

1
2 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
3

4 Supreme Court No. Electronically Filed
5 District Court Case No. A-18-77276 Mar 17 2020 02:21 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

6 VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company;
7 LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,
8 Petitioners,

9 v.

10 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND
11 FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN
12 DELANEY in her capacity as District Judge,
Respondent,
13 JOYCE SEKERA, an individual,
14 Real Party in Interest

15
16 **APPENDIX TO PETITIONERS' EMERGENCY PETITION FOR WRIT OF**
17 **MANDAMUS AND/OR WRIT OF PROHIBITION UNDER NRAP RULES**
18 **21(a)(6) AND 27(e) AND ALTERNATIVE EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY**
19 **UNDER NRAP RULES 8 AND 27(e)**
Volume 13 (Exhibits 51-56)

20 Michael A. Royal, Esq. (SBN 4370)
21 Gregory A. Miles, Esq. (SBN 4336)
22 ROYAL & MILES LLP
23 1522 W. Warm Springs Rd.
24 Henderson, Nevada 89014
25 Telephone: (702) 471-6777
26 Facsimile: (702) 531-6777
27 Email: mroyal@royalmilesllp.com
28 gmiles@royalmilesllp.com

Petitioners, VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC, by and through their counsel of record, Royal & Miles LLP, hereby submit is Appendix in compliance with Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 30.

INDEX/TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tab	Document/Exhibit Description	Bate Number	<u>Vol.</u>
1	Complaint (filed April 14, 2018), Case A772761	VEN 001-004	1
2	Venetian Security Narrative Report, No. 1611V-0680	VEN 005-006	1
3	Acknowledgment of First Aid Assistance & Advice to Seek Medical Care, No. 1611V-0680	VEN 007	1
4	Venetian Security Scene Photos	VEN 008-014	1
5	Transcript of Joyce Sekera Deposition (taken March 14, 2019)	VEN 015-032	1
6	First Amended Complaint (filed June 28, 2019)	VEN 038-41	1
7	Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents and Materials to Defendant (served August 16, 2018)	VEN 042-049	1
8	Fifth Supplement to Defendants' 16.1 List of Witnesses and Production of Documents For Early Case Conference (served January 4, 2019)	VEN 050-053	1
9	Defendants' Motion for Protective Order (filed February 1, 2019)	VEN 054-083	1
10	Declaration of Peter Goldstein, Esq. (Dated February 13, 2019)	VEN 084-085	1
11	Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion for Protective Order (filed March 5, 2019)	VEN 086-139	1

Tab	Document/Exhibit Description	Bate Number	<u>Vol.</u>
12	Sekera's Reply to Defendant Venetian Casino Resort, LLC's Opposition to Sekera's Motion for Terminating Sanctions, in the matter of Smith v. Venetian, case no. A-17-753362-C (filed March 12, 2019)	VEN 140-185	1
13	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing [On] Defendant's Motion for Protective Order (March 13, 2019)	VEN 186-200	1
14	Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation (filed April 4, 2019)	VEN 201-206	1
15	Transcript of Hearing on Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report (May 14, 2019)	VEN 207-266	2
16	Order (filed July 31, 2019)	VEN 267-270	2
17	Motion for Leave to File Motion for Reconsideration on Order Reversing Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation and Motion to Stay Order Until Hearing On Reconsideration or, Alternatively, Motion to Stay All Proceedings Pending Application for Writ of Mandamus On Order Shortening Time (filed August 12, 2019)	VEN 271-488	2
18	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order Granting Petitioners' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Mode of Operation Theory of Liability (filed July 23, 2019)	VEN 449-452	2
19	Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Sekera's Motion to Extend Discovery Deadlines and Continue Trial (Second Request) on Order Shortening Time (filed August 28, 2019)	VEN 453-455	2
20	Transcript of Hearing on Motion for Leave to File Motion for Reconsideration (September 17, 2019)	VEN 456-483	3
21	Court Minutes, Discovery Commissioner (September 18, 2019)	VEN 484-485	3

Tab	Document/Exhibit Description	Bate Number	<u>Vol.</u>
22	Privacy Policy, The Venetian Resort Las Vegas (July 7, 2019), https://www.venetian.com/policy.html	VEN 486-495	3
23	Order Regarding Plaintiff's Motion for Terminating Sanctions for Willful Suppression of Evidence Pursuant to Rule 37; and Defendant's Related Motion(s) to Strike	VEN 496-498	4
24	Defendants' Initial 16.1 List of Witnesses and Production of Documents for Early Case Conference (July 6, 2018)	VEN 499-508	4
25	Documents Related to Termination of Gary Shulman	VEN 509-514	4
26	Notice of Taking Deposition (Gary Shulman) (April 1, 2019)	VEN 515-517	4
27	Appendix to Petitioners' Emergency Petition for Writ of Mandamus and/or Writ of Prohibition Under NRAP Rules 21(a)(6) and Emergency Motion Staying Execution, Volume 1, 2 & 3, filed September 27, 2019	VEN 518 - 532	5
28	Appendix to Petitioners' Reply Brief, Volume 4, filed October 28, 2019	VEN 533 - 537	5
29	Petitioners' Emergency Petition for Writ of Mandamus and/or Writ of Prohibition Under NRAP Rules 21(a)(6) and 27(e), filed September 27, 2019	VEN 538 - 606	5
30	Emergency Motion Under NRAP 8 Staying Execution of Order Directing Petitioners to Disclose Private, Protected Information of Guests Not Involved in Underlying Lawsuit, filed September 27, 2019	VEN 607 - 625	5
31	Order Directing Answer and Imposing Temporary Stay, filed October 1, 2019	VEN 626 - 627	5
32	Joyce Sekera's Motion for Extending Briefing, filed October 8, 2019	VEN 628 - 631	5

Tab	Document/Exhibit Description	Bate Number	<u>Vol.</u>
33	Joyce Sekera's Opposition to Appellants' Emergency Motion for Stay Under NRAP 27(e), filed October 8, 2019	VEN 632 - 648	5
34	Joyce Sekera's Answering Brief, filed October 11, 2019	VEN 649 - 701	5
35	Reply to Joyce Sekera's Opposition to Petitioners' Emergency Under NRAP 27(e), filed October 15, 2019	VEN 702 - 710	5
36	Order Granting Stay, filed October 17, 2019	VEN 711 - 712	5
37	Petitioners' Reply Brief, filed October 28, 2019	VEN 713 - 749	5
38	Defendants' Motion for Protective Order as to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Incident Reports from May 1999 to Present, Motion to Compel Information and Documents of Prior Incident Reports Provided to Plaintiff Expert Thomas Jennings and Identified in His May 30, 2019 Rebuttal Report and for Leave to Retake the Jennings Deposition to Address the 196 Prior Claims Referenced in His Report at Plaintiff's Expense, filed August 5, 2019	VEN 750 - 936	6
39	Notice of Hearing on Defendants' Motion for Protective Order as to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Incident Reports from May 1999 to Present, Motion to Compel Information and Documents of Prior Incident Reports Provided to Plaintiff Expert Thomas Jennings and Identified in His May 30, 2019 Rebuttal Report and for Leave to Retake the Jennings Deposition to Address the 196 Prior Claims Referenced in His Report at Plaintiff's Expense, filed August 5, 2019	VEN 937	6

