1	

Honorable Mike K. Nakagawa United States Bankruptcy Judge

Entered on Docket April 14, 2014

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * * * * *

In re:	Case No.: 12-12779-MKN (Lead) Chapter 11	
LAS VEGAS BILLBOARDS, LLC,	Jointly Administered Under Case No.: 12-12780-MKN	
Debtor.))	Date: April 2, 2014 Time: 9:30 a.m.	

ORDER ON EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND COUNTERMOTION FOR SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE¹

On April 2, 2014, the court heard the Emergency Motion to Enforce Settlement Agreement ("Enforcement Motion") brought on behalf of LED Ventures, LLC, along with the Countermotion for Specific Performance ("Countermotion") brought on behalf of Las Vegas Billboards, LLC. The appearances of counsel were noted on the record. After arguments were presented, the matter was taken under submission.

BACKGROUND

On March 12, 2012, Las Vegas Billboards, LLC ("LVB" or "Debtor") filed a voluntary Chapter 11 petition. A separate Chapter 11 petition was filed by Seiler, Inc., denominated Case No. 12-12780-LBR, and both proceedings were jointly administered.

On July 19, 2013, Debtor filed a motion to approve certain settlement agreements ("Settlement Motion") and related matters involving a variety of parties, including LED Ventures, LLC ("LEDV"). (ECF No. 548). A copy of a "Settlement Agreement and Mutual

¹ In this Order, all references to "ECF No." are to the numbers assigned to the documents filed in the case as they appear on the docket maintained by the clerk of the court.

Release," signed by the settling parties and their counsel ("Settlement Agreement"), was attached as Exhibit "1" to the Settlement Motion. On August 21, 2013, a hearing on the Settlement Motion was conducted. On August 23, 2013, an order approving the Settlement Motion ("Settlement Order") was entered. (ECF No. 584).

On November 21, 2013, Debtor filed a motion seeking to voluntarily dismiss the Chapter 11 proceeding. (ECF No. 614). On December 23, 2013, an order was entered dismissing the proceeding and approving the release of certain funds held in escrow. (ECF No. 624). On February 10, 2014, the bankruptcy case was closed. (ECF No. 629).

On March 11, 2014, LEDV filed a motion to reopen the bankruptcy case. (ECF No. 630).² On March 12, 2014, an order was entered reopening the case. (ECF No. 634). Upon the reopening of the case, LEDV filed the instant Enforcement Motion seeking to enforce certain provisions of the Settlement Agreement. (ECF No. 636).³ LEDV alleges that pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, it entered into a certain Asset Purchase Agreement ("APA) dated December 18, 2013, to sell certain billboards to a third party.⁴ LEDV further alleges that as a result of delays caused by Debtor's breach of the Settlement Agreement, the sale price for the billboards had to be reduced and the closing date for the sale had to be extended to March 11, 2014 pursuant to an amendment to the APA ("APA Amendment").⁵ LEDV maintains that in response to the APA Amendment, the Debtor has interfered with the sale by submitting a separate, insufficient Loan and Purchase Agreement ("L&P Agreement") as an alleged exercise

² Along with its motion to reopen, LEDV filed the Omnibus Declaration of Sean A. Cash ("Omnibus Cash Declaration") (ECF No. 632), as well as the Declaration of Ogonna M. Atamoh ("First Atamoh Declaration") (ECF No. 633).

³ The Enforcement Motion is accompanied by the Declaration of George Garcia ("First Garcia Declaration") (ECF No. 637), as well as a further Declaration of Ogonna M. Atamoh ("Second Atamoh Declaration") (ECF No. 638).

⁴ A copy of the APA is attached as Exhibit "5" to the Omnibus Cash Declaration.

⁵ A copy of the APA Amendment is attached as Exhibit "8" to the Omnibus Cash Declaration.

of a right of first refusal ("ROFR")⁶ under the APA. LEDV specifically seeks an order "finding that LVB breached Section 3(m) of the Settlement Agreement for failure to match the Buyer's offer in the APA, as amended." The Enforcement Motion was scheduled to be heard on an expedited basis on April 2, 2014, pursuant to an order shortening time. (ECF No. 642).⁷

On March 27, 2014, Debtor filed opposition ("Opposition") to the Enforcement Motion. (ECF No. 646).⁸ In its Opposition, Debtor included the Countermotion to enforce the ROFR through entry of an order requiring LEDV to sell the billboards to the Debtor to facilitate completion of the L&P Agreement.

