1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	DICTO	CT COURT
8	DISTRICT COURT  CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
9	CLARK COU	UNII, NEVADA
10	RONALD D. SLOAN; ROBIN SCHWARZ; GARY COLLINS; JILL BROWN; LARK TERRELL; NANCY HERBOLD; DANIEL R. SLOAN; BETTY ANN SLOAN; PEARL	Case No.: A-14-701465-B Dept. No.: XI
12	KIRK; JAMES BOAN; N O WAIT; LARRY ORWICK; PATRICIA LA SALLE; BRIAN	
13 14	WOLFE; STUART R. CAMERON; ROBERT WEBSTER; HUGO BONDI; JOAN BRATSETH; P A BRATSETH;	
15	DEREK MILANI; DEAN RACHEY; SAM BROUNSTEIN; SANDRA JANSEN; BRIAN	NOTICE OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT
16	JANSEN; RHONDA KIM NICHOLS; SCOTT NICHOLS; CARMEN ADAIR;	AND SETTLEMENT HEARING
17	KRISTA SCHOFIELD; MARK BRATSETH; ROSE TRUST 11; CLIFF OLSON; DON	
18	COLLINS; ROYCE NORDSTROM; NATALIE MAYZEL; DAVID JESSKE;	
19.	THORNTON D. BARNES; JAMES HASON; SANDRA HASON; EDDIE GUILLET; RYAN GUILLET;	
20 21	ON BEHALF OF CAN-CAL RESOURCES, LTD.,	
22	Plaintiffs,	
23	vs.	
24	CAN-CAL RESOURCES, LTD., a Nevada corporation; WILLIAM J. HOGAN;	
25	THOMPSON MACDONALD; RONALD SCHINNOUR; MICHAEL HOGAN;	
26	CANDEO LAVA PRODUCTS, INC. a Canadian Corporation, and FUTUREWORTH	
27	CAPITAL CORP., a Canadian Corporation,	
28	Defendants.	
		1

TO:

ALL OWNERS OF CAN-CAL RESOURCES, LTD. ("CAN-CAL" OR "THE COMPANY") COMMON STOCK AS OF March 15, 2018 ("CURRENT CAN-CAL SHAREHOLDERS"). 1

PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY AND IN ITS ENTIRETY. YOUR RIGHTS MAY BE AFFECTED. THIS NOTICE RELATES TO A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND DISMISSAL OF SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE LITIGATION AND CONTAINS IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS. YOUR RIGHTS MAY BE AFFECTED BY LEGAL PROCEEDINGS IN THIS DERIVATIVE ACTION.

IF THE COURT APPROVES THE SETTLEMENT AND DISMISSAL OF THE DERIVATIVE ACTION, CURRENT SHAREHOLDERS WILL BE FOREVER BARRED FROM CONTESTING THE APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND FROM PURSUING THE SETTLED CLAIMS. THESE ACTIONS ARE NOT "CLASS ACTONS." THUS, THERE IS NO COMMON FUND UPON WHICH YOU CAN MAKE A CLAIM FOR A MONETARY PAYMENT.

THE COURT HAS MADE NO FINDINGS OR DETERMINATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE MERITS OF THE DERIVATIVE ACTION. THE RECITATION OF THE BACKGROUND AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE SETTLEMENT CONTAINED HEREIN DOES NOT CONSTITUTE THE FINDINGS OF THE COURT. IT IS BASED ON REPRESENTATIONS MADE TO THE COURT BY COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES.

IF YOU WERE NOT THE BENEFICIAL OWNER OF CAN-CAL COMMON STOCK ON THE DATE ABOVE, PLEASE TRANSMIT THIS NOTICE TO SUCH BENEFICIAL OWNER.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED, pursuant to an Order of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Clark County (the "Court"), that a proposed settlement agreement (the "Settlement") has been reached between Can-Cal, the Individual Defendants, the Corporate Defendants, and Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and derivatively on behalf of Can-Cal in connection with the following shareholder derivative action: *Ronald D. Sloan, et al. v. Can-Cal Resources, Ltd.*, et al., Case No. A-14-701465-B, pending in the above Court (the "Derivative Action").

