## **ORIGINAL**

1 Matthew D. Francis (6978) REC'D & FILED Adam P. McMillen (10678) 2 WATSON ROUNDS 2012 JUL -2 PM 1:3-5371 Kietzke Lane 3 Reno, NV 89511 ALAN GLOVER Telephone: 775-324-4100 Facsimile: 775-333-8171 Attorneys for Plaintiff Jed Margolin 5 6 7 In The First Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada . 8 In and for Carson City 9 JED MARGOLIN, an individual, 10 11 Plaintiff, Case No.: 090C00579 1B Dept. No.: 1 12 VS. 13 OPTIMA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER a California corporation, OPTIMA 14 TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, a Nevada corporation, REZA ZANDIAN 15 aka GOLAMREZA ZANDIANJAZI aka GHOLAM REZA ZANDIAN 16 aka REZA JAZI aka J. REZA JAZI aka G. REZA JAZI aka GHONONREZA 17 ZANDIAN JAZI, an individual, DOE 18 Companies 1-10, DOE Corporations 11-20, and DOE Individuals 21-30, 19 Defendants. 20 21 Please take notice that the Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Appearance of 22 Counsel for Optima Technology Corporations, or in the Alternative, Motion to Strike General 23 Denial of Optima Technology Corporations, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, was filed in the 24 above-entitled Court on June 28, 2012. 25 /// 26 ///

1

27

### Affirmation Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

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

DATED: June 29, 2012

WATSON ROUNDS

By: <u>Jo J Adam P. McMillen</u>
Matthew D. Francis
Adam P. McMillen
Watson Rounds
5371 Kietzke Lane
Reno, NV 89511

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jed Margolin

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Watson Rounds, and that on this date, I deposited for mailing, in a sealed envelope, with first-class postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document, **Notice of Entry of Order**, addressed as follows:

Reza Zandian 8775 Costa Verde Blvd. Apt #501 San Diego, CA 82122

Dated: June 29, 2012

Carla Ousby

# Exhibit 1

# Exhibit 1

REC'D & FILED Case No. 09 0C 00579 1B 1 2012 JUN 28 AM 11: 13 Dept. No. 2 Ι ALAN GLOVER 3 In The First Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada 5 In and for Carson City 6 7 JED MARGOLIN, an individual, 8 Plaintiff, 9 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S vs. MOTION TO COMPEL 10 APPEARANCE OF COUNSEL FOR OPTIMA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, OPTIMA TECHNOLOGY 11 a California corporation, OPTIMA CORPORATIONS, OR IN THE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, a Nevada ALTERNATIVE, MOTION TO 12 corporation, REZA ZANDIAN STRIKE GENERAL DENIAL OF aka GOLAMREZA ZANDIANJAZI **OPTIMA TECHNOLOGY** 13 CORPORATIONS aka GHOLAM REZA ZANDIAN aka REZA JAZI aka J. REZA JAZI 14 aka G. REZA JAZI aka GHONONREZA ZANDIAN JAZI, an individual, DOE Companies 15 1-10, DOE Corporations 11-20, and DOE 16 Individuals 21-30. 17 Defendants. 18 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Jed Margolin's motion for an order 19 compelling Defendants Optima Technology Corporation, a California corporation, and Optima 20 Technology Corporation, a Nevada corporation (collectively "Optima Technology 21 Corporations") to retain legal counsel, or, in the alternative, to strike the General Denial of those 22 Corporations filed on March 13, 2012. 23 Upon consideration of the foregoing documents, and the Court deeming itself fully 24 advised of the matter, the Court hereby enters its Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion and finds 25 and orders as follows: 26 Plaintiff filed the Complaint in this action on December 11, 2009. After extensive 27 briefing regarding service on Defendants concluded, and after the Court denied Defendants' 28

1 2

 Motions to Dismiss, Defendants served two "General Denials." The first General Denial was served on March 5, 2012 on behalf of the individual Reza Zandian aka Golamreza Zandianjazi aka Gholam Reza Zandian aka Reza Jazi aka J. Reza Jazi aka G. Reza Jazi aka Ghononreza Zandian Jazi. The second General Denial was served on March 13, 2012 on behalf of the Optima Technology Corporations.

On March 13, 2012, Defense counsel moved to withdraw from representing all of the individual and corporate Defendants in this action. On March 16, 2012, Plaintiff filed a non-opposition to Defense counsel's Motion to Withdraw and on April 26, 2012, this Court granted Defense counsel's Motion to Withdraw. No appearance of counsel has been entered for any of the Defendants as of this date.

NRS 7.285 provides that "[n]o person shall practice law in this state unless he is an active member of the State Bar of Nevada pursuant to the rules of the supreme court." The statute further provides that any person who practices law who is not an active member of the State Bar of Nevada is guilty of a misdemeanor. SCR 77 provides that, with certain inapplicable exceptions, no person may practice law as an officer of the courts in this state who is not an active member of the state bar. Nevada case law is clear on this issue as well. See State v. Stu's Bail Bonds, 115 Nev. 436, n. 1, 991 P.2d 469, 470 n. 1 (1999) ("business entities are not permitted to appear, or file documents, in proper person"); Salman v. Newell, 110 Nev. 1333, 1336, 885 P. 2d 607, 608 (1994) (observing that no statute or rule permits a non-lawyer to represent an entity and concluding that an entity cannot proceed in proper person); Sunde v. Contel of California, 112 Nev. 541, 542–43, 915 P.2d 298, 299 (1996) (explaining that non-lawyers may not represent entities in court).

In addition, courts may strike pleadings when a corporation has failed to retain counsel. See Trustees of Operating Engineers Pension Trust v. O'Donnell, 2007 WL 672528, \*2 (D. Nev. 2007) (granting motion to compel and alternative motion to strike answer) (citations omitted).

In light of the foregoing, the Court finds that the Optima Technology Corporations cannot defend, prosecute, or participate in this action without counsel licensed in the State of

Nevada. In Plaintiff's Motion, Plaintiff requested that the Optima Technology Corporations be ordered to retain legal counsel no later than June 15, 2012. Plaintiff also requested that the March 13, 2012 General Denial filed by the Optima Technology Corporations be stricken if the Optima Technology Corporations did not retain new counsel by June 15, 2012. Pursuant to the above findings, the Court further finds that Plaintiff's requests should be granted with the Optima Technology Corporations now being given until July 15, 2012 to retain counsel or their General Denial will be stricken.

THEREFORE, Plaintiff Jed Margolin's Motion to Compel Appearance of Counsel for the Optima Technology Corporations or in the Alternative Motion to Strike the General Denial of the Optima Technology Corporations is GRANTED as follows:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Optima Technology Corporations must retain counsel and that counsel must enter an appearance in this matter on behalf of the Optima Technology Corporations by July 15, 2012.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if no appearance is entered on behalf of the Optima Technology Corporations by July 15, 2012, the Optima Technology Corporations' General Denial, filed on March 13, 2012, shall be stricken.

Dated this 28 day of June 2012.

JAMES T. RUSSELL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 24 day of June, 2012, I placed a copy of the foregoing Order in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Matthew D. Francis, Esq. Adam P. McMillen, Esq. 5371 Kietzke Lane Reno, NV 89511

Reza Zandian 8775 Costa Verde Blvd. Apt #501 San Diego, CA 82122

Jum M. L.