On March 31, 2014, LEDV filed a reply ("Reply"). (ECF No. 656).9

On April 8, 2014, after the matters were taken under submission, a "Supplemental Declaration Ray Koroghli" was filed by the Debtor. (ECF No. 662). As of the date of this Order, no objection to the court's consideration of the untimely document ("Second Koroghli Declaration") has been filed by LEDV.

THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, THE APA, AND THE L&P AGREEMENT.

The instant dispute is based on the parties interpretation of the language of the Settlement

⁶ A copy of the L&P Agreement is attached as Exhibit "2" to the Second Atamoh Declaration. The L&P Agreement was accompanied by a transmittal letter from Debtor's counsel dated March 7, 2014, asserting that the agreement represents the Debtor's exercise of the ROFR as permitted by the Settlement Agreement ("ROFR Letter"). That ROFR Letter also is included as part of Exhibit "2" to the Second Atamoh Declaration.

⁷ The order shortening time was obtained through an ex parte request filed by LEDV. (ECF No. 639). That request was supported by another Declaration of Ogonna M. Atamoh ("Third Atamoh Declaration"). (ECF No. 640).

⁸ The Opposition is accompanied by the declarations of Scott A. Marquis ("Marquis Declaration") (ECF No. 647), David L. Harris ("DL Harris Declaration") (ECF No. 648), Chad Harris ("C Harris Declaration") (ECF No. 649), Jim Wilkins ("Wilkins Declaration") (ECF No. 650), Ray Koroghli ("First Koroghli Declaration") (ECF No. 651), and John M. Netzorg ("Netzorg Declaration") (ECF No. 652).

⁹ The Reply is accompanied by a supplemental declaration from George Garcia ("Second Garcia Declaration") (ECF No. 657), as well as by declarations from Max Drachman ("Drachman Declaration") (ECF No. 658) and Jeffrey J. Whitehead ("Whitehead Declaration") (ECF No. 659).

Agreement, the APA, and the L&P Agreement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

A. The Settlement Agreement.

As part of the settlement between the parties, certain assets were assigned to LEDV described in Section 3(b) of the Settlement Agreement as "the Black Bongo, Paradise, and Oasis billboard structures, panels, ground leases, permits, and all other rights or interests specified..., or are necessary to operate Black Bongo, Paradise, and Oasis." Section 3(b)(4) particularizes that the assigned assets include "All state and local licenses, authorizations or permits to construct, maintain and operate the [billboards], excluding any non-transferable licenses not specifically related to the [billboards] such as LVB's County and State business licenses..."

Section 6(a)(5) of the Settlement Agreement provides that LEDV "intends to move expeditiously to market and sell" the subject billboards.

Section 3(m) of the Settlement Agreement is entitled "Right of First Refusal" and states that the Debtor:

shall have a right of first refusal on LEDV's intended sale of its billboards. LEDV will give LVB written notice via email to Scott Marquis, Esq.... and David Harris... and provide a full and complete copy of the all documents exchanged between LEDV and the offeror after redacting the offeror's identity (which specifically identifies the precise offer deemed acceptable by **LEDV**) by overnight delivery to the office of Marguis Aurbach Coffing (Notice). LVB shall not interfere or in any way disrupt any efforts by LEDV to sell any of its billboards. LVB will have the right of first refusal and may exercise its right to **match** any such offer by sending written acceptance of such offers in its entirety within fifteen (15) calendar days after LVB receives Notice. LVB shall thereafter have thirty (30) calendar days from its acceptance to close. In the event LVB agrees to accept an offer, but fails to timely close on that offer, LVB shall forfeit any further rights of first refusal. However, if LVB does not accept an offer, and such offer does not close, then LVB's right of first refusal shall remain valid and enforceable.

(Emphasis added).