Tab	Document/Exhibit Description	Bate Number	<u>Vol.</u>
40	Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Testimony and Documents, filed August 5, 2019	VEN 938 - 988	6
		989-1005	7
41	Notice of Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Testimony and Documents, filed August 5, 2019	VEN 1006	7
42	Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Testimony and Documents and Countermotion to Strike False Accusations Levied by Plaintiff in "I. Introduction" and "Legal Argument" Section "III.D." With Appropriate Sanctions, filed August 14, 2019	VEN 1007 - 1228	7
		1229 - 1476	8
		1477 - 1486	9
43	Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion for a Protective Order and Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Compel, filed August 30, 2019	VEN 1487 - 1719	9
44	Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion for a Protective Order and Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Compel, filed September 10, 2019	VEN 1720 - 1896	10
45	Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Countermotion to Strike False Accusations Levied by Plaintiff in "I. Introduction" and "Legal Argument" Section "III.D." With Appropriate Sanctions and Opposition to Plaintiff's Countermotion for Rule 11 Sanctions, filed September 11, 2019	VEN 1897 - 1917	10
46	Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Countermotion for Rule 11 Sanctions, filed September 12, 2019	VEN 1918 - 1921	10
47	Hearing Transcript of Proceedings re: All Pending Motions, dated September 18, 2019	VEN 1922 - 1964	10
48	Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation, filed December 2, 2019	VEN 1965 - 1975	11

Tab	Document/Exhibit Description	Bate Number	<u>Vol.</u>
49	Defendants' Limited Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation dated December 2, 2019, filed December 16, 2019	VEN 1976 - 2204	11
		2205 - 2222	12
50	Plaintiff's Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation dated December 2, 2019, filed December 16, 2019	VEN 2223 - 2391	12
51	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation dated December 2, 2019, filed December 23, 2019	VEN 2392 - 2444	12
		2445 - 2595	13
52	Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Limited Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation dated December 2, 2019, filed December 23, 2019	VEN 2596 - 2602	13
53	Order for Hearing, filed January 2, 2020	VEN 2603 - 2615	13
54	Court Minutes re: Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report, January 21, 2020	VEN 2616	13
55	Hearing Transcript re: Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report, January 21, 2020	VEN 2617 - 2660	13
56	Order on Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report, filed March 13, 2020	VEN 2661 - 2664	13

///

///

///

///

///

1 The Appendix shall be contained in 13 separate volumes in accordance with
2 NRAP 30(c)(3) (2013), each volume containing no more than 250 pages.

3
4 DATED this 13 day of March, 2020.

5 ROYAL & MILES LLP

6
7
8 By: 

9 Michael A. Royal, Esq. (SBN 4370)
10 Gregory A. Miles, Esq. (SBN 4336)
11 1522 W. Warm Springs Rd.
12 Henderson, NV 89014
13 (702) 471-6777
14 Counsel for Petitioners
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 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

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

17
18
19

17
18
19

20
21
22
23

25

26

27

MARIA CONSUELO CRUZ 4/17/2019

Page 19

1 Q So do you actually know where the water
2 would come from? Whether it would come from the ice
3 or whether it would come from a bottle?
4 MR. ROYAL: Objection, form.
5 THE WITNESS: No. When the water spill is
6 from a water cooler, you can see the water coming from
7 it.
8 BY MR. GALLIHER:
9 Q When you say water cooler, what do you mean?
10 A An ice cooler.
11 Q So people carry ice coolers over those
12 floors?
13 A Yes.
14 Q Now, have you ever seen anyone use the food
15 court and leave the food court with drinks?
16 A Sometimes, yes.
17 Q And how about the Bouchon Bakery; have you
18 ever seen anyone order drinks from the Bouchon Bakery
19 and leave from it?
20 A No, hu-huh.
21 Q Have you ever seen anyone walk around with
22 liquor or alcohol in a glass or cup?
23 A Everyone does it in the casino; yep.
24 Q So would it be fair to say that you have
25 seen that?

Page 20

1 A Oh, yes.
2 Q Now I want you to isolate, on a given
3 shift -- we'll say the day shift.
4 On the average, what's your best estimate of
5 how many spills you would see during the day shift
6 when you were a casino porter at the Venetian?
7 A Sometimes I did, but I did not work always
8 at the same station.
9 Q Well, I understand. What I'm looking for is
10 your best estimate of the number of times on one shift
11 that you would see spills when you were employed at
12 the Venetian.
13 MR. ROYAL: Object to form.
14 THE WITNESS: At times two or three times.
15 BY MR. GALLIHER:
16 Q Would that be an average?
17 A Yes.
18 Q And we're talking about spills that would be
19 in the area that you were responsible for?
20 A The floor close to the food court and Lux
21 Cafe, it's floor. But there are areas that are
22 carpeted.
23 Q Well, I'm talking strictly about the marble
24 floors.
25 A In rare occasions.

Page 21

1 Q So are you saying that on rare occasions,
2 you would see spills on the floor, the marble floors,
3 next to the Lux Cafe or the food court?
4 A Not spills -- spills, but say that someone
5 just dropped a little bit of a soda.
6 Q And if someone dropped a little bit of soda,
7 that's something that you would clean up?
8 A Yes, yes.
9 Q And why would you do that?
10 A Because I had to. I was being paid to do
11 that.
12 Q And was there a concern about whether or not
13 the floor was dangerous with that little bit of liquid
14 on it?
15 MR. ROYAL: Objection, form.
16 THE WITNESS: Yes. It also gets stained.
17 BY MR. GALLIHER:
18 Q And is that why you cleaned it up, to
19 protect the customers?
20 A Yes.
21 Q That was your job; right?
22 A Yes, and I would also get tips.
23 Q When you say you get tips, who would give
24 you tips?
25 A The guests, when they say that you are

Page 22

1 keeping an eye to make sure that they didn't fall.
2 Q During your time at the Venetian, had you
3 ever seen a customer fall on liquid on the marble
4 floor?
5 A Yes.
6 Q And how many occasions?
7 A The one I recall is a lady that fell with a
8 coffee.
9 Q And you recall a lady that fell with a
10 coffee?
11 A Yes.
12 Q And how do you recall that?
13 A Well, we were cleaning and suddenly I think
14 a lady came out with a coffee from a bakery, the
15 Bouchon Bakery on the first floor.
16 Q And so was that a fall that you personally
17 saw?
18 A Well, we saw her fall and we were close by.
19 I had been checking the floor.
20 Q So is that the only time that you've seen a
21 customer fall at the Venetian on the marble floor?
22 A Oh, many, but they were drunk.
23 Q So you've seen a lot of drunk people fall on
24 the marble floor at the Venetian?
25 A No, just that they had fallen because they

7 (Pages 19 to 22)

1 were drunk.
 2 Q And how do you know that?
 3 A Because you can see it.
 4 Q Did you witness those falls?
 5 A Yes.
 6 Q So how many of these falls did you witness?
 7 A Well, about three I would say, the ones that
 8 I watched.
 9 Q When you saw these people that you described
 10 as drunk fall, were they hurt?
 11 A These people were not alone. There were
 12 other drinkers.
 13 Q All right. But my question is when you saw
 14 these people fall, were they hurt?
 15 MR. ROYAL: Objection, form.
 16 THE WITNESS: I don't know because we can't
 17 get involved with that. And if they're drunk, they
 18 get up. They are to get up on their own or someone
 19 picks them up.
 20 BY MR. GALLIHER:
 21 Q So it sounds to me like you are saying you
 22 don't know whether they were hurt or not.
 23 A Well, no. No.
 24 Q Is that right?
 25 A Yes, because if they were drunk, they would

