Electronically Filed 09/12/2008 02:24:34 PM

1 0096 ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, IV **CLERK OF THE COURT** Nevada Bar No. 8642 JENNIFER L. TAYLOR Nevada Bar No. 5798 ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP 401 N. Buffalo Drive, Suite 202 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Telephone: (702) 247-4661 Facsimile: (702) 247-6227 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 7 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 CASE NO. A558629 11 TED R. BURKE, MICHAEL R. and LAURETTA L. KEHOE; JOHN BERTOLDO; Dept. XIII 12 PAUL BARNARD; EDDY KRAVETZ; STEVE FRANKS; PAULA MARIA MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF 13 BARNARD; PETER T. and LISA A. THE PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF FREEMAN; LEON GOLDEN; C.A. MURFF; FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW GERDA FERN BILLBE; BOB and ROBYN 14 | AND ORDER GRANTING NOMINAL DEFENDANT KOKOWEEF, INC.'S TRESKA; MICHAEL RANDOLPH, and 15 FREDERICK WILLIS, RENEWED MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY FROM PLAINTIFFS AS Plaintiffs, 16 DRAFTED AND SUBMITTED BY KOKOWEEF, INC. 17 VS. 18 LARRY H. HAHN, individually, and as DATE OF HEARING: TIME OF HEARING: President and Treasurer of Kokoweef, Inc., and 19 || former President and Treasurer of Explorations Incorporated of Nevada; HAHN'S WORLD OF SURPLUS, INC., a Nevada corporation; DOES 20 I-X, inclusive; DOE OFFICERS, DIRECTORS 21 and PARTICIPANTS I-XX. 22 Defendants,. 23 and KOKOWEEF, INC, a Nevada corporation; 24 **EXPLORATIONS INCORPORATED OF** NEVADA, a dissolved corporation; 25 Nominal Defendants. 26 27 28

ROBERTSON

& VICK, LLP

Comes now the Plaintiffs, by and through their attorneys of record, the law firm of ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP and moves this honorable Court for an Order Clarifying This Court's Entry of Preliminary Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order Granting 3 Nominal Defendant Kokoweef's Renewed Motion To Require Security From Plaintiffs, as submitted by Kokoweef, Inc. (hereafter "Kokoweef") and signed by this Honorable Court on 5 August 26, 2008. NOTICE OF MOTION ALL COUNSEL AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD HEREIN: TO: PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Plaintiffs will bring the above and foregoing MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF FACT AND 10 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER GRANTING NOMINAL DEFENDANT 11 12 KOKOWEEF, INC.'S RENEWED MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY FROM PLAINTIFFS AS DRAFTED AND SUBMITTED BY KOKOWEEF, INC. on for hearing at the courtroom of 13 the above-entitled Court on the 13th day of October , 2008, at 9:00a.m. of said day, in 14 Department XIII of said Court. 15 Dated this 11th day of September, 2008. 16 17 18 ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP 19 By 20 Alexander Robertson, IV Neyada Bar No. 8642 Jennifer L. Taylor. 21 Nevada Bar No. 5798 401 N. Buffalo Drive, Suite 202 22 Las Vegas, Nevada 89120 23 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 24 25 H26 111 27 III28 -HI

ROBERTSON

& VICK, LLP

#### POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

#### **Summary of Facts:**

On or about July 30, 2008, an evidentiary hearing was held regarding Kokoweef's Renewed Motion To Require Security From the Plaintiffs. The Court took the matter under advisement after presentation of evidence and rendered its Decision on the motion on August 11, 2008 (hereafter the "Decision"). A true and correct copy of the Decision is attached hereto as Exhibit "1".

On or about August 26, 2008, counsel for Kokoweef submitted to the Court its

Preliminary Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order Granting Defendant

Kokoweef's Renewed Motion To Require Security From Plaintiffs (hereafter the "Order"). A

true and correct copy of the Order is attached hereto as Exhibit "2". However, the Order was
never provided to Plaintiffs' counsel prior to its submission to the Court.

Counsel for Plaintiffs first saw the Order upon service of the Notice of Entry of the Order. Upon review of the Order, it was evident that the Order, as drafted by Kokoweef and in contravention of the Decision, was not "consistent with" the Decision (Decision 2:25-26), went beyond the language of the Decision and went beyond the language of the governing statute, NRS 41.520.

