


REC'D & FILED ✓

2013 DEC 20 PM 3:31

ALAN GLOVER

BY  CLERK  
DEPUTY

**MSAD**

GEOFFREY W. HAWKINS, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 7740

JOHNATHON FAYEGHI, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 12736

**HAWKINS MELENDREZ, P.C.**

9555 Hillwood Drive, Suite 150

Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

Phone: (702) 318-8800

Fax: (702) 318-8801

ghawkins@hawkinsmelendrez.com

*Attorneys for Defendant*

*Reza Zandian aka Goamreza Zandian*

*aka Gholamreza ZandianJazi*

*aka Reza Jazi aka J. Reza Jazi*

*aka G. Reza Jazi aka Ghononreza*

*Zandian Jazi*

**In The First Judicial District Court Of The State Of Nevada**

**In and For Carson City**

JED MARGOLIN, an individual.

Plaintiff,

vs.

OPTIMA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,  
a California corporation, OPTIMA  
TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, a Nevada  
corporation, REZA ZANDIAN aka  
GOLAMREZA ZANDIANJAZI aka  
GHOLAM REZA ZANDIAN aka REZA  
JAZI aka J. REZA JAZI aka G. REZA JAZI  
aka GHONONREZA ZANDIAN JAZI, an  
individual, DOE Companies 1-10, DOE  
Corporations 11-20, and DOE Individuals 21-  
30,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 090C00579 1B

DEPT. NO. 1

**DEFENDANT REZA ZANDIAN AKA  
GOLAMREZA ZANDIANJAZI AKA  
GHOLAM REZA ZANDIAN AKA REZA  
JAZI AKA J. REZA JAZI AKA G. REZA  
JAZI AKA GHONONREZA ZANDIAN  
JAZI'S MOTION TO SET ASIDE  
DEFAULT JUDGMENT**

Defendant REZA ZANDIAN ("Zandian") by and through his attorney Geoffrey W. Hawkins, Esq., of the law firm HAWKINS MELENDREZ P.C., and pursuant to NRCP 55 and 60,


HAWKINS MELENDREZ, P.C.  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Suite 150  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134  
Telephone (702) 318-8800 • Facsimile (702) 318-8801

1 hereby moves for an order from this Court to set aside the default judgment entered against Zandian  
2 in the above-captioned matter.

3 This motion is made and based upon the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities,  
4 the attached exhibits, the pleadings and papers on file herein, and any oral argument this Honorable  
5 Court may allow.

6 DATED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013.

7  
8 **HAWKINS MELENDREZ, P.C.**

9  
10 

11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 GEOFFREY W. HAWKINS, ESQ.  
13 Nevada Bar No. 7740  
14 JOHNATHON FAYEGHI, ESQ.  
15 Nevada Bar No. 12736  
16 9555 Hillwood Drive, Suite 150  
17 Las Vegas, NV 89134  
18 Phone: (702) 318-8800  
19 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
20 *Reza Zandian*

HAWKINS MELENDREZ, P.C.  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Suite 150  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134  
Telephone (702) 318-8800 • Facsimile (702) 318-8801

1 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

2 I.

3 STATEMENT OF FACTS

4 The instant matter arises out of Plaintiff JED MARGOLIN's ("Plaintiff") allegations of  
5 fraudulent conduct on the part of Zandian and other defendants with regard to United States Patent  
6 Nos. 5,566,073, 5,904,724, 5,978,488, and 6,377,436.

7 Plaintiff's Original Complaint was filed on or about December 11, 2009 against Zandian,  
8 Optima Technology Corporation, a California corporation (Optima CA), and Optima Technology  
9 Corporation, a Nevada corporation (Optima NV). Plaintiff's Complaint alleged the following  
10 causes of action: (1) Conversion; (2) Tortious Interference With Contract; (3) Intentional  
11 Interference With Prospective Economic Advantage; (4) Unjust Enrichment; and (5) Unfair and  
12 Deceptive Trade Practices. On or about December 2, 2010, Plaintiff filed an Application for Entry  
13 of Default against Zandian for failure to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint. On or about March 1,  
14 2011 default was entered against Zandian. Then on or about June 9, 2011, Zandian's prior counsel,  
15 John Peter Lee, Esq., filed a Motion to Dismiss on a Special Appearance on behalf of Zandian,  
16 Optima CA and Optima NV. On August 3, 2011, this Court set aside the default against Zandian,  
17 Optima CA and Optima NV; denied Mr. Lee's Motion to Dismiss, and granted Plaintiff and  
18 extension of time for service.

