# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

MOHAMMAD HAMED, by his )	
authorized agent WALEED HAMED,	
	CIVIL NO. SX-12-CV-370
Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant,	
, )	ACTION FOR DAMAGES,
vs.	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
vs. )	AND DECLARATORY RELIEF
FATHI YUSUF and UNITED CORPORATION,	
FAIII 1050F and UNITED CORI ORATION,)	
Defendants/Counterclaimants, )	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendants/Counterclaimants,	JUNI INIAL DEMANDED
,	
vs.	
)	
WALEED HAMED, WAHEED HAMED,	
MUFEED HAMED, HISHAM HAMED, and )	
PLESSEN ENTERPRISES, )	
)	
Additional Counterclaim Defendants. )	)
)	1
)	

### RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF DEFENDANTS' NON-RESPONSE RE REQUEST TO STIPULATE TO EXISTENCE OF PARTNERSHIP

Defendants/counterclaimants Fathi Yusuf ("Yusuf") and United Corporation ("United") (collectively, the "Defendants"), respectfully submit that this Court should ignore the "Notice of Defendants' Non-Response Re Request to Stipulate to Existence of Partnership" (the "Notice") because Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Regarding the Existence of the Partnership was completely unnecessary, as is the proposed stipulation. In Defendants' Opposition to the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, after pointing out their concession of the partnership contained in pleadings filed with this Court, Defendants stated:

Since April 7, 2014, there is no longer any controversy that there was a partnership between Yusuf and Hamed to carry on as co-owners the business of the Plaza Extra Stores. This position was also stated by counsel for Defendants on the record at the telephonic hearing on May 29, 2014.

P.O. Box 756 St. Thomas, U.S. V.I. 00804-0756 (340) 774-4422

DUDLEY, TOPPER
AND FEUERZEIG, LLP
1000 Frederiksberg Gade

Obviously, the proposed stipulation goes far beyond the mere stipulation as to the existence of a partnership.

Hamed v. Yusuf, et al. Case No. SX-12-CV-370 Page 2

<u>See</u> Opposition at p. 3, ¶ 6. Accordingly, the statement in the Notice that "Apparently Defendants want the benefit of being able to move past the issue of dissolving their business relationship with Plaintiff without admitting there is a partnership" makes absolutely no sense.

In the Notice, Hamed quotes from a single page (89) of Yusuf's 229 page deposition transcript suggesting he is waffling on the existence of the partnership. Hamed conveniently ignores the extensive testimony from that deposition where Yusuf repeatedly acknowledges the existence of the partnership. See Exhibit 1 at p. 19, 24-6, 52-5, and 71.

Accordingly, because the existence of a partnership is not disputed, this Court should not waste its valuable time performing the completely unnecessary task of deciding an undisputed issue.

DUDLEY\_FOPPER and FEUERZEIG, LLP

Dated: July 2, 2014

By:

Gregory H. Hodges (V.I. Bar No. 174) 1000 Frederiksberg Gade - P.O. Box 756

St. Thomas, VI 00804 Telephone: (340) 715-4405 Telefax: (340) 715-4400 E-mail:ghodges@dtflaw.com

and

Nizar A. DeWood, Esq. (V.I. Bar No. 1177)

The DeWood Law Firm

2006 Eastern Suburbs, Suite 101

Christiansted, VI 00830 Telephone: (340) 773-3444 Telefax: (888) 398-8428

Email: info@dewood-law.com

Attorneys for Fathi Yusuf and United Corporation

DUDLEY, TOPPER AND FEUERZEIG, LLP

1000 Frederiksberg Gade
P.O. Box 756
St. Thomas, U.S. V.I. 00804-0756
(340) 774-4422

Hamed v. Yusuf, et al. Case No. SX-12-CV-370 Page 3

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July 2014, I caused the foregoing Response To Notice Of Defendants' Non-Response Re Request To Stipulate To Existence Of Partnership to be served upon the following via e-mail:

Joel H. Holt, Esq.
Law Offices of Joel H. Holt
2132 Company Street
Christiansted, V.I. 00820
Email: holtvi@aol.com

Mark W. Eckard, Esq. Eckard, P.C. P.O. Box 24849 Christiansted, VI 00824 Email: mark@markeckard.com Carl Hartmann, III, Esq. 5000 Estate Coakley Bay, #L-6 Christiansted, VI 00820 Email: carl@carlhartmann.com

Jeffrey B.C. Moorhead, Esq. C.R.T. Building 1132 King Street Christiansted, VI 00820 Email: jeffreymlaw@yahoo.com