This Notice incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement ("Stipulation") fully executed as of March 15, 2018, and all capitalized terms used herein, unless otherwise defined, shall have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation. The Stipulation may be inspected at the office of Clerk of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Clark County, located at 200 Lewis Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89155, during business hours of each business day and is also available on the website of Defendants' Counsel at Holland & Hart at <a href="https://www.hollandhart.com/lasvegas#newsInsight">www.hollandhart.com/lasvegas#newsInsight</a> and Jones Lovelock at <a href="https://www.sklar-law.com/Notices/Can-Cal">www.sklar-law.com/Notices/Can-Cal</a>).

Plaintiffs filed the Derivative Action derivatively on behalf of Can-Cal and allege that the Corporate Defendants and Individual Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Company in connection with Can- Cal's property located in Pisgah, San Bernardino County, California, known as the "Pisgah Property." The Pisgah Property is made up of a volcanic cinder material known as the "Pisgah Material." In summary, Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants sought to ursurp a corporate opportunity through an Amended Material Supply Agreement ("Amended MSA") entered into by Can-Cal with a company called Candeo Lava Products, Inc. ("Candeo").

The proposed Settlement, if approved by the Court, would fully and forever resolve the Derivative Action on the terms set forth in the Stipulation, which are summarized in this Notice, and include the dismissal of the Derivative Action with prejudice.

This Notice is not intended to be and should not be construed as an expression of any opinion by the Court with respect to the merits of the claims made in the Derivative Action but is merely to advise you of the proposed Settlement and of your rights as a Current Can-Cal Shareholder.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

### A. The Derivative Action

Beginning on May 29, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a shareholder derivative complaint in this Court, the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Clark County, against the Individual Defendants, the Corporate Defendants and nominal Defendant Can-Cal, styled as:

1

Ronald D. Sloan, et al. v. Can- Cal Resources, Ltd., et al, Case No. A-14-701465-B (the "Derivative Action"). The Derivative Action alleges breaches of fiduciary duty, unjust enrichment, abuse of control, gross mismanagement, and taking of corporate opportunities relating to the events alleged in the Complaint. The Derivative Action seeks compensatory damages, punitive damages, corporate governance reforms, restitution and disgorgement of Defendants' alleged profits, equitable and/or injunctive relief, and costs and attorneys' fees. Plaintiffs' fundamental claim is that Individual Defendants William Hogan, Ronald Schinnour, Michael Hogan and Thompson MacDonald took from Can-Cal a corporate opportunity and engaged in self-dealing by entering into favorable contracts for their personal benefit, awarding themselves excessive compensation through stock and taking from the company its main corporate asset and opportunity, the development of its Pisgah Material, located at the Pisgah Property. Plaintiffs allege the Individual Defendants conspired to transfer the benefit of that corporate opportunity and asset to former Chairman of the Board William Hogan and a company under his control, Candeo Lava Products, Inc. ("Candeo"), through a Material Supply Agreement ("MSA") entered into by and between Can-Cal and Candeo and an Amended Material Supply Agreement ("Amended MSA"). Defendants have denied all liability and damages.

# B. The Canadian Action

On or about January 24, 2017, the Corporate Defendants and William J. Hogan, collectively, filed a Statement of Claim commencing an action in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta, Calgary, Canada, naming as defendants 36 of the 40 original individual Plaintiffs in the Nevada Derivative Action (the "Canadian Action"). The Canadian Action alleges that the primary purpose of the Derivative Action was a civil conspiracy among the Derivative Action Plaintiffs to unlawfully interfere with the Amended MSA and Cadeo's research, development and verification of the Pisgah Material. The Canadian Action seeks general damages of \$3,187,500.00, consequential damages for loss of business opportunities in an amount to be proven at trial, punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial and costs and other relief as deemed appropriate by the Court. The defendants in the Canadian Action have denied all liability

and damages.