1 just get up and go. We can't stick our hands in that
 2 situation.
 3 Q I understand. But you don't know whether
 4 those people, when they got up, were hurt?
 5 A No.
 6 Q We're here today basically to -- because
 7 we're involved in a lawsuit as a result of a fall
 8 occurring on November 4, 2016. It happened in the
 9 early afternoon hours.
 10 A Early wasn't it?
 11 Q Yeah. Do you know?
 12 A I was in that morning shift.
 13 Q So how is it that you know which fall I'm
 14 talking about?
 15 A Because I was sent the video.
 16 Q And you were sent the video by whom?
 17 A I don't know who.
 18 Q So you've seen the video showing the fall?
 19 A Yes.
 20 Q So you didn't see the fall until you saw the
 21 video?
 22 A No, I remember that lady.
 23 Q Do you remember seeing the lady fall?
 24 A Yes.
 25 Q All right. So you were sent a video that

1 showed a fall on November 4, 2016; right?
 2 A Yes.
 3 Q And you watched the video?
 4 A Yes.
 5 Q And that fall was a fall that you personally
 6 saw when it occurred?
 7 A Yes. I was there.
 8 Q So when you talked about a fall involving a
 9 lady with coffee, is that the fall you were talking
 10 about?
 11 A She's the one.
 12 Q So how is it that you determined that she
 13 fell carrying coffee?
 14 A Because I was there.
 15 Q Did anyone discuss this fall with you?
 16 A No, but I remember it. But I no longer work
 17 at the Venetian.
 18 Q I understand. Did you meet with anyone in
 19 preparation for today's deposition?
 20 A I just received some documents stating that
 21 I had to come.
 22 Q Did you -- so you did not meet with anyone
 23 to discuss today's deposition?
 24 A No.
 25 Q Did you discuss today's deposition with

1 anyone over the telephone?
 2 A I was only called and told to be here today.
 3 Q So what I'm trying to determine is, where
 4 did you form your opinion that the lady was carrying
 5 coffee?
 6 A Because I know that she was coming from
 7 purchasing coffee.
 8 Q And you testified that she was coming from
 9 purchasing coffee at the Bouchon Bakery; right?
 10 A I think so, because she was coming down next
 11 to the area where they sell coffee.
 12 Q So you did not discuss your testimony of
 13 today's deposition with anyone before you showed up?
 14 A No.
 15 Q And I want to make sure I'm clear on this:
 16 That you personally witnessed this fall when it
 17 happened, separate and apart from what you saw in the
 18 video?
 19 A Yes.
 20 Q So you actually saw the fall twice. You saw
 21 the fall in person when it happened and then you saw
 22 it again on the video; is that right?
 23 A Yes, yes. I was there. I was cleaning in
 24 the surroundings.
 25 Q When the video was sent to you, was it sent

1 to you in a letter?
 2 A No.
 3 Q How was it sent to you?
 4 A I don't know. I received -- no. The next
 5 day I received these papers.
 6 Q Well, my question was, how was the video
 7 sent to you?
 8 A I don't know.
 9 Q Well, did you receive it at your home?
 10 A No, my phone.
 11 Q All right. So the video that you described
 12 was sent to you on your telephone?
 13 A Uh-huh, yes.
 14 Q And you don't know who sent it?
 15 A No.
 16 Q Did the sender identify themselves in any
 17 way to tell you who sent it to you?
 18 A No. I was only mailed these papers and then
 19 I was called from the telephone.
 20 Q All right. When you say you were called
 21 from the telephone, did the call from the telephone
 22 result in the video being sent to you?
 23 A I believe so. That's how I got it.
 24 Q So when the person called you on the
 25 telephone, did they identify themselves?

1 Q So when the person that talked to you on the
 2 telephone about this case, did they tell you they were
 3 from the Venetian?
 4 A Yes. It was from the Venetian, about an
 5 accident that happened at the Venetian.
 6 Q Did the video that was sent to you, was it
 7 accompanied by any type of a message?
 8 A No.
 9 Q No text or anything of that nature?
 10 A No. I was only sent the video and that
 11 paper that I received.
 12 Q All right. So you were sent the video, you
 13 were sent the paper, which is the subpoena to today's
 14 deposition.
 15 A And I don't even know why.
 16 Q And you weren't sent anything else?
 17 A No. I don't even know why I'm here.
 18 Q So have you understood all my questions
 19 today?
 20 A Yes.
 21 Q Anything you want me to repeat or rephrase
 22 for you?
 23 A No.
 24 MR. GALLIHER: Pass the witness.
 25 /////

1 A Yes. I was told that it was from here.
 2 Q From where?
 3 A From this page, what it says on this page.
 4 Q So did someone tell you that the video was
 5 coming from my office?
 6 A No, no. I didn't pay attention. They only
 7 send me a video and this letter stating that I had to
 8 be here. And I don't know why I'm involved in this.
 9 Q I'm still trying to figure out how you
 10 received the video.
 11 So when the person called you on the
 12 telephone, did they -- how did they get your telephone
 13 number?
 14 MR. ROYAL: I'm going to -- I'm sorry -- a
 15 belated objection as to form.
 16 Go ahead.
 17 BY MR. GALLIHER:
 18 Q So when the person called, did you ask them
 19 how they got your telephone number?
 20 A No, but since it was coming from the
 21 Venetian, they know my telephone number.
 22 Q All right. So then, you knew that the video
 23 that was being sent to you on your telephone was
 24 coming from the Venetian; is that right?
 25 A Yes.

1 EXAMINATION
 2 BY MR. ROYAL:
 3 Q Okay. I just have a few questions for you.
 4 A Again?
 5 Q I'm going to show you -- strike that.
 6 You testified that you saw a video, and I'm
 7 going to show you what's been identified -- I'm not
 8 sure how you want to do this, but I've got it right
 9 here.
 10 MR. GALLIHER: Okay. Just for the record,
 11 you are showing her your -- the video on computer.
 12 MR. ROYAL: Exactly.
 13 BY MR. ROYAL:
 14 Q So it's been identified as VEN019. And I
 15 have a laptop and I'm going to try and turn this so
 16 you can see it with the witness as best I can. A
 17 little bit tricky here. One second. You can scoot
 18 back just a little bit.
 19 Okay. I'm just going to -- and what I'm
 20 going to do for the record, I'm just going to indicate
 21 numbers so we can identify what we're looking at.
 22 Right now it's paused. It's at 12:31:33 of the -- of
 23 the footage.
 24 Do you recognize the area?
 25 A That's in front of the Grand Lux Cafe.

