

# Jorden Timothy **ciemlestics**

# Official Service Of Demand For Arbitration - JAMS

Jorden Timothy

Tue, Feb 18 at 7:34 PM

To: smoore@grsm.com <smoore@grsm.com>
Cc: Jamie Olyera <volvera@grsm.com>

Dear Sara A. Moore,

Pursuant to JAMS rules and the arbitration agreement, attached is a formal Demand for Arbitration filed against the following Respondents:

- 1. DRVM LLC (Dissolved)
- 2. AMJ Services LLC
- 3. Maged Boutros (Individually, under ORS 60.645)
- JAMS has received and processed the arbitration filing, including all supporting exhibits. If you require direct access to these documents, please confirm, and I will provide them separately.

As you are now representing the Respondents, this email serves as official notice and service of the arbitration filing.

Please confirm receipt of this email. Additionally, please confirm whether you represent all three Respondents listed above. If there is a separate legal representative for any Respondent, kindly provide their contact information for further communications.

Best regards,

Jorden Hollingsworth

FACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE PART

Demand of Arbitration.pdf, JAMS Arbitration Demand.pdf



#### Confirmation of Representation - Amendment to Demand

3 messages

## Jorden Timothy <

Thu, Feb 27 at 4:07 PM

To: <smoore@grsm.com>

Cc: Jamie Olvera <yolvera@grsm.com>

Sara Moore,

I am submitting an amendment to my arbitration demand, which includes naming additional respondents. Given your representation of the original respondents, I need confirmation on whether you will also be representing the newly named parties.

Since my previous emails have gone unanswered, I am setting a firm deadline of Monday for your response. If I do not receive confirmation by 10:00AM on March 3rd, 2025, I will proceed with serving each newly named respondent individually.

I expect a response to this email confirming either (1) that you will be representing the additional respondents, or (2) that they will need to be served separately. Please advise accordingly.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Best,

Jorden Hollingsworth

\* Exhibit List.pdf, \*New Amendment .pdf

Sara Moore <smoore@grsm.com>

Mon, Mar 3 at 1:18 PM

Dear Mr. Timothy:

We have received your Amended Demand for Arbitration, dated February 27, 2025. As stated previously in my February 14 communication, we can confirm that we represent Respondent DRVM, LLC. We also understand based on your amended demand that you have named 10 additional respondents, but we will need to confirm whether they are properly named as we suspect many are not appropriate parties to this claim and whether we will represent them.

Given that the demand raises causes of action under Oregon law, my colleague, Nicole Demmon, will be handling this claim on behalf of DRVM moving forward. She will contact you soon to schedule a time to meet and confer about the named respondents and service.

Thanks,

SARA A. MOORE

Partner & Bay Area Co-Practice Group Leader

GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI I GRSM50 YOUR 50 STATE LAW FIRM™

315 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94111 P: 415.986.5900 | F: 415.986.8054 smoore@grsm.com

grsm.com

vCard | Bio | LinkedIn

[Quoted text hidden]

of the cranded relipects crastified allows. If you are list the intended technical of this communication, you are hereby notified that thy unioritizated, notes, with dissentration, distribution, dissentiability or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient and her

### GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP YOUR 50 STATE LAW FIRM™ http://www.grsm.com

orden Timothy	Mon, Mar 3 at 1:27 PM
o: Sara Moore <smoore@grsm.com></smoore@grsm.com>	

Dear Ms. Moore,

Thank you for your response confirming receipt of my amended demand for arbitration. I understand that your firm represents DRVM, LLC and that you are assessing whether you will also represent additional respondents.

To clarify, all named respondents were included based on clear financial, payroll, and business structuring connections to the claims at issue. Given the nature of this dispute, the appropriate forum to determine each respondent's involvement is through full discovery, including payroll records, commission structures, and financial transfers between entities.

I am open to a meet-and-confer discussion regarding procedural matters, including service, but I want to emphasize that any argument regarding whether a respondent is an "appropriate party" is premature at this stage, as no discovery has taken place. The facts surrounding payroll movement, commissions, and financial responsibility will determine liability, and I intend to request full discovery into these matters before any determinations are made regarding respondent involvement.

Please let me know your availability to schedule a discussion. I look forward to your colleague, Ms. Demmon,

reaching out.

Best regards.

Jorden Hollingsworth

[Quoted text hidden]