#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

ELAINE P. WYNN, an individual,

Petitioner,

VS.

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

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT JUDGE, DEPT. XI,

Respondent,

 $\parallel$  and

WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED, a Nevada Corporation,

Real Party in Interest.

Case No. 71432

Electronically Filed
Dec 13 2016 08:33 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
WYNN RESORTS, It MITTED
MOTION TO FILE
WOLUMES II-III OF ITS
APPENDIX UNDER SEAL, TO
INCLUDE REDACTED FILING,
AND TO REDACT PORTIONS OF
ITS ANSWER TO PETITION FOR
WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR, IN
THE ALTERNATIVE,
MANDAMUS

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Real Party in Interest Wynn Resorts, Limited ("Wynn Resorts") hereby moves for a Motion to File Volumes II-III of its Appendix Under Seal, to Include Redacted Filing, and Redact Portions of its Answer to Petition for Writ of Prohibition or, in the Alternative, Mandamus ("Motion to Seal/Redact"). Wynn Resorts brings its motion pursuant to Part VII of the Supreme Court Rules Governing Sealing and Redacting Court Records. SRCR 3(4) permits sealing or redacting records when sealing or redacting furthers a protective order entered under NRCP 26(c).

The district court issued the Wynn Parties' Protective Order with Respect to Confidentiality ("Protective Order") on February 14, 2013, which governs the process by which parties to this action may designate information as Confidential or Highly Confidential as defined therein. Both Wynn Resorts' Answer and the Appendices filed therewith contain information that the parties to the action have designated Confidential or Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order.

As such, Wynn Resorts respectfully requests that this Court grant its request to seal Appendices II-III, include a redacted filing, and to redact certain portions of its Answer.

#### II. RELEVANT FACTS

The parties entered into a Protective Order with Respect to Confidentiality under NRCP 26(c) (the "Protective Order") on February 14, 2013. (Ex. 1.) The Protective Order governs the use and disclosure of Confidential and Highly Confidential information in this case, including the filing of such information with the Court. The Protective Order requires that the filing of any documents that summarize or quote from Highly Confidential or Confidential information be submitted to the Court with a Motion to Seal and Redact. (*Id.* ¶ 13.)

The Protective Order permits the parties to designate materials that contain "information that constitutes, reflects, or discloses nonpublic information, trade secrets, know-how, or other financial, proprietary, commercially sensitive, confidential business, marketing, regulatory, or strategic information (regarding business plans or strategies, technical data, and nonpublic designs)" as Confidential. (Id.  $\P$  4.) Additionally, the Protective Order allows for the designation of materials as Highly Confidential if "the disclosure of which would create a substantial risk of competitive, business, or personal injury to the Producing Party." (Id.  $\P$  5.) Any information designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential filed with the Court may be kept under seal and/or redacted upon motion of a party. (Id.  $\P$  9.) If a Party wants to challenge a particular designation, the Protective Order sets forth the procedure to do so. (Id.  $\P$  18.) The materials retain their Confidential or Highly Confidential designation unless and until the parties agree otherwise or the district court issues an order removing the designation. (Id.)

#### III. ANALYSIS

#### A. Standards for Sealing or Redacting Court Records or Exhibits.

Part VII of the Supreme Court Rules provides that records submitted to this Court may be submitted in redacted or sealed form, subject to further order. The Court will keep the documents redacted or under seal if there is an appropriate basis under SRCR 3(4). SRCR 3(4) permits the sealing or redaction of the record when justified by compelling privacy or safety interests that outweigh the public interest in access to the court record. Furthermore, the public interest in privacy outweighs the public interest in open court records when the sealing or redaction furthers a protective order entered under NRCP 26(c). SRCR 3(4)(b).

### B. The Documents in Volumes II-III of the Appendix Further the Purpose of the Protective Order Entered by the District Court.

The documents Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal contain information designated Confidential or Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order. Volumes II and III of the Appendix contain briefs that the district court ordered redacted and exhibits thereto that the district court ordered sealed or redacted in the manner contemplated and outlined in the Protective Order. Lastly, the Petition itself quotes and summarizes Confidential or Highly Confidential information that is protected under the Protective Order.

1. Elaine P. Wynn's (1) Memorandum Re: Wynn Resorts' Waiver Arguments and (2) Motion Requiring Reciprocal Compliance with Protocol and for Order Requiring Turnover of Privileged Matter, Injunctive Relief, Protection and Other Appropriate Relief on Order Shortening Time.

Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal Elaine P. Wynn's (1) Memorandum Re: Wynn Resorts' Waiver Arguments and (2) Motion Requiring Reciprocal Compliance with Protocol and for Order Requiring Turnover of Privileged Matter, Injunctive Relief, Protection and Other Appropriate Relief on an Order Shortening Time ("Memorandum"). The Memorandum is included in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix on pages 172-261. The Memorandum was filed under

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

seal by Elaine P. Wynn ("Ms. Wynn") on July 7, 2016. Ms. Wynn filed a Motion to Seal her Memorandum the same day, which the district court denied without prejudice on August 12, 2016. Ms. Wynn subsequently filed a Motion to Redact her (1) Memorandum Re: Wynn Resorts' Waive Arguments and (2) Motion Requiring Wynn Resorts' Reciprocal Compliance with Protocol and for Orders Requiring Turnover of Privileged Matter, Injunctive Relief, Protection and other Appropriate Relief on an Order Shortening Time and to Seal the Declarations of Elaine P. Wynn and Jeffrey Y. Wu and Exhibits 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-13 on September 2, 2016, which was granted by the district court on September 15, 2016. Ms. Wynn has not, to date, filed the redacted Memorandum with the district court.

In addition, the Memorandum is subject to the Protocol Regarding Service of Filings Related to Motion to Disqualify Quinn Emanuel (the "Protocol"), entered by 20, 2016, District Court on September and attached hereto Exhibit 2. The Protocol allows for Wynn Resorts and Ms. Wynn to redact a certain set of filings that stemmed from Wynn Resorts' motion to disqualify Quinn Emanuel for that firm's improper access to and use of Wynn Resorts' privileged information. Put very briefly, when the Okada Parties filed counterclaims and named all of the individual board members who voted to redeem Aruze's shares in the Company, Ms. Wynn was still on the Wynn Resorts' board. Ms. Wynn and/or her then-counsel and Wynn Resorts' counsel engaged in privileged communications about this action that are protected by a common interest, recognized by statute. When a dispute arose between Ms. Wynn and Wynn Resorts related to her waiver of any personal privilege she may have had through her use of the Wynn Resorts' server, the District Court was charged with resolving the issue. To do so, the District Court ordered that Wynn Resorts and Ms. Wynn could file certain of their related briefs under seal, and the Okada Parties would not be given access to those filings. Wynn Resorts guided itself accordingly in its filings.

Subsequently, the district court entered the Protocol, which provided a process by which Wynn Resorts and Ms. Wynn could identify and redact any privileged information, serve the subject filings on the Okada Parties with appropriate privilege redactions with an accompanying privilege log, and outlined a process by which the Okada Parties could challenge any purportedly privileged information. The parties are in the meet and confer stage of this process. The Memorandum is one of the few filings subject to the Protocol.

In light of the above, in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides the Court with version of the Memorandum that has been redacted for attorney-client privilege under the Protocol (the same copy served on the Okada Parties). However, in addition to the privilege redactions, the Memorandum still contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order. Therefore, Wynn Resorts asks this Court to seal the redacted version of the Memorandum.

## 2. Elaine P. Wynn's Status Report Regarding Proposed ESI Protocol for July 21, 2016 Hearing.

Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal Elaine P. Wynn's Status Report Regarding Proposed ESI Protocol for July 21, 2016 Hearing (the "Status Report"). The Status Report is included in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix on pages 262-349. The Status Report was served by Ms. Wynn on July 20, 2016; Ms. Wynn filed a Motion to Seal her Status Report Regarding Proposed ESI Protocol for July 21, 2106 Hearing the same day. The district court granted Ms. Wynn's Motion to Seal on September 2, 2016.

The Status Report is also subject to the Protocol, discussed above. Therefore, in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides the Court with version of the Status Report that has been redacted for attorney-client privilege under the Protocol (and served on the Okada Parties). However, in addition to the privilege redactions, the Status Report still contains Confidential and

Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order. Therefore, Wynn Resorts asks this Court to seal the Status Report because it contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order.

3. Wynn Resorts, Limited's Opposition to Elaine P. Wynn's Motion for Protective Order, or in the Alternative, Motion for Stay of Discovery.

Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal Wynn Resorts, Limited's Opposition to Elaine P. Wynn's Motion for Protective Order, or in the Alternative, Motion for Stay of Discovery (the "Opposition"). The Opposition is included in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix on pages 350-415. The Opposition was filed under seal on August 10, 2016; Wynn Resorts filed a Motion to Seal the same day. The district court granted Wynn Resorts' Motion to Seal on September 15, 2016, and an Order on Motions to Seal and/or Redact was entered on October 5, 2016.

In Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides an unredacted version of the Opposition. Wynn Resorts asks this Court to seal the Opposition because it contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order, and was ordered sealed by the district court on September 2, 2016.

4. Wynn Resorts, Limited's Motion to (1) Adopt its Confidentiality Designations for Elaine P. Wynn's Deposition Testimony, Et Al. and the associated Appendix.

Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal Wynn Resorts, Limited's Motion to (1) Adopt its Confidentiality Designations for Elaine P. Wynn's Deposition Testimony, Et Al. and the associated Appendix (the "Motion to Adopt"). The Motion to Adopt and its Appendix is included in Volume III of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix on pages 416-566. The Motion to Adopt was served on September 23, 2016; Wynn Resorts filed its Motion to Seal Wynn Resorts, Limited's Motion to (1) Adopt its Confidentiality Designations for Elaine P. Wynn's Deposition Testimony, Et Al. on Order Shortening Time on September 27, 2016. The district court granted Wynn Resorts' Motion to Seal on September 29, 2016.

Further, the district court ordered that Ms. Wynn's "deposition transcript will remain designated Highly Confidential in its entirety for the duration of the stay . . . . " (Ex. 3.) Although the stay related to the confidentiality of the entirety of Ms. Wynn's deposition transcript has expired, the transcript still contains Confidential and Highly Confidential designations that the district court adopted in its order dated October 13, 2016.

Therefore, in Volume III of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides an unredacted version of the Motion to Adopt and Appendix. Wynn Resorts asks this Court to seal the Motion to Adopt and Appendix because it contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order, and was ordered sealed by the district court on September 29, 2016.

#### C. The Redacted Document Should be Allowed.

Wynn Resorts seeks to file a redacted version of Wynn Resorts' Motion to Disqualify Quinn Emanuel and for Orders Requiring Turnover of Privileged Matter, Injunctive Relief, Protection and Other Appropriate Relief on Order Shortening Time (the "Motion to Disqualify"). Wynn Resorts filed a redacted version of its Motion to Disqualify on June 3, 2016, along with a Motion to Redact Certain Portions of Wynn Resorts' Motion to Disqualify. The district court granted Wynn Resorts' Motion to Redact on July 8, 2016.

In Volume I of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides the redacted version of the Motion to Disqualify. Wynn Resorts asks this Court to allow it to file the redacted version of the Motion to Disqualify because the unredacted version contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order, and was ordered redacted by the district court on July 8, 2016.

#### D. The Answer Should be Redacted

Pursuant to SRCR 3(4) and 3(5), the Court should allow the redaction of the Answer to Ms. Wynn's Petition because it summarizes and/or discusses the deposition testimony and/or exhibits discussed above that a party designated Highly Confidential and/or Confidential under the Protective Order. The redactions prevent the disclosure of the Confidential or Highly Confidential information quoted within the Answer. Therefore, Wynn Resorts requests the proposed redactions to its Answer be granted.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, Wynn Resorts respectfully requests that this Court permit it to file the Answer in redacted form and to submit the unredacted Answer under seal. Wynn Resorts also respectfully requests an order allowing it to file Volumes II and III of its Appendix under seal

DATED this 12th day of December, 2016.

#### PISANELLI BICE PLLC

By:	/s/ Todd L. Bice
Ū	James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
	Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534
	Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
	400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorneys for Real Party in Interest Wynn Resorts, Limited

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

#### **DECLARATION OF TODD L. BICE, ESQ.**

- I, Todd L. Bice, Esq., being first duly sworn, hereby declare as follows:
- 1. I am a resident of the State of Nevada and a partner at the law firm PISANELLI BICE PLLC. I am one of the attorneys representing Petitioner Wynn Resorts, Limited ("Wynn Resorts") in the above-entitled action. I make this Declaration in support of Wynn Resorts' Motion to File Appendix Under Seal, to Include Redacted Filing, and Redact Portions of Answer to Petition for Writ of Prohibition or, in the Alternative, Mandamus ("Motion to Seal/Redact."). I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and I am competent to testify to those facts.
- 2. The District Court issued Wynn Resorts' Protective Order with Respect to Confidentiality ("Protective Order") on February 14, 2013, which governs the protection of Confidential and Highly Confidential information (as defined therein) in this action. In relevant part, the Protective Order provides:

Any Producing Party may designate Discovery Material that is in its possession, custody, or control produced to a Receiving Party as "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential" under the terms of this Protective Order if the Producing Party in good faith reasonably believes that such Discovery Material contains nonpublic, confidential information as defined in Sections 4 and 5 below.

#### (Protective Order $\P$ 2.)

3. The Protective Order also provides the procedure to challenge a party's designations:

designation Any party may object to the Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information on the ground that such information does not constitute Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information by serving written notice upon counsel for the Producing Party within sixty (60) calendar days of the date the item(s) was designated, specifying the item(s) in question and the grounds for the objection. If a party objects to the designation of any materials as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information, the party challenging the designation shall arrange for an EDCR 2.34 conference to be held within ten (10) calendar days of service of

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

objection to the designation to attempt to informally resolve the dispute. If the parties cannot resolve the matter, the party challenging the designation may file a motion with the Court to resolve the dispute. Such motions must be filed within ten (10) calendar days of the EDCR 2.34 conference. This Protective Order will not affect the burden of proof on any such motion, or impose any burdens upon any party that would not exist had the Protective Order not been entered; as a general matter, the burden shall be on the person making the designation to establish the propriety of the designation. Any contested information shall continue to be treated as confidential and subject to this Protective Order until such time as such motion has been ruled upon.

#### (Protective Order ¶ 18.)

- 4. In accordance with the district court's Protective Order, the parties to this action designated certain information Confidential or Highly Confidential.
- 5. Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal Elaine P. Wynn's (1) Memorandum Re: Wynn Resorts' Waiver Arguments and (2) Motion Requiring Reciprocal Compliance with Protocol and for Order Requiring Turnover of Privileged Matter, Injunctive Relief, Protection and Other Appropriate Relief on an Order Shortening Time ("Memorandum"). The Memorandum is included in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix on pages 172-261. The Memorandum was filed under seal by Elaine P. Wynn ("Ms. Wynn") on July 7, 2016. Ms. Wynn filed a Motion to Seal her Memorandum the same day, which the district court denied without prejudice on August 12, 2016. Ms. Wynn subsequently filed a Motion to Redact her (1) Memorandum Re: Wynn Resorts' Waive Arguments and (2) Motion Requiring Wynn Resorts' Reciprocal Compliance with Protocol and for Orders Requiring Turnover of Privileged Matter, Injunctive Relief, Protection and other Appropriate Relief on an Order Shortening Time and to Seal the Declarations of Elaine P. Wynn and Jeffrey Y. Wu and Exhibits 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-13 on September 2, 2016, which was granted by the district court on

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

September 15, 2016. Ms. Wynn has not, to date, filed the redacted Memorandum with the district court.

In addition, the Memorandum is subject to the Protocol Regarding Service of Filings Related to Motion to Disqualify Quinn Emanuel (the "Protocol"), entered by the District Court on September 20, 2016, and attached hereto as Exhibit 2. The Protocol allows for Wynn Resorts and Ms. Wynn to redact a certain set of filings that stemmed from Wynn Resorts' motion to disqualify Quinn Emanuel for that firm's improper access to and use of Wynn Resorts' privileged information. Put very briefly, when the Okada Parties filed counterclaims and named all of the individual board members who voted to redeem Aruze's shares in the Company, Ms. Wynn was still on the Wynn Resorts' board. Ms. Wynn and/or her then-counsel and Wynn Resorts' counsel engaged in privileged communications about this action that are protected by a common interest, recognized by statute. When a dispute arose between Ms. Wynn and Wynn Resorts related to her waiver of any personal privilege she may have had through her use of the Wynn Resorts' server, the District Court was charged with resolving the issue. To do so, the District Court ordered that Wynn Resorts and Ms. Wynn could file certain of their related briefs under seal, and the Okada Parties would not be given access to those filings. Wynn Resorts guided itself accordingly in its filings.

Subsequently, the district court entered the Protocol, which provided a process by which Wynn Resorts and Ms. Wynn could identify and redact any privileged information, serve the subject filings on the Okada Parties with appropriate privilege redactions with an accompanying privilege log, and outlined a process by which the Okada Parties could challenge any purportedly privileged information. The parties are in the meet and confer stage of this process. The Memorandum is one of the few filings subject to the Protocol.

27

28

In light of the above, in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides the Court with version of the Memorandum that has been redacted for attorney-client privilege under the Protocol (the same copy served on the Okada Parties). However, in addition to the privilege redactions, the Memorandum still contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order. Therefore, Wynn Resorts asks this Court to seal the redacted version of the Memorandum.

6. Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal Elaine P. Wynn's Status Report Regarding Proposed ESI Protocol for July 21, 2016 Hearing (the "Status Report"). The Status Report is included in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix on pages 262-349. The Status Report was served by Ms. Wynn on July 20, 2016; Ms. Wynn filed a Motion to Seal her Status Report Regarding Proposed ESI Protocol for July 21, 2106 Hearing the same day. The district court granted Ms. Wynn's Motion to Seal on September 2, 2016.

The Status Report is also subject to the Protocol, discussed above. Therefore, in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides the Court with version of the Status Report that has been redacted for attorney-client privilege under the Protocol (and served on the Okada Parties). However, in addition to the privilege redactions, the Status Report still contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order. Therefore, Wynn Resorts asks this Court to seal the Status Report because it contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order.

7. Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal Wynn Resorts, Limited's Opposition to Elaine P. Wynn's Motion for Protective Order, or in the Alternative, Motion for Stay of Discovery (the "Opposition"). The Opposition is included in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix on pages 350-415. The Opposition was filed under seal on August 10, 2016; Wynn Resorts filed a Motion to Seal the same day. The district court granted Wynn Resorts' Motion to Seal on

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

September 15, 2016, and an Order on Motions to Seal and/or Redact was entered on October 5, 2016.

In Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides an unredacted version of the Opposition. Wynn Resorts asks this Court to seal the Opposition because it contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order, and was ordered sealed by the district court on September 2, 2016.

8. Wynn Resorts seeks to file under seal Wynn Resorts, Limited's Motion to (1) Adopt its Confidentiality Designations for Elaine P. Wynn's Deposition Testimony, Et Al. and the associated Appendix (the "Motion to Adopt"). The Motion to Adopt and Appendix is included in Volume III of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix on pages 416-566. The Motion to Adopt was served on September 23, 2016; filed its Motion Seal Wynn Resorts to Wynn Resorts, Limited's Motion to (1) Adopt its Confidentiality Designations for Elaine P. Wynn's Deposition Testimony, Et Al. on Order Shortening Time on September 27, 2016. The district court granted Wynn Resorts' Motion to Seal on September 29, 2016. Further, the district court ordered that Ms. Wynn's "deposition transcript will remain designated Highly Confidential in its entirety for the duration of the stay . . . . " (Ex. 3.) Although the stay related to the confidentiality of the entirety of Ms. Wynn's deposition transcript has expired, the transcript still contains Confidential and Highly Confidential designations that the district court adopted in its order dated October 13, 2016.

Therefore, in Volume II of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides an unredacted version of the Motion to Adopt and Appendix. Wynn Resorts asks this Court to seal the Motion to Adopt and Appendix because it contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order, and was ordered sealed by the district court on September 29, 2016.

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

9. Wynn Resorts seeks to file a redacted version of Wynn Resorts' Motion to Disqualify Quinn Emanuel and for Orders Requiring Turnover of Privileged Matter, Injunctive Relief, Protection and Other Appropriate Relief on Order Shortening Time (the "Motion to Disqualify"). Wynn Resorts filed a redacted version of its Motion to Disqualify on June 3, 2016, along with a Motion to Redact Certain Portions of Wynn Resorts' Motion to Disqualify. The district court granted Wynn Resorts' Motion to Redact on July 8, 2016.

In Volume I of the Real Party in Interest's Appendix, Wynn Resorts provides the redacted version of the Motion to Disqualify. Wynn Resorts asks this Court to allow it to file the redacted version of the Motion to Disqualify because the unredacted version contains Confidential and Highly Confidential information under the Protective Order, and was ordered redacted by the district court on July 8, 2016.

10. Wynn Resorts also seeks to file a redacted version of its Answer to Petition for Writ of Prohibition or, in the Alternative, Mandamus (the "Answer"). The includes information designated Confidential Answer Highly Confidential under the Protective Order. Specifically, the Answer contains quotations and summaries of Ms. Wynn's deposition testimony. Although Wynn Resorts does not agree that this information should be designated as Highly Confidential, the district court has ordered that the entirety of her transcript should remain designated as Highly Confidential during the pendency of the stay (see Ex. 3).

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Dated this 12th day of December, 2016.

/s/ Todd L. Bice TODD L. BICE, ESQ.

# PISANELLI BICE 400 SOUTH 7<sup>TH</sup> STREET, SUITE 300 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC, and						
that on this 12th day of December, 2016, I electronically filed and served by						
electronic mail and United States Mail a true and correct copy of the above and						
foregoing WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED'S MOTION TO FILE						
VOLUMES II-IV OF ITS APPENDIX UNDER SEAL, TO INCLUDE						
REDACTED FILING, AND TO REDACT PORTIONS OF ITS ANSWER TO						
PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,						
MANDAMUS properly addressed to the following:						

#### SERVED VIA U.S. MAIL

John B. Quinn, Esq. Michael T. Zeller, Esq. QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP	William R. Urga, Esq. Martin A. Little, Esq. JOLLEY URGA WOODBURY & LITTLE
	3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
865 Figueroa Street, Tenth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017	16th Floor
_	Las Vegas, NV 89169
Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn	
	Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn

/s/ Shannon Thomas
An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

# EXHIBIT 1

Som to Column

**CLERK OF THE COURT** 

**NEOJ** James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027 JJP@pisanellibice.com Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534 TLB@pisanellibice.com Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695 DLS@pisanellibice.com 4 PISANELLI BICE PLLC 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone: 702.214.2100 6 Facsimile: 702.214.2101 7 Paul K. Rowe, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted) pkrowe@wlrk.com 8 Bradley R. Wilson, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted) brwilson@wlrk.com 9 WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ 51 West 52nd Street 10 New York, New York 10019 Telephone: 212.403.1000 11 Robert L. Shapiro, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted) 12 RS@glaserweil.com GLASER WEIL FINK JACOBS HOWARD 13 AVCHEN & SHAPIRO, LLP 10250 Constellation Boulevard, 19th Floor 14 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: 310.553.3000 15 Attorneys for Wynn Resorts, Limited, Linda Chen, 16 Russell Goldsmith, Ray R. Irani, Robert J. Miller, John A. Moran, Marc D. Schorr, Alvin V. Shoemaker, 17 Kimmarie Sinatra, D. Boone Wayson, and Allan Zeman 18 19 20 WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED, a Nevada Corporation, 21 Plaintiff, 22 VS. 23 KAZUO OKADA, an individual, ARUZE USA, INC., a Nevada corporation, and 24 UNIVERSAL ENTERTAINMENT CORP., a Japanese corporation, 25 Defendants. 26 27

AND ALL RELATED CLAIMS

28

DISTRICT COURT **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** Case No.: A-12-656710-B Dept. No.: XI NOTICE OF ENTRY OF WYNN PARTIES' PROTECTIVE **ORDER WITH RESPECT TO** CONFIDENTIALITY

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the "Wynn Parties' Protective Order With Respect to Confidentiality" was entered in the above-captioned matter on February 14, 2013, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto.

DATED this 14th day of February, 2013.

PISANELLI BACE P

By:

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027 Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534 Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

and

Paul K. Rowe, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted)
Bradley R. Wilson, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted)
Grant R. Mainland, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted)
WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ
51 West 52nd Street
New York, New York 10019

and

Robert L. Shapiro, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted)
GLASER WEIL FINK JACOBS HOWARD
AVCHEN & SHAPIRO, LLP
10250 Constellation Boulevard, 19th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067

Attorneys for Wynn Resorts, Limited, Linda Chen, Russell Goldsmith, Ray R. Irani, Robert J. Miller, John A. Moran, Marc D. Schorr, Alvin V. Shoemaker, Kimmarie Sinatra, D. Boone Wayson, and Allan Zeman

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of Pisanelli Bice PLLC, and that on this 14th day of February, 2013, I caused to be electronically served through the Court's filing system true and correct copies of the foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER properly addressed to the following:

Samuel S. Lionel, Esq. Paul R. Hejmanowski, Esq. Charles H. McCrea, Esq. LIONEL SAWYER & COLLINS 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 1700 Las Vegas, NV 89101

Howard M. Privette, Esq. William F. Sullivan, Esq. Thomas A. Zaccaro, Esq. John S. Durrant, Esq. PAUL HASTINGS LLP 515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071

William R. Urga, Esq. Martin A. Little, Esq. JOLLEY URGA WIRTH WOODBURY & STANDISH 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 16th Floor Las Vegas, NV 89109

Donald J. Campbell, Esq. J. Colby Williams, Esq. CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS 700 South Seventh Street Las Vegas, NV 89101

Ronald L. Olson, Esq. Mark B. Helm, Esq. Jeffrey Y. Wu, Esq. MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 355 South Grand Avenue, 35th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071