MARIA CONSUELO CRUZ 4/17/2019

Page 31

1 Q And when you said that you patrolled an
2 area -- strike that. What would this --
3 When you're assigned to work this area, what
4 would the area be called?
5 A Station 2.
6 Q Okay. And you kind of broadly told us what
7 you did in Station 2. Did that include cleaning the
8 restroom?
9 A No, not -- the bathrooms were something
10 separate.
11 Q Okay. So you weren't cleaning bathrooms?
12 A No, no.
13 Q Do you know who was cleaning bathrooms on
14 the day this happened?
15 A I don't remember.
16 Q Okay. So if you are not cleaning bathrooms,
17 what was your general job -- strike that. Let me ask
18 it again.
19 Looking at VEN019 at 12:31:33, does this
20 depict an area that you would have been patrolling on
21 the day of the incident?
22 A That's called the rotunda. It's a big round
23 circle and then you take the hallway on the way to the
24 corner. Around the corner by security that passes in
25 front of the Grand Lux Cafe, that's Station 2.

Page 32

1 Q Okay. Okay. I'm going to let this run
2 starting at 12:33:10, and I'm going to make it go a
3 little bit faster to kind of move it along here.
4 There's a -- at 12:33:35, there's a woman
5 approaching a man. He's looking down. Do you know
6 who that woman is?
7 A No.
8 Q I want you to watch from the left over here.
9 Okay. It's 12:33 -- I'm going to go back here, sorry.
10 12:33:52. I want -- there's a woman coming from the
11 left with a broom and so forth.
12 Do you recognize that person?
13 A No. Maybe it was me.
14 Q Well, that's my question. I want you to
15 watch again.
16 A I think I am.
17 Q Okay.
18 A Yes.
19 Q Do you think that was you?
20 A Yes, it's me. It's me.
21 Q So starting at -- I want to get the times
22 right. So starting at 12:33:52, on the left side
23 that's a person. You think that's you?
24 A I think so.
25 Q Okay. And what was -- what did you notice?

Page 33

1 What was that person doing?
2 A Me?
3 Q Yeah. What were you doing?
4 A Checking around.
5 Q Okay.
6 A We went to the bathroom to check the towels
7 to get a clean towel.
8 Q Okay. Do you recall, or can you tell
9 watching this at 12:33:52, whether or not you noticed
10 there was anything on the floor in the area to your
11 immediate right?
12 A No, no. I was -- I would have walked right
13 over it.
14 Q You didn't see anything?
15 A No.
16 Q All right. You were -- okay.
17 I'm going to continue and we're now moving
18 ahead to about 12:38:40, we'll call it. There is a
19 woman depicted sitting on the floor and a couple of
20 men in suit jackets.
21 Do you remember this scene as it's depicted
22 here generally?
23 A You mean where she fell?
24 Q Yes. Do you remember seeing something
25 similar to this?

Page 34

1 A That's not the lady that fell.
2 Q Well, okay. Let's move to --
3 A Or this is her.
4 Q Okay. At 12:39:37 we see a PAD -- a male
5 PAD person. Do you know who that is kind of at the
6 top of the screen? Okay. I'm just trying to identify
7 people. Maybe you can't tell from this.
8 At 12:39:48, do you see yourself?
9 A Yes.
10 Q Okay. And that's you on the right?
11 A As I said, the other one is David.
12 Q There is a man with a bucket at 12:39:51.
13 Who is that?
14 A That's David.
15 Q David Martinez?
16 A Yes, uh-huh.
17 Q Now he's pointing to someone at 12:40:01.
18 Do you know who that is?
19 A I don't know.
20 Q Okay. Now, Mr. Martinez, you see him
21 mopping up an area?
22 A But it wasn't wet there.
23 Q Okay. Do you know -- well, that was my
24 question. You see him -- we're at 12:40:15. He's got
25 a bucket.

10 (Pages 31 to 34)

1 What's your recollection of what he was
2 doing at this particular time depicted here on the
3 video?
4 A It seems like she dropped something -- she
5 spilled some coffee.
6 Q Okay. Did you actually see anything on the
7 floor?
8 A No.
9 Q And then I'm going to fast-forward a little
10 here. Okay. I'm going to go back.
11 At 12:41:07, do you see yourself?
12 A Before she fell, you mean?
13 Q No. I'm looking at -- right now it's at
14 12:41:09, the video. Do you see yourself in the
15 video?
16 A Yes.
17 Q Okay, I'm going to let it run now. What are
18 you doing?
19 A Drying whatever the other one has been
20 cleaning.
21 Q Okay. So just tell me the process. You've
22 got a towel on the floor that you are using under your
23 foot.
24 A To dry whatever. To dry whatever is being
25 wet by the other one with a bucket, but there was

1 but...
2 Q Okay. So...
3 A What happened to -- the floor right there
4 you see is waxed.
5 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm having a
6 hard time.
7 THE INTERPRETER: "It was waxed."
8 THE COURT REPORTER: Could you repeat the
9 whole response?
10 MR. ROYAL: Well, I don't think there's a
11 question pending, but go ahead.
12 THE WITNESS: The floor is heavy with wax
13 right there.
14 BY MR. ROYAL:
15 Q Okay. Now, do you remember cleaning the
16 area beyond what we watched on the video as you
17 remember what you did?
18 A Yes. We clean the entire surroundings.
19 People left beer, soda, coffee.
20 Q When you say the entire surroundings, what
21 were you making reference to?
22 A Well, look, we have to be careful going
23 around this column because the floor -- everything
24 that has to do with cleaning.
25 Q Well, okay. I just want to make sure. I'm

1 nothing there.
2 Q I see, okay.
3 So when Mr. Martinez goes over an area with
4 a mop, your job was to follow with a dry towel?
5 A Well, yes. At that moment, yes.
6 Q Okay. Now I'm going to go back. I'm going
7 to go back to -- okay. I'm going to go back to
8 12:36:49 and I want you to watch. I'm going to start
9 it.
10 A They are in suits.
11 Q Is that something that you recall seeing,
12 what we just watched there? I stopped it at 12:36:58.
13 A Yes. I remember the lady falling.
14 Q Did you ever talk to the lady who was --
15 A No, you can't. You can't.
16 Q Do you remember hearing any conversations
17 between the lady who fell and anyone else as you were
18 at the scene?
19 A No, because the security guards are the ones
20 that speak to them.
21 Q Okay. You didn't hear any of the
22 conversation?
23 A No.
24 Q Now, I heard you say something about shoes.
25 A Some people fake falls to get something,

1 going to show you -- I'm just going to show this. I'm
2 not going to run it at 12:43:17.
3 Okay. You mentioned something about beer,
4 sodas and so forth. What are you making reference to?
5 A Right there at the corner, people leave beer
6 cans, soda cans, so we have to clean it.
7 Q I meant in what we're looking at at
8 12:43:17. Do you see any beer cans or soda cans
9 there?
10 A No, no. No, but this is the least busy
11 time.
12 Q Okay. All right. I just want to focus on
13 this time. So I'm clear with my question, do you
14 remember completing the task of cleaning up this area
15 or working with David Martinez after the woman got up
16 and left?
17 A Well, yes. It was cleaned. We had to clean
18 because she spilled coffee.
19 Q Okay. Other than her -- the woman spilling
20 coffee, did you see anything else on the floor when
21 you were cleaning after she fell?
22 A No, but we have to check everything anyway.
23 Q Okay. Now, earlier when you're talking
24 about equipment, I heard you say you have cleaners,
25 towels, broom and dust pans.