Section 11 of the Settlement Agreement is entitled "Entire Agreement" and state as follows:

The Parties acknowledge that they have read this Agreement and the exhibits in their entirety, fully understand its contents and effect, and agree to the same after having been provided an opportunity to consult with an attorney of their

choosing on the terms and conditions set forth herein. There are no representations, covenants, warranties, promises, agreements, conditions, or undertakings, oral or written, between the Parties other than as set forth herein. The Parties each acknowledge that they have not relied upon any inducements or representations on the part of another Party, or any agent on behalf of another Party, in entering into this Agreement. This Agreement may not be modified except by a written instrument duly executed by the parties.

(Emphasis added).

Section 14 of the Settlement Agreement is entitled "Integration and Amendment" and states that "This Agreement represents the full and **complete integration of the agreement** between the parties and is the complete expression thereof." (Emphasis added).

B. The APA.

Section 2.2 of the APA describes the assets being sold to include, inter alia, "(a) The billboard structures identified as the Black Bongo, Paradise, and Oasis billboard structures,..., together with all lighting, components, fixtures, parts, appurtenances, and equipment attached to or made a part thereof...," "(b) All leases, licenses, easements, contracts, air rights, encroachment rights, other rights of ingress or egress, and all other grants of the right to place, construct, own, operate or maintain [the billboards]..." and "(d) All state and local licenses, authorizations or permits to construct, maintain and operate [the billboards]."

Section 2.6 of the APA addresses the purchase price to be paid for the sale of the billboards. Section 2.6(a) provides for a total purchase price of \$4.5 million, with \$500,000 to be paid as a deposit, and the balance of \$4,000,000 to be paid upon close of escrow. Section 2.6(c) requires the \$500,000 deposit to be paid to the escrow agent within forty-eight (48) hours after execution of the APA. The APA Amendment reduced the total purchase price from \$4.5 million to \$4.2 million, but not the amount of the deposit. The APA Amendment also changed the deadline to close the sale from February 4, 2014, to March 11, 2014.

Section 2.6(b) of the APA is entitled "Evidence of Funds" and states as follows:

Upon signing this Agreement, Buyer shall provide to Seller evidence of funds on hand in an account in Buyer's name in a chartered banking institution in an amount sufficient to pay the entire balance of the Purchase Price. If upon signing this Agreement, Buyer fails to provide to Seller evidence of funds on

hand in an account in Buyer's name in a chartered banking institution in an amount sufficient to pay the entire balance of the Purchase Price, Seller may, but shall not be obligated to terminate this Agreement by giving written notice to Buyer. If Seller elects to terminate this Agreement as provided herein, neither Seller nor Buyer will have any further obligation under this Agreement.

(Emphasis added).

Section 9.1 of the APA provides that the agreement may be terminated if the Debtor successfully exercises the right of first refusal under Section 3(m) of the Settlement Agreement, or if LEDV and the buyer consent to termination of the agreement. Additionally, the APA may be terminated by the buyer or by LEDV if certain other conditions are not met.

Section 9.3 of the APA addresses the disposition of the \$500,000 deposit in the event of termination. If the Debtor successfully exercises the right of first refusal or the parties consent to termination of the APA, the deposit is returned to the buyer. If LEDV terminates the APA without fault of the buyer, the deposit is returned to the buyer along with a \$25,000 break up fee. If the buyer terminates the APA without fault of LEDV, the deposit may be retained by LEDV as its sole remedy.

Section 11.8 of the APA provides that it is "a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the agreement between the Parties...[and that it] **may not be amended except by a written agreement** executed by the Party to be charged with the amendment." (Emphasis added).

C. <u>The L&P Agreement.</u>

Recital "A" to the L&P Agreement incorporates by reference the assets identified in the APA and identifies the buyer as Oasis Las Vegas, LLC ("Oasis LV").

Section 1 of the L&P Agreement provides for the Debtor to sell to Oasis LV the rights to the billboards that the Debtor will acquire from LEDV.

