 I don't -- I would be -- I'm more concerned that the 10 (No response.) 11 penalty fit the crime, and I think that the full CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hearing none, all those 11 12 amount is warranted here, more so than the concern 12 in favor signify by saying "Aye." 13 about \$10,000 or whatever amount we choose. (Board Commission responds simultaneously: 13 14 So I'd say, for the crime, that the "Aye.") 14 15 \$160,000 would be warranted. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed? 15 **CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:** What are the costs? 16 (No response.) 16 **COORDINATOR HARDIN:** \$1,283.81. 17 17 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is carried. 18 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any other comments? MR. KIZER: Thank you. 18 19 **COMMISSIONER OPATIK:** I would just speak MR. MANINGO: Thank you. 19 20 to the motion. (Proceedings concluded at 2:00 p.m.) 20 I'm in agreement with it, given -- given 21 -oOo-22 the gravity of the offense, I would like to see 22 23 the -- the fine of \$160,000 as well, because the 23 24 respondent would have to pay the fine before they 24 25 could get their license, so I would just like to see 25

	Page 17
1	STATE OF NEVADA ) COUNTY OF CLARK )
2	COUNTY OF CHARK )
3	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
4	I, Andrea N. Martin, a duly commissioned and
5	licensed court reporter, Clark County, State of
6	Nevada, do hereby certify:
7	That I reported the taking of the
8	aforementioned State of Nevada Real Estate
9	Commission Hearing, commencing on Wednesday,
10	September 16, 2015, at the hour of 1:44 p.m.; that I
11	thereafter transcribed my said shorthand notes into
12	typewriting, and that the typewritten transcript
13	herein is a complete, true, and accurate
14	transcription of said proceedings; that I am not a
15	relative or employee of any of the parties involved
16	in said action, nor a relative or employee of an
17	attorney involved in nor a person financially
18	interested in said action.
19	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
20	in my office in the County of Clark, State of
21	Nevada, this 30th day of September, 2015.
22	
23	ANDREA N. MARTIN, CRR, CCR NO. 887
24	
25	
I	

## **EXHIBIT B**

Brown MTR- 13 - of 13

## C& 25 15 100 27 ed 'D 80 242 E FROM C 10/24/15 09 3 36 6 P 8 9 2 0 6 32

1	Samuel A. Schwartz, Esq.		
2	Nevada Bar No. 10985 Bryan A. Lindsey, Esq.		
	Nevada Bar No. 10662		
3	Schwartz Flansburg PLLC 6623 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 300		
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89119		
5	Telephone: (702) 385-5544 Facsimile: (702) 385-2741		
6	Attorneys for the Chapter 7 Trustee, Victoria L. Nel	son	
7	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
8	In re:	) Case No.: 15-10110-LED	
9	AMERI-DREAM REALTY, LLC,	) Chapter 7	
LO   L1	Debtor.	) )	
L2 L3	VICTORIA NELSON, In her Capacity As The Chapter 7 Trustee of AMERI-DREAM REALTY, LLC,	) Adv. No.: 15-01087-LED )	
L4	Plaintiff,	)	
L5	v.	)	
L6	ELSIE PELADAS-BROWN, Defendant.	) )	
L7		, )	
L8   L9	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINDINGS OF FACT AND CON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR S	CLUSIONS OF LAW ON	
20	TO: ALL INTERESTED PARTIES, CREDIT	ORS AND TRUSTEES	
21	The Court, the Debtor, the United States Tr	ustee, and all creditors and parties in interes	
22	are hereby notified that an Order of the Findings o	f Fact and Conclusions of Law on Plaintiff's	
23	Motion for Summary Judgment was entered by the	Court on October 27, 2015, a copy of which	
25	is attached hereto, as Exhibit A (ECF No. 20).		
26	Dated: October 28, 2015.		
27			

1	Respectfully Submitted,
	/s/ Samuel A. Schwartz
2	Samuel A. Schwartz, Esq.
	Nevada Bar No. 10985
3	Bryan A. Lindsey, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 10662
4	Schwartz Flansburg PLLC
Ì	6623 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 300
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
6	Telephone: (702) 385-5544
	Facsimile: (702) 385-2741
7	Attorneys for the Chapter 7 Trustee, Victoria L. Nelson
8	
9	
10	
11	
.	
12	
13	
14	
15	
Ì	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
11	
23	
24	
25	
26	

