

1 SEVERIN A. CARLSON
Nevada Bar No. 9373
2 TARA C. ZIMMERMAN
Nevada Bar No. 12146
3 KAEMPFER CROWELL
510 West Fourth Street
4 Carson City, Nevada 89703
Telephone: (775) 882-1311
5 Fax: (775) 882-0257
scarlson@kcnvlaw.com
6 tzimmerman@kcnvlaw.com

7 Attorneys for Defendant
REZA ZANDIAN

8

9 IN THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

10 IN AND FOR CARSON CITY

11 JED MARGOLIN, an individual,

12 Plaintiff,

vs.

13

14 OPTIMA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
a California corporation; OPTIMA
TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, a Nevada
15 corporation; REZA ZANDIAN aka
GOLAMREZA ZANDIANJAZI aka
16 GHOLAM REZA ZANDIAN aka REZA JAZI
aka J. REZA JAZI aka G. REZA JAZI aka
17 GHONONREZA ZANDIAN JAZI, an
individual; DOE COMPANIES 1-10; DOE
18 CORPORATIONS 11-20; and DOE
INDIVIDUALS 21-30,

19

Defendants.

20

21

22 **DEFENDANT REZA ZANDIAN'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF**
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

23

24

Defendant REZA ZANDIAN ("Defendant" or "Zandian"), by and through his counsel
Kaempfer Crowell, hereby submits his Reply ("Reply") in Support of Motion for Protective

REC'D & FILED

2015 JUL 20 PM 2:14

SUSAN MERRIWETHER
CLERK

BY COOPER
DEPUTY

1 Order ("Motion"). This Reply is supported by the papers and pleadings on file herein, the
2 accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and any oral argument that may be
3 entertained by this Court.

4 DATED this 20th day of July, 2015.

5 KAEMPFER CROWELL

6 BY:  #4027 for

7 SEVERIN A. CARLSON

Nevada Bar No. 9373

8 TARA C. ZIMERMAN

Nevada State Bar No. 12146

9 510 West Fourth Street

Carson City, Nevada 89703

10 **Attorneys for Defendant REZA ZANDIAN**

11 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

12 **I. LEGAL ARGUMENT**

13 **A. Mr. Zandian Cannot Be Made to Appear Before this Court for the**
14 **Requested Judgment Debtor Examination.¹**

15 The plain language of NRS 21.270 precludes Plaintiff from requiring Zandian to travel to
16 Carson City, Nevada for the purpose of conducting the judgment debtor examination. Pursuant to
17 NRS 21.270, "no judgment debtor may be required to appear [for a judgment debtor
18 examination] outside the county in which he resides." NRS 21.271 (1)(b). Zandian is a resident
19 of France, and not of Carson City. Attached hereto is a utility bill for Mr. Zandian's residence in
20

21 ¹ Zandian is permitted to respond to arguments presented by Plaintiff regarding the debtor examination of
22 Zandian and the requested discovery from Zandian in this Reply. Zandian's Motion applied to both the debtor
23 examination and discovery requests propounded on Zandian, as well as the third-party subpoenas. *See* Defendant
24 Reza Zandian's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment Debtor Examination and to Produce Documents and
Motion for Protective Order at 8:22-9:2 (requesting as follows: "to the extent that this Court orders that any debtor's
examination is permitted at all, a protective order should be issued limiting the first phase of post-judgment
discovery to the judgment debtor only. And such discovery should be limited to information and documents that are
relevant to judgment debtor's current assets, meaning at most, such information and documents should be limited to
the past three years."). Accordingly, it is proper for Zandian to address these arguments in this Reply, and Plaintiff's
request to respond to the arguments presented herein must be denied.

1 France. See **Exhibit 1**. The due date for this bill is June 25, 2015 and reflects Zandian's address
2 at 6 Rue Edouard Fournier 75116 Paris. *Id.* Attached as well are Mr. Zandian's most recent
3 Paris residency and French ownership taxes for 2014, which similarly reflect Zandian's French
4 address of 6 Rue Edouard Fournier 75116 Paris. See **Exhibit 2**. Finally, attached hereto are
5 copies of Zandian's passport listing his Country of Residency as France, as well as a copy of
6 Zandian's French residency permit with the date of entry to France of March 15, 2012 and an
7 expiration date of August 5, 2015. See **Exhibit 3**.