Section 2 of the L&P Agreement is entitled "Terms and Conditions" and provides in pertinent part as follows:

(b) <u>Buyer shall loan to Seller the total sum of FOUR MILLION TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND AND NO/100 DOLLARS U.S. (\$4,200,000.00 U.S.) (The "Funds") for the sole purpose of allowing Seller to exercise its ROFR as set forth</u>

26

27

28

in the Settlement to purchase the Purchased Assets. Buyer expressly acknowledges and agrees that pursuant to said ROFR, Buyer must pay \$500,000.00 into escrow on behalf of the Seller, as Seller's deposit, no later than Monday, March 10, 2014 or the date upon which escrow is opened whichever comes later. Further Buyer expressly acknowledges that it will pay the remaining \$3,700,000.00 into escrow within thirty days of March 7, 2014 to allow Seller to close escrow on the Purchases Assets.

- (d) Seller acknowledges that <u>Buyer is obtaining the funds</u> <u>from Northern Trust Bank (the "Northern Loan") pursuant to a bank approval obtained by Buyer on March 6, 2014</u> and that all the costs Northern Loan including points, bank's attorney's fees and other Northern Loan related expenses shall be charges paid as expenses from the billboards.
- (f) As of the date of closing of this Agreement and on the same date and time that Seller receives title to the Billboard Assets, Seller shall assign...all of its right, title, and interest in and to the Billboard Assets...to Buyer...consistent with the assignment provisions of the APA in full satisfaction of the loan of \$4,200,000.00.
- (h) As of the date of closing of this Agreement, the Management Agreement...for the Billboard Assets entered between Buyer and Seller, wherein Seller will be defined as the Operator of the Purchases Assets, will become effective.
- (k) Seller shall be provided with two (2) options to repurchase the Paradise and Black Bongo billboard <u>locations</u>...as follows upon two (2) days' written notice to Buyer: (i) Payment of THREE MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND AND NO/100 DOLLARS U.S. (\$3,700,000.00) no later than one (1) year from the date of closing of this Agreement between Seller and Buyer ("Option No. 1"); or (ii) Pay of THREE MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND AND NO/100 DOLLARS (\$3,800,000.00 U.S.) no later than eighteen months from the date of closing of this Agreement between Seller and Buyer ("Option No. 2"). Pursuant to Option No. 2, shall provide no less than 60 days' written notice and remit ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND AND NO/100 DOLLARS (\$100,000.00) to Buyer to exercise the same. Option No. 2 shall automatically terminate upon default by Seller under the Management Agreement discussed herein. Option No. 2 shall not be assignable in any event independent of the Management Agreement and Buyer must provide written approval of any contemplated assignee, subject to qualifications related to management of billboards and significant experience related to the same. In no event shall these options ever be interpreted as an equitable mortgage. Buyer shall retain full title to the Oasis billboard location, upon execution of this Assignment Agreement and Bill of Sale, and Seller shall have no right whatsoever to own or purchase that billboard under the terms set forth in this Section.
 - (1) Buyer shall retain full title to the Oasis Billboard,

upon execution of the Assignment Agreement and Bill of Sale, and Seller shall have no right to obtain any ownership interest. <u>Seller and Buyer are executing a Management agreement</u> however, in no event will the Management Agreement or this Agreement provide Seller with any ownership, preemptive or option rights in the Oasis Billboard after closing.

(m) Seller shall pay all attorneys fees incurred by Buyer in review of this Agreement, Seller's ROFR discussed herein, and the Management Agreement, up to a maximum amount of SIX THOUSAND AND NO/100 DOLLARS U.S. (\$6,000.00). If the loan needed to obtain the Purchased Assets is not completed by Buyer, this Agreement will be considered null, void, and without further legal effect, and Buyer shall pay its own attorneys fees as well as any other costs or expenses incurred in investigating the transaction contemplated hereunder.

(Emphasis added).

Section 6 of the L&P Agreement is entitled "Default" and provides as follows:

In the event that Seller defaults in regard to any obligation of Seller hereunder, Buyer may terminate this Agreement, but only upon Seller's failure to cure said default within 30 days of receipt of written notice by Buyer of that default; except under circumstances where Seller is in monetary default for which the cure period shall be ten (10) days upon receipt of written notice by Buyer of that monetary default. In the event of monetary default by Seller, Seller shall be obligated to pay for Buyer's costs of collection, including reasonable attorney's fee directly related to said default.