Following, for this Court's review, is a comparison of the Decision and the controlling statute to the Order submitted by Defendants.

20 ///

2

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 ///

26 ///

27 /

ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP 2

28 ///

9/11/08 3:39 SJG

1 2	Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law submitted by Kokoweef	Proposed Corrected Language From Court's August 11, 2008 Decision and/or NRS 41.520
3 4 5	"Kokoweef has met its burden as the moving Defendant, under 41.520 3A to show that there is 'no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the cause of actionwill benefit the corporation or its security holders' and that Plaintiffs have	The Decision noted: "The Court is persuaded the Defendant has made a prima facia showing on the point and that the same has not been rebutted." Decision 2: 10-12.
6	failed to rebut showing." Order 2:9-	Plaintiffs propose that the Order be amended to properly reflect the Court's language in the Decision.
8	"The Court has the authority to revisit the amount of security required of Plaintiffs and make adjustments of the amount of security required as the case progresses." Order 2:20-22.	The Decision properly noted that 41.520(4)(b) of the statute provides that the Court can adjust the amount of security one way or the other as the case progresses. Decision 2:20-22.
10 11		Plaintiffs request that the Order be clarified to properly incorporate the language of the Decision and NRS 41.520.
12 13 14	As a matter of law, Kokoweef has met its burden as the moving Defendant, under 41.520(3)(a), to show that there is 'no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the cause of actionwill benefit the corporation or its security holders' and that the Plaintiffs have failed to rebut such showing."  Order 2:26-28, 3:1-2.	The Decision again merely noted that Kokoweef had made a "prima facia" showing on whether there was a reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the cause of action would benefit the corporation or its security holders. Decision 2:10-12.
15 16		Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that this Conclusion of Law within the Order be clarified to correctly reflect the language of the Decision.
17 18 19	[I]t is herebyORDERED that in the event the Plaintiffs fail to post the security within the limitations set forth hereinabove, as set forth in NRS 41.50(b)(4), the above-captioned case shall be dismissed, with prejudice without any further order of this Court. Order 3:23-26.	First, clarification of this language is necessary as it contains a typographical error, specifically "NRS 41.50(b)(4)" as opposed to the correct notation of the statute, NRS 41.520(4)(b).
20 21		Second, neither the Decision, nor NRS 41.520 contemplate dismissal with prejudice for failure to timely post the required security.
22 23		Third, neither the Decision nor NRS 41.520(4)(b) contemplates an automatic dismissal without further action by Defendant.
24 25		Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that the Order be clarified to be consistent with the Decision and to reflect the proper language of the statute,
26		which omits any reference to dismissal with or without prejudice.

ROBERTSON & Vick, LLP 28

"[I]t is further ORDERED that, notwithstanding the dismissal of the above-captioned case, the Court shall retain jurisdiction herein to enable Defendants to submit a request to the Court for an award of attorneys' fees and costs incurred herein." Order 3:27-28, 4:1-2.

the Decision and NRS 41.520.

Neither the Decision, nor NRS 41.520 contemplate a subsequent award of attorneys' fees and costs. Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that this language be stricken so that the Order will be consistent with the Decision and accurately reflect the language of NRS 41.520

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP 28

LEGAL AUTHORITY

For the Court's reference and convenience, Plaintiffs have attached their proposed

Amended Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law which, as noted above, are consistent with

Courts possess inherent authority to reconsider prior orders. <u>Trail v. Faretto</u>, 91 Nev. 401, 536 P.2d 1026 (1975) (concluding that "a court may, for sufficient cause shown, amend, correct, resettle, modify or vacate, as the case may be, an order previously made and entered on the motion in the progress of the cause or proceeding"). EDCR 2.24 ratifies this procedure in Clark County.

Plaintiffs specifically seek clarification and/or reconsideration of the Order because it is not consistent with the Decision and/or NRS 41.520. Therefore, it contains misstatements of the law of this case, as set forth in the Decision, and is appropriate for clarification and/or reconsideration. As noted above, Plaintiffs have attached hereto, as Exhibit "3", Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order consistent with the Decision, and the language of NRS 41.520. Plaintiffs request that the Court adopt its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order.

ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP

By:

ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, IV

Bar No. 8642

JENNIFER L. TAYLOR

Bar No. 5798

401 N. Buffalo Drive, Suite 202 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Exhibit "1"

2

3

9

10

11

13

16

17

18

19

20

## ORIGINAL

DISTRICT COURT

FILED

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

3 39 PH '08

TED R BURKE; MICHAEL R. and LAURETTA L. KEHOE; JOHN BERTOLDO; PAUL BARNARD; EDDY KRAVETZ; JACKIE and FRED KRAVETZ; STEVEN FRANKS; PAULA MARIA BARNARD; PETER T. and LISA A. FREEMEN; LEON GOLDEN; C. A. ) MURFF; GERDA FERN BILLBE; BOB and ROBYN TRESKA; MICHAEL RANDOLPH, and FREDERICK WILLIS,

A558629 ) CASE NO. XIII ) DEPT. NO.

Plaintiffs,

) Date: July 30, 2008 Time: 9:00 a.m.

vs.

LARRY L. HAHN; HAHN'S WORLD OF 12 SURPLUS, INC.,

Defendant(s).

14 and

> KOKOWEEF, INC.; EXPLORATIONS INCORPORATION OF NEVADA,

> > Nominal Defendants.

DECISION

THIS MATTER having come before the Court on July 30, 2008 for evidentiary hearing regarding Nominal Defendant's INC.] Renewed Motion to Require Security from [KOKOWEEFE, 23 Plaintiffs, and the Court having taken the matter under advisement after presentation of evidence and having now fully considered the evidence adduced and the post-hearing briefs submitted by counsel and being fully advised in the premises;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Court decides the submitted issues as

医21 图22 第22 AUG

28

27

MARK R. DENTON

DISTRICT JUDGE

DEPARTMENT TIBRTEEN LAS VEGAS, NV 80165

follows:

Under the relevant statute, NRS 41.520(3)(a), it is clear that the burden is upon the moving Defendant to show that there is "... no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the cause of action ... will benefit the corporation or its security holders." Of course, this is a more stringent burden than would, by analogy, be applicable on a preliminary injunction motion, which would implicate "probability," not "possibility."

Even so, the Court is persuaded that Defendant has made a prima facia showing on the point and that the same has not been 12 rebutted. Therefore, the Court will require a modicum of security likely consequences given what appears to be the the continuation of this litigation on the well-being the corporation.

However, the Court is not persuaded that the security required should be of the magnitude sought at this point by Defendant. Instead, the Court will order security in the sum of In this regard, the Court takes some comfort in the \$75,000.00. language of subsection 4(b) of the statute which provides that the Court can revisit its determination one way or the other as the 23 case progresses.

Counsel for Defendant is directed to promptly submit proposed preliminary Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and a proposed order consistent with the foregoing. Such proposed order

27

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

28

MARK R. DENTON

DISTRICT JUDGE

DEPARTMENT THIRTEEN LAS VEGAS, NV 89155

should provide for the posting of security within 15 days from and after notice of entry of the order.

This Decision sets forth the Court's intended disposition on the subject but anticipates further order of the Court to make such disposition effective as an order or judgment.

DATED this

day/of Augustn 2008.

MARK R. DENTON DISTRICT JUDGE

#### CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that on the date filed, I placed a copy of the foregoing in the attorney's folder in the Clerk's Office or mailed a copy to:

NEIL J. BELLER, ESQ.

M. NELSON SEGEL, ESQ.

CLARY CANNON

Attn: PATRICK C. CLARY, ESQ

LORRAINE TASHIRO

Judicial Executive Assistant

Dept. No. XIII

for

3

23 Mark R. Denton

27

DISTRICT JUDGE

Exhibit "2"