8 The documents relied upon by Plaintiff in his Opposition to Motion for Protective Order
9 ("Opposition") do not, as Plaintiff asserts, "indicate[] that Zandian resides and does business
10 throughout Nevada, including Carson City, Nevada." Opposition at 5:21-23. The deeds Plaintiff
11 cites to and attaches as Exhibits 7-9, 13-15, 19, 21-22 and 25 were all signed in the spring of
12 2014, approximately 15 months ago. That Mr. Zandian traveled to Carson City to execute the
13 deeds in 2014 does not evidence his residency as of today. The 2014 Schedule K-1 is similarly
14 inapposite. We are now seven and a half months removed from the last day covered by the 2014
15 K-1. What's more, this K-1 was filed by Zandian's partners - not Zandian himself - and his
16 partners did not have his updated information in France at the time they filed this schedule.

17 Moreover, despite Plaintiff's assertion to the contrary, Nevada case law does not mandate
18 that Zandian appear at a debtor examination before this Court in Carson City even if he were a
19 resident of Nevada. Plaintiff has cited absolutely no Nevada case law supporting this assertion,
20 relying instead on a non-binding Federal District of Nevada case. See *Rausch v. World Series of*
21 *Golf, Inc.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59911, 2012 WL 1517294 (D.Nev. Apr. 23, 2012). This case,
22 however, does not stand for the proposition that Plaintiff relies upon it for. The issue in this case
23 was not whether a non-resident of Nevada can be hailed into Court for a debtor examination in
24 contradiction of the plain language of NRS 21.270(1). Nowhere in *Rausch* was the issue of

1 residency and NRS 21.270(1) discussed or contemplated. Rather, the issue before that court was
2 simply the application of NRS 21.270(3), which states:

3 [a] judgment debtor who is regularly served with an order issued
4 pursuant to [NRS 21.270], and who fails to appear at the time and
5 place specified in the order, may be punished for contempt by the
6 judge issuing the order.

7 Unlike in *Rausch*, this Court has not yet issued an order requiring Zandian to appear for a
8 judgment debtor examination – this is in fact the very issue remaining to be resolved by this
9 motion practice. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s reliance on the *Rausch* case is misplaced. Nevada law is
10 clear: “no judgment debtor may be required to appear [for a judgment debtor examination]
11 outside the county in which he resides.” NRS 21.270(1). Plaintiff has cited no authority to the
12 contrary, and has provided no evidentiary proof that Zandian is a resident of Carson City. For
13 these reasons, Zandian must not be required to appear for the debtor examination and Plaintiff’s
14 motion to require such must be denied. For the same reasons, Zandian’s Motion must be granted.

15 **B. The Documents Sought From Zandian Are Not Reasonably Calculated to**
16 **Lead to the Discovery of Relevant Evidence.**

17 The requests upon Zandian amount to an over-sweeping, overly broad and burdensome
18 review of all of Zandian’s financial records. Zandian appreciates Plaintiff’s concession that
19 request k. is limitless in duration, but disagrees with Plaintiff’s characterization of a. and j. as
20 being limited. Neither of these requests contains a time frame or limit on the information being
21 sought, and are each objectionable for that reason.

22 The remaining requests, while they do contain a time frame, are similarly overbroad and
23 oppressive. Plaintiff has not shown why he needs records dating back more than eight years.
24 That Zandian executed an agreement with his family on August 21, 2003, and that he allegedly
signed fraudulent assignment documents with the U.S. Patent and Trademark office in 2007,

1 have absolutely no bearing on his current assets. Moreover, all of the transfers of real estate
2 Plaintiff complains of occurred in 2014. These 2014 transfers do not make it reasonable for
3 Plaintiff to seek discovery of documents going back more than seven years prior to 2007.
4 Instead, it appears that Plaintiff is improperly trying to use discovery related to the requested
5 judgment debtor examination to harass Zandian by conducting a “carte blanche” invasion into
6 facts entirely unrelated to Zandian’s current assets available to satisfy the judgment. *Schlatter v.*
7 *Eighth Judicial District Court*, 93 Nev. 189, 561 P.2d 1342 (1977) (Nevada recognizes that the
8 discovery rules do not provide for a “carte blanche” invasion into a party’s private affairs); *In re*
9 *Surety Assoc. of Am.*, 388 F.2d 412, 414 (2nd Cir. 1967) (Parties are not permitted to “roam in
10 the shadow zones of relevancy” in an attempt to explore irrelevant matters on the theory that they
11 may conceivably become so.). Given the overbroad nature of the requests, Zandian requests that
12 the Court deny Plaintiff’s Motion to Produce Documents in its entirety. Alternatively, Zandian
13 requests that this Court modify the requests and permit discovery of only such records related to
14 the current assets of the judgment debtor, or those dating back no further than the last three
15 years.