Michel Bart

R:\DOC\$\6254\1\DRFTPLDG\1570588.DOCX

DUDLEY, TOPPER AND FEUERZEIG, LLP

1000 Frederiksberg Gade
P.O. Box 756
St. Thomas, U.S. V.I. 00804-0756
(340) 774-4422

## 

#### THE VIDEOTAPED ORAL DEPOSITION OF FATHI YUSUF

was taken on the 2nd day of April, 2014, at the Law Offices of Adam Hoover, 2006 Eastern Suburb, Christiansted, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, between the hours of 9:17 a.m. and 4:16 p.m., pursuant to Notice and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Reported by:

Cheryl L. Haase
Registered Professional Reporter
Caribbean Scribes, Inc.
2132 Company Street, Suite 3
Christiansted, St. Croix U.S.V.I.
(340) 773-8161

**EXHIBIT** 

1

Q. First of all, Item No. 2, My brother-in-law,

Mohammad Hamed, and I have been full partners in the

Plaza Extra Supermarket since 1984, while we were obtaining

financing and constructing the store, which finally opened

in 1986.

Is that true?

- A. Yes.
- Q. No. 3, Mohammad -- Mohammad Hamed and I decided to open a St. Thomas Plaza Extra store, and used our own capital and later obtained financing to make the store ready for opening.

Is that true?

- A. That's true.
- Q. No. 4, Mohammad Hamed gave his eldest son, Waleed a/k/a Wally, power of attorney to manage his interest for the family.

Is that true?

A. Hold on to No. 4, please.

Yes, it -- I would say yes, but my understanding really of that time, the man give a power of attorney to his son.

- Q. Okay.
- A. I said here to -- to manage his affair? That's fine.
  - Q. You had no problem with that?

1	A. Go ahead, sir.
2	Q. All right. Going just on that same document, Item
3	No. 41. And that's a short one, it says, The Hameds and I
4	were able to turn the store around by the last part of 1994.
5	Is that correct?
6	A. Yes.
7	(Deposition Exhibit No. 3 was
8	marked for identification.)
9	Q. (Mr. Holt) All right. Showing you Exhibit No. 3,
10	these are interrogatories filed in the same case in
11	St. Thomas. If you look over on the last page, can you tell
12	me, or second-to-last page, if that's your signature?
13	A. I see two signature. I see my son on top, and my
14	signature below.
15	Q. Okay. And those are signed under oath, is that
16	correct?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Okay. Looking at this document, can you go to
19	Interrogatory No. 2, which is on Page 4, and it has a
20	sentence in it that says, Without waiving said objection,
21	Mohammad Hamed?
22	MR. HODGES: Hold on. Hold on.
23	Q. (Mr. Holt) See No. 2?
24	A. Yeah, I see No. 2. Yes, sir.
25	Q. (Mr. Holt) It says, Without waiving said

objection, Mohammad Hamed is a partner in Plaza Extra Supermarkets, and has been since the mid-1980s, is that correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And then over on Item No. 3, Interrogatory No. 3, on the next page, it says, Notwithstanding said objection, Waleed Hamed has been working for Plaza Extra on and off since 1986.

#### Is that correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Next sentence, From the time he worked at the St. Thomas Plaza Extra during the period of plaintiff's joint venture with United, which is the only relevant issue, he was a partner with general management duties, is that correct?
- A. He's -- excuse me. Give me chance to let me read it, please.
  - Q. Sure.
- A. He was general manager, sir, by the way, where? Wally was general manager where?
- Q. I'm just reading the answer. It says he was -says, At the time he worked at the St. Thomas Plaza Extra
  during the period of plaintiff's joint venture with United,
  which is the only relevant issue, he was a partner with
  general management duties.

So I guess that would be the St. Thomas store?

A. Well, we weren't there, really. We weren't there for less than a month, I believe. We just helping out somebody, our partner, the one we -- we have a joint venture with, and he was supposed to do a one-third, one-third, one-third income or loss. It's fine. And we went there to help him. None of us was getting salaries. And that is, I think, a month to six weeks, no more.

Wally were never in charge for Plaza Extra

St. Thomas. He, yes, one of the management. I used to give him a lot of duty, a lot of responsibility.

- Q. Okay. And then, so he wasn't a partner with the general management duties. He was just a manager.
  - A. He's not a partner.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. He's never a partner. Wally never a partner. Wally was employed as a manager. His father was my associate with a deal that I'll give him 50 percent of the profit of Plaza Extra store, whether it's one store or 300 store.
- Q. Okay. And then looking over at Item No. 4, and the only difference between 3 and 4 is instead of saying Waleed Hamed, it says Waheed Hamed. And my question was, was Waheed Hamed a partner with general management duties?

Q. You agree, though, that Mr. Mohammad Hamed is your partner to the extent that he is sharing in 50 percent of the net profits of the three Plaza Extra stores.

