IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

WYNN RESORTS LIMITED,

Petitioner,

VS.

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

Respondent,

KAZUO OKADA; UNIVERSAL ENTERTAINEMENT CORP. AND ARUZE USA, INC.,

Real Parties in Interest.

Case Nos. 74591
Electronically Filed
Dec 19 2017 08:06 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
WYNN RESORTS OF EMPLIFIED SCOURT
OPPOSITION TO ELAINE P.
WYNN'S MOTION TO
INTERVENE AS REAL PARTY IN
INTEREST

I. INTRODUCTION

Elaine P. Wynn's ("Ms. Wynn") request to intervene in Wynn Resorts, Limited's ("Wynn Resorts" or the "Company") Petition for Writ of Mandamus or Alternatively, Prohibition (hereinafter "Petition") should be denied. She did not in any way participate in the motion for summary judgment which gives rise to the Petition. She made no appearance, submitted no briefs and made no argument. Instead, as she did when raising a last minute *amicus curiae* brief in support of the Okada Parties' unsuccessful petition for rehearing in Case Nos. 70050 and 70452, she simply seeks to interject her own agenda on matters not subject to any briefing before the District Court. Contrary to Ms. Wynn's wants, a litigant does not become a real party in interest to intervene any time this Court addresses a legal issue like the Business Judgment Rule. Ms. Wynn confessed her lack of standing and interest when she played no role in the District Court proceedings. This Court has already ordered

expedited briefing on the Petition and there is no basis for allowing Ms. Wynn to interject matters outside of the District Court's summary judgment decision. Accordingly, the Court should see the Emergency Motion to Intervene as Real Party in Interest (hereinafter "Motion") for what it is – an attempt to muddy the waters – and deny Ms. Wynn's Motion.

II. ARGUMENT

Ms. Wynn does not have a sufficient interest in the Petition to intervene as a real party in interest. A party is aggrieved "'when either a personal right or right or property is adversely and substantially affected' by a district court's ruling." *Valley Bank of Nevada v. Ginsburg*, 110 Nev. 440, 446, 874 P.2d 729, 734 (1994) (quoting *Estate of Hughes v. First Nat'l Bank*, 96 Nev. 178, 180, 605 P.2d 1149, 1150 (1980) (applying NRAP 3A(e)). Having an interest in an "issue of law" is not enough.

In identifying what Ms. Wynn considers her "interest," she argues that the "argument [raised in the Petition] directly affects Ms. Wynn's claims against Wynn Resorts for contractual interference and aiding and abetting a breach of fiduciary duty – claims directed against the company's violations of substantive law rather than disagreement with the board's business judgment." (Mot. at 3.) Of course, she made no such claim in the District Court proceedings and Ms. Wynn does not identify how the Petition "directly affects" claims that were not subject to the motion, matters that were never briefed nor even discussed. Respectfully, this is the same effort to parachute in at the last moment and raise collateral issues just as she did with her unsupported *amicus curiae* brief on the Okada Parties' Petition for Rehearing. Nothing in that prior Petition concerned Ms. Wynn's claims, and the same is true here. She simply seeks to interject matter that were not before the District Court and are not the subject of the District Court's order.

Ms. Wynn's reference to how she was allowed to file an *amicus curie* brief in Case Nos. 70050 and 70452 – something she obtained on an emergency basis – is

hardly support for her motion. As Wynn Resorts noted in opposing that unfounded brief, Ms. Wynn was not seeking to address matters that were actually before the Court, but to interject issues that Ms. Wynn had never presented to the District Court. She now seeks to do the same once again, having not participated in any fashion in the District Court proceedings that are the subject of the Petition. The Court need look no further than her prior *amicus curiae* brief and Wynn Resorts' response thereto to confirm that she has no standing to participate in this Petition.

Ms. Wynn's final argument is that the Petition will impact the upcoming trial, and therefore she has an interest in the expeditious resolution of the issues. That fact, of course, goes directly against her. Ms. Wynn's involvement in collateral matters on a petition that this Court has required expediting briefing upon is not warranted. Wynn Resorts have been given a short period of time to respond to the Okada Parties' answer over the holidays. It should not have to waste its time and resources responding to Ms. Wynn's collateral issues, particularly where Ms. Wynn did not participate in the District Court proceedings on any of the issues presented.

III. CONCLUSION

The Court should deny Ms. Wynn's Motion to Intervene.

DATED this 18th day of December, 2017.

PISANELLI BICE PLLC

By: /s/ Todd L. Bice
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

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC, and that on this 18th day of December, 2017, I electronically filed and served by electronic mail, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing WYNN RESORTS, LIMITED'S OPPOSITION TO ELAINE P. WYNN'S MOTION TO INTERVENE AS REAL PARTY IN INTEREST properly addressed to the following:

Donald J. Campbell, Esq.
J. Colby Williams, Esq.
CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS
700 South 7th Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Attorneys for Stephen A. Wynn

Melinda Haag, Esq. James N. Kramer, Esq. ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE 405 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Attorneys for Kimmarie Sinatra

J. Stephen Peek, Esq. Bryce K. Kunimoto, Esq. Robert J. Cassity, Esq. HOLLAND & HART LLP 9555 Hillwood Drive, Second Floor Las Vegas, NV 89134 Attorneys for Kazuo Okada

David S. Krakoff, Esq. Benjamin B. Klubes, Esq. Adam Miller, Esq. BUCKLEY SANDLER LLP 1250 – 24th Street NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20037 Attorneys for Aruze USA, Inc. and Universal Entertainment Corp.

Steve Morris, Esq. Rosa Solis-Rainey, Esq. MORRIS LAW GROUP 411 E. Bonneville Avenue, Suite 360 Las Vegas, NV 89101 Attorneys for Defendants J. Randall Jones, Esq. Mark M. Jones, Esq. Ian P. McGinn, Esq. KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway 17th Floor Las Vegas, NV 89169 Attorneys for Aruze USA, Inc. and Universal Entertainment Corporation

William R. Urga, Esq.
David J. Malley, Esq.
JOLLEY URGA WOODBURY
HOLTHUS & ROSE
330 S. Rampart Boulevard, Suite 380
Las Vegas, NV 89145
Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn

Mark E. Ferrario, Esq. Tami D. Cowden, Esq. GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 400 Las Vegas, NV 89169 Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn

Daniel F. Polsenberg, Esq.
Joel D. Henriod, Esq.
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER
CHRISTIE
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite
600
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn

1		
2	James M. Cole, Esq. SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP One South Dearborn St.	
3 4	Washington, DC 20005 Chicago, Illinois 60603 Attorneys for Elaine P. Wynn	
5	SERVED VIA HAND-DELIVERY	
6	The Honorable Elizabeth Gonzalez	
	Eighth Judicial District court, Dept. XI	
7	Regional Justice Center	
8	200 Lewis Avenue	
9	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
10	Respondent	
11		
12	/s/ Shannon Dinkel	
13	An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLO	7
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		