# II. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS AND THE BENEFITS OF THE SETTLEMENT

Plaintiffs believe that the Derivative Action has substantial merit and that the Canadian Action is without merit. Plaintiffs' entry into this Stipulation and Settlement is not intended to be and shall not be construed as an admission or concession concerning the relative strength or merit of the claims alleged in the Derivative Action or the Canadian Action. Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel also acknowledge the significant risk, expense, and length of continued proceedings necessary to defend the Canadian Action and prosecute the Derivative Action against Defendants through trial and through possible appeals. Plaintiffs' Counsel have also taken into account the substantial risks, costs, and delays involved in complex shareholder derivative litigation, generally, as well as the unique challenges presented by the Derivative Action and the defense of the Canadian Action, including pleading fraud with the requisite particularity, and the significant challenges of meeting the burdens of proof applicable to the underlying claims and of defeating the available affirmative defenses, including the business judgment rule and the exculpation and indemnification rights afforded the Individual Defendants pursuant to Nevada Law under NRS Chapter 78 and the Articles and By-Laws of Can-Cal.

Plaintiffs' Counsel have conducted an extensive investigation over the course of three years, including: (i) reviewing Can-Cal's press releases, public statements, SEC filings, and expert witnesses' reports about the Company and the potential economic value of the Pisgah Material; (ii) reviewing Confidential information and test result and reports about the Pisgah Material and its potential commercial uses and value; (iii) researching the applicable law with respect to the claims alleged in the Derivative Action and the Canadian Action and the potential claims and defenses thereto; (iv) preparing and filing the derivative complaint and numerous Motions in the Derivative Action and the Canadian Action, including defending against the removal of the Derivative Action to Federal Court in Nevada and its subsequent remand to state court, multiple motions to dismiss the Derivative Action, a successful motion to compel an annual meeting of the stockholders of Can-Cal, a successful motion to compel discovery, and

numerous communications and letters regarding discovery matters and disputes; (v) conducting damages analyses and expert witness analyses; (vi) participating in informal conferences with Defendants' Counsel regarding the specific facts of the cases, the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the cases, and other issues in an effort to facilitate negotiations and fact gathering; (vii) evaluating the merits of, and Defendants' potential liability in connection with the Derivative Action; (viii) reviewing and analyzing confidential document discovery produced by Defendants; (ix) reviewing and analyzing relevant documents in the Derivative Action and evaluating the merits thereof; (x) submitting numerous correspondence and other documents to the SEC and filing formal motions to intervene and responses in the SEC Administrative Proceeding involving Can-Cal to protect the stockholders' interests; (xi) submitting comprehensive briefs prior to two separate Judicial Settlement Conferences, outlining their position, and Plaintiffs' claims in the Derivative Action; (xii) participating in two (2) in-person Judicial Settlement Conferences and meetings in the Derivative Action; (xiii) assisting Canadian counsel in filing a defense and motion to adjourn in the Canadian Action; and (xiv) negotiating this Settlement with Defendants at a day-long in-person meeting on November 13, 2017.

Based on Plaintiffs' Counsel's thorough review and analysis of the relevant facts and difficult circumstances, allegations, defenses, and controlling legal principles, Plaintiffs' Counsel believe that the Settlement set forth in this Stipulation is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and confers substantial benefits upon Can-Cal and its shareholders. Based on their evaluation, Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel have determined that the Settlement is in the best interests of Can-Cal and its shareholders and have agreed to settle the Derivative Action and the Canadian Action upon the terms and subject to the conditions set forth herein.

