1	JASON D. WOODBURY	REC'D & FILED
2	Nevada Bar No. 6870 KAEMPFER CROWELL	2014 APR 21 PM 3: 48
	510 West Fourth Street	WER OVER
3	Carson City, Nevada 89703 Telephone: (775) 884-8300	ALACIAL
4	Facsimile: (775) 882-0257	BYCELEE
5	JWoodbury@kcnvlaw.com Attorneys for Reza Zandian	ν
6		IAL DISTRICT COURT JEVADA IN AND FOR
7		ON CITY
0		
8		
9	JED MARGOLIN, an individual,	
10	Plaintiff,	
		Case No. 09OC00579 1B
11	VS.	Dept. No. I
12	OPTIMA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,	-
13	a California corporation, OPTIMA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, a Nevada	
15	corporation, REZA ZANDIAN aka	
14	GOLAMREZA ZANDIANJAZI aka GHOLAM REZA ZANDIAN aka REZA	
15	JAZI aka J. REZA JAZI aka G. REZA JAZI	
	aka GHONOREZA ZANDIAN JAZI, an individual, DOE Companies 1-10, DOE	
16	Corporations 11-20, and DOE Individuals	
17	21-30,	
10	Defendants.	
18		
19		
20	OPPOSITION TO MOTION	FOR WRIT OF EXECUTION
	COMES NOW, Defendant REZA ZA	NDIAN ("ZANDIAN"), by and through his
21		
22	attorneys, Kaempfer Crowell, and hereby	opposes the Motion for Writ of Execution
23	("Motion") served by mail on April 2, 20	14. This Opposition is made pursuant to
24	FJDCR 15(3) and is based on the attached	memorandum of points and authorities, all
		Page 1 of 6

KAEMPFER CROWELL 510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703

Page 1 of 6

	1	
	1	papers and pleadings on file in this matter and any evidence received and arguments
	2	entertained by the Court at any hearing on the <i>Motion</i> .
	3	DATED this 21 st day of April, 2014.
	4	KAEMPFER CROWELL
	5	
	6	Jason D. Woodbury
	7	Nevada Bar No. 6870 510 West Fourth Street
	8	Carson City, Nevada 89703 Telephone: (775) 884-8300
	9	Facsimile: (775) 882-0257 JWoodbury@kcnvlaw.com
	10	Attorneys for Reza Zandian
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
KAEMPFER CROWELL 510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
KAEMP 510 We Carson Cit	24	
		Page 2 of 6
		1.3 0 i

1	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
2	I. Procedural Background
3	On June 24, 2013, this Court entered default judgment in the amount of
4	\$1,495,775.74 in this case. ¹ On April 2, 2014, Plaintiff served the instant <i>Motion</i> .
5	Attached to the <i>Motion</i> are two exhibits. The first, Exhibit 1, is a document entitled
6	<i>"First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees."</i> The second, Exhibit 2, is
7	actually a series of documents each entitled "Writ of Execution" some of which purport
8	to be issued to the Sheriff of Washoe County and some of which purport to be issued to
9	the Constable of Clark County.
10	On April 9, 2014, ZANDIAN filed a Motion to Retax and Settle Costs ("Motion to
11	<i>Retax</i> ") in response to the <i>First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees.</i> ² The
12	Motion to Retax is pending and has not been addressed at this time.
13	<u>II. Argument</u>
14	A. This Court should deny Plaintiff's <i>Motion</i> to issue the proposed
15	<i>Writs</i> because they include fees and costs which this Court has not granted.
16	The proposed Writs presented to this Court by Plaintiff include the following
17	amounts as "sums [which] have accrued since the entry of judgment." ³ Two of these
18	items, \$34,787.50 in attorney's fees and \$1,022.59 in "accrued costs" reflect the costs
19	
20	¹ See Default J. at 2:19 – 3:3 (June 24, 2013). This Court's Default Judgment reflects that the judgment includes "damages, along with pre-judgment interest, attorney's fees and costs." Id. at 2:21-22. However,
	the Default Judgment does not itemize the amount of each category and only reflects a lump sum of
21	\$1,495,775.74. Plainliff's proposed Writ of Execution does itemize these categories and sums as follows:
21 22	\$1,495,775.74. Plaintiff's proposed <i>Writ of Execution</i> does itemize these categories and sums as follows: "\$900,000.00 principal," "\$83,761.25 attorney's fees", "\$488,545.89 interest, and" "\$24,021.96 costs, making a total amount of \$1,495,775.74". <i>Exhibit 2 to Motion for Writ of Execution</i> at 2:1-5 (hereinafter
22	\$1,495,775.74. Plaintiff's proposed <i>Writ of Execution</i> does itemize these categories and sums as follows: "\$900,000.00 principal," "\$83,761.25 attorney's fees", "\$488,545.89 interest, and" "\$24,021.96 costs, making a total amount of \$1,495,775.74". <i>Exhibit 2 to Motion for Writ of Execution</i> at 2:1-5 (hereinafter referred to as "proposed <i>Writs</i> "). Adding to the confusion, the sums of the categories listed in Plaintiff's proposed writs do not equal what is reported as the "total amount." (\$900,000 + \$83,761.25 + \$488,545.89 + \$24,021.96 = \$1,497,329.10 not \$1,495,775.74). Plaintiff, however, offers no explanation
22 23	\$1,495,775.74. Plaintiff's proposed <i>Writ of Execution</i> does itemize these categories and sums as follows: "\$900,000.00 principal," "\$83,761.25 attorney's fees", "\$488,545.89 interest, and" "\$24,021.96 costs, making a total amount of \$1,495,775.74". <i>Exhibit 2 to Motion for Writ of Execution</i> at 2:1-5 (hereinafter referred to as "proposed <i>Writs</i> "). Adding to the confusion, the sums of the categories listed in Plaintiff's proposed writs do not equal what is reported as the "total amount." (\$900,000 + \$83,761.25 + \$488,545.89 + \$24,021.96 = \$1,497,329.10 not \$1,495,775.74). Plaintiff, however, offers no explanation for the discrepancy between the categories and total and, to date, has made no effort to correct any error. For this reason alone, this Court should deny the <i>Motion</i> and require clarification by Plaintiff. A writ of
22	\$1,495,775.74. Plaintiff's proposed <i>Writ of Execution</i> does itemize these categories and sums as follows: "\$900,000.00 principal," "\$83,761.25 attorney's fees", "\$488,545.89 interest, and" "\$24,021.96 costs, making a total amount of \$1,495,775.74". <i>Exhibit 2 to Motion for Writ of Execution</i> at 2:1-5 (hereinafter referred to as "proposed <i>Writs</i> "). Adding to the confusion, the sums of the categories listed in Plaintiff's proposed writs do not equal what is reported as the "total amount." (\$900,000 + \$83,761.25 + \$488,545.89 + \$24,021.96 = \$1,497,329.10 not \$1,495,775.74). Plaintiff, however, offers no explanation for the discrepancy between the categories and total and, to date, has made no effort to correct any error.
22 23	\$1,495,775.74. Plaintiff's proposed <i>Writ of Execution</i> does itemize these categories and sums as follows: "\$900,000.00 principal," "\$83,761.25 attorney's fees", "\$488,545.89 interest, and" "\$24,021.96 costs, making a total amount of \$1,495,775.74". <i>Exhibit 2 to Motion for Writ of Execution</i> at 2:1-5 (hereinafter referred to as "proposed <i>Writs</i> "). Adding to the confusion, the sums of the categories listed in Plaintiff's proposed writs do not equal what is reported as the "total amount." (\$900,000 + \$83,761.25 + \$488,545.89 + \$24,021.96 = \$1,497,329.10 not \$1,495,775.74). Plaintiff, however, offers no explanation for the discrepancy between the categories and total and, to date, has made no effort to correct any error. For this reason alone, this Court should deny the <i>Motion</i> and require clarification by Plaintiff. A writ of execution must be precise.