1 A Yes.
2 Q Okay. Because I made a note here that I was
3 confused whether you had a dust pan or dust mop.
4 A Dust pan.
5 Q So when I showed that video of you earlier
6 walking around the area when you were carrying some
7 things, can you tell us what you had in your hands?
8 A Dust pan and a broom.
9 Q Okay. You were also asked about the tower.
10 Does that area have, like, the bridge? Does that have
11 a bridge that goes over the Las Vegas Boulevard?
12 A No.
13 Q I wasn't clear what you meant by "tower." I
14 know there's a bell tower or a clock tower.
15 A I was talking about the small tower where
16 there was sun coming in.
17 Q Oh, I see what you mean. I see. I was
18 confused.
19 A And now they have Bouchon Bakery around it,
20 but the restaurant is at the small tower.
21 Q Okay. All right. You were asked earlier
22 about when mops and a bucket would come to an area.
23 And in this particular case, what we just saw in the
24 video was a mop and a bucket came to the area.
25 A David is the one who brought it to see if

1 there was a big spill.
2 Q Was there a big spill?
3 A No, no, there was not. I had just walked by
4 that area.
5 Q Was there a little spill?
6 A No, no.
7 Q Were there pieces of ice that you found on
8 the floor?
9 A No, no.
10 Q You testified about drunk people that you
11 have seen in the past fall.
12 A Yes.
13 Q For any of those people, do you recall
14 inquiring as to why they fell?
15 A No. What for? They drink and then they
16 fall and then between each other, they pick up each
17 other. They usually are not alone.
18 Q Okay. And I want to make sure I understand.
19 When you were asked about falls and you said the lady
20 that fell with coffee, is that the lady that we saw in
21 the video that I showed you that's been marked as
22 VEN019?
23 A Yes. I remember the lady falling.
24 Q And that's the lady you were making
25 reference to?

1 A Yes. It's the most recent. She's the one
2 that I remember.
3 MR. ROYAL: Thanks. I'll pass.
4
5 FURTHER EXAMINATION
6 BY MR. GALLIHER:
7 Q I heard your remark during your testimony in
8 response to Mr. Royal's question, some people, they
9 fall to get something. What did you mean by that?
10 A Sometimes they look like they fall.
11 Q And is that what you saw in the video,
12 someone who looked like they fell?
13 A I don't know. I don't know her intentions,
14 but there was no water there.
15 Q Did she look like she fell or not?
16 A Yes, she slips, but it must have been her
17 shoe. It wasn't water.
18 Q And you mentioned also that the area where
19 the fall happened had been heavily waxed. What did
20 you mean by that?
21 A I wasn't talking about that area in
22 particular. Those floors are cleaned every night.
23 Q Are they waxed every night?
24 A No, no. They clean them with a machine.
25 Q And that's every night?

1 A No. I don't recall.
2 Q Do you know one way or the other?
3 A Yes, they do it.
4 Q So as I understand what you are saying, you
5 never saw anything liquid on the floor where the fall
6 happened at any time that day; is that right?
7 MR. ROYAL: I object. Misstates testimony.
8 THE WITNESS: No, no, that is correct.
9 BY MR. GALLIHER:
10 Q All right. So you didn't see any water on
11 the floor, you didn't see any coffee on the floor, you
12 didn't see anything wet on the floor; is that right?
13 A No -- yes, that is correct.
14 Q So the only fluid you saw in connection with
15 this fall on that day was a dry floor?
16 A Yes. I think what you see is that she
17 slipped, but it was her shoe.
18 Q All right. So your testimony is that she
19 didn't slip because she hit anything wet, she slipped
20 because of her shoe?
21 A Because of her shoe.
22 Q All right. So the answer to my question is
23 yes?
24 A Yes.
25 Q Thank you. Nothing further.

MARIA CONSUELO CRUZ 4/17/2019

Page 43

1 THE WITNESS: Is that it?
2 MR. ROYAL: Yes. Nothing for me.
3 MR. GALLIHER: Okay, we're done. Thank you.
4 (The deposition concluded at 3:09 p.m.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

13 (Page 43)

Canyon Court Reporting, Inc. (702) 419-9676

VEN 2451

REPORTER'S DECLARATION

STATE OF NEVADA)
COUNTY OF CLARK)

I, Pauline C. May, CCR No. 286, declare as follows:

That I reported the taking of the deposition of the witness, MARIA CONSUELO CRUZ, commencing on Wednesday, April 17, 2019 at the hour of 2:00 p.m.

That prior to being examined, the witness was by me duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

That I thereafter transcribed said shorthand notes into typewriting and that the typewritten transcript of said deposition is a complete, true and accurate transcription of said shorthand notes taken down at said time, and that a request has not been made to review the transcript.

I further declare that I am not a relative or employee of counsel of any party involved in said action, nor a relative or employee of the parties involved in said action, nor a person financially interested in the action.


Dated at Las Vegas, Nevada this _____ day of _____, 2019.

Pauline C. May, CCR 286, RPR

Surveillance Video

EXHIBIT “F”

EXHIBIT “G”



1 **OBJ**

2 Michael A. Royal, Esq.

3 Nevada Bar No. 4370

4 Gregory A. Miles, Esq.

5 Nevada Bar No. 4336

6 **ROYAL & MILES LLP**

7 1522 West Warm Springs Road

8 Henderson Nevada 89014

9 Tel: 702-471-6777

10 Fax: 702-531-6777

11 Email: mroyal@royalmilesllp.com

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

13 *VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and*

14 *LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC*

15 **DISTRICT COURT**

16 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

17 JOYCE SEKERA, an Individual;

CASE NO.: A-18-772761-C

DEPT. NO.: XXV

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, d/b/a
21 THE VENETIAN LAS VEGAS, a Nevada
22 Limited Liability Company; LAS VEGAS
23 SANDS, LLC d/b/a THE VENETIAN LAS
24 VEGAS, a Nevada Limited Liability Company;
25 YET UNKNOWN EMPLOYEE; DOES I
26 through X, inclusive,

27 Defendants.

Hearing Requested

28 **DEFENDANTS' LIMITED OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATIONS DATED DECEMBER 2, 2019**

29 Defendants, VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, and LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC
30 (hereinafter collectively "*Venetian*"), by and through their counsel of record, Michael A. Royal, Esq.,
31 of ROYAL & MILES LLP, hereby files DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY
32 COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION DATED DECEMBER 2, 2019.

ROYAL & MILES LLP
1522 W Warm Springs Road
Henderson NV 89014
Tel: (702) 471-6777 ♦ Fax: (702) 531-6777

1 This Objection is based upon the Points and Authorities below, the papers and pleadings filed
2 herein, and any oral argument allowed at the hearing on this matter.