Patrick C Clary Nevada Bar No. 53 3 Curtis W. Cannon Nevada Bar No. 10535 7201 W. Lake Mead Boulevard, Suite 503 Las Vegas, Nevada 89128 Telephone: 702.382.0813 FAX: 702.382-7277 6 Attorneys for so-called Nominal Defendant Kokoweef, Inc. 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 -000-] ] TED R. BURKE; MICHAEL R and LAURETTA L. ) KEHOE; JOHN BERTOLDO; PAUL BERNARD; EDDY KRAVETZ; JACKIE and FRED KRAVETZ; CLARY CANNON LLP STEVEN FRANKS; PAULA MARIA BARNARD; PETE T. and LISA A. FREEMAN; LEON GOLDEN; C.A. MURFF; GERDA FERN BILLBE; BOB and ROBYN TRESKA; MICHAEL RANDOLPH, ) PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF and FREDERICK WILLIS, Plaintiffs VB. LARRY L. HAHN, individually, and as President of and Treasurer of Kokoweef, Inc., and former President and Treasurer of Explorations Incorporated of Nevada; HAHN'S WORLD OF SURPLUS, INC., a Nevada corporation; DOES I-X, inclusive; DOE OFFICERS, DIRECTORS and PARTICIPANTS I-XX, 23 Defendants, 24 and KOKOWEEF, INC., a Nevada corporation; EXPLORATIONS INCORPORATED OF NEVADA, a dissolved Nevada corporation; 26 27 Nominal Defendants. 28

NOTC

CLARY CANNON LLP

) CASE NO. A558629 DEPT. XIII

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT KOKOWEEF'S RENEWED MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY FROM PLAINTIFFS

DATE OF HEARING: 7/30/08 TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 a.m.

7

8

9

10

11

15

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on August 27, 2008 there was entered in the above-captioned case this Court's Preliminary Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order Granting Defendant Kokoweef's Renewed Motion to Require Security from Plaintiffs, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

CLARY CANNON LLP

By\_ Patrick C. Clary

Attorneys for Kokoweef, Inc.

IS HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGED of a copy of the above and foregoing Notice of Entry of Preliminary Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Order Granting Defendant Kokoweef's Renewed Motion to Require Security from Plaintiffs on the 38 day of August, 2008.

NEIL J. BELLER, LTD.

By\_ Beller Nevada Bar No. 002360

Attorneys for Plaintiffs 7408 West Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

Nevada Bar No. 000530 Attorney for Larry L Hahn and Hahn's World of Surplus, Inc. 724 South Ninth Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

s. Programme		
1 2 3 4	Nevada Bar No. 53 City Center West, Suite 503 7201 West Lake Mead Boulevard Las Vegas, Nevada 89128 Telephone: 702.382.0813	FILED  Aug 28 18 21 AH *08  CLERK COURT
б	Attorneys for Defendant Kokoweef, Inc.	
7	DISTRICT COUR	T.
9	CLARK COUNTY, NE	IVADA
10	-o0o-	
LAW OFFICES OF  CLARY CANNON LLP  7201 WEYT LAKE MEAD BOULEVARD, SUITE 503  LAS VERAS, NEVADA 89128  TEL: 702,382,0813 - FAX: 702,382,7277  O 6 8 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1	PETE T. and LISA A. FREEMAN; LEON GOLDEN; C.A. MURFF; GERDA FERN BILLBE;	DEPT. XIII  PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT KOKOWEEF'S RENEWED MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY FROM PLAINTIFFS
22	Defendants,	) }
23	and	
· 24 25	KOKOWEEF, INC., a Nevada corporation; EXPLORATIONS INCORPORATED OF NEVADA, a dissolved Nevada corporation;	
26	Nominal Defendants.	
27 28	The Renewed Motion to Require Secu	rity from Plaintiffs filed

7

8

9

12

14

21

22

23

24

25

26

herein on June 12, 2008 by so-called Nominal Defendant Kokoweef, Inc. ("Kokoweef") having come on for an evidentiary hearing on July 30, 2008, the Court having taken its decision on the said Motion under advisement after presentation of evidence and having fully considered the evidence adduced and the post-hearing briefs submitted by counsel for the Plaintiffs and for Kokoweef, and the Court being fully advised in the premises, the Court finds as follows:

### PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Kokoweef has met its burden as the moving Defendant, under NRS 41.520(3)(a) to show that there is " . . . no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the cause of action . . . will benefit the corporation or its security holders" and that the Plaintiffs have failed to rebut such showing.
- 2. Therefore, the Court will require a modicum of security given what appears preliminarily to be the likely consequences of the continuation of this litigation on the well-being of the corporation.
- 3. At this time the security required should not be of the magnitude sought by Kokoweef so that the amount of security is to be in the sum of \$75,000.
- 4. The Court has the authority to revisit the amount of security required of Plaintiffs and make adjustments of the amount of security required as the case progresses.

## PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing preliminary findings, the Court concludes as follows:

1. As a matter of law Kokoweef has met its burden as the moving Defendant, under NRS 41.520(3)(a), to show that there is " . . . no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the cause of action .

25

26

27

3

4

5

 $\mathfrak{g}$ 

9

· · will benefit the corporation or its security holders" and that the Plaintiffs have failed to rebut such showing.

- 2. As a matter of law Kokoweef is entitled to an amount of security to be posted by the Plaintiffs in the sum of \$75,000.
- 3. Pursuant to Subsection 4(b) of NRS 41.520, as a matter of law the Court is entitled to revisit its determination one way or the other as the above-captioned case progresses.

#### ORDER

Based upon the foregoing preliminary findings and conclusions, and good cause otherwise showing, it is hereby

ORDERED that the aforesaid Renewed Motion to Require Security from Plaintiffs be, and the same hereby is, granted on and subject to the terms and conditions contained herein; and it is further

ORDERED that, within 15 days from and after the date of service of notice of entry of this Order, the Plaintiffs be, and they hereby are, directed to post with the Clerk of the Court for the purposes set forth in NRS 41.520 the sum of \$75,000 in cash or bond; and it is further

ORDERED that the stay of the above-captioned case shall, and it hereby is directed to, remain in full force and effect until 10 days after the posting of the \$75,000 security required by this Order; and it is further

ORDERED that in the event the Plaintiffs fail to post the security within the limitations set forth hereinabove, as set forth in NRS 41.50(b)(4), the above-captioned case shall be dismissed, with prejudice without any further order of this Court; and it is further

ORDERED that, notwithstanding the dismissal of the abovecaptioned case, the Court shall retain jurisdiction herein to enable

28

CLARY CANNON LLF 7201 West Lake Wead Boulevard, Buitz 503 Defendants to submit a request to the Court for an award of attorneys's fees and costs incurred herein.

DATED this day of August, 2008.

MARKA DENION

DISTRICT JUDGE

CLARY CANNON LLP

Patrick C. Clay

Attorneys for Defendant Kokoweef, Inc.

Exhibit "3"

FFCL ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, IV Nevada Bar No. 8642 JENNIFER L. TAYLOR Nevada Bar No. 5798 ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP 401 N. Buffalo Drive, Suite 202 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 5 Telephone: (702) 247-4661 Facsimile: (702) 247-6227 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 7 8 DISTRICT COURT 9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 10 11 TED R. BURKE, MICHAEL R. and ) CASE NO. A558629 LAURETTA L. KEHOE; JOHN BERTOLDO; Dept. XIII 12 | PAUL BARNARD; EDDY KRAVETZ; STEVE FRANKS; PAULA MARIA [PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY FINDINGS BARNARD; PETER T. and LISA A. 13 OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW FREEMAN; LEON GOLDEN; C.A. MURFF; AND ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT 14 GERDA FERN BILLBE; BOB and ROBYN KOKOWEEF'S RENEWED MOTION TO TRESKA; MICHAEL RANDOLPH, and REQUIRE SECURITY FROM 15 FREDERICK WILLIS, **PLAINTIFFS** Plaintiffs, 16 DATE OF HEARING: TIME OF HEARING: 17 VS. LARRY H. HAHN, individually, and as President and Treasurer of Kokoweef, Inc., and former President and Treasurer of Explorations 19 | Incorporated of Nevada; HAHN'S WORLD OF 20 SURPLUS, INC., a Nevada corporation; DOES I-X, inclusive; DOE OFFICERS, DIRECTORS and PARTICIPANTS I-XX, 21 22 Defendants., 23 and KOKOWEEF, INC, a Nevada corporation; 24 **EXPLORATIONS INCORPORATED OF** NEVADA, a dissolved corporation; 25 Nominal Defendants. 26 27 28