19 On or about August 11, 2011, Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint against Zandian,  
20 Optima CA, and Optima NV. At the time Plaintiff's Amended Complaint was filed, Zandian was  
21 still represented by John Peter Lee, Esq. On or about February 17, 2012, Zandian's prior counsel,  
22 John Peter Lee, Esq., filed a Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint on Special Appearance. On or  
23 about February 21, 2012, this Court issued an order denying the Motion to Dismiss Amended  
24 Complaint.

25 On or about March 5, 2012, Zandian filed a General Denial to the Amended Complaint.  
26 Shortly thereafter, Mr. Lee's office filed a Motion to Withdraw on or about March 7, 2012. In his  
27 Motion to Withdraw, Mr. Lee provided the Court with an incorrect last known address for Zandian.  
28 The address provided was 8775 Costa Verde Blvd., San Diego, CA 92122. As Plaintiff is well

1 aware, Zandian has not lived in the US for over three years. Zandian has resided at 6 Rue Edouard  
2 Fournier, 75116 Paris, France since August 2011. In fact, Plaintiff's counsel's firm had knowledge  
3 of Zandian's French address as early as March 2013 due to its representation of Fred Sadri in the  
4 Nevada Supreme Court Case No. 62839/Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A635430. (*See*  
5 Notice of Appeal in Case No. A635430, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**).

6 On or about July 16, 2012, Plaintiff allegedly served Zandian with written discovery.  
7 However, Zandian never received any written discovery due to the fact that said written discovery  
8 was mailed to the address mistakenly provided in John Peter Lee Esq.'s Motion to Withdraw. Due  
9 to the fact that Zandian never received Plaintiff's written discovery, responses to the same were  
10 never provided. On or about, December 14, 2012, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Sanctions Pursuant to  
11 NRCPC 37. In Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions, Plaintiff requested the Court to strike Zandian's  
12 General Denial and award Plaintiff his fees and costs incurred in bringing the motion. Again,  
13 Zandian never received said Motion for Sanctions and as a result no opposition was filed. On or  
14 about, January 15, 2013, this Court issued an order striking the General Denial of Zandian and  
15 awarded Plaintiff his fees and costs incurred in bringing the Motion for Sanctions.

16 On or about March 28, 2013 the Clerk of this Court entered default against Zandian. On or  
17 about April 5, 2013, Plaintiff filed an Amended Notice of Entry of Default against Zandian. A copy  
18 of said Amended Notice of Entry of Default was again mailed to the incorrect address provided in  
19 Zandian's prior counsel's Motion to Withdraw. Plaintiff failed to mail a copy of the Amended  
20 Notice of Entry of Default to Zandian's French address, despite having knowledge of said address  
21 back in March of 2013. *See Exhibit A*.

22 On or about April 17, 2013, Plaintiff filed an Application for Entry of Default Judgment  
23 against Zandian. A copy of Plaintiff's Application was again mailed to the incorrect address  
24 provided in John Peter Lee's Motion to Withdraw, despite Plaintiff's knowledge of Zandian's  
25 correct address in France. *See Exhibit A*. Furthermore, Plaintiff filed his Application for Entry of  
26 Default Judgment without providing any notice to Zandian of the impending filing despite  
27 Plaintiff's previous and extensive dealings with Zandian. On June 24, 2013 this Court entered a  
28 Default Judgment against Zandian. On June 27, 2013, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Entry of Default

HAWKINS MELENDEZ, P.C.  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Suite 150  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134  
Telephone (702) 318-8800 • Facsimile (702) 318-8801

1 Judgment against Zandian. Both the June 24, 2013 Default Judgment and the June 27, 2013 Notice  
2 of Entry of Default Judgment were mailed to the incorrect mailing address by Plaintiff, despite  
3 Plaintiff's knowledge of Zandian's correct address in France.