16
17 **C. A Protective Order Prohibiting the Production Requested in the Subpoenas**
is Proper.

18 As an initial matter, Zandian did attempt in good faith to resolve this issue. Contrary to
19 the representation made in Plaintiff’s Opposition, in attempting to resolve the discovery dispute,
20 Zandian’s counsel, Ms. Zimmerman,² did not propose to resolve the dispute by offering to have

21
22 ² It is not inappropriate for Ms. Zimmerman to represent Zandian in this action on account of her serving as a
23 law clerk to Judge Russell. The Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct do not require Ms. Zimmerman to recuse
24 herself from representation as she neither participated in this action personally nor substantially while serving as a
law clerk to Judge Russell. *See* NEV. R. PROF. COND. 1.12(a) (“Except as stated in paragraph (d), a lawyer shall not
represent anyone in connection with a matter in which the lawyer participated personally and substantially as a judge
or other adjudicative officer, or law clerk to such a person or as an arbitrator, mediator or other third-party neutral,
unless all parties to the proceeding give informed consent confirmed in writing.”). Ms. Zimmerman has no personal
recollection of this case, and explained such to counsel for Plaintiff. Ms. Zimmerman further explained that she
clerked for Judge Russell from August 2010 through August 2011 and that, given the nature of the actions that

1 Zandian produce the records requested in the subpoena in lieu of the subpoenaed parties.
2 Likewise, Ms. Zimmerman never took any such resolution off any table. Rather,
3 Ms. Zimmerman simply stated that which is presented in Zandian's Motion: that this discovery
4 being sought from third-parties related to Zandian's assets is available from a less-intrusive
5 source – the judgment debtor himself. This is a basic principle of discovery and is codified in
6 Nevada's Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* NRCP 26(b)(1). Seeking these records from a third-party
7 without first requesting the same from the party himself makes the subpoenas objectionable.
8 Plaintiff must follow the required procedure for obtaining discovery and cannot simply ignore
9 NRCP 26. Given the nature of these documents, Plaintiff cannot bypass requesting these records
10 from a less-intrusive source and instead issue harassing, oppressive, burdensome and annoying
11 subpoenas to third-parties at his own misguided discretion.

12 Plaintiff makes the nonsensical argument that he should be permitted to seek these
13 records from third-parties because he "has not been provided the requested documents by
14 Zandian himself." Opposition at 10:14-15. However, Zandian has not been ordered to produce
15 any records related to his assets. The issue of any such production is still pending before this
16 Court pursuant to Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment Debtor Examination and to Produce
17 Documents. Thus, that Zandian has not produced these documents cannot serve as a valid basis
18 for permitting this improper third-party discovery.

19 Plaintiff asserts that he "is not aware of any rule that requires 'concrete evidence of a
20 concealed or fraudulently transferred asset' before the discovery can go forward". *See*
21 Opposition at 10:22-25. While the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure do not contain this language
22 verbatim, interpreting substantially similar rules, courts have held that the rules of civil

23 occurred during that time, even if she had been personally involved in the matter, that involvement was not
24 "substantial". As importantly, none of the actions taken in this case during Ms. Zimmerman's clerkship are currently
at issue before this Court. The only actions that occurred in this action during that time were the entry of default(s)
and the issuance of an order denying Zandian's Motion to Dismiss and setting aside a default against him. Default
was later reentered against Zandian, leading to the present proceedings.