ORDR

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027 JJP@pisanellibice.com Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534 TLB@pisanellibice.com Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695 DLS@pisanellibice.com PISANELLI BICE PLLC 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone: 702.214.2100 Facsimile: 702.214.2101 Paul K. Rowe, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted) pkrowe@wlrk.com Bradley R. Wilson, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted) brwilson@wlrk.com WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ 51 West 52nd Street New York, New York 10019 Telephone: 212.403.1000 11 Robert L. Shapiro, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted) 12 RS@glaserweil.com GLASER WEIL FINK JACOBS HOWARD AVCHEN & SHAPIRO, LLP 10250 Constellation Boulevard, 19th Floor Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: 310.553.3000 15 Attorneys for Wynn Resorts, Limited, Linda Chen, Russell Goldsmith, Ray R. Irani, Robert J. Miller, John A. Moran, Marc D. Schorr, Alvin V. Shoemaker, 17 Kimmarie Sinatra, D. Boone Wayson, and Allan Zeman 18 DISTRICT COURT 19 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 20 WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED, a Nevada Corporation, 21 Plaintiff, 22 VS. 23 KAZUO OKADA, an individual, ARUZE USA, INC., a Nevada corporation, and 24 UNIVERSAL ENTERTAINMENT CORP., a Japanese corporation, 25 Defendants. 26 27 AND ALL RELATED CLAIMS

**CLERK OF THE COURT** Case No.: A-12-656710-B Dept. No.: XI WYNN PARTIES' PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO CONFIDENTIALITY

The Wynn Parties hereby propose that the handling of confidential material in these proceedings shall be governed by the provisions set forth below:

- 1. Applicability of this Protective Order: Subject to Section 20 below, this Protective Order does not and will not govern any trial proceedings in this action but will otherwise be applicable to and govern the handling of documents, depositions, deposition exhibits, interrogatory responses, responses to requests for admissions, responses to requests for production of documents, and all other discovery obtained pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure or other legal process by or from, or produced on behalf of, a party or witness in connection with this action (this information hereinafter shall be referred to as "Discovery Material"). As used herein, "Producing Party" or "Disclosing Party" shall refer to the parties and nonparties that give testimony or produce documents or other information in connection with this action; "Receiving Party" shall refer to the parties in this action that receive such information, and "Authorized Recipient" shall refer to any person or entity authorized by Sections 10 and 11 of this Protective Order to obtain access to Confidential Information, Highly Confidential Information, or the contents of such Discovery Material.
- 2. Designation of Information: Any Producing Party may designate Discovery Material that is in its possession, custody, or control produced to a Receiving Party as "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential" under the terms of this Protective Order if the Producing Party in good faith reasonably believes that such Discovery Material contains nonpublic, confidential information as defined in Sections 4 and 5 below.
- 3. Exercise of Restraint and Care in Designating Material for Protection: Each Producing Party that designates information or items for protection under this Protective Order must take care to limit any such designation to specific material that qualifies under the appropriate standards. Indiscriminate designations are prohibited.
- 4. Confidential Information: For purposes of this Protective Order, "Confidential Information" means any Protected Data (as defined below) or any information that constitutes, reflects, or discloses nonpublic information, trade secrets, know-how, or other financial, proprietary, commercially sensitive, confidential business, marketing, regulatory, or strategic

information (regarding business plans or strategies, technical data, and nonpublic designs), the disclosure of which the Producing Party believes in good faith might reasonably result in economic or competitive, or business injury to the Producing Party (or its affiliates, personnel, or clients) and which is not publicly known and cannot be ascertained from an inspection of publicly available sources, documents, material, or devices. Confidential Information shall also include sensitive personal information that is not otherwise publicly available, such as home addresses; social security numbers; dates of birth; employment personnel files; medical information; home telephone records/numbers; employee disciplinary records; family court documents sealed by the family court pursuant to NRS 125.110 or designated Confidential by agreement of the parties to the family court proceedings at issue; wage statements or earnings statements; employee benefits data; tax records; and other similar personal financial information. A party may also designate as "CONFIDENTIAL" compilations of publicly available discovery materials, which would not be known publicly in a compiled form.

- (a) Protected Data. The term "Protected Data" shall refer to any information that a party believes in good faith to be subject to federal, state or foreign data protection laws or other privacy obligations. Protected Data constitutes highly sensitive materials requiring special protection. Examples of such laws include, but are not limited to, the Macau Personal Data Protection Act ("MDPA"), Macao Special Administrative Region Law n.º 16/2001 ("Judicial system for operating games of fortune in casinos"), and other state, federal, and/or foreign law(s) that impose special protections.
- 5. Highly Confidential Information: For purposes of this Protective Order, Highly Confidential Information is any Protected Data and/or Confidential Information as defined in Section 4 above that also includes (a) extremely sensitive, highly confidential, nonpublic information, consisting either of trade secrets or proprietary or other highly confidential business, financial, regulatory, private, or strategic information (including information regarding business plans, technical data, and nonpublic designs), the disclosure of which would create a substantial risk of competitive, business, or personal injury to the Producing Party, and/or (b) nonpublic documents or information reflecting the substance of conduct or communications that are the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

subject of state, federal, or foreign government investigations. Certain Protected Data may compel alternative or additional protections beyond those afforded Highly Confidential Information, in which event the parties shall meet and confer in good faith, and, if unsuccessful, the party seeking any greater protection shall move the Court for appropriate relief. A party may re-designate material originally "CONFIDENTIAL" as "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" by giving notice of such a re-designation to all parties.

- Designating Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. If 6. any party in this action determines in good faith that any information, documents, things, or responses produced in the course of discovery in this action should be designated as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information (the "Designating Party"), it shall advise any party receiving such material of this fact, and all copies of such document, things, or responses, or portions thereof deemed to be confidential shall be marked "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" (whether produced in hard copy or electronic form) at the expense of the designating party and treated as such by all parties. A Designating Party may inform another party that a document is Confidential or Highly Confidential by providing the Bates number of the document in writing. If Confidential or Highly Confidential Information is produced via an electronic form on a computer readable medium (e.g., CD-ROM), other digital storage medium, or via Internet transmission, the Producing Party or Designating Party shall affix in a prominent place on the storage medium or container file on which the information is stored, and on any container(s) for such medium, the legend "Includes CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION" or "Includes HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION." Nothing in this section shall extend confidentiality or the protections associated therewith to any information that does not otherwise constitute "Confidential Information" or "Highly Confidential Information" as defined in Sections 4 and 5 herein.
- 7. Redaction Allowed: Any Producing Party may redact from the documents or things it produces matter that the Producing Party claims is subject to the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, a legal prohibition against disclosure, or any other privilege from disclosure. Any Producing Party also may redact information that is both personal and

nonresponsive, such as a social security number. A Producing Party may not withhold nonprivileged, responsive information solely on the grounds that such information is contained in a document that includes privileged information. The Producing Party shall mark each redaction with a legend stating "REDACTED," and include an annotation indicating the specific reason for the redaction (e.g., "REDACTED—Work Product"). All documents redacted based on attorney client privilege or work product immunity shall be listed in an appropriate log in conformity with Nevada law and Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(5). Where a document consists of more than one page, the page on which information has been redacted shall so be marked. The Producing Party shall preserve an unredacted version of such document. In addition to the foregoing, the following shall apply to redactions of Protected Data:

- (a) Any party may redact Protected Data that it claims, in good faith, requires protections under the terms of this Protective Order.
  - (b) Protected Data shall be redacted from any public filing not filed under seal.
- (c) The right to challenge and the process for challenging redactions shall be the same as the right to challenge and the process from challenging the designation of Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information.
- as provided herein, Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information designated or marked shall be maintained in confidence, used solely for the purposes of this action, to the extent not otherwise prohibited by an order of the Court, shall be disclosed to no one except those persons identified herein in Sections 10 and 11, and shall be handled in such manner until such designation is removed by the Designating Party or by order of the Court. Confidential or Highly Confidential information produced by another party shall not be used by any Receiving Party for any commercial, competitive or personal purpose. Nothing in this Protective Order shall govern or restrict a Producing Party's use of its own Confidential or Highly Confidential Information in any way.
- 9. Once the Court enters this Protective Order, a party shall have thirty (30) days to designate as Confidential or Highly Confidential any documents previously produced in this

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

action, which it can do by stamping "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" on the document, or informing the other parties of the Bates-numbers of the documents so designated.