# III. DEFENDANTS' DENIALS OF WRONGDOING AND LIABILITY

Defendants have denied and continue to deny each and all of the claims, contentions, and allegations made against them or that could have been made against them in the Derivative Action and Defendants believe the Derivative Action has no merit and that the claims in the Canadian Action do have merit. Defendants have expressly denied and continue to deny all

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

charges of wrongdoing or liability against them arising out of any of the conduct, statements, acts, or omissions alleged, or that could have been alleged in the Derivative Action. Defendants assert that they have satisfied their fiduciary duties and have acted in good faith and in the best interest of Can-Cal and its shareholders at all relevant times. Defendants have entered into this Stipulation and Settlement solely to avoid the continuing additional expense, inconvenience, and distraction of the Derivative Action and the Canadian Action and to mitigate the risks and uncertainty inherent in any legal proceedings. Defendants believe that it is desirable and beneficial that the Derivative Action and the Canadian Action be settled in the manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Stipulation because, among other things, it will allow the Company to conclude these legal proceedings on terms that are just and reasonable, including the amendment of the Amended MSA to give Can-Cal substantial equity funds in a short period of time, the completion of required audits for 2015, 2016 and through third quarter 2017 (which were filed with the SEC on March 12, 2018) and which may enable Can-Cal's stock to continue trading and resolve the SEC Administrative Proceeding, the adoption and maintenance of corporate governance measures, including selection of a new Board of Directors, that the current Board of Can-Cal has determined, in its business judgment, serve Can-Cal's and its shareholders' best interests. Further, Can-Cal through its Board, acknowledges that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of Can-Cal and its shareholders.

Neither the Stipulation, nor any of its terms or provisions, nor entry of the Judgment, nor any document or exhibit referred or attached to the Stipulation, nor any action taken to carry out the Stipulation, is, may be construed as, or may be used as evidence of the validity of any of the Released Claims or an admission by or against Defendants of any fault, wrongdoing, or concession of liability whatsoever.

#### IV. THE SETTLEMENT HEARING

The Settlement Hearing will be held before Department 11 of this Court on July 9, 2018 at 8:30 a.m., located at the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Clark County, 200 Lewis Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89155, to determine: (a)

whether the proposed Settlement, upon the terms set forth in the Stipulation, should be finally approved in all respects as fair, reasonable, and adequate; (b) whether the Judgment approving the Settlement should be entered; (c) whether Plaintiffs' Counsel's agreed-to Fee and Expense Amount and Can-Cal's Share issuance should be finally approved; and (d) whether the corporate governance and other changes to Can-Cal's operations should be approved. The Settlement Hearing may be continued by the Court at the Settlement Hearing, or at any adjourned session thereof without further notice.

#### V. THE SETTLEMENT

The terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement are set forth fully in the Stipulation and its Exhibits. The Stipulation has been filed with the Court and the following is only a summary of the terms of the settlement and the payments and corporate governance matters addressed in the Stipulation.

As a result of the filing, prosecution, and settlement of the Derivative Action and the Canadian Action, Can-Cal has already adopted and implemented and/or will adopt and implement the Second Amended MSA, attached as Exhibit A to the Stipulation and the corporate resolutions and amendments to the Articles of Incorporation and other corporate governance measures described in Exhibit B to the Stipulation within thirty (30) calendar days after the Effective Date of the Settlement. The Amended MSA and the corporate governance measures were jointly developed and negotiated by the Parties through Counsel. Without admitting any wrongdoing, Can-Cal, through its Board, acknowledges that the securing of the Second Amended MSA and the corporate governance reform measures confer substantial benefits upon the Company and its shareholders. Can-Cal, through its Board, also acknowledges that the prosecution and settlement of the Derivative Action and the resolution of the Canadian Action were substantial and material factors in the Board's decision to enter into the Second Amended MSA and adopt and implement the corporate governance measures identified in Exhibit B to the Stipulation.

Further, Can-Cal shall receive \$50,000 working capital from the Initial Settlement Payment under the Stipulation and another \$150,000 pursuant to the Second Amended MSA

within six months of the Effective Date (plus additional revenues under the Second Amended MSA) and Plaintiffs' Counsel will be paid in full for their services and reimbursed for their costs and expenses as provided for in the Stipulation and the Board of Directors of Can-Cal will resign and be replaced by a Board of Directors selected by Plaintiffs and Defendants.