1 procedure do not permit discovery intended as a “fishing expedition” on the basis of the
2 propounding party’s speculation of relevancy. *Zuk v. E. Penn. Psych. Inst.*, 103 F.3d 294, 299
3 (3rd Cir. 1996); *see also Oppenheimer Fund*, 437 U.S. at 351 (stating that “discovery, like all
4 matters of procedure, has ultimate and necessary boundaries”). Parties are not entitled to open-
5 ended and unlimited discovery based solely on the theory that there may be concealed assets and
6 cannot use this supposition to gain access to financial books and records of third-parties without
7 concrete evidence that specific assets are being concealed. *Id.* at 299. Furthermore, Plaintiff must
8 show undue hardship with respect to not being able to proceed without the requested
9 information. *Wardleigh v. Second Judicial Dist. Court*, 111 Nev. 345, 891 P.2d 1180 (1995). As
10 shown herein and in Zandian’s Motion, Plaintiff will not be able to show such a hardship given
11 the narrow issue – judgment debtor’s present assets currently available to pay the judgment
12 against him. Accordingly, consistent with Zandian’s Motion, to the extent that this Court orders
13 that any debtor examination is permitted at all, a protective order should be issued limiting the
14 first phase of post-judgment discovery to the judgment debtor only. And such discovery should
15 be limited to information and documents that are relevant to judgment debtor’s current assets,
16 meaning at most, such information and documents should be limited to the past three years.
17 Then, only if concrete evidence of a concealed or fraudulently transferred asset is developed,
18 should this Court even consider expanding discovery to any third-party who allegedly has the
19 asset.

20 **II. CONCLUSION**

21 For the reasons stated herein, a protective order should be issued with respect to
22 Plaintiff’s Motion for Judgment Debtor Examination and to Produce Documents, as well as the
23 third-party subpoenas.


24 *///./*

1 /././.
2 /././.
3 /././.
4 /././.

5 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the
6 social security number of any person.

7 DATED this 20th day of July, 2015.

8 KAEMPFER CROWELL

9 BY:  #1027 per

SEVERIN A. CARLSON
Nevada Bar No. 9373
TARA C. ZIMMERMAN
State Bar No. 12146
510 West Fourth Street
Carson City, Nevada 89703
Attorneys for Defendant REZA ZANDIAN

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that on the 20th day of July, 2015, I caused the foregoing DEFENDANT REZA ZANDIAN'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER to be served this date by depositing a true copy of the same for mailing at Carson City, Nevada, first class postage fully prepaid and addressed to the following:

Matthew D. Francis, Esq.
Adam P. McMillen, Esq.
Watson Rounds
5371 Kietzke Lane
Reno, Nevada 89511
775.324.4100
775.333.8171 - facsimile
Attorneys for Plaintiff


an employee of Kaempfer Crowell

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

N° client : 6 003 992 790
Identifiant internet : SMTNETRBR4



295954 54459 8622
1 / 3 566



Par Internet et Mobile
espaceclient.edf.com

sur Smartphone et Tablette

Télécharger l'appli mobile EDF&MOI

Par téléphone

Du lundi au samedi dès 8h et jusqu'à 21h

09 69 32 15 15

(Service gratuit + prix appel)

Par courrier

EDF SERVICE CLIENTS TSA 20012
41975 BLOIS CEDEX 9

Vos boutiques

Retrouver la boutique la plus proche de
chez vous sur boutiques.edf.com

Service dépannage Electricité (ERDF)
09 726 750 75 (Service gratuit + prix appel)

Lieu de consommation

.....
6 RUE EDOUARD FOURNIER
75116 PARIS

Titulaire du contrat

M. ZANDIAN JAZI GHOLAM REZA

Type de contrat

N° client : 6 003 992 790

N° compte : 4 02 4 004 833 996

(à transmettre pour le règlement de
factures)

Electricité "Tarif Bleu"

Service livraison (PDL) :

N° : 610 633 121

Capacité : 06 kVA

Adresse

Informations

Actualisation réglementaire

Selon la réglementation en vigueur,
les tarifs de la CSPE et des TCFE ont
été actualisés au 01/01/2015. Sur décision des
autorités de régulation, le Tarif Réglementé de Vente
pour les particuliers, le Tarif Réglementé de Vente
pour les professionnels et le montant de la
taxe sur le chiffre d'affaires ont été modifiés au
01/11/2014 et le montant de la
taxe sur le chiffre d'affaires ont été modifiés au
01/08/2014. Vos Conditions
de Vente ont été modifiées au
01/08/2014. Plus d'information sur le site edf.fr

M. ZANDIAN JAZI GHOLAM REZA
6 RUE EDOUARD FOURNIER
75116 PARIS

Facture du 25/06/2015
N° 32 195 821 941

Electricité (relevé client)	176,54 €
TVA	29,10 €

Facture TTC

205,64 €

Montant total
205,64 €
TTC

Prélevé le
10/07/2015

Les prochaines étapes

- Prochaine facture vers le 07/12/2015.
- Prochaine relève ERDF vers le 07/12/2015.