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 1 2 I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent electronically on 3 October 28, 2015, to the following: 4 elsiep2013@gmail.com. 5 I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent via 6 7 REGULAR MAIL on October 28, 2015, to the following: 8 Pearl Insurance Group c/o The Corporation Trust Company of Nevada 9 311 S. Division Street Carson City, NV 89703 10 Lance A. Maningo 11 Bellon & Maningo 12 732 S. Sixth Street, #102 Las Vegas, NV 89101 13 Greenwich Insurance Company 14 c/o Lee Santos XL Select Professional 15 100 Constitution Plaza, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor 16 Hartford, CT 06103 17 Elsie Peladas-Brown 9931 W. Cherokee Avenue 18 Las Vegas, NV 89147-7704 19 /s/ Janine Lee 20 Janine Lee

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

# Exhibit A

Honorable Laurel E. Davis United States Bankruptcy Judge

Entered on Docket October 27, 2015

6

7

8

10

13

14

15

26

27

1

2

3

4

5

Samuel A. Schwartz, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 10985

9 Bryan A. Lindsey, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 10662

Schwartz Flansburg PLLC

6623 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 300

Las Vegas, Nevada 89119 Telephone: (702) 385-5544

Facsimile: (702) 385-2741

Attorneys for the Chapter 7 Trustee, Victoria L. Nelson

#### UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

1	In re:	) Case No.: 15-10110-LED
16	AMERI-DREAM REALTY, LLC,	) ) Chapter 7
17	Debtor.	) )
18		)
19	VICTORIA NELSON, In her Capacity As The	) Adv. No.: 15-01087-LED )
20	Chapter 7 Trustee of AMERI-DREAM REALTY, LLC,	) )
21		)
22	Plaintiff, v.	<ul><li>Hearing Date: October 26, 2015</li><li>Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m.</li></ul>
23	ELSIE PELADAS-BROWN,	) )
24		)
25	Defendant.	) )
		•

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Upon consideration of the Motion (the "Motion") of Victoria L. Nelson, in her capacity as the Chapter 7 Trustee (the "Plaintiff" or the "Trustee") of Ameri-Dream Realty, LLC (the "Debtor" or the "Company"), for summary judgment against defendant Elsie Peladas-Brown ("Brown" or the "Defendant") on all claims for relief set forth in that certain adversary complaint filed on May 21, 2015 (the "Complaint"); and the Motion being supported by the Plaintiff's Statement of Undisputed Facts, as amended, and the declarations in support thereof; and due and proper notice of the Motion having been given; and the Court having considered the Motion and pleadings in support thereof and the arguments of counsel at the hearing on the Motion; and after due deliberation thereon, the Court finds and concludes as follows:

#### **Findings of Fact**

- 1. On May 21, 2015, the Plaintiff commenced this adversary proceeding against the Defendant by filing her Complaint (Docket No. 1).
- 2. In 2014, the Defendant was a member, manager and property manager of the Company, a real estate sales and property management company based in Las Vegas, Nevada, prior to filing for relief under Chapter 7 of the United States Bankruptcy Code. The Company was family owned and operated prior to its collapse. The Defendant was a member and manager of the Company for all time periods that are the subject of this lawsuit.
- 3. The Company is domiciled in the State of Nevada and conducted significant business activities in the District of Nevada. The Defendant is a former resident of the State of Nevada, but fled to Philippines.
- 4. The Plaintiff is the Court-appointed Trustee over the Company in Case No. 15-10110-LED, United States Bankruptcy Court, for the District of Nevada (the "Action").

25

26

1	İ
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	i
9	
0	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
0	

5.	As part of its business, the Company managed residential rental properties (the
"Business").	In the normal course of its Business, the Company received and held rental
security depos	sits on behalf of its customers' tenants. At the time of the Defendant's wrongful
actions set for	rth herein, the Company held in excess of \$1,200,000 of tenant security deposit
money (the "S	Security Deposits").