This Notice provides a summary of some, but not all, of the payments and benefits Can-Cal will receive and the corporate governance reforms that Can-Cal has enacted or agreed to enact as consideration for the Settlement. For a list of all of the payments, corporate governance reforms and other benefits, please see the Stipulation and Exhibits A and B attached to the Stipulation.

#### VI. DISMISSAL AND RELEASES

If the Court approves the Settlement at the Settlement Hearing, the Parties will jointly request entry of the Judgment by the Court, the entry of which is a condition of the Stipulation:

(a) approving finally the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation as fair, adequate, and reasonable, and directing its consummation pursuant to its terms; (b) dismissing with prejudice the Derivative Action and all Released Claims against Released Persons<sup>2</sup>; and (c) permanently barring and enjoining the institution, commencement, or prosecution by Released Persons and all Current Can-Cal Shareholders against Released Persons of any Released Claims or any claims arising from, relating to, or in connection with the institution, prosecution, assertion, defense, settlement, or resolution of the Derivative Action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The terms Released Claims and Released Persons are defined as follows:

<sup>• &</sup>quot;Released Claims" means any and all suits, claims, debts, demands, controversies, obligations, losses, rights, liabilities, and causes of action of every nature, including both known and Unknown Claims (as defined in paragraph 1.28 of the Stipulation), whether arising under federal, state, common or foreign law, at law or in equity, that were asserted or could have been asserted, directly or derivatively on behalf of Can-Cal, by Plaintiffs as shareholders or by any other Current Can-Cal Shareholder, or by Can-Cal, that arise out of or relate to: (i) the allegations asserted in the Derivative Action; or (ii) the Settlement, except for any claims to enforce the Settlement.

<sup>• &</sup>quot;Released Persons" means each and all of Can-Cal, the Corporate Defendants, the Individual Defendants, and their Related Persons.

In consideration of the obligations and commitments undertaken by Defendants and the releases by the Released Persons, which constitute good and valuable consideration, and subject to the terms and conditions of the Stipulation, on the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and all Current Can-Cal Shareholders (solely in their capacity as Can-Cal shareholders) shall fully, finally and forever release, relinquish and discharge as against the Released Persons any and all of the Released Claims (including Unknown Claims), and shall forever be barred and enjoined from instituting, commencing, or prosecuting any and all Released Claims against the Released Persons.

#### VII. ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES

In recognition of the substantial benefits provided to Can-Cal and Current Can-Cal Shareholders as a result of the initiation, prosecution, pendency, and settlement of the Derivative Actions, including the entry of the Second Amended MSA and the corporate governance matters referred to herein, Plaintiffs' Counsel will request, and Candeo has agreed to pay or cause to be paid, subject to the Court's approval, attorneys' fees and expenses in the total amount of \$375,000 (the "Fee and Expense Amount") to be paid by Candeo under the Second Amended MSA, of which Can-Cal shall retain \$50,000 as capital. To date, Plaintiffs' Counsel have neither received any payment for their services in conducting the Derivative Action, nor have they been reimbursed for their out-of-pocket expenses incurred in excess of \$100,000.

Moreover, in light of the substantial benefits they have helped to create for Can-Cal and all Current Can-Cal Shareholders, the Plaintiffs' Counsel shall be issued Can-Cal common stock in the amount of \$375,000, calculated at U.S. \$0.17 per share, subject to adjustment, as set forth more specifically in the Stipulation.