4 Plaintiff's failure to provide notice to Zandian of the Application for Default Judgment  
5 violates the Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant clearly has good cause for the instant Default  
6 Judgment to be set aside based upon NRCPC 55(b)(2) and NRCPC 55(c)'s incorporation of NRCPC  
7 60(b)(1)'s allowance for inadvertence, surprise and excusable neglect as evidence of good cause.  
8 *Intermountain Lumber and Builders Supply, Inc. v. Glen Falls Insurance Co.*, 83 Nev. 126,129, 424  
9 P.2d 884, 886 (1967). As such, Defendant should be allowed the opportunity to Set Aside the  
10 Default Judgment and be provided the opportunity to file a responsive pleading of its choice in this  
11 matter.

12 **II.**  
13 **STATEMENT OF LAW**

14 NRCPC 55(c) provides that, in the court's discretion, a default judgment may be set aside in  
15 accordance with NRCPC 60. NRCPC 60 provides the moving party relief, in part, through rules 60(b)  
16 and 60(c). NRCPC 60(b) states in pertinent part:

17 On motion and upon such terms as are just, the court may relieve a  
18 party or a party's legal representative from a final judgment, order,  
19 or proceeding for the following reasons:

- 20 (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;
- 21 (3) fraud (whether heretofore denominated intrinsic or
- 22 extrinsic), misrepresentation or other misconduct of an
- 23 adverse party;

24 The motion shall be made within a reasonable time, and for  
25 reasons (1), (2), and (3) not more than 6 months after the  
26 proceeding was taken or the date that written notice of entry of the  
27 judgment or order was served.

28 If mistake, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect, fraud, misrepresentation, misconduct of an  
adverse party, or discharged judgment is shown, an order or judgment should be withdrawn and the

1 issues should be addressed on their proper merits. Furthermore, it is a firmly established policy of  
2 the Nevada Supreme Court that “justice is best served when controversies are resolved on their  
3 merits whenever possible.” *Gutenberger v. Continental Thrift and Loan Company*, 94 Nev. 173,  
4 175, 576 P.2d 745 (1978).

5 “The salutary purpose of Rule 60(b) is to redress any injustices that may have resulted  
6 because of excusable neglect or the wrongs of an opposing party. Rule 60 should, therefore, be  
7 liberally construed to effectuate that purpose.” *Carlson v. Carlson*, 108 Nev. 358, 361-362, 832  
8 P.2d 380, 382 (1992), quoting *Nevada Indus. Devel., Inc. v. Benedetti*, 103 Nev. 360, 364, 741 P.2d  
9 802, 805 (1987).

10 If a defendant enters an appearance or if the plaintiff knows of the identity of defendant’s  
11 counsel, the plaintiff has an obligation to notify the defendant of his intent to take a default.  
12 *Rowland v. Lepire*, 95 Nev. 639, 600 P.2d 237 (1979); *Gazin v. Hoy*, 102 Nev. at 438;  
13 Nev.Sup.CT.R. 1752. A failure to provide notice requires such default to be set aside. *Id.* “An  
14 appearance within the contemplation of NRCP 55(b)(2) does not necessarily require some  
15 presentation or submission to the court... [t]hat rule is designed to insure (sic) fairness to a party or  
16 his representative who has indicated a clear purpose to defend the suit.” *Christy v. Carlise*, 99 Nev.  
17 612, 584 P.2d 687 (1978).

18 The Nevada Supreme Court construes the term “appearance” loosely to allow for situations  
19 where plaintiff’s counsel has awareness of the identity of defendant’s counsel or when plaintiff  
20 knows that the defendant intends to defend itself against plaintiff’s suit. *Christy v. Carlise*. 94 Nev.  
21 651, 584 P.2d 687 (1978); *Franklin v. Bartsas Realty*. 95 Nev. 559, 598 P.2d 1147 (1979); *Gazin v.*  
22 *Hoy*. 102 Nev. at 438. Such awareness compels the plaintiff, pursuant to the rules of professional  
23 responsibility, to make an inquiry of the defendant’s intentions to litigate the matter before he  
24 proceeds with the entry of a default. *Cen Val Leasing Corporation v. Bockman*. 99 Nev. 612, 668  
25 P.2d 1074 (1983). Failure to make such inquiry mandates that the default be set aside. *Id.*