- 6. In late March of 2014, the Company discovered that significant funds were missing from the bank account designated to hold tenant security deposits. At the time of the theft, the Company held security deposits for more than 1,000 tenants.
- 7. The Defendant orchestrated various unauthorized transactions, unbeknownst to the Company or her co-manager and ex-husband, John M. Brown ("Mr. Brown"), which transactions included the wire transfers of the majority of the Security Deposits to the Philippines.
- 8. Specifically, on the following dates, Brown transferred money from the Company's general account at JP Morgan Chase Bank and/or security deposit account at JP Morgan Chase Bank to Unibank, Inc. Metro Philippines (the "Philippines Bank"):
- a. On February 27, 2013, Brown transferred \$25,000 from the general account to the Philippines Bank;
- b. On May 14, 2013, Brown transferred \$50,000 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
- On April 10, 2013, Brown transferred \$49,263 from the security deposit c. account to the Philippines Bank;
- d. On April 17, 2013, Brown transferred \$24,600 from the security deposit account to the Philippines Bank;

## CORRECTED DESCRIPTION DESCRIPTION DESCRIPTION DESCRIPTION DESCRIPTION DE LA COMPANSION DE L

1	e. On May 17, 2013, Brown transferred \$97,930 from the security deposit
2	account to the Philippines Bank;
3	f. On May 24, 2013, Brown transferred \$49,000 from the security deposit
4	account to the Philippines Bank;
5	g. On June 25, 2013, Brown transferred \$71,500 from the security deposit
6	account to the Philippines Bank;
8	h. On July 18, 2013, Brown transferred \$35,000 from the security deposit
9	account to the Philippines Bank;
10	i. On September 10, 2013, Brown transferred \$7,670 from the security
11	deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
12	j. On September 23, 2013, Brown transferred \$18,700 from the security
13	deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
14 15	k. On September 27, 2013, Brown transferred \$23,255 from the security
16	deposit account to the Philippines Bank;
17	1. On October 9, 2013, Brown transferred \$10,020 from the security deposit
18	account to the Philippines Bank;
19	m. On October 22, 2013, Brown transferred \$13,960 from the security deposit
20	account to the Philippines Bank;
21	n. On October 24, 2013, Brown transferred \$11,700 from the security deposit
23	account to the Philippines Bank; and
24	o. On December 20, 2013, Brown transferred \$8,000 from the security
25	deposit account to the Philippines Bank.
26	
27	

- 9. Including, but not limited to, the specific transactions listed above, the Defendant embezzled a total of \$1,174,373.63 in Security Deposits from the Company.
- 10. On September 16, 2015, the Nevada Real Estate Commission held a hearing regarding the Defendant's actions contained herein. At the Real Estate Commission hearing, Brown's attorney, Mr. Lance Maningo, indicated Brown's acquiescence to the factual allegations listed above, and admitted the funds were used to support Brown's family and friends in the Philippines after catastrophic events.
- 11. The Security Deposits were disbursed in the Philippines and are not recoverable. The Defendant disbursed the Security Deposits to friends and family in need after the damage caused by Typhoon Haiyan in November of 2013. Typhoon Haiyan was reported to be one of the strongest storms ever recorded, with winds reaching or exceeding 195 miles per hour.
- 12. Neither the Company nor Mr. Brown had any knowledge of the Defendant's scheme, and on May 4, 2015, Mr. Brown was divorced from the Defendant.
- 13. The divorce decree, which was uncontested, requires the Defendant to indemnify Mr. Brown and the Company from any claims of embezzlement or theft relating to the loss of the Security Deposits.
  - 14. Mr. Brown has not been charged with a crime in this matter.
- 15. At all times relevant to the Complaint, the Defendant was a member, manager and the property manager for the Company. The Defendant was also a licensed real estate agent and property manager in the State of Nevada, and a member of the Greater Association of Las Vegas Realtors.
- 16. As a licensed realtor and property manager in the State of Nevada, the Defendant is charged with the knowledge and responsibility of safeguarding the Security Deposits. It is

undeniable in light of the Defendant's licenses that she knew sending the Security Deposits to the Philippines would be a violation of the law, and would cause her to lose her real estate licenses, which licenses are now inactive. The Defendant also knew she had a duty to manage the Security Deposits prudently and in a fashion that minimized risk.

17. The Defendant had the knowledge and the motive to breach her fiduciary duties to the Company, its customers and its tenants, and in fact did breach such duties by secretly transferring the Security Deposits to the Philippines. The transfers of the Security Deposits were made for no consideration at all, and the Defendant understood the Security Deposits could not possibly be repaid.