Use of Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information in 10. Depositions. Counsel for any party shall have the right to disclose Confidential or Highly Confidential Information at depositions, provided that such disclosure is consistent with this Protective Order, including Sections 10 and 11. Any counsel of record may request that all persons not entitled under Sections 10 or 11 of this Protective Order to have access to Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information leave the deposition room during the confidential portion of the deposition. Failure of such other persons to comply with a request to leave the deposition shall constitute substantial justification for counsel to advise the witness that the witness need not answer the question where the answer would disclose Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. Additionally, at any deposition session, (1) upon inquiry with regard to the content of any discovery material(s) designated or marked as "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY;" (2) whenever counsel for a party deems that the answer to a question may result in the disclosure or revelation of Confidential or Highly Confidential Information; and/or (3) whenever counsel for a party deems that the answer to any question has resulted in the disclosure or revelation of Confidential or Highly Confidential Information, counsel to any party may designate portions of a deposition transcript and/or video of any deposition (or any other testimony) as containing Confidential or Highly Confidential Information in accordance with this Order by a statement on the record during the deposition or by notifying all other parties in writing, within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the transcript or video that it contains Confidential or Highly Confidential Information and designating the specific pages, lines, and/or counter numbers as containing Confidential or Highly Confidential Information. If a designation is made via a statement on the record during a deposition, counsel must follow up in writing within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the transcript or video, identifying the specific pages, lines, and/or counter numbers containing the Confidential or Highly Confidential Information. confidentiality designations are made within the thirty calendar (30) day period, the entire

transcript shall be considered nonconfidential. During the thirty (30) day period, the entire transcript and video shall be treated as Confidential Information (or Highly Confidential Information). All originals and copies of deposition transcripts that contain Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information shall be prominently marked "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" on the cover thereof and, if and when filed with the Court, the portions of such transcript so designated shall be filed under seal. Counsel must designate portions of a deposition transcript as "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" within thirty calendar (30) days of receiving the transcript. Any DVD or other digital storage medium containing Confidential or Highly Confidential deposition testimony shall be labeled in accordance with the provisions of Section 6.

- Information produced pursuant to this Protective Order may be disclosed or made available only to the Court, its employees, other court personnel, any discovery referee, mediator or other official who may be appointed by the Court, and to the persons below:
- (a) A party, or officers, directors, employees, and agents of a party deemed necessary by counsel to aid in the prosecution, defense, or settlement of this action;
- (b) Counsel for a party (including in house attorneys, outside attorneys associated with a law firm(s) of record, and paralegal, clerical, and secretarial staff employed by such counsel);
- (c) Persons retained by a party to provide litigation support services (photocopying, videotaping, translating, preparing exhibits or demonstrations, organizing, storing, retrieving data in any form or medium, etc.);
- (d) Consultants or expert witnesses (together with their support staff) retained for the prosecution or defense of this litigation, provided that such an expert or consultant is not a current employee of a direct competitor of a party named in this action.
  - (e) Court reporter(s) and videographers(s) employed in this action;
  - (f) Any authors or recipients of the Confidential Information;

th) A party may seek leave of court to provide information of a consultant employed by a competitor

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

- (g) A witness at any deposition or other proceeding in this action, who shall sign the Confidentiality Agreement attached as "Exhibit A" to this Protective Order before being shown a confidential document; and
- (h) Any other person as to whom the parties in writing agree or that the Court in these proceedings so designates.

Any person to whom Confidential Information is disclosed pursuant to subparts (a) through (g) hereinabove shall be advised that the Confidential Information is being disclosed pursuant to an order of the Court, that the information may not be disclosed by such person to any person not permitted to have access to the Confidential Information pursuant to this Protective Order, and that any violation of this Protective Order may result in the imposition of such sanctions as the Court deems proper. Any person to whom Confidential Information is disclosed pursuant to subpart (c), (d), (g) or (h) of this section shall also be required to execute a copy of the form Exhibit A. The persons shall agree in writing to be bound by the terms of this Protective Order by executing a copy of Exhibit A (which shall be maintained by the counsel of record for the party seeking to reveal the Confidential Information) in advance of being shown the Confidential Information. No party (or its counsel) shall discourage any persons from signing a copy of Exhibit A. If a person refuses to execute a copy of Exhibit A, the party seeking to reveal the Confidential Information shall seek an order from the Court directing that the person be bound by this Protective Order. In the event of the filing of such a motion, Confidential Information may not be disclosed to such person until the Court resolves the issue. Proof of each written agreement provided for under this Section shall be maintained by each of the parties while this action is pending and disclosed to the other parties upon good cause shown and upon order of the

12. Persons Authorized to Receive Highly Confidential Information. "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" documents and information may be used only in connection with this case and may be disclosed only to the Court and the persons listed in subsections (b) to (e) and (g) to (h) of Section 10 above, but shall not be disclosed to a party, or an employee of a party, unless otherwise agreed or ordered. With respect to sub-section (f), the

parties will consider disclosure of Highly Confidential Information to an author or recipient on a case by case basis. Any person to whom Highly Confidential Information is disclosed pursuant to sub-sections (c), (d), (g) or (h) of Section 10 above shall also be required to execute a copy of the form Exhibit A.

- 13. Filing of Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information With Court. Any party seeking to file or disclose materials designated as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information with the Court in this Action must seek to file such Confidential or Highly Confidential Information under seal pursuant to Rule 3 of the Nevada Rules for Sealing and Redacting Court Records. The Designating Party will have the burden to provide the Court with any information necessary to support the designation as Confidential Information.
- 14. Notice to Nonparties. Any party issuing a subpoena to a nonparty shall enclose a copy of this Protective Order and advise the nonparty that it may designate any Discovery Material it produces pursuant to the terms of this Protective Order, should the nonparty producing party wish to do so. This Order shall be binding in favor of nonparty designating parties to the maximum extent permitted by law. Any nonparty invoking the Protective Order shall comply with, and be subject to, all applicable sections of the Protective Order.
- Information or Highly Confidential Information learns of any possession, knowledge, use or disclosure of any Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information in violation of the terms of this Protective Order, the Receiving Party shall immediately notify in writing the party that produced the Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. The Receiving Party shall promptly furnish the Producing Party the full details of such possession, knowledge, use or disclosure. With respect to such unauthorized possession, knowledge, use or disclosure the Receiving Party shall assist the Producing Party in remedying the disclosure (e.g., by retrieving the Confidential Information from an unauthorized recipient) and/or preventing its recurrence.
- 16. Copies, Summaries or Abstracts. Any copies, summaries, abstracts or exact duplications of Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information shall be marked "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL-ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" and shall be

б

considered Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information subject to the terms and conditions of this Protective Order. Attorney-client communications and attorney work product regarding Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information shall not be subject to this section, regardless of whether they summarize, abstract, paraphrase, or otherwise reflect Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information.

- 17. Information Not Confidential. The restrictions set forth in this Protective Order shall not be construed to apply to any information or materials that:
- (a) Were lawfully in the Receiving Party's possession prior to such information being designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential Information in this action, and that the Receiving Party is not otherwise obligated to treat as confidential;
- (b) Were obtained without any benefit or use of Confidential or Highly Confidential Information from a third party having the right to disclose such information to the Receiving Party without restriction or obligation of confidentiality;
- (c) Were independently developed after the time of disclosure by persons who did not have access to the Producing Party's Confidential or Highly Confidential Information;
- (d) Have been or become part of the public domain by publication or otherwise and not due to any unauthorized act or omission on the part of a Receiving Party; or
  - (e) Under law, have been declared to be in the public domain.
- Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information on the ground that such information does not constitute Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information by serving written notice upon counsel for the Producing Party within sixty (60) calendar days of the date the item(s) was designated, specifying the item(s) in question and the grounds for the objection. If a party objects to the designation of any materials as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information, the party challenging the designation shall arrange for an EDCR 2.34 conference to be held within ten (10) calendar days of service of a written objection to the designation to attempt to informally resolve the dispute. If the parties cannot resolve the matter, the party challenging the designation may file a motion with the Court to resolve the dispute.

Such motions must be filed within ten (10) calendar days of the EDCR 2.34 conference. This Protective Order will not affect the burden of proof on any such motion, or impose any burdens upon any party that would not exist had the Protective Order not been entered; as a general matter, the burden shall be on the person making the designation to establish the propriety of the designation. Any contested information shall continue to be treated as confidential and subject to this Protective Order until such time as such motion has been ruled upon.

- 19. Use in Court. If any Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information is used in any pretrial Court proceeding in this action, it shall not necessarily lose its confidential status through such use, and the party using such information shall take all reasonable steps consistent with the Nevada Supreme Court Rules Governing Sealing and Redacting Court Records to maintain its confidentiality during such use.
- 20. No Waiver. This Protective Order is entered solely for the purpose of facilitating the exchange of documents and information among the parties to this action without involving the Court unnecessarily in the process. Nothing in this Protective Order, nor the production of any information or document under the terms of this Protective Order, nor any proceedings pursuant to this Protective Order shall be deemed to be a waiver of any rights or objections to challenge the authenticity or admissibility of any document, testimony or other evidence at trial. Additionally, this Protective Order will not prejudice the right of any party or nonparty to oppose production of any information on the ground of attorney-client privilege; work product doctrine or any other privilege or protection provided under the law.
- 21. Reservation of Rights. The parties each reserve the right to seek or oppose additional or different protection for particular information, documents, materials, items or things. This Stipulation shall neither enlarge nor affect the proper scope of discovery in this Action. In addition, this Stipulation shall not limit or circumscribe in any manner any rights the Parties (or their respective counsel) may have under common law or pursuant to any state, federal, or foreign statute or regulation, and/or ethical rule.
- 22. Inadvertent Failure to Designate. The inadvertent failure to designate information produced in discovery as Confidential or Highly Confidential shall not be deemed, by

itself, to be a waiver of the right to so designate such discovery materials as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. Within a reasonable time of learning of any such inadvertent failure, the Producing Party shall notify all Receiving Parties of such inadvertent failure and take such other steps as necessary to correct such failure after becoming aware of it. Disclosure of such discovery materials to any other person prior to later designation of the discovery materials in accordance with this section shall not violate the terms of this Protective Order. However, immediately upon being notified of an inadvertent failure to designate, all parties shall treat such information as though properly designated, and shall take any actions necessary to prevent any future unauthorized disclosure, use, or possession.