# VIII. THE RIGHT TO OBJECT AND/OR BE HEARD AT THE SETTLEMENT HEARING

Any Current Can-Cal Shareholder may object and/or appear and show cause, if he, she, or it has any concern why the Settlement should not be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate, or why the Judgment should not be entered, or why the Fee and Expense Amount or Can-Cal Share issuance should not be approved; provided, however, unless otherwise ordered by

27

28

1

the Court, no Current Can-Cal Shareholder shall be heard or entitled to contest the approval of the terms and conditions of the Settlement, or, if approved, the Judgment to be entered thereon approving the same, or the Fee and Expense Amount or Can-Cal Share issuance, unless that shareholder has, at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the Settlement Hearing: (a) filed with the Clerk of the Court a signed, written objection to the Settlement setting forth: (i) the nature of the objection; (ii) proof of ownership of Can-Cal common stock through the date of the Settlement Hearing, including the number of shares of Can-Cal common stock and the date of purchase; and (iii) any and all documentation in support of such objection; and (b) if a Current Can-Cal Shareholder intends to appear and requests to be heard at the Settlement Hearing, such shareholder must have, in addition to the requirements of (a) above, filed with the Clerk of the Court, Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Clark County, located at the Regional Justice Center, 200 Lewis Avenue., Las Vegas, NV 89155: (i) a written notice of such shareholder's intention to appear; (ii) a statement that indicates the basis for such appearance; and (iii) the identities of any witnesses the shareholder intends to call at the Settlement Hearing and a statement as to the subjects of their testimony. If a Current Can-Cal Shareholder files a written objection and/or written notice of intent to appear, such shareholder must also simultaneously serve copies of such notice, proof, statement, and documentation, together with copies of any other papers or briefs such shareholder files with the Court (either by hand delivery or by first class mail) at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the Settlement Hearing upon each of the following:

Stephen R. Hackett, Esq.		
SKLAR WILLIAMS PLLC		
410 S. Rampart Blvd., Ste. 350		
Las Vegas, NV 89145		

William R. Fishman, Esq. 2000 S. Colorado Blvd. Tower 1, Ste. 900 Denver, CO 80222

Counsel for Plaintiffs

Patrick J. Reilly, Esq. HOLLAND & HART 9555 Hillwood Dr., 2nd Floor Las Vegas, NV 89134

Justin C. Jones, Esq. JONES LOVELOCK 400 S. 4<sup>th</sup> St., Ste. 500 Las Vegas, NV 89101

Counsel for Defendants

Any Current Can –Cal Shareholder who does not make his, her, or its objection in the manner provided herein shall be deemed to have waived such objection and shall forever be foreclosed from making any objection to the fairness, reasonableness, or adequacy of the Settlement, or the Fee and Expense Amount and Can-Cal Share issuance, unless otherwise ordered by the Court, but shall otherwise be bound by the Judgment to be entered and the releases to be given.

#### IX. CONDITIONS FOR SETTLEMENT

The Settlement is conditioned upon the occurrence of certain events described in the Stipulation, which requires, among other things: (a) entry of the requested Judgment by this Court; (b) expiration of the time to appeal from or alter or amend the Judgment; (c) dismissal with prejudice of the Derivative Action; and (d) discontinuance of the Canadian Action. If, for any reason, any one of the conditions described in the Stipulation is not met, the Stipulation might be terminated and, if terminated, will become, subject to certain exceptions identified in the Stipulation, null and void, and the Parties to the Stipulation will be restored to their respective positions as of March 14, 2018.

# X. EXAMINATION OF PAPERS AND INQUIRIES

This Notice contains only a summary of the terms of the Settlement. For a more detailed statement of the matters involved in the Derivative Action, reference is made to the Stipulation, which may be inspected at the office of the Clerk of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for Clark County, located at the Regional Justice Center, 200 Lewis Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89155, during business hours of each business day.

Any other inquiries regarding the Settlement or the Derivative Actions should be addressed in writing to the following:

Stephen R. Hackett, Esq. SKLAR WILLIAMS PLLC 410 S. Rampart Blvd., Ste. 350 Las Vegas, NV 89145

William R. Fishman, Esq. 2000 S. Colorado Blvd. Tower 1, Ste. 900 Denver, CO 80222

Counsel for Plaintiffs

Counsel for Plaintiffs

# PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR CAN-CAL REGARDING THIS NOTICE