(Emphasis added).

DISCUSSION

Both sides to the instant dispute assert that their counterpart has failed to comply with ROFR requirements of Section 3(m) of the Settlement Agreement.¹⁰ LEDV asserts that the L&P Agreement does not match the terms of the APA and therefore is not a valid exercise of the ROFR.¹¹ Debtor, on the other hand, asserts that LEDV did not provide it with copies of all the

Debtor attempts to argue that LEDV is not complying with the ROFR requirement based, in part, on earlier settlement drafts and discussions that preceded the Settlement Agreement. See DL Harris Declaration at ¶¶ 29-32. Reference to such drafts and discussions are immaterial in view of the above-quoted language of Sections 11 and 14 of the Settlement Agreement.

The parties also dispute whether the Debtor violated the Settlement Agreement by failing to provide current permits necessary to operate and sell the subject billboards. LEDV maintains that it was required to reduce the purchase price from \$4.5 million to \$4.2 million as a

documents exchanged with its buyer in compliance with Section 3(m). Moreover, Debtor asserts that the Evidence of Funds requirement in Section 2.6(b) of the APA is an unreasonable provision inserted in bad faith. As a consequence, Debtor maintains that the L&P Agreement is a proper exercise of the ROFR under the APA.

As to the first argument raised by the Debtor, Section 3(m) of the Settlement Agreement plainly requires, among other things, for LEDV to give written notice to the Debtor's counsel and its principal of any intended sale of the billboards and to "provide a full and complete copy of all documents exchanged between LEDV and the offeror after redacting the offeror's identity (which specifically identifies the precise offer deemed acceptable by LEDV) by overnight delivery to the office of Marquis Aurbach Coffing." Presumably, only authorized representatives of LEDV and the buyer, as well as those involved in the transaction, would have personal knowledge of the documents exchanged. LEDV represents that all documents exchanged between LEDV and the buyer in connection with both the APA and the APA Amendment were provided to Debtor's counsel. See Second Atamoh Declaration at ¶¶ 17-24. Counsel for the Debtor emailed to LEDV's counsel on February 21, 2014, an acknowledgment that hand delivery of the documents would constitute proper notice under Section 3(m) of the Settlement Agreement. Id. at Exhibit "3." No one disputes that a hand delivery of documents occurred. See Marquis Declaration at ¶ 56. As none of the declarations submitted by the Debtor includes a witness having personal knowledge of the documents exchanged between LEDV and its buyer, the court gives weight to the uncontroverted testimony of LEDV's counsel.¹²

2122

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2627

result of the permits being out of compliance with local law. See Omnibus Cash Declaration at ¶¶ 53-54. It also maintains that it expended \$28,886.87 in costs and government fees to bring the billboards into compliance. See First Garcia Declaration at ¶¶ 43-46; Second Garcia Declaration at ¶¶ 17-23. Debtor disputes whether compliance was required by the Settlement Agreement, see Marquis Declaration at ¶¶ 10-17, and whether all or some of the billboards in fact were noncompliant. Compare DL Harris Declaration at ¶¶ 12-20 with Wilkins Declaration at ¶¶ 4-12. As it appears that compliance has been reached, there is no need to resolve the issue as between LEDV and the Debtor prior to a sale of the billboards.

Debtor raises several arguments concerning the identity of the buyer under the APA. See C Harris Declaration at ¶¶ 17-24; Marquis Declaration at ¶¶ 75-76. The argument is, of course, contrived at best given that Section 3(m) of the Settlement Agreement specifically

1 | 2 | S | 3 | e | 4 | f | 5 | s | 6 | u |

As to the second argument raised by the Debtor, the Evidence of Funds requirement in Section 2.6(b) of the APA obviously is not mirrored in the L&P Agreement. That provision expressly states that "Upon signing this Agreement, Buyer shall provide to Seller evidence of funds on hand in an account in Buyer's name in a chartered banking institution in an amount sufficient to pay the entire balance of the Purchase Price." The record establishes that the buyer under the APA provided to LEDV evidence of the funds necessary to complete the transaction under the original APA within 48 hours of executing that document, see Whitehead Declaration at ¶7, and has deposited into escrow with Chicago Title the full amount required to close the sale under the APA Amendment, i.e., \$4.2 million. Id. at ¶8.