26 ///  
27 ///  
28 ///

## III.

LEGAL ARGUMENT**A. Plaintiff Failed To Provide Zandian With Written Notice Of Application For Default Judgment.**

In *Christy v. Carlisle*, the Nevada Supreme Court held “written notice of application for default judgment must be given if the defendant or representative has appeared in the action. The failure to serve such notice voids the judgment.” *Christy v. Carlise*. 94 Nev. 651, 584 P.2d 687 (1978). In *Christy*, the defendant’s insurance carrier was notified by plaintiff’s counsel of the lawsuit and was advised that it had an indefinite extension of time to answer. *See Id.* Negotiations ensued between plaintiff and the insurance company, however a settlement was not reached. Plaintiff’s counsel then caused service of process to be made upon the director of the department of motor vehicles pursuant to NRS 14.070. *See Id.*

The summons and complaint were mailed to the defendant’s Las Vegas address, however the defendant had moved. As a result, neither the defendant nor her insurance company received actual notice that service of process had been made. *See Id.* Plaintiff obtained a default judgment against the defendant for failure to respond to the complaint. Upon learning of the default judgment (which was outside the 6-month time period) defendant’s counsel filed a motion to set aside default judgment pursuant to Rule 55(b)(2). *See Id.* Defendant’s counsel argued that for the purposes of that rule the defendant had appeared in the action and was entitled to written notice of application for judgment. The district court ruled that the settlement negotiations and exchange of correspondence between plaintiff’s counsel and the defendant’s insurance company should be deemed an appearance within the intendment of Rule 55(b)(2) requiring a 3-day notice of the application for default judgment. *See Id.* Since no notice was provided, the district court set aside the default judgment and provided the defendant with additional time to file a responsive pleading. On appeal, the Supreme Court affirmed the district court’s decision. *See Id.*

In this case, Zandian seeks relief from the entry of Default Judgment against him based on Plaintiff’s failure to provide a three day notice of Plaintiff’s Application for Entry of Default Judgment. As stated above, prior to filing his April 17, 2013 Application for Entry of Default

1 Judgment, Plaintiff, through his counsel, had knowledge of Zandian's personal residence in France.  
2 See **Exhibit A**. However, Plaintiff failed to provide Zandian with the required three-day notice,  
3 despite knowing that Zandian intended to defend himself against Plaintiff's suit, as evidenced by  
4 Zandian's February 17, 2012 Motion to Dismiss and March 5, 2012 General Denial. Furthermore,  
5 Plaintiff failed to mail a copy of the April 5, 2013 Amended Notice of Entry of Default and the  
6 April 17, 2013 Application for Entry of Default Judgment to Zandian's French address despite  
7 knowledge of said address. Due to Plaintiff's failure to provide the required three day notice,  
8 failure to mail a copy of the April 5, 2013 Amended Notice of Entry of Default to Zandian's correct  
9 address in France, and subsequent failures to mail a copy of the April 17, 2013 Application for  
10 Entry of Default Judgment, the June 24, 2013 Default Judgment and the June 27, 2013 Notice of  
11 Entry of Default Judgment to Zandian's French address, Zandian was unaware of the impending  
12 default. Therefore, pursuant to NRCPP 55(b)(2) and the holding in *Christy*, Zandian is entitled to a  
13 set aside of Plaintiff's Default Judgment.

14 **B. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect is Present**

15 For a party to seek relief from judgment or order under NRCPP 60(b)(1), he must  
16 demonstrate that the judgment was a result of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect,  
17 and a meritorious defense must be tendered within a timely manner. *Gutenberger*, 94 Nev. at 175.  
18 In addition to the reasons set forth in Paragraph A, Zandian seeks relief from the Default Judgment  
19 based on excusable neglect.