ROBERTSON

& VICK, LLP

9/11/08 3:51 SJG

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

The Renewed Motion to Require Security from Plaintiffs filed herein on June 12, 2008 by Nominal Defendant Kokoweef, Inc. ("Kokoweef") having come on for an evidentiary hearing on July 30, 2008, the Court having taken its decision on the said Motion under advisement after presentation of evidence and having fully considered the evidence adduced and the post-hearing briefs submitted by counsel for the Plaintiffs and for Kokoweef, and the Court being fully advised in the premises, the Court finds as follows:

#### PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Kokoweef has made a prima facia showing, to meet its burden as the moving Defendant, under NRS 41.520(3)(a), that there is "...no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the cause of action...will benefit the corporation or its security holders" and that Plaintiffs have failed to rebut such showing.
- 2. Therefore, the Court will require a modicum of security given what appears preliminarily to be the likely consequences of the continuation of this litigation on the well-being of the corporation.
- 3. At this time the security required should not be of the magnitude sought by Kokoweef so that the amount of security is to be in the sum of \$75,000.
- 4. The Court has the authority to revisit the amount of security required of Plaintiffs and make adjustments of the amount of security required, one way or the other, as the case progresses.

#### PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the foregoing preliminary findings, the Court concludes as follows:

- 1. As a matter of law Kokoweef made a prima facia showing, to meet its burden as the moving Defendant, under NRS 41.520(3)(a), that there is "...no reasonable possibility that the prosecution of the cause of action ... will benefit the corporation or its security holders" and that the Plaintiffs have failed to rebut such showing.
- 2. As a matter of law Kokoweef is entitled to an amount of security to be posted by the Plaintiffs in the sum of \$75,000.

ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP

28

3. Pursuant to Subsection 4(b) of NRS 41.520, as a matter of law, the Court is entitled to revisit its determination one way or the other as the above-captioned case progresses. 2 <u>ORDER</u> 3 Based upon the foregoing preliminary findings and conclusions, and good cause 4 otherwise showing, it is hereby 3 ORDERED that the aforesaid Renewed Motion To Require Security From Plaintiffs be, 6 and the same hereby is, granted on and subject to the terms and conditions contained herein; and 7 it is further ORDERED that, within 15 days from and after the date of service of notice of entry of 9 this Order, the Plaintiffs be, and they hereby are, directed to post with the Clerk of the Court for 10 the purposes set forth in NRS 41.520 the sum of \$75,000 in cash or bond; and it is further 11 ORDERED that the stay of the above-captioned case shall, and it hereby is directed to, 12 remain in full force and effect until 10 days after the posting of the \$75,000 security required by 13 this Order; and it is further 14 ORDERED that in the event the Plaintiffs fail to post the security within the limitations 15 set forth hereinabove, as set forth in NRS 41.520(4)(b), the above-captioned case shall be dismissed without prejudice. 17 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of September, 2008. 18 19 20 DISTRICT JUDGE 21 ROBERTSON & VICK, LLP 22 Jennifer L. Taylor 24 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 25 26 27 28

ROBERTSON

& Vick, LLP

# Q

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 12th day of September, 2008, I served a copy of the above and
foregoing MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF
FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER GRANTING NOMINAL
DEFENDANT KOKOWEEF, INC.'S RENEWED MOTION TO REQUIRE SECURITY
FROM PLAINTIFFS AS DRAFTED AND SUBMITTED BY KOKOWEEF, INC. by
depositing a copy thereof for mailing at Las Vegas, Nevada, postage prepaid, addressed to:

M. Nelson Segel, Chartered	
M. Nelson Segel, Esq.	
624 South 9th Street	
Las Vegas, NV 89101	
Telephone: (702) 385-6266	
Facsimile: (702) 382-2967	
Attorneys for Larry Hahn	and
Hahn's World of Surplus.	Inc.

CLARY CANNON, LLP
Patrick C. Clary, Esq.
Curtis W. Cannon, Esq.
7201 West Lake Mead Boulevard, Suite 503 Las Vegas, NV 89129
Telephone: (702) 382-0813
Facsimile: (702) 382-7277
Attorneys for Kokoweef, Inc.