. KAEMPFER CROWELL 510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703

JM_FJD_1820

and fees requested in the *First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees*. Those
fees and costs are disputed and this Court has yet to resolve any dispute as to their
amount. Indeed, there is significant doubt that Plaintiff has any legal basis to recover
post-judgment fees in this case. In any event, however, the proposed *Writs* do not
accurately reflect the previous orders of this Court and should be rejected.

More egregious, Plaintiff's proposed Writs reflect a higher sum than this Court 6 has actually awarded—even assuming the adoption of the First Memorandum of Post-7 Judgment Costs and Fees. The proposed Writs would have this Court authorize 8 execution for the total sum of \$1,592,091.22.4 One would assume that this sum consists 9 of the amount previously awarded by this Court, \$1,495,775.74, added to the sum 10 requested in the First Memorandum of Post-Judgment Costs and Fees, \$93,315.40. 11 However, those two figures add up to 1,589,091.14, \$3,000.08 less than the sum 12 reflected in the proposed Writs. No explanation for this is provided in the Motion. 13 Simply, the proposed Writs are erroneous on their face and this Court should decline 14 their issuance. 15 //// 16 //// 17 //// 18 //// 19 //// 20 //// 21 //// 22 //// 23 24 3 Proposed Writs at 2:7 4 Proposed Writs at 2:17-19. Page 4 of 6

KAEMPFER CROWELL 510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703

1	III. Conclusion
2	For all these reasons explained herein, it is respectfully requested that this Court
3	deny the <i>Motion</i> .
4	DATED this $2^{5^{+}}$ -day of April, 2014.
5	KAEMPFER CROWELL
6	
7	400-7
8	Jason D. Woodbury Nevada Bar No. 6870
9	510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703
10	Telephone: (775) 884-8300 Facsimile: (775) 882-0257
11	JWoodbury@kcnvlaw.com Attorneys for Reza Zandian
12	AFFIRMATION pursuant to NRS 239B.030
13	The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not
14	contain the social security number of any person.
15	DATED this 21 st day of April, 2014.
16	KAEMPFER CROWELL
17	
18	ADW-
19	Jason D. Woodbury Wevada Bar No. 6870
20	510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703
21	Telephone: (775) 884-8300 Facsimile: (775) 882-0257
22	<u>JWoodbury@kcnvlaw.com</u> Attorneys for Reza Zandian
23	
24	
	Page 5 of 6

KAEMPFER CROWELL 510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703

JM_FJD_1822

	1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
	2	Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that service of the foregoing
	3	OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR WRIT OF EXECUTION was made this date by
	4	depositing a true copy of the same for mailing at Carson City, Nevada, addressed to each
	5	of the following:
	6	Matthew D. Francis Adam P. McMillen
	7	WATSON ROUNDS 5371 Kietzke Lane
	8	Reno, NV 89511
	9	DATED this 21 st day of April, 2014.
	10	
	11	A. R. Jola an employee of Kaempfer Crowell
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
ELL reet 89703	22	
KAEMPFER CROWELL 510 West Fourth Street Carson City, Nevada 89703	23	
KAEMF 510 Wé Carson Ci	24	
		Page 6 of 6