20 In *Stoecklein v. Johnson Elec., Inc.*, the Nevada Supreme Court considered a similar set of  
21 facts as found in the instant matter. In *Stoecklein* the plaintiff filed a complaint against Stoecklein  
22 and five other defendants. An answer was filed by the defendants and subsequently a scheduling  
23 order for the trial was sent to counsel for the parties stating that the parties should be ready for trial  
24 on September 30, 1991. The scheduling order stated that the court would notify the attorneys for  
25 each party of the date of trial and any pretrial deadlines. See *Stoecklein v. Johnson Elec., Inc.*, 109  
26 Nev. 268, 849 P.2d 305 (1991). However, on August 19, 1991 Stoecklein's counsel withdrew due  
27 to nonpayment of legal fees. See *Id.* The order of withdrawal filed with the district court provided  
28 an incorrect address for future pleadings to be served on Stoecklein. See *Id.* As such, Stoecklein



1 never received notice from the court of the trial date. A bench trial was held, however Stoecklein  
2 failed to appear. Judgment was then entered against Stoecklein and the other defendants.

3 Following the bench trial, Plaintiff's counsel sent the notice of the judgment to Stoecklein's  
4 correct address. See *Id.* Upon receipt of the notice of judgment, Stoecklein immediately obtained  
5 counsel and filed a motion for relief from judgment under NRCPC 60(b)(1). See *Id.* The motion was  
6 based on Stoecklein's assertion that he had received no notice of the trial date. The district court  
7 denied Stoecklein's motion. See *Id.*

8 On appeal, the Nevada Supreme Court held that there was no evidence in the record that  
9 showed notice of the trial date was sent to or received by Stoecklein. Therefore, Stoecklein's  
10 failure to appear for trial was due to circumstances that constitute excusable neglect under NRCPC  
11 60(b)(1). See *Id.*

12 In the instant matter, Zandian's prior counsel, John Peter Lee Esq., withdrew as counsel on  
13 or about March 7, 2012, due to a break down in communications among other things. In his Motion  
14 to Withdraw, John Peter Lee Esq., provided an incorrect address for future pleadings and discovery  
15 to be served on Zandian. As such, Zandian never received any pleadings or discovery in this matter  
16 after April 26, 2012 (the date the Court granted John Peter Lee Esq.'s Motion to Withdraw).

17 Specifically, Zandian did not receive the following: (1) Plaintiff's written discovery which was  
18 allegedly served on July 16, 2012; (2) Plaintiff's December 14, 2012 Motion for Sanctions Pursuant  
19 to NRCPC 37; (3) the January 15, 2013 Order striking the General Denial of Zandian and awarding  
20 Plaintiff his fees and costs incurred in bringing the Motion for Sanctions; (4) the April 5, 2013,  
21 Amended Notice of Entry of Default against Zandian; (5) Plaintiff's April 17, 2013, Application for  
22 Entry of Default Judgment against Zandian; (6) the June 24, 2013 Default Judgment; and (7) the  
23 June 27, 2013 Notice of Entry of Default Judgment. Zandian only learned of the Default Judgment  
24 while visiting the US on business in late November of 2013. Upon learning of the Default  
25 Judgment, Zandian retained the law firm of Hawkins Melendrez P.C. to file the instant motion.

26 As was the case in *Stoecklein*, Zandian's failure to respond to Plaintiff's written discovery  
27 and failure to oppose Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions and Application for Entry of Default  
28 Judgment were due to circumstances that constitute excusable neglect under NRCPC 60(b)(1).

1 Furthermore, there are several factors the Court should use to determine whether the  
2 conditions of 60(b)(1) have been met: (1) prompt application to remove the judgment; (2) a lack of  
3 intent to delay the proceedings; (3) ignorance on the part of counsel or party as to procedure; and  
4 (4) good faith. *Ogle v. Miller*, 87 Nev. 573, 576, 491 P.2d 40, 42 (1971).

5 **1. Zandian Promptly Files This Motion**

6 Rule 60(b)(1) states that a motion under subsection (b)(1) must be brought “not more than  
7 six months after judgment, order, or proceeding was entered or taken.” NRCp 60(b)(1); *see also*  
8 *Deal v. Baines*, 110 Nev. 509, 512, 874 P.2d 775 (1994). This Court has found prompt application  
9 to remove the judgment is a persuasive factor. *See Hotel Last Frontier Corporation v. Frontier*  
10 *Properties, Inc.*, 79 Nev. 150, 154, 380 P.2d 283 (1963). In this case, the Default Judgment was  
11 entered on or about June 24, 2013 and the Notice of Entry of Default Judgment was filed on or  
12 about June 27, 2013. Zandian learned of the Default Judgment in late November of 2013 while  
13 visiting the US on business. Upon learning of the Default Judgment, Zandian retained Hawkins  
14 Melendrez, P.C. to represent him in this matter. Zandian’s current motion comes less than six  
15 months after the entry of the Default Judgment. Therefore, Zandian has promptly applied for the  
16 removal of the Default Judgment.