3 DATED this 16 day of December, 2019.

4 **ROYAL & MILES LLP**

5
6 By 

7 Michael A. Royal, Esq.
8 Nevada Bar No. 4370
9 1522 W. Warm Springs Rd.
10 Henderson, NV 89014
11 *Attorney for Defendants*
12 *VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and*
13 *LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC*

14 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

15 **I.**

16 **NATURE OF OBJECTION**

17 Defendants' limited objection relates to the scope of the Discovery Commissioner's ruling on
18 the production of incident reports. First, Defendants object to the Discovery Commissioner's ruling
19 that Defendants must produce reports of all incidents occurring on the casino floor level of the
20 Venetian property, when the subject incident occurred in the Grand Lux rotunda area which Plaintiff
21 claims to be especially dangerous because there is a food court and other establishments nearby.
22 Defendants contend that other areas of the property outside the Grand Lux rotunda area where the
23 subject incident occurred are not reasonably relevant to any issues in the case. This is especially
24 significant where Plaintiff's own expert has demonstrated that the subject flooring tests differently in
25 different areas of the property. Second, Defendants object to the Discovery Commissioner's ruling that
26 Defendants must not only produce five (5) years of prior incident reports, but also subsequent incident
27 reports from the date of the subject incident to the date of production (more than three years).
28 Moreover, all of these documents, per the Discovery Commissioner, are to be produced in unredacted

1 form without any NRCP 26(c) protection whatsoever. The sole basis for ordering the production of
2 subsequent incident reports as related by the Discovery Commissioner is the fact that Plaintiff has a
3 claim for punitive damages.

4 Defendants previously provided Plaintiff with sixty-eight (68) prior incident reports from
5 November 4, 2013 to November 4, 2016. Defendants do not object to providing an additional two (2)
6 years of prior incident reports (from November 4, 2011 to November 4, 2013) in the Grand Lux
7 rotunda area where the subject incident occurred; however, Defendants respectfully submit that the
8 proper scope of discovery related to other incident reports in this matter would be to limit further
9 production to the Grand Lux area for the five (5) years preceding the subject incident. Moreover, there
10 is no good, legal basis for the Court to order the production of subsequent incident reports in a
11 negligence case based on a slip/fall from a foreign substance. As to the Discovery Commissioner's
12 order that any further reports be provided in unredacted form, there is a pending stay as to that
13 particular issue granted by the Nevada Court of Appeals.
14
15

16 **II.**

17 **DECLARATION OF MICHAEL A. ROYAL**

18 STATE OF NEVADA)
19) ss.
20 COUNTY OF CLARK)

21 MICHAEL A. ROYAL, ESQ., being first duly sworn, under oath deposes and states:

22 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada and I am counsel
23 for Venetian Casino Resort, LLC, and Las Vegas Sands, LLC, in connection with the above-captioned
24 matter. I have personal knowledge of the following facts and if called upon could competently testify
25 to such facts.

26 ///

27 ///

28

2. I declare that the exhibits identified herein below are true and correct copies of documents produced in or otherwise related to this matter, and move the Court to take judicial notice of the following cases attached hereto.

EXHIBIT	TITLE
A	Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation, filed December 2, 2019
B	Transcript of Proceedings Before Discovery Commissioner (September 18, 2019)
C	Transcript of Joyce Sekera Deposition (taken March 14, 2019), selected pages
D	Thomas Jennings Report (dated May 30, 2019)
E	Transcript of Thomas Jennings Deposition (taken July 2, 2019), selected pages
F	Thomas Jennings Report (dated December 28, 2018)
G	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Mode of Operation Theory of Liability (filed July 23, 2019)
H	First Amended Complaint (filed June 28, 2019)
I	<i>Boucher v. Venetian Casino Resort, LLC</i> , Case No. A-18-773651-C, Order Regarding Plaintiff's Limited Objection to the Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents (filed October 29, 2019)
J	Petitioners' Emergency Petition for Writ of Mandamus and/or Writ of Prohibition Under NRAP Rules 21(a)(6) and 27(e) (filed 09.27.19)
K	Petitioners' Reply Brief, Appellate Court No. 79689-COA (filed 10.28.19)

DATED this 16 day of December, 2019.


MICHAEL A. ROYAL

III.

PERTINENT FACTS AND EVIDENCE

Plaintiff has generally requested that Defendants produce information from 1999 to the present related to an assortment of materials. (See Exhibit A, *Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation* (filed December 2, 2019) at 3:17-27; 4-6.) Defendants filed a motion for protective

1 order and Plaintiff filed a motion to compel. (*See id.* at 7:9-26.) The Discovery Commissioner ruled
2 as follows in pertinent part:

3 1. Defendants be ordered to produce “unredacted records
4 related to other incidents involving guests slipping and falling on the
5 **Venetian common area marble floor on the casino level of the**
6 **Venetian property** due to the existence of a foreign substance from
November 4, 2013 to the present (only as of the date of production).”
(*See id.* at 8:16-19. Emphasis added.)

7 2. Defendants produce records related to any coefficient of
8 friction testing accomplished in the **Grand Lux area** of the Venetian
9 property from November 4, 2011 to November 4, 2016, where such
10 information was disclosed by Venetian pursuant to NRCP 16.1 or which
is not otherwise protected in accordance with nRCP 26. (*See id.* at
8:25-28; 9:1-3. Emphasis added.)

11 3. Defendants produce records related to the removal of
12 carpeting “limited to the **Grand Lux area of the Venetian property**”
13 from November 4, 2011 to November 4, 2016. (*See id.* at 9:4-9.
Emphasis added.)

14 The subject incident occurred in the Grand Lux rotunda area of the Venetian. (*See* Exhibit B,
15 *Transcript of Proceedings Before Discovery Commissioner* (September 18, 2019) at 8:1-3.) The
16 Discovery Commissioner limited Plaintiff’s request for any coefficient of friction testing the Grand
17 Lux area for the five (5) years preceding the subject incident. (*See id.* at 20:19-25; 21:1; *see also*
18 *id.* 21:2-9, “Anything that was done in that [the Grand Lux rotunda] area”). The Commissioner further
19 limited Plaintiff’s inquiry about changes to the Venetian flooring (*i.e.* carpet to marble) to the Grand
20 Lux rotunda area. (*See id.* at 21:2-25; 22:1-2.) The Commissioner initially ruled that the production
21 of other incident reports would likewise be limited to the Grand Lux rotunda area. (*See id.* at 22:24-25;
22 23:1-13.) Then, after further discussion, the Commissioner expanded the scope of other incident
23 reports to the entire casino level of the Venetian property “five years prior to the present, and pursuant
24 to Judge Delaney’s ruling, unredacted.” (*See id.* at 27:1-8. Emphasis added.)

25 The Commissioner acknowledged that Plaintiff’s claims arise from a temporary transient
26 condition. (*See id.* at 30:17-25; 31:1-8.) However, the Commissioner ruled that Defendants must
27
28

1 produce subsequent incident reports based on the fact that Plaintiff has an existing punitive damages
2 claim. (*See id.* at 27:14-25; 28:1; 32:19-25; 41:3-19.) The Commissioner did not otherwise set forth
3 any legal basis for ruling that Defendants must now provide Plaintiff with unredacted subsequent
4 incident reports in a case involving a slip and fall from an alleged foreign substance, simply because
5 Plaintiff has a claim for punitive damages. There was no analysis of NRCP 26(b)(1) or review of
6 Nevada case law on the subject. Indeed, Plaintiff did not present any Nevada law and no legal known
7 legal precedent was relied upon by the Court on the issue of producing subsequent incident reports.
8

9 As discussed further herein below, Defendants contend that the following rulings by the
10 Discovery Commissioner are in error:

11 1. That Defendants be ordered to provide copies of other incident reports
12 in any areas outside the Grand Lux rotunda area of the property where Plaintiff's fall
13 occurred; and
14

15 2. That Defendants be ordered to provide subsequent incident reports from
16 November 4, 2015 to the present in a case based upon a slip and fall from a foreign
17 substance based solely on an existing claim for punitive damages.