- 23. No Waiver of Privilege: Disclosure (including production) of information after the parties' entry of this Protective Order that a party or nonparty later claims was inadvertent and should not have been disclosed because of a privilege, including, but not limited to, the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine ("Privileged Information"), shall not constitute a waiver of, or estoppel as to, any claim of attorney-client privilege, attorney work product, or other ground for withholding production as to which the Disclosing or Producing Party would be entitled in this action.
- 24. Effect of disclosure of Privileged Information: The Receiving Party hereby agrees to promptly return, sequester, or destroy any Privileged Information disclosed or produced by Disclosing or Producing Party upon request by Disclosing or Producing Party regardless of whether the Receiving Party disputes the designation of Privileged Information. The Receiving Party may sequester (rather than return or destroy) such Privileged Information only if it contends that the information itself is not privileged or otherwise protected and it challenges the privilege designation, in which case it may only sequester the information until the claim of privilege or other protection is resolved. If any party disputes the privilege claim ("Objecting Party"), that Objecting Party shall object in writing by notifying the Producing Party of the dispute and the basis therefore. The parties thereafter shall meet and confer in good faith regarding the disputed claim within seven (7) court days after service of the written objection. In the event that the parties do not resolve their dispute, the Objecting Party may bring a motion for a determination of

whether a privilege applies within ten (10) court days of the meet and confer session, but may only contest the asserted privileges on ground other than the inadvertent production of such document(s). In making such a motion, the Objecting Party shall not disclose the content of the document(s) at issue, but may refer to the information contained on the privilege log. Nothing herein shall relieve counsel from abiding by applicable ethical rules regarding inadvertent disclosure and discovery of inadvertently disclosed privileged or otherwise protected material. The failure of any party to provide notice or instructions under this Paragraph shall not constitute a waiver of, or estoppel as to, any claim of attorney-client privilege, attorney work product, or other ground for withholding production as to which the Disclosing or Producing Party would be entitled in this action.

- inadvertently produces a document that contains no discoverable information, the Producing Party may request in writing that the Receiving Party return the document, and the Receiving Party will return the document. A Producing Party may not request the return of a document pursuant to this section if the document contains any discoverable information. If a Producing Party inadvertently fails to redact personal information (e.g., a social security number), the Producing Party may provide the Receiving Party a substitute version of the document that redacts the personal information, and the Receiving Party shall return the original, unredacted document to the Producing Party.
- disposition of this action, all Confidential Material and/or Highly Confidential Material produced by an opposing party or nonparty (including, without limitation, any copies, extracts or summaries thereof) as part of discovery in this action shall be destroyed by the parties to whom the Confidential Material and/or Highly Confidential Material was produced, and each counsel shall, by declaration delivered to all counsel for the Producing Party, affirm that all such Confidential Material and/or Highly Confidential Material (including, without limitation, any copies, extracts or summaries thereof) has been destroyed; provided, however, that each counsel shall be entitled to retain pleadings, motions and memoranda in support thereof, declarations or

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

affidavits, deposition transcripts and videotapes, or documents reflecting attorney work product or consultant or expert work product, even if such material contains or refers to Confidential Material and/or Highly Confidential Material, but only to the extent necessary to preserve a litigation file with respect to this action.

- 27. Attorney's Fees. Nothing in this Protective Order is intended to either expand or limit a prevailing party's right under the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure or other applicable state or federal law to pursue costs and attorney's fees incurred related to confidentiality designations or the abuse of the process described herein.
- Injunctive Relief and Sanctions Available for Unauthorized Disclosure or Use 28. of Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. The Parties and/or nonparties shall not utilize any Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information for their own personal and/or business advantage or gain, aside from purpose(s) solely related to the instant litigation. The Parties and nonparties acknowledge and agree that unauthorized use and/or disclosure of Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information beyond this litigation shall subject the offending party or nonparty to sanctions contemplated in NRCP 37(b)(2)(A)-(D), up to and including entry of judgment against the offending party in circumstances involving willful disobedience with this order. Further, the Parties and/or nonparties receiving or being given access to Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information acknowledge that monetary remedies would be inadequate to protect each party in the case of unauthorized disclosure or use of Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information that the Receiving Party only received through discovery in this action and that injunctive relief would be necessary and appropriate to protect each party's rights in the event there is any such unauthorized disclosure or use of Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. The availability of injunctive relief to protect against the unauthorized disclosure or use of Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information shall not be exclusive.
- 29. Other Actions and Proceedings. If a Receiving Party (a) is subpoensed in another action, investigation, or proceeding, (b) is served with a demand in another action,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

26

27

28

investigation, or proceeding, or (c) is served with any legal process by one not a party to this Protective Order, seeking materials which were produced or designated as Confidential of Highly Confidential pursuant to this Protective Order, the Receiving Party shall give prompt actual written notice by electronic transmission to counsel of record for such Producing Party within five (5) business days of receipt of such subpoena, demand or legal process, or such shorter notice as may be required to provide other parties with the opportunity to object to the immediate production of the requested discovery materials to the extent permitted by law. The burden of opposing enforcement of the subpoena shall fall upon the party or nonparty who produced or designated the Discovery Material as Confidential or Highly Confidential Information. Unless the party or nonparty who produced or designated the Confidential or Highly Confidential Information obtains an order directing that the subpoena not be complied with, and serves such order upon the Receiving Party prior to production pursuant to the subpoena, the Receiving Party shall be permitted to produce documents responsive to the subpoena on the subpoena response date. Compliance by the Receiving Party with any order directing production pursuant to a subpoena of any Confidential or Highly Confidential Information shall not constitute a violation of this Protective Order. Nothing in this Protective Order shall be construed as authorizing a party to disobey a lawful subpoena issued in another action.

- 30. Execution in Counterparts. This Protective Order may be signed in counterparts, and a fax or "PDF" signature shall have the same force and effect as an original ink signature.
- 31. Order Survives Termination. This Protective Order shall survive the termination of this action, and the Court shall retain jurisdiction to resolve any dispute concerning the use of information disclosed hereunder.

DATED this 7th day of February 2013.

PISANELLI BICE PLLC

By: /s/ James J. Pisanelli
James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar # 4027
Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar # 4534
Debra L. Spinelli, Bar # 9695
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

DATED this 7th day of February, 2013.

CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS

By: /s/ J. Colby Williams

Donald J. Campbell, Esq., Bar # 1216

J. Colby Williams, Esq., Bar # 5549

700 South Seventh Street
Las Vegas, NV 89109

Attorneys for Stephen A. Wynn

	i .	
1	and	DATED this 7th of day of February, 2013.
2	Paul K. Rowe, Esq. (admitted pro hac vice) Bradley R. Wilson, Esq. (admitted pro hac vice)	JOLLY URGA WIRTH WOODBURY & STANDISH
3	Grant R. Mainland, Esq. (admitted pro hac vice) Wachtell, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ	By: /s/ William R. Urga
4 5	51 West 52nd Street New York, NY 10019	William R. Urga, Esq., Bar # 1195 Martin A. Little, Esq., Bar # 7067 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 16th Floor
6	and Robert L. Shapiro, Esq. (admitted pro hac vice)	Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
7	GLASER WEIL FINK JACOBS HOWARD AVCHEN & SHAPIRO, LLP	Ronald L. Olson, Esq.*  Mark B. Helm, Esq.*
8	10259 CONSTELLATION Blvd., 19th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067	Jeffrey Y. Wu, Esq.* MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
9	Attorneys for Wynn Resorts, Limited, Linda Chen, Russell Goldsmith, Ray R. Irani, Robert	355 South Grand Avenue, 35th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
10	J. Miller, John A. Moran, Marc D. Schorr, Alvin V. Shoemaker, Kimmarie Sinatra, D.	Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn
11	Boone Wayson, and Allan Zeman	
12		
13	OR	<u>DER</u>
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	DATED: February 13,2013	
16		E HONORABLE BLIZABETH GONZALEZ
17	DIS	STRICT COURT JUDGE
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	\	
23		
24 25		
25 26		
27		
20		

of perjury, as follows:

#### **EXHIBIT A**

# CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT do hereby acknowledge and agree, under penalty

- 1. I have read the Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order ("the Protective Order") entered in Wynn Resorts, Limited v. Kazuo Okada, et al., Eighth Judicial District Court Case No. A-12-656710-B on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and I fully understand its contents.
- 2. I hereby agree and consent to be bound by the terms of the Protective Order and to comply with it in all respects, and to that end, I hereby knowingly and voluntarily submit and subject myself to the personal jurisdiction of the Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada so that the said court shall have the power and authority to enforce the Protective Order and to impose appropriate sanctions upon me for knowingly violating the Protective Order, including punishment for contempt of court for a knowing violation of the Protective Order.
- 3. I understand that by signing this instrument, I will be eligible to receive "Confidential Information" and/or "Highly Confidential Information" under the terms and conditions of the Protective Order. I further understand and agree that I must treat any "Confidential Information" and/or "Highly Confidential Information" in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Protective Order, and that, if I should knowingly make a disclosure of any such information in a manner unauthorized by the Protective Order, I will have violated a court order, will be in contempt of court, and will be subject to punishment by the court for such conduct.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_(Signature)

25 (Printed Name)
26

(Address)

# EXHIBIT 2

How to blue

**CLERK OF THE COURT** 

(702) 222-2500 + Fax: (702) 669-4650

Phone:

14

15

16

17

19

**NEOJ** 1 J. Stephen Peek, Esq. (1758) Bryce K. Kunimoto, Esq. (7781) Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779) 3 HOLLAND & HART LLP 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89134 Tel: (702) 669-4600 Fax: (702) 669-4650 speek@hollandhart.com bkunimoto@hollandhart.com bcassity@hollandhart.com 7 David S. Krakoff, Esq. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) Benjamin B. Klubes, Esq. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) Adam Miller, Esq. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) BUCKLEYSANDLER, LLP 1250 24th Street NW, Suite 700 10 Washington DC 20037 Tel: (202) 349-8000 11 Fax: (202) 349-8080 dkrakoff@buckleysandler.com bklubes@buckleysandler.com amiller@buckleysandler.com 13

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED, a Nevada corporation,

Attorneys for Defendant Kazuo Okada and

and Universal Entertainment Corp.

Defendants/Counterclaimants Aruze USA, Inc.,

Plaintiff,

20 ٧.

21 KAZUO OKADA, an individual, ARUZE USA, INC., a Nevada corporation, and UNIVERSAL

22 || ENTERTAINMENT CORP., a Japanese corporation,

Defendants.

24

26

27

28

AND ALL RELATED CLAIMS.

CASE NO.: A-12-656710-B

DEPT. NO.: XI

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF PROTOCOL **REGARDING SERVICE OF FILINGS** RELATED TO MOTION TO DISQUALIFY QUINN EMANUEL

**Electronic Filing Case** 

Hearing Date: Hearing Time:

HOLLAND & HART LLP	9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor

Phone: (702) 222-2500 ◆ Fax: (702) 669-4650

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a Protocol Regarding Service of Filings Related to Motion to Disqualify Quinn Emanuel was entered on the 20th day of September, 2016. A copy is attached hereto.

DATED this 21st day of September 2016.

By \_/s/ Robert J. Cassity
J. Stephen Peek, Esq. (1758)
Bryce K. Kunimoto, Esq. (7781)
Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779)
HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

David S. Krakoff, Esq.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
Benjamin B. Klubes, Esq.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
Adam A. Miller, Esq.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
BUCKLEYSANDLER, LLP
1250 24th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington DC 20037

Attorneys for Defendant Kazuo Okada and Defendants/Counterclaimants Aruze USA, Inc., and Universal Entertainment Corp.

# HOLLAND & HART LLP

9 10 11 Las Vegas, NV 89134 Phone: (702) 222-2500 ◆ Fax: (702) 669-4650 12 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor 13 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

2

3

4

5

6

8

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 21st day of September 2016, a true and correct copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF PROTOCOL REGARDING SERVICE OF

FILINGS RELATED TO MOTION TO DISQUALIFY QUINN EMANUEL was served

by the following method(s):

by submitting electronically for filing and/or service with the Eighth Electronic: Judicial District Court's e-filing system and served on counsel electronically in accordance with the E-service list to the following email addresses:

James J. Pisanelli, Esq. Todd L. Bice, Esq. Debra L. Spinelli, Esq. PISANELII BICE PLLC 400 South 7th Street, Suite 300 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Paul K. Rowe, Esq. (pro hac vice) Bradley R, Wilson, Esq, (pro hac vice) Grant R. Mainland, Esq. (pro hac vice) WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ 51 West 52nd Street New York, NY 10019

Robert L Shapiro, Esq, (pro hac vice) GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD AVCHEN & SHAPIRO, LLP 10529 Constellation Blvd., 19th Floor Los Angeles, California 90067

Mitchell J. Langberg, Esq. BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP 100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, NV 89106

Attorneys for Wynn Resorts, Limited, Linda Chen, Russell Goldsmith, Ray R. Irani, Robert J. Miller, John A. Moran, Mare De. Schorr, Alvin V. Shoemaker, Kimmarie Sinatra, D. Boone Wayson, and Allan Zeman

William R. Urga, Esq. David J. Malley, Esq. JOLLY URGA WOODBURY & LITTLE 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 16th Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Daniel F. Polsenberg, Esq. Joel D. Henriod, Esq. LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway Ste 600 Las Vegas, NV 89169

John B. Quinn, Esq. (pro hac vice) Michael T. Zeller, Esq. (pro hac vice) Jennifer D. English, Esq. (pro hac vice) Susan R. Estrich, Esq. (pro hac vice) Michael L. Fazio, Esq. (pro hac vice) QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 865 S. Figueroa Street, Tenth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017

Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn

Richard A. Wright, Esq. WRIGHT STANISH & WINCKLER 300 S. 4th Street Ste 701 Las Vegas, NV 89101

Attorneys for Defendant Kazuo Okada and Defendants/Counterclaimants Aruze USA, Inc., and Universal Entertainment Corp.

22

24

25

26

27

28

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
-4650	12
(702) 669-	13
c: (702	14
• Fax:	15
(702) 222-2500	16
2) 222	17
	18
Phone:	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>

28

HOLLAND & HART LLP 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor

1	
2	Melinda Haag, Esq. (pro hac vice) James N. Kramer, Esq. (pro hac vice)
3	ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP 405 Howard Street
4	San Francisco, CA 94015
5	Attorneys for Kimmarie Sinatra
6	G. Mark Albright, Esq.
7	William H. Stoddard, Jr. Esq. ALBRIGHT, STODDARD, WARNICK &
8	ALBRIGHT 801 South Rancho Drive, Ste D-4
9	Las Vegas, NV 89106
0	Attorneys for Intervenor
1	

Donald J. Campbell, Esq. J. Colby Williams, Esq. CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS 700 South Seventh Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Attorneys for Stephen A. Wynn

An Employee of Holland & Hart, LLP

9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89134	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ORDR J. Stephen Peek, Esq. (1758) Bryce K. Kunimoto, Esq. (7781) Robert J. Cassity, Esq. (9779) HOLLAND & HART LLP 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89134 Tel: (702) 669-4600 Fax: (702) 669-4650 speek@hollandhart.com bkunimoto@hollandhart.com bkunimoto@hollandhart.com  David S. Krakoff, Esq. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) Benjamin B. Klubes, Esq. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) BuckleySandler LLP 1250 24th Street NW, Suite 700 Washington DC 20037 Tel: (202) 349-8000 Fax: (202) 349-8080 dkrakoff@buckleysander.com bklubes@buckleysandler.com amiller@buckleysandler.com  Attorneys for Defendant Kazuo Okada and Defendants/Counterclaimants Aruze USA, Inc., and Universal Entertainment Corp.	Electronically Filed 09/20/2016 03:51:56 PM   Hum b. Lauren  CLERK OF THE COURT
d Drive Nevae	16	DISTRIC	ΓCOURT
Hillwood S Vegas,	17	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
9555 Hil Las V	18 19	WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED, a Nevada corporation,	CASE NO.: A-12-656710-B DEPT NO.: XI
	20	Plaintiff, v.	PROTOCOL REGARDING SERVICE OF FILINGS RELATED TO MOTION TO
	21	KAZUO OKADA, an individual, ARUZE USA, INC., a Nevada corporation, and UNIVERSAL	DISQUALIFY QUINN EMANUEL
	22	ENTERTAINMENT CORP., a Japanese corporation,	
	23	Defendants.	
	25	AND ALL RELATED CLAIMS.	
	26	AND ADD RELATED CERTIFIES.	
	27		
	28	The Court and the Parties have discussed service of filings related to the Wynn Resorts,	

Page 1 of 3

59-15-13803:1 8090

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

or other filing relating to the Disqualification Motion (hereinafter a "Disqualification Filing"), the following procedures shall be followed:

- The Disqualification Filing shall not be served on the Okada Parties when filed, but a Notice of Filing shall be filed and served on all Parties.
- Within one (1) judicial day of filing any Disqualification Filing, the filing Parties 2. shall serve on the other Parties (excluding the Okada Parties) a version of the Disqualification Pleading that they propose to serve on the Okada Parties, with any information that they claim is subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine redacted ("Proposed Redacted Filing").
- Within two (2) judicial days of receiving the version of the Disqualification Filing 3. described in Paragraph 2, the receiving Parties shall indicate in writing to the filing Parties whether they consent to service of the Proposed Redacted Filing on the Okada Parties. If the Receiving Parties do not consent to the Proposed Redacted Filing, within the same two (2) judicial day period, they shall provide a version of the Disqualification Filing that they propose to serve on the Okada Parties, with any information that they claim is subject to the attorneyclient privilege or work product doctrine redacted. Failure to object to a redaction shall not be construed as acceptance of the underlying privilege claim.
- Within two (2) judicial days of receiving the information required by Paragraph 3, 4. the filing Parties shall serve the Okada Parties with a version of the Disqualification Filing with all information over which no Parties have claimed attorney-client privilege or work product protection, and redacting all information over which any Parties have claimed attorney-client privilege or work product protection. At the same time, the filing Parties shall serve a privilege log describing each redaction that they assert is protected by the attorney-client privilege or work

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

product doctrine (including the individuals involved, their affiliations, a general description of the redacted information, and a specific explanation of the basis for the redaction). To the extent any redactions based upon the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine were made by Parties other than the Filing Party and not accepted and adopted by the Filing Parties, the Parties claiming those protections shall serve a privilege log in the same form, manner and timing as described above.