17 **2. There Is No Intent To Delay The Proceedings**

18 This Court has also found the absence of intent to delay proceedings a persuasive factor. *Id.*  
19 As previously stated, Zandian’s prior counsel, John Peter Lee, Esq., withdrew as counsel on or  
20 about March 7, 2012. Furthermore, the last known address provided by Mr. Lee in his Motion to  
21 Withdraw was inaccurate. From April 26, 2012 Zandian did not receive any of the pleadings or  
22 discovery filed in this case. In late November 2013, Zandian learned of the Default Judgment while  
23 visiting the US for business purposes. Upon learning of the Default Judgment, Zandian  
24 immediately retained the services of Hawkins Melendrez P.C. Now, having retained counsel,  
25 Zandian files this Motion in order to state his meritorious defenses and proceed to have the trier of  
26 fact make a determination.

27 ///

28 ///

1           **3.       Zandian Lacks Knowledge of Procedural Requirements**

2           Lack of knowledge of the party or counsel as to procedural requirements has been given  
3 weight by this Court. *See Hotel*, 79 Nev. at 154. In this case, Zandian was without counsel as of  
4 March 7, 2012. As such, Zandian was unaware of the procedural requirements. Now, having  
5 retained counsel, Zandian files this Motion.

6           **4.       Zandian Files This Motion In Good Faith.**

7           Of the multiple elements, this Court has found good faith to be the most significant. *Id.* In  
8 *Stocklein v. Johnson Electric*, 109 Nev. 268, 849 P.2d 305 (1993), the Nevada Supreme Court stated  
9 that “good faith is an intangible and abstract quality with no technical meaning or definition and  
10 encompasses, among other things, an honest belief, the absence of malice, and the absence of design  
11 to defraud.” (*quoting Doyle v. Gordan*, 158 N.Y.S.2d 248, 259060 (Sup. Ct. 1954). There is no  
12 question that Zandian is acting in good faith by seeking to have this Court set aside the Default  
13 Judgment. The last known address provided by Zandian’s prior counsel in his Motion to Withdraw  
14 was inaccurate. As such, from April 26, 2012 on Zandian did not receive any of the pleadings or  
15 discovery filed in this case. Zandian did not receive Plaintiff’s written discovery, Plaintiff’s Motion  
16 for Sanctions, or Plaintiff’s Application for Entry of Default Judgment. Zandian only learned of the  
17 Default Judgment in November of 2013. Immediately upon learning of the Default Judgment,  
18 Zandian retained the law firm of Hawkins Melendrez P.C. The instant Motion comes less than six  
19 months after the entry of the Default Judgment.

20           **C.       Although A Meritorious Defense Is No Longer Required, Zandian Has Clearly**  
21 **Demonstrated A Meritorious Defense**

22           Prior to 1990, this Court had consistently held that a party moving to set aside a default  
23 judgment must show a meritorious defense to the claim. *See Sealed Unit Parts v. Alpha Gamma*  
24 *Ch.*, 99 Nev. 641, 643, 668 P.2d 288, 289 (1983). However, in *Price v. Dunn*, 106 Nev. 100, 787  
25 P.2d 785 (1990), this Court ruled that the meritorious defense requirement must be set aside  
26 pursuant to the United States Supreme Court holding in *Peralta v. Heights Medical Center, Inc.*,  
27 485 U.S. 80, 108 S.Ct. 896, 99 L. Ed. 2d 75 (1988). Most recently, in *Epstein v. Epstein*, 113 Nev.

1 1401, 950 P.2d 771, the Nevada Supreme Court overruled the requirement that a party must show a  
2 meritorious defense because it is inconsistent with the holding in *Price* and *Peralta*.