18 III.

19 DISCUSSION

20 A. Standard of Review

21 Rule 26(b)(1), Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure, reads as follows:
22

23 *Unless otherwise limited by order of the court in accordance with these rules, the scope*
24 *of discovery is as follows: Parties may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged*
25 *matter that is **relevant** to any party's claims or defenses and **proportional** to the needs*
26 *of the case, **considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the***
27 ***amount in controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information, the***
28 ***parties' resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and***
whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.
Information within this scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be
discoverable. (Emphasis added.)

1 Plaintiff must therefore demonstrate that the desired discovery is **relevant** to her claims here
2 and that it is **proportional** to the needs of the case with five factors: 1) importance of issues at stake;
3 2) amount in controversy; 3) parties' relative access to relevant information; 4) parties' resources; the
4 importance of the discovery in resolving contested issues; and 5) the burden of proposed discovery vs.
5 the likely benefit.

6
7 1. **Relevancy**

8 Under the first prong of this test, for information to be discoverable, it must be "relevant to any
9 party's claim or defense." (*Id.*) The phrase "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
10 admissible evidence" has been omitted from the previous rule. The word "relevant" has been provided
11 as one of the driving factors in weighing discovery issues.

12 Recall that Plaintiff was not a normal guest/patron of the Venetian property at the time of the
13 incident, but was instead a pseudo employee, someone assigned a Venetian employee parking pass and
14 ID badge to gain special access to the property. She worked on property for nearly a year prior to the
15 incident and, as discussed further herein, Plaintiff walked the Grand Lux rotunda area many hundreds
16 of times without incident until November 4, 2016 - the only difference being the alleged existence of
17 a foreign substance reportedly causing her to fall.

18
19 What is "relevant" about incidents occurring anywhere other than the Grand Lux rotunda area
20 where Plaintiff fell? It is an area of which Plaintiff was extremely familiar in the course of her
21 employment. There is no evidence that Plaintiff routinely ventured into any other areas of the Venetian
22 property - to the contrary, it was her daily routine to traverse the Grand Lux rotunda area. What may
23 have occurred in areas outside the Grand Lux rotunda area or on occasions following the subject
24 incident is simply not "relevant".

25
26 As also discussed further herein below, Plaintiff has claimed to have reports of 196 prior
27 incidents occurring in the Grand Lux rotunda area; therefore, Defendants respectfully submit that
28

1 Plaintiff is in possession of more than sufficient "relevant" information she needs to make her case for
2 constructive notice and/or dangerous condition, with that information reportedly confined to the Grand
3 Lux rotunda area.

4 2. **Proportionality**

5 Even if the Court deems the information "relevant", that alone is insufficient. Under the second
6 part of the NRCP 26(b)(1) test, to be discoverable, information must be "proportional to the needs of
7 the case." The rule provides six factors to consider: 1) "the importance of the issues at stake in action";
8 2) "the amount in controversy"; 3) "the parties' relative access to relevant information"; 4) "the parties'
9 resources; 5) the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues" and 6) "whether the burden or
10 expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit." Defendants have previously produced
11 a total of sixty-eight (68) prior incident reports and Plaintiff claims to have a total of 196.¹ Requiring
12 Defendants to produce additional prior incident reports beyond the Grand Lux rotunda area and beyond
13 the date of the subject incident serves no good purpose other than to burden and harass Defendants.
14

15 Defendants note that NRCP 26(b)(2)(C) further limits discovery. It requires the Court to limit
16 the frequency or extent of discovery if the Court determines that the discovery sought is (1)
17 "unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or can be obtained from some other source that is more
18 convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive"; (2) "the party seeking discovery has had ample
19 opportunity to obtain the information by discovery in the action;" or (3) "the proposed discovery is
20 outside the scope permitted by Rule 26(b)(1)." Courts, thus, have a "duty to pare down overbroad
21 discovery requests under Rule 26(b)(2)." (*See Rowlin v. Alabama Dep't. of Pub. Safety*, 200 F.R.D.
22 459, 461 (M.D. Ala. 2001) (referencing application of FRCP 26(b)(2)).) Rule 26 provides the Court
23
24
25
26
27

28 ¹Pursuant to the DCRR, Plaintiff is to produce all of the other incident information she has collected to Defendants. (*See Exhibit A at 9:26-28.*)

1 with broad discretion to "tailor discovery narrowly" (*See Crawford-El v. Britton*, 523 U.S. 574, 599,
2 118 S. Ct. 1584, 140 L. Ed. 2d 759 (1998).)

3 B. **Defendants Object to Producing Records of Other Incidents in Areas Outside the Grand**
4 **Lux Rotunda Where the Subject Incident Occurred**

5 Defendants do not object to the Commissioner's ruling to produce prior incident reports from
6 November 4, 2011 to November 4, 2016; however, Defendants take issue with the ruling that
7 production is not limited to the Grand Lux rotunda area, but expands to all areas of the Venetian
8 property on the casino level.

9
10 As Defendants previously noted, the Commissioner expressly limited Plaintiff's request for any
11 coefficient of friction testing to the Grand Lux rotunda area. The Commissioner further limited
12 Plaintiff's request for floor remodeling (*i.e.* changing carpeting to stone flooring) to the Grand Lux
13 rotunda area. The ruling should likewise be limited to the Grand Lux area when it comes to the
14 production of prior incident reports.

15 Plaintiff testified in deposition that she walked across the Grand Lux rotunda area daily to use
16 the restroom where she was headed at the time of the subject area. (*See Exhibit C, Transcript of Joyce*
17 *Sekera Deposition* (taken March 14, 2019) at 84:21-25; 85:1-9, 15-25; 86:1-25; 87:1-5; 88:7-14; 109:5-
18 13.) Plaintiff testified that she was working five (5) to seven (7) days per week at her kiosk job from
19 9:00 am to 7:00 pm, sometimes as much as eighty (80) hours. (*See id.* at 57:5-20; 59:17-24; 75:5-25;
20 76:1-17.) Plaintiff would therefore have worked more than 200 days on property between December
21 28, 2015 and November 4, 2016, walking through the Grand Lux rotunda area several hundred times
22 prior to the subject incident. There is no evidence that Plaintiff routinely walked through other areas
23 of the Venetian property.
24

25
26 Plaintiff expert Thomas Jennings related in a report dated May 30, 2019 that he was aware of
27 196 slip and fall events between January 1, 2012 to August 5, 2016 occurring on Venetian property,
28 "the majority of those occurring on the marble flooring within the same approximate area as Plaintiff's

1 slip and fall.” (See Exhibit D, *Report of Thomas Jennings*, dated May 30, 2019) at 3.) When asked
2 about this in his deposition of July 2, 2019, Mr. Jennings testified of his understanding that the alleged
3 196 prior incidents occurred in the “Grand Lux area.” (See Exhibit E, *Transcript of Thomas Jennings*
4 *Deposition* (taken July 2, 2019) at 84:7-25;85:1-3;86:12-19; 87:6-25; 88:1-3.)