- To the extent that the Okada Parties dispute any of the redactions in the version of 5. the Disqualification Filing that they receive pursuant to Paragraph 4, the Parties shall hold a meet-and-confer within five (5) judicial days, after which the Okada Parties may file a motion challenging the redactions with the Court within seven (7) judicial days.
- With respect to any Disqualification Filings filed before the entry of this Order, 6. the time limits in Paragraphs 2 and 3 shall be changed to five (5) judicial days. The time limit for the service of the privilege logs shall be changed to five (5) judicial days, but the other time limits set forth in Paragraphs 4 and 5 shall not change.
- The procedures set forth herein, and any related motions, shall be separate and 7. distinct from any efforts by the Parties to file motions under seal, which pertains only to whether filings should be publicly available.

DATED:

ELIZABETH GONZALEZ T COURT JUDGE

# EXHIBIT 3

Hom D. Lahren

**CLERK OF THE COURT** 

**ORDR** 

3

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027

Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695

Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534

JJP@pisanellibice.com

TLB@pisanellibice.com

DLS@pisanellibice.com 4 PISANELLI BICE PLLC 400 South 7th Street, Suite 300 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: 702.214.2100 Facsimile: 702.214.2101 7 Robert L. Shapiro, Esq. (pro hac vice admitted) RS@glaserweil.com GLÄSER WEIL FINK HOWARD **AVCHEN & SHAPIRO LLP** 10250 Constellation Boulevard, 19th Floor Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: 310.553.3000 11 Mitchell J. Langberg, Esq., Bar No. 10118 mlangberg@bhfs.com 12 BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK LLP 100 North City Parkway. Suite 1600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89106 Telephone: 702.382.2101 14 Attorneys for Wynn Resorts, Limited, Linda Chen, Russell Goldsmith, Ray R. Irani, Robert J. Miller, John A. Moran, Marc D. Schorr, Alvin V. Shoemaker, Kimmarie Sinatra, D. Boone Wayson, and Allan Zeman 17 18 19 WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED, a Nevada Corporation, 20 Plaintiff. 21 V\$. 22 KAZUO OKADA, an individual, ARUZE USA, INC., a Nevada corporation, and 23 UNIVERSAL ENTERTAINMENT CORP., a Japanese corporation, 24 Defendants. 25 26 AND ALL RELATED CLAIMS 27 28

**DISTRICT COURT** CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA Case No.: A-12-656710-B Dept. No.: XI ORDER ON WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED'S MOTION TO (1) ADOPT ITS CONFIDENTIALITY DESIGNATIONS FOR ELAINE P. WYNN'S DEPOSITION TESTIMONY, (2) PROVIDE THE ENTIRETY OF **HÉR DEPOSITION TESTIMONY TO** ERNST & YOUNG, AND (3) PROVIDE CERTAIN MATERIALS TO WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED'S SPECIAL **COMMITTEE**; APPLICATION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME Hearing Dates: September 27 and 29, 2016

Hearing Times: 8:30 a.m.

Wynn's Deposition Testimony, (2) Provide the Entirety of Her Deposition Testimony to Ernst & Young, and (3) Provide Certain Materials to Wynn Resorts, Limited's Special Committee; Application for Order Shortening Time, filed on September 23, 2016 ("Wynn Resorts' Motion regarding Confidentiality"), came before this Court for hearing on September 27, 2016. Ms. Wynn's oral motion to stay came before this Court on September 29, 2016, which sought to stay the Court's rulings as to the confidentiality designations of Ms. Wynn's deposition and service of the transcript on the Okada Parties, and as to provision of discovery materials to the Special Committee ("Ms. Wynn's Oral Motion to Stay"). Ms. Wynn did not oppose or seek to stay the Court's ruling as to the provision of the deposition transcript to Ernst & Young.

The Court having reviewed and considered Wynn Resorts' Motion regarding Confidentiality, the opposition filed thereto, Ms. Wynn's Oral Motion to Stay, and the arguments of counsel presented at the hearing, and good cause appearing therefor,

THE COURT HEREBY GRANTS Wynn Resorts' Motion regarding Confidentiality.

THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that Ms. Wynn's Oral Motion to Stay is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as follows:

- The Oral Motion to Stay is GRANTED as to the confidentiality designations of Ms.
   Wynn's deposition and service of the transcript on the Okada Parties; and the Court's rulings on these issues are STAYED until and including October 20, 2016;
- The Motion to Stay is DENIED as to the provision of discovery materials to the Special Committee.

1	3. The deposition transcript will remain designated Highly Confidential in its entirety for		
2	the duration of the stay (i.e., until and including October 20, 2016). Consistent with		
3	this Court's rulings, however, Ernst & Young is not bound by any Confidential of		
4	Highly Confidential designations and may receive, use and/or disclose designated		
5	materials in any manner and without restriction.		
6	DATED: 10/12/16		
7			
8	THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ		
9	Respectfully submitted by:		
10	PISANE DE BICEPLLC HOLLAND & HART LLP		
11	By: By: By: By: J. Stephen Peek, Esq. J. Ste		
12	Todd L. Bice, Esq., Bar No. 4534 Bryce K. Kunimoto, Esq. Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695 Robert J. Cassity, Esq.		
13	400 South 7th Street, Suite 300 9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor Las Vegas, NV 89101 Las Vegas, NV 89134		
14	and		
15	Robert L. Shapiro, Esq. David S. Krakoff, Esq. GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD Benjamin B. Klubes, Esq.		
16	AVCHEN & SHAPIRO LLP Adam Miller, Esq. 10250 Constellation Blvd., 19th Floor BUCKLEY SANDLER LLP		
17	Los Angeles, CA 90067 1250 – 24th Street NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20037		
18	and and		
19	Mitchell J. Langberg, Esq. BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER Richard A. Wright, Esq. WRIGHT STANISH & WINCKLER		
20	SCHRECK 100 N. City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, NV 89106 WRIGHT STANISH & WINCKLER 300 South 4th Street, Suite 701 Las Vegas, NV 89101		
21	Attorneys for Wynn Resorts, Limited, Linda — Attorneys for Defendants Kazuo Okada,		
22	Chen, Russell Goldsmith, Ray R. Irani, Aruze USA, Inc. and Universal Entertainment Corp.		
23	Schorr, Alvin V. Shoemaker, Kimmarie Sinatra, D. Boone Wayson, and Allan Zeman		
24			
25			
26			

Ì		
I	JOLLEY URGA WOODBURY & LITTLE	CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS
2		
3	By:	Bý:
4	William R. Urga, Esq. David J. Malley, Esq. 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 16th Fl. Las Vegas, NV 89169	Donald Campbell, Esq. Bar No. 1216 J. Colby Williams, Esq., Bar No. 5549 700 South Seventh Street Las Vegas, NV 89101
6	and	Attorneys for Stephen A. Wynn
7	John B. Quinn, Esq. Michael T. Zeller, Esq.	
8	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP	
9	865 Figueroa Street, Tenth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017	
10	and	
1.1.	Daniel F. Polsenberg, Esq. Joel D. Henriod, Esq.	
12	LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE	
13	3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, #600 Las Vegas, NV 89169	
14	Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		•
28		

## JOLLEY URGA WOODBURY & LITTLE CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS By: Donald Campbell, Esq. Bar No. 1216 Leolby Williams, Esq., Bar No. 5549 700 South Seventh Street Las Vegas, NV 89101 William R. Urga, Esq. David J. Malley, Esq. 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 16th Fl. Las Vegas, NV 89169 Attorneys for Stephen A. Wynn and John B. Quinn, Esq. Michael T. Zeller, Esq. QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 865 Figueroa Street, Tenth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017 and Daniel F. Polsenberg, Esq. Joel D. Henriod, Esq. LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, #600 Las Vegas, NV 89169 Attornevs for Elaine P. Wynn