The relevant language of the L&P Agreement does not require proof of such funds. ¹³ In fact, the latter agreement is not even between LEDV and the Debtor, but rather an agreement between the Oasis LV and the Debtor to obtain funds from Oasis LV to be used for the Debtor's purchase of the billboards from LEDV. As indicated from the above-quoted provisions of the L&P Agreement, it is structured for Oasis LV to borrow funds from Northern Trust to pay the \$4.2 million purchase price under the APA Amendment. ¹⁴ In pertinent part, Section 2(b) of the L&P Agreement provides that Oasis LV "…expressly acknowledges and agrees that pursuant to said ROFR, [Oasis LV] must pay \$500,000.00 into escrow on behalf of the Seller, as Seller's deposit, no later than Monday, March 10, 2014 or the date upon which escrow is opened whichever comes later. Further [Oasis LV] expressly acknowledges that it will pay the remaining

provides for the identity of the offeror to be redacted.

¹³ Indeed, the ROFR Letter acknowledges that the Debtor is seeking to alter the terms of the APA by changing the escrow holder and by substituting the evidence of funds requirement in Section 2.6(b). <u>See</u> ROFR Letter at 1 n.1. Debtor asserted that the changes are immaterial.

¹⁴ Debtor would then acquire the billboards from LEDV and assign them to Oasis LV in satisfaction of the loan. Thereafter, Debtor would manage the billboards for a fee as well as a share of the advertising contracts. For up to eighteen months, Debtor also would have the right to purchase the Paradise and Black Bongo billboards from Oasis LV for a specific price, but Oasis LV would retain all rights to the Oasis billboard. The transaction obviously preserves for the Debtor a long-term business opportunity that would be lost if the sale under the APA and APA Amendment is concluded.

\$3,700,000.00 into escrow within thirty days of March 7, 2014 to allow Seller to close escrow on the Purchases Assets." In pertinent part, Section 2(d) then provides that Oasis LV "...is obtaining the funds from Northern Trust Bank (the "Northern Loan") pursuant to a bank approval obtained by Buyer on March 6, 2014 and that all the costs Northern Loan including points, bank's attorney's fees and other Northern Loan related expenses shall be charges paid as expenses from the billboards."

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

Unlike Section 2.6(b) of the APA, Sections 2(b) and 2(d) of the L&P Agreement do not require Oasis LV to provide evidence of funds available to complete the purchase of the billboards from LEDV. In fact, Section 2(d) is the equivalent of a recital indicating that Oasis LV is attempting to obtain a loan from Northern Trust to fund the balance of the purchase price. Unlike the evidence of funds provided by the buyer under the APA and, more important, the buyer's actual deposit of the full purchase price into escrow, Oasis LV's ability to perform under the L&P Agreement depends on its ability to close a loan transaction with Northern Trust. As to the latter, Oasis represents that Northern Trust is its current mortgage lender and "...has committed to finance this transaction as well" apparently as reflected by certain correspondence. See First Koroghli Declaration at ¶ 7 and Exhibit "A." That correspondence is addressed "To whom it may concern" and is dated 3/5/14 ("Northern Trust Letter"). That letter is signed by an individual named Matt Rechner, who apparently is a senior vice president and banking practice lender with Northern Trust, and states as follows: "This letter serves as bank confirmation that the Oasis Las Vegas, LLC partnership holds and has access to significant liquidity in excess of the purchase price contemplated for funding of the acquisition of the subject billboards, leases and other assets in Las Vegas, Nevada." On its face, the language of the Northern Trust Letter does not commit Northern Trust to loan any funds to Oasis LV. 16 Four weeks have elapsed since

¹⁵ Counsel for Oasis LV apparently relies on the same Northern Trust Letter in asserting that his client "had obtained the loan commitment" before the L&P Agreement was executed. <u>See</u> Netzorg Declaration at ¶ 8.