#### **Conclusions of Law**

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction over this adversary proceeding and the Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334 and venue is proper in the District of Nevada pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1409(a).
- 2. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over all claims in this case because they are asserted in connection with the Trustee's duties to recover assets on behalf of the estate, and because the allegations in this lawsuit share a common nexus of facts with those in the Action.
- 3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendant because: (i) the Defendant engaged in significant business in the District of Nevada; (ii) the Defendant's wrongful conduct occurred in significant part in the District of Nevada; and (iii) the Company is a debtor before this Court, and holds the claims asserted in the Complaint.
- 4. As a manager of the Company, the Defendant owed fiduciary duties to the Company.
  - 5. Through improper action or wrongful conduct and without privilege, the

Defendant breached her fiduciary duties to the Company.

- 6. The Defendant had knowledge she was breaching her fiduciary duties, and acted purposely and with malice and intent to injure the Company.
- 7. The tortious conduct of the Defendant proximately caused the damage to the Company, because the Security Deposits were transferred for no consideration, and the Defendant knew it.
- 8. The Defendant had a duty to the Company to use ordinary care when representing the reasons for transferring the Security Deposits.
- 9. The Defendant breached her duty of care to the Company by falsely representing the transfer of the Security Deposits was an appropriate transaction for the Company to undertake.
- 10. Under Nevada law, the Defendant is required to safeguard the Security Deposits on behalf of the tenants.
- 11. As a result of the Defendant's false representations of the appropriateness of the wire transfers of the Security Deposits, the Company transferred the Security Deposits for no consideration.
- 12. The Company suffered damages as a result of the transfer of the Security Deposits, and those damages were caused by the Defendant's misrepresentations.
- 13. The tenants managed by the Company relied on the representations of the Defendant that the Security Deposits were safe. As a result of those false representations of the safety of the Security Deposits, nearly 1,000 tenants transferred their money to the Company, even though the Defendant knew or should have known that those payments would never be repaid, given the Defendant's plan to abscond with the money.

## $\textbf{Consideration} \ \, \textbf{Total} \ \, \textbf{Consideration} \ \, \textbf{Total} \ \, \textbf{Consideration} \ \, \textbf{Total} \ \, \textbf{Consideration} \ \,$

	14. T	The Company suffered damages as a result of the transfer of the Security Deposits
1		
2		ges were proximately caused by the Defendant's misrepresentations regarding the
3	safety of the Sec	urity Deposits.
4	15. T	The Company was unaware at all times relevant to the Complain that the
5	Defendant consp	pired to abscond with the Security Deposits to the Philippines.
6	    16. M	Ir. Brown was unaware at all times relevant to the Complaint that the Defendant
7		
8	conspired to abso	cond with the Security Deposits to the Philippines.
9	17. T	The Company and Mr. Brown are innocent of all claims asserted in the Complaint
10	against the Defer	ndant.
11		
12	Submitted by:	
13		A A MODELLIN C. PLACE
14	SCHWARTZ FI 	LANSBURG PLLC
15	By: /s/Samuel A	<u>. Schwartz</u> vartz, Esq., NBN 10985
16	Bryan A. Lindse	y, Esq., NBN 10662
17	6623 Las Vegas   Las Vegas, NV 8	Blvd. South, Suite 300 89119
18	Attorneys for the	e Chapter 7 Trustee, Victoria L. Nelson
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	]]	

## SUBMISSION TO COUNSEL FOR APPROVAL PURSUANT TO LR 9021 1 In accordance with LR 9021, counsel submitting this document certifies that the order 2 3 accurately reflects the court's ruling and that (check one): 4 The court has waived the requirement set forth in LR 9021(b)(1). 5 X No party appeared at the hearing or filed an objection to the motion. 6 I have delivered a copy of this proposed order to all counsel who appeared at the 7 hearing, and any unrepresented parties who appeared at the hearing, and each has 8 approved or disapproved the order, or failed to respond, as indicated below [list each 9 party and whether the party has approved, disapproved, or failed to respond to the 10 11 document]: 12 I certify that this is a case under Chapter 7 or 13, that I have served a copy of this 13 order with the motion pursuant to LR 9014(g), and that no party has objected to the 14 form or content of this order. 15 APPROVED: 16 DISAPPROVED: 17 18 FAILED TO RESPOND: 19 SCHWARTZ FLANSBURG PLLC 20 By: /s/Samuel A. Schwartz Samuel A. Schwartz, Esq., NBN 10985 21 Bryan A. Lindsey, Esq., NBN 10662 22 6623 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 300 Las Vegas, NV 89119 23 Attorneys for the Chapter 7 Trustee, Victoria L. Nelson 24

25

26