A. He's my partner, sir, under a lot of conditions. There is a uniform law of a partnership, and there is individual agreement. If you want to call it in the -- in the category of partners, you may call it, but there is an agreement and commitment attached to that. It's not there is a loan at 20-percent interest, there is a loan at 8-percent interest, and there is a loan, a friendship, at no interest at all, but we all call them loan. Isn't it?

I have, with this gentleman, a shake-hand commitment, and I live up to it up to now, just to show you how clean I am and how decent I am, this man never have my signature as a partner, but I have never deny him as a partner in the profit. But there is a lot of condition, he have to live up to it.

- Q. Okay. I'll get to the conditions in a second.
- A. Okay.
- Q. So you haven't denied that he's a partner in 50 percent of the net profits in the three stores?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you've also agreed that he owns 50 percent of the inventory and equipment in the stores, the three stores, correct?

A.	Yes.

- Q. Okay. And that would include 50-percent interest in the net profits of any bank accounts, payables, receivables?
  - A. Whatever is belong to Plaza is for me and him.
- Q. Okay. Now, you mentioned some conditions. What conditions are there?

Are there some other conditions to this partnership agreement?

A. No. The condition is, I have the final word.

It's I am obligated to consult with him, if I see it's important for me to consult. I was suppose to be, after 1993, I was supposed to have an office within the supermarket free of charge. I was -- he was supposed to, the Plaza Extra was supposed to pay all the gross receipt from January 1st, 1994 up to present, and it was covering in the building, the entire building of United Shopping Plaza.

My duty was, is to go and commit the same thing we ensure, to bring money to Mr. Hamed an extent, which cost him nothing. It cost me personal guarantee, and it costing me everything I own except my children and my wife.

- Q. Okay. And so I'm going to go back in reverse order a little bit.
  - A. Yes.

24

25

office that --

- 1 When you say one of the conditions was -- was he 2 agreed to cover United, you're talking about insurance coverage, is that what you're talking about? 3 4 A. No, including the insurance. 5 Okay. So the Plaza Extra stores would pay for Q. 6 insurance on the whole shopping center? 7 A. Yes. 8 And the Plaza Extra Supermarket would pay the Q. 9 gross receipts, not just on the grocery store profits, but 10 on the rent? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Okay. 13 Excuse me. One more item. The United Shopping 14 Plaza was using the entire shopping center value 15 depreciation to offset any income tax, which that, in 16 return, it will give you greater saving than the insurance 17 and the gross receipt. 18 Q. So there's a tradeoff you're giving them --19 It's a tradeoff, yes. A. 20 You're giving them depreciation; they're paying Q. 21 gross receipts and insurance? 22 A. Yes. Yes, sir. 23 Q. Okay. And then you said that something about an
  - A. No, I have -- you see, I have an office in the --

25

1 for our shopping center manager, within the supermarket. 2 It's on the second floor. And by the way, I'm not charging 3 for the second floor. 4 Q. Okay. And then you also said that one of the 5 conditions was that you would have the final word, but that 6 you 7 A. Excuse me. 8 Q. You said that one of the conditions was that you 9 would have the final word, --10 A. Oh, yes. 11 -- but that you did have an obligation to consult Q. 12 with him? 13 A. An absolute obligation, yes. 14 Q. Okay. All right. 15 Now, I want to go back to this -- to this 16 deposition, because this ties a little bit into it. 17 Yeah, okay. A. 18 Okay. It says, I see Mr. Idheileh come knock on 19 my door, come on in, shake hand, I offer him coffee. I -- I 20 don't remember whether he took it or not. 21 MR. HODGES: Pardon me. What page are you 22 reading from? 23 THE WITNESS: This is --24 MR. HOLT: Page 21, the top, about halfway

down, which says, I see Mr. Idheileh come knock on my door.

1	A. Yes.	
2	Q. Is that true?	
3	A. Yes, sir.	
4	Q. Okay. The partnership was formed for the purpose	
5	of operating supermarkets in the district of St. Croix and	
6	St. Thomas.	
7	Is that true?	
8	A. Yes, sir. It's true.	(
9	Q. Okay. And then the next one says, where, A	
10	serious dispute and disagreement between the partners	
11	A. Where where are you reading, sir?	
12	Q. The third one down where, A serious dispute	
13	between the partners related to financial matters resulting	
14	in the partners being unable to continue.	
15	Do you see that one? That's the third one	
16	down?	
17	THE WITNESS: Which one? Which one? Right	
18	here?	
19	MR. HODGES: Yeah.	
20	A. Yeah, whatever it is.	
21	Q. (Mr. Holt) Okay. What what were the disputes	
22	and disagreements?	
23	A. What dispute?	
24	Q. It says, Serious disputes and disagreements have	
25	arisen between the partners.	