LEDV also argues that the obligations under the L&P Agreement are illusory due to the attorneys fees language of Section 2(m) together with the default language in Section 6. According to Section 2(m), if Oasis LV fails to obtain the loan to complete the purchase of the

that letter was dated, and no additional correspondence or communication from Northern Trust has been offered expressing an intention to loan \$4.2 million or any other sum to Oasis LV. More important, the record does not include a declaration from the letter's author or anyone else from Northern Trust attesting to any commitment to fund a loan to fulfill the purchase price reflected in the APA Amendment.¹⁷

"The purpose of a right of first refusal...is to allow the holder of the right to be notified when the owner intends to sell or has accepted an offer, which, in most cases, will be presumptively the fair market value of the property and to allow the holder to purchase the property under identical terms." 77 Am. Jur.2d, Vendor and Purchaser, § 34 (2nd ed. 2014). A ROFR may be enforced by an order of specific performance. See Rinstone v. Enterprise Bank & Trust, 2012 WL 1681986 at *3 (D. Ariz. 2012). See generally 25 WILLISTON ON CONTRACTS § 67:85 (4th ed. 2013). ROFR provisions are fully enforceable under Nevada law under general contract principles. See, e.g., Crow-Spieker #23 v. Robert L. Helms Const. and Development Co., 731 P.2d 348 (Nev. 1987) (plain language of contract did not trigger right of first refusal).

The party who gives a ROFR must receive a bona fide offer and its decision to accept the offer must be in good faith. See 3 CORBIN ON CONTRACTS § 11.4 (Matthew Bender 2013).

Generally, precision in the terms required to be matched is necessary to prevent the grantor from

billboards, the L&P Agreement "will be considered null, void, and without further legal effect" and Oasis LV would have to pays its attorneys fees otherwise covered by the Debtor. According to Section 6, the Debtor's defaults under the L&P Agreement creates certain rights in favor of Oasis LV, but none in the event of a default by Oasis LV. In other words, if the Debtor is allowed to proceed under the L&P Agreement and the transaction does not close, LEDV could lose its cash buyer under the APA with no or little recourse against the Debtor or Oasis LV.

after the evidentiary record was closed, indicating that it could close the transaction within two weeks if allowed to do so. The representative of Oasis LV attests, in pertinent part, that "After checking with our lender, and reviewing our own cash position, Oasis could close this transaction within two (2) weeks of this Court's order authorizing LVB to proceed with its right of first refusal." Second Koroghli Declaration at ¶ 4. As previously discussed, the Northern Trust Letter was not a loan commitment and the latest declaration from Oasis LV does not evidence that a loan commitment has been received. Indeed, there is still no declaration from a representative of Northern Trust establishing such a commitment. Rather, it appears that Oasis LV is counting on its "own cash position" to fund all or part of the purchase price.

effectively extinguishing the ROFR by including vague terms that cannot be ascertained or met by the holder of the ROFR. See generally 77 Am. Jur.2d, supra, § 35. Additionally, a grantor of an ROFR may not include peculiar terms of burdensome conditions that make compliance impossible. See Davis v. Iofredo, 713 N.E.2d 26, 28 (Ohio App.8 Dist. 1998). Likewise, precision in the acceptance of the terms is necessary to prevent the holder of the ROFR from impeding the marketability of the property. See 77 Am. Jur.2d, supra, at § 35. A holder's exercise of a ROFR cannot be conditional, see, e.g., Christian v. Edelin, 843 N.E.2d 1112, 1115 (Mass.App.Ct. 2006) (offer containing a mortgage contingency is not the same as a cash offer), just as the exercise of an option cannot be equivocal. See United States v. T.W. Corder, Inc., 208 F.2d 411, 413 (9th Cir. 1953) (notice of exercise of an option must be unconditional and in exact accord with the terms of the option); Gershenhorn v. Walter R. Stutz Enterprises, 72 Nev. 293, 306, 304 P.2d 395, 401 (Nev. 1957) (notice of exercise of option insufficient to constitute acceptance of uncertain terms). Where the good faith of the terms required to be matched are challenged, the grantor of the ROFR must provide a reasonable justification for insistence upon the terms. See Prince v. Elm Inv. Co., Inc., 649 P.2d 820, 825 (Utah 1982). Compare West Texas Transmission, L.P. v. Enron Corp., 907 F.2d 1554, 1563 (5th Cir. 1990) ("...the owner of the property subject to a right of first refusal remains master of the conditions under which he will relinquish his interest, as long as those conditions are commercially reasonable, imposed in good faith, and not specifically designed to defeat the preemptive rights.").