5 Accordingly, Plaintiff provided her expert, Thomas Jennings, with a report purporting to
6 document 196 prior incidents in the Grand Lux rotunda area, where Plaintiff’s fall occurred, and Mr.
7 Jennings presented opinions based on that information. Mr. Jennings also acknowledged that
8 coefficient of friction testing on marble flooring throughout the property may vary depending on a
9 variety of factors, explaining why his findings in the matter of *Smith v. Venetian* were so different.
10 (See *id.* at 70:10-19; 71:11-25; 72:1-22; 73:1-9.)² Mr. Jennings further commented on the Grand Lux
11 rotunda area as being unique in that there are food and beverage establishments available to patrons.
12 (Id. at 63:22-25; 64:1-10; see also Exhibit F, *Report of Thomas Jennings*, dated December 28, 2018
13 at 3, “Within the general area of plaintiff’s slip and fall incident are food courts, cafes, coffee bars and
14 other operations that dispense beverages.”)

15 The Court will recall that Plaintiff has asserted that the area of her fall is unique within the
16 Venetian property due to the fact that it is located near a variety of food and beverage establishments,
17 thereby triggering the self-serve mode of operation doctrine. (See Exhibit G, *Findings of Fact,*
18 *Conclusions of Law and Order Granting Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Mode*
19 *of Operation Theory of Liability* (July 23, 2019).) Those same dynamics are not found in other areas
20 of the property.

21 Plaintiff claims to have evidence of more than 100 prior incidents in the Grand Lux rotunda
22 area where she fell. It is an area of which Plaintiff, by virtue of her employment, is very familiar,
23

24
25
26
27
28 ²Mr. Jennings tested the marble flooring in the *Smith* litigation as .90 COF dry; .40 COF wet.
He tested the flooring in the *Sekera* litigation as .70 COF dry and .33 COF wet.

1 having walked through it many hundreds of times prior to the incident. There is no reasonable basis
2 for Plaintiff to have incident reports for any areas outside the Grand Lux area. The Discovery
3 Commissioner limited Plaintiff's other requests to the Grand Lux rotunda area, but then expanded it
4 throughout the property as to other incidents, which is overly broad and unnecessary. This is especially
5 true in light of Eldorado Club, Inc. v. Graff, 78 Nev. 507, 511, 377 P.2d 174, 176 (1962) ("*it is error*
6 *to receive 'notice evidence' of the type here [prior incident reports] for the purpose of establishing*
7 *the defendant's duty*"). Accordingly, Defendants respectfully submit that the Discovery
8 Commissioner's Report and Recommendation that Venetian be ordered to produce other incident
9 reports for events occurring beyond the Grand Lux rotunda area should be reversed, with the Court
10 limiting disclosure to the area where Plaintiff fell, which is surrounded by the food and beverage areas
11 Plaintiff has so often highlighted.

12
13
14 **C. Defendants Object to Producing Records of Subsequent Incident Reports**

15 Defendants further respectfully disagree with the Commissioner's recommendation that they
16 be ordered by the Court to produce unredacted subsequent incident reports for the entire casino level
17 of the Venetian property, effectively order that Defendants produce more than eight (8) years of
18 records. Defendants' objection is based on the fact that this is a negligence case arising from a slip and
19 fall where Plaintiff claims to have encountered a temporary transitory condition - which Plaintiff
20 claimed to have transferred to her pants and shirt after landing on the floor. (See Exhibit C at 90:13-
21 23; 93:10-24. See also Exhibit H, *First Amended Complaint* at 3:4-22.)

22
23 The Discovery Commissioner agreed that she would not order the production of subsequent
24 incident reports in a negligence case based on a temporary transitory condition such as liquid on a
25 walkway. (See Exhibit A, at 41:3-19; see also Exhibit I, *Boucher v. Venetian Casino Resort, LLC*,
26 Case No. A-18-773651-C, *Order Regarding Plaintiff's Limited Objection to the Discovery*
27 *Commissioner's Report and Recommendation on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of*
28

1 *Documents* (filed October 29, 2019) at 2:9-10 “Subsequent incident reports do not need to be provided,
2 because liquid on a walkway is a transient condition.”)

3 Plaintiff’s argument on this issue before the Discovery Commissioner below was that Plaintiff
4 fell due to a permanent condition, referring to cases such as *Ginnis v. Mapes Hotel Corp.*, 470 P.2d
5 135 (Nev. 1970) (strict product liability action based on a defective door). However, by Plaintiff’s own
6 admission, she walked successfully through the Grand Lux rotunda area hundreds of times without
7 incident until allegedly encountering a liquid substance on November 4, 2016. Plaintiff’s own expert,
8 Mr. Jennings, testified that the floor in the Grand Lux rotunda area where Plaintiff fell is safe when
9 dry. (See Exhibit E at 94:25; 95:1-3.) Plaintiff knew that from her own personal experience. The
10 Discovery Commissioner did not agree with Plaintiff’s argument that the subject flooring where
11 Plaintiff fell constituted a permanent condition and, accordingly, not order the production of
12 subsequent incidents on that basis. However, Defendants’ insist that the Commissioner erred in
13 ordering the production of subsequent incidents based on the fact that Plaintiff has an existing punitive
14 damages claim.

17 As previously noted, *Eldorado Club, Inc.*, stands for the proposition that prior incident reports
18 in a case like this one are not admissible to establish a defendant’s duty. In *Reingold v. Wet ‘n Wild*
19 *Nev., Inc.*, 113 Nev. 967, 969-70, 944 P.2d 800, 802 (Nev. 1997), the court held that while evidence
20 of subsequent incidents may be admissible to show a dangerous defective condition (citing *Ginnis*,
21 *supra*), “evidence of subsequent accidents may not be admitted to demonstrate a defendant’s
22 knowledge of the condition prior to the instant accident.” However, that is exactly why Plaintiff is
23 seeking this subsequent incident information.

25 Plaintiff cited in her briefing with the Discovery Commissioner cases outside the jurisdiction
26 of Nevada allowing for evidence of subsequent incidents; however, these all related to strict products
27 liability (*Hilliard v. A. H. Robins Co.*, 148 Cal. App. 3d 374, 196 Cal. Rptr. 117 (Ct. App. 1983); *GM*
28

1 *Corp. v. Mosely*, 213 Ga. App. 875 (Ga. Ct. App. 1994); *Coale v. Dow Chem. Co.*, 701 P.2d 885 (Colo.
2 App. 1985); *Palmer v. A.H. Robins Co.*, 684 P.2d 187 (Colo. 1984); *Hoppe v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 779
3 F. Supp. 1413 (SD NY 1991)); fraud (*Schaffer v. Edward D. Jones & Co.*, 552 N.W.2d 801 (S.D.
4 1996)), invasion of privacy (*Roth v. Farner-Bocken Co.*, 667 N.W.2d 651 (S.D. 2003)), workers
5 compensation (*Boshears v. Saint-Gobain Calmar, Inc.*, 272 S.W.3d 215 (Mo. App. 2008)); post
6 incident writings of an event containing admissions of the event (*Bergeson v. Dilworth*, 959 F.2d 245
7 (10th Cir. 1992)); concealment of