Prélèvement automatique

EXHIBIT 2

EXHIBIT 2



DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE DES FINANCES PUBLIQUES

AVIS D'IMPÔT 2014

TAXES FONCIÈRES

votees et perçues par la commune, le département et divers organismes

6616006473 0004

CENTRE DES FINANCES PUBLIQUES
SIP PARIS 16EME MUETTE
12 RUE GEORGE SAND
75796 PARIS CEDEX 16

eco pli 77 LOGNES PIC 17.09.14 C10202



6616006473 0004

M ZANDIAN JAZI GHOLAMZEZA
GHOLAM REZA
6 RUE EDOUARD FOURNIER
75016 PARIS

Vos références

Numéro fiscal : 19 75 393 067 438
Référence de l'avis : 14 75 6034371 31

Numéro de propriétaire : 116 Z00554W

Débiteur(s) légal(aux) :
M ZANDIAN JAZI GHOLAMZEZA
GHOLAM REZA

PROPRIETAIRE 4121 MCZDG8

Numéro de rôle : 221
Date d'établissement : 08/08/2014
Date de mise en recouvrement : 31/08/2014

Votre situation

MONTANT À PAYER

Au plus tard le 15/10/2014

2 913,00 €

*payé
chèque 272
12/10/14 Nilod
2913 €*

Attention modification de la loi :
il est interdit de payer en espèces
ce montant supérieur à 300 €.

Attention : l'enveloppe retour est réservée au paiement par TIP ou par chèque bancaire. Ne joignez aucun autre document (sauf votre RIB si nécessaire).

Partie à détacher en suivant les pointillés

Pour payer par smartphones, scannez ce code avec l'application Impôts gouv



voir explications
la rubrique
Comment
payer vos taxes

EPCI

Les reconstructions ou additions créées de la part départementale durant la durée de 2 ans, à compter du moment des travaux, quelle que soit la nature des travaux déclarés au sein des 50 jours suivant leur réalisation, cette exonération s'applique aux immeubles, sauf collectivités. Selon leur décision, et l'ensemble des logements ou par des prêts conventionnés ou par tout des prêts accordés par l'Etat.

Les logements qui, en vue de leur location, sont acquis avec le concours financier de l'Etat ou avec une subvention de l'Agence nationale pour la rénovation urbaine (ANRU) ou sont aménagés au moyen d'une aide de l'ANAH en vue de leur location ou attribution à titre temporaire aux personnes défavorisées peuvent dans certaines conditions être exonérés pour 15 ou 25 ans.

Les constructions neuves affectées à l'habitation principale et financées pour plus de la moitié de leur coût (20 % en cas de démembrement de propriété) par un prêt aide de l'Etat sont exonérées pendant 15 ans. Dans certains cas, la durée d'exonération peut être ramenée à 10 ans.

La durée d'exonération est portée à 20 ans et à 30 ans (à certaines conditions sont réunies), pour les constructions nouvelles achevées à compter de 2002, affectées au logement social et qui satisfont à au moins 4 des 5 critères de qualité environnementale.

La durée d'exonération est portée à 25 ans ou à 30 ans pour les constructions de logements sociaux à usage locatif ou

pendant les 10 (pour les peupliers), 30 (pour les résineux) ou 50 (pour les feuillus) années qui suivent le semis, la plantation ou la replantation, ou la constatation de la régénération.
- Les futaies irrégulières constatées en équilibre de régénération sont exonérées à concurrence de 25 % pendant 15 ans.