In the instant case, the Evidence of Funds requirement in Section 2.6(b) of the APA appears to be consistent with standards in the industry. The uncontroverted testimony from LEDV's broker is that "it is common and customary to require a potential buyer to provide proof of funds in the form of a line of credit, bank statement reflecting the balance in a bank account, or letter from a bank confirming the potential buyer has the financial wherewithal to close the deal based upon proof of funds." See Drachman Declaration at ¶5. Additionally, the uncontroverted testimony from LEDV's broker is that "it is customary and common in the industry to require proof of funds from the potential buyer at or around the time the letter of

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

intent is submitted or offer to purchase is signed by the prospective buyer." Id. at $\P 6.^{18}$

In stark contrast, and as previously discussed, Section 2(b) and Section 2(d) of the L&P Agreement reflect no such requirements. And as previously noted at 17, Debtor still has not provided proof of funds sufficient to complete the purchase transaction, either from its own cash resources or through a commitment from Northern Trust.

There is no dispute that the APA was transmitted to the Debtor on or about December 19, 2013, see Omnibus Cash Declaration at ¶ 51, and that the Debtor conveyed its intention not to exercise the ROFR through an email of its counsel transmitted on January 6, 2014. Id. at ¶ 52 and Exhibit "7" thereto. Although Debtor's counsel previously transmitted emails questioning the necessity for the Evidence of Funds requirement, see Marquis Declaration at ¶ 38 and Exhibits "8" and "9," the presence of the requirement is not mentioned in the January 6, 2014 email as being a factor in the Debtor's decision not to exercise the ROFR at a time when the proposed purchase price was even higher. The court concludes that the Evidence of Funds requirement is commercially reasonable and not designed to defeat the ROFR provided by Section 3(m) of the Settlement Agreement.

Under these circumstances, LEDV's inclusion of the Evidence of Funds requirement is in good faith.

CONCLUSION

The court having concluded that the Evidence of Funds requirement of Section 2.6(b) of the APA is a material term included in good faith, the court also concludes that the L&P Agreement does not match the terms of the APA and does not constitute a valid exercise of the ROFR. The court is satisfied that the buyer under the APA has deposited into escrow funds sufficient to complete the sale transaction.

Nothing in the Marquis Declaration, DL Harris Declaration, C Harris Declaration, Wilkins Declaration, First Koroghli Declaration, or Netzorg Declaration contradicts Drachman's testimony.

¹⁹ Exhibit "7" is a copy of an email dated January 6, 2014, from Debtor's counsel to LEDV's counsel stating, in pertinent part, that "LVB is not going to exercise the right of first refusal on the offer as it was written and presented to LVB..."

1	The court will grant the Enforcement Motion and will authorize the sale under the APA	
2	and APA Amendment to close at or after 12:00 p.m. (noon), Pacific Daylight Time, on April 17	
3	2014. Debtor's Countermotion accordingly will be denied.	
4	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Emergency Motion Enforce Settlement	
5	Agreement, brought by LED Ventures, LLC, Docket No. 636, be, and the same hereby is,	
6	GRANTED AS FOLLOWS: THE PARTIES TO THE ASSET PURCHASE	
7	AGREEMENT, DATED AS OF DECEMBER 18, 2013, AS AMENDED, ARE	
8	AUTHORIZED TO COMPLETE THE SALE TRANSACTION AT OR AFTER 12:00	
9	P.M. (NOON), PACIFIC DAYLIGHT TIME, ON APRIL 17, 2014.	
10	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Countermotion for Specific Performance,	
11	brought by Las Vegas Billboards, LLC, Docket No. 646, be, and the same hereby is, DENIED .	
12		
13	Notice and Copies sent through:	
14		
15	BNC MAILING MATRIX	
16		
17	###	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		