3 Despite the fact that Zandian is not required to demonstrate a meritorious defense pursuant  
4 to *Price* and *Epstein*, Zandian has clearly demonstrated a meritorious defense through his June 9,  
5 2011 and February 17, 2012 Motions to Dismiss as well as his March 5, 2012 General Denial.

6 **IV.**

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 Based on the foregoing points and authorities, Defendant Reza Zandian respectfully requests  
9 that the default judgment be set aside to allow him to respond as intended.

10 **AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030**


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

13 **DECLARATION**

14 The undersigned also declares under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and  
15 accurate to the best of my knowledge.

16 Dated this 19<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013.

17  
18 **HAWKINS MELENDREZ, P.C.**

19  
20 

21 GEOFFREY W. HAWKINS, ESQ.  
22 Nevada Bar No. 7740  
23 JOHNATHON FAYEGHI, ESQ.  
24 Nevada Bar No. 12736  
25 9555 Hillwood Drive, Suite 150  
26 Las Vegas, NV 89134  
27 Phone: (702) 318-8800  
28 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
*Reza Zandian*


HAWKINS MELENDEZ, P.C.  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Suite 150  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134  
Telephone (702) 318-8800 • Facsimile (702) 318-8801

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 5(b), I hereby certify that, on the 19<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2013, service of **DEFENDANT REZA ZANDIAN AKA GOLAMREZA ZANDIANJAZI AKA GHOLAM REZA ZANDIAN AKA REZA JAZI AKA J. REZA JAZI AKA G. REZA JAZI AKA GHONONREZA ZANDIAN JAZI'S MOTION TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT JUDGMENT** was made this date by depositing a true copy of the same for mailing, first class mail, at Las Vegas, Nevada, addressed follows:

Matthew D. Francis  
Adam P. McMillen  
WATSON ROUNDS  
5371 Kietzke Lane  
Reno, Nevada 89511  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
*Jed Margolin*

  
An employee of Hawkins Melendrez, P.C.

HAWKINS MELENDRIZ, P.C.  
9555 Hillwood Drive, Suite 150  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134  
Telephone (702) 318-8800 • Facsimile (702) 318-8801

**INDEX OF EXHIBITS**

Exhibit No.	TITLE	NUMBER OF PAGES
A	Notice of Appeal in Nevada Supreme Court Case No. 62839/Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A635430	2

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# Exhibit A



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 NOAS  
2 REZA ZANDIAN  
3 6, rue Edouard Fournier  
4 75116 Paris, France  
5 Pro Per Appellant

6 DISTRICT COURT  
7 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

8 GHOLAMREZA ZANDIAN JAZI, also  
9 known as REZA ZANDIAN, individually,

CASE NO.: A-11-635430-C  
DEPT. NO.: IV

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 FIRST AMERICAN TITLE COMPANY, a  
13 Nevada business entity; JOHNSON SPRING  
14 WATER COMPANY, LLC, formerly known  
15 as BIG SPRING RANCH, LLC, a Nevada  
16 Limited Liability Company, FRED SADRI,  
17 Trustee of the Star Living Trust, RAY  
18 KOROGHLI, individually, and ELIAS  
19 ABRISHAMI, individually,

20 Defendants.

21 AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS  
22 AND THIRD-PARTY CLAIMS

23 1334.024072-td

24 **NOTICE OF APPEAL**

25 Notice is hereby given that REZA ZANDIAN a member of the above named company,  
26 hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of Nevada from the Order to Distribute Attorney Fee and Costs  
27 Awards to Defendants entered in this action on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2013.

28 DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2013.

29 BY:   
30 REZA ZANDIAN  
31 6, rue Edouard Fournier  
32 75116 Paris, France  
33 Pro Per Appellant



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the \_\_\_ day of March, 2013, I served a copy of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL, upon the appropriate parties hereto, by enclosing it in a sealed envelope, deposited in the United States mail, upon which first class postage was fully prepaid addressed to:

Stanley W. Parry  
100 North City Parkway, Ste. 1750  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

Elias Abrishami  
P.O. Box 10476  
Beverly Hills, California 90213

Ryan E. Johnson, Esq.  
Watson & Rounds  
777 North Rainbow Blvd. Ste. 350  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89107



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ryan E. Johnson', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is enclosed within a large, hand-drawn oval.