Dégrèvements jeunes agriculteurs

Les jeunes agriculteurs bénéficient, pendant les 5 années qui suivent celle de leur installation, d'un dégrèvement égal à 50 % de la taxe foncière sur les propriétés non bâties des parcelles qu'ils exploitent. Les communes et/ou leurs groupements peuvent, pour une durée de 1 à 5 ans et pour la part leur revenant, porter ce dégrèvement à 100 %.

Références du CGI

- 1. art. 1607 bis à 1609 G
- 2. art. 1417 A, art. 1465 A, art. 1383 E bis
- 4. art. 1384 E, 1566 B, 1593 bis E
- 5. art. 1383 B, C, et C bis • 6. art. 1383 D
- 7. art. 1383 D • 8. art. 1383 E

LAR_NB V2.4 10014
P017

DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE DES FINANCES PUBLIQUES



MISE EN DEMEURE DE PAIEMENT
Art L 257 0A et L 258 A
du Livre des procédures fiscales
Le 07/04/2015

Pour nous contacter

Votre centre des finances publiques

SIP PARIS 16EME MUETTE
12 RUE GEORGE SAND
75796 PARIS CEDEX 16
Tél : 01 44 30 48 84
Courriel :
sip.paris-16e-muette@dgif.finances.gouv.fr
Accueil guichet : avec ou sans rendez-vous
TLJ 9H-12H/13H30-16H SF JEUDI AM
BDF: BDFEFRPPCCT FR76 3000 1000 6464 7200 0000 085

CENTRE DES FINANCES PUBLIQUES
SIP PARIS 16EME MUETTE
12 RUE GEORGE SAND
75796 PARIS CEDEX 16



M ZANDIAN JAZI
GHOLAM REZA
6 RUE EDOUARD FOURNIER
PARIS
75016 PARIS 16

Vos références

Numéro de dossier : 827503315001218 075033
Action : 1M00001

Madame, Monsieur,

Selon mes informations, vous n'avez pas payé les sommes dont le détail figure dans le tableau ci-dessous.

Je vous invite à régulariser votre situation sans délai.

À défaut, j'engagerai à votre encontre, à l'issue d'un délai de huit jours suivant la notification de la présente mise en demeure de payer, des poursuites pouvant occasionner des frais élevés.

Le présent document TIENT LIEU DU COMMANDEMENT prévu par le code des procédures civiles d'exécution.

Désignation des impositions (1)	Date (2)	Montant dû	Versements effectués	Reste à payer
Taxe habitation 2014 Rôle 78001	31/10/2014	4 487,00 €	0,00 €	4 487,00 €
Majoration	15/12/2014	449,00 €	0,00 €	449,00 €
Total dû :				4 936,00 €

** Situation arrêtée au 07/04/2015*

Vous pouvez contester cette mise en demeure de payer auprès du directeur départemental des finances publiques dans les deux mois suivant sa notification.

Je vous prie de croire, Madame, Monsieur, à l'assurance de ma considération distinguée.

Le comptable public

EXHIBIT 3

EXHIBIT 3

RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE
AUTORISATION PROVISOIRE DE SÉJOUR

PREFECTURE DE POLICE
DOSSIER N° 10ST000000
ENTRÉE EN FRANCE 15/03/2012
NOM (M.) ZANDIAN JAZI
PRÉNOMS GHOLAN REZA
NÉ(E) LE 15/01/1952 A ISFAHAN
NATIONALITÉ IRANIENNE
ADRESSE 06 RUE EDOUARD FOURNIER
75116 PARIS

N° 9913081553



EST AUTORISÉ(E) A PROLONGER PROVISOIREMENT
SON SÉJOUR EN FRANCE JUSQU'AU 05/08/2015

CEtte autorisation n'est valable qu'accompagnée du document
NO H95628481 VALABLE DU 05/07/2013 AU 05/07/2018
JUSTIFIANT DE L'IDENTITÉ DE SON TITULAIRE.

SIGNATURE
DU TITULAIRE

SIGNATURE ET CACHET
DE L'AUTORITÉ

Pour le Préfet de Police et par délégation
Le Directeur de la Police Générale

Cyrille MAILLET - M 1

FAIT A PARIS (CITE)
LE 06/05/2015

VALABLE JUSQU'AU 05/08/2015
02455778

CEtte autorisation ne permet pas à son titulaire d'occuper un emploi

IMPRIMERIE NATIONALE - Version 0/14 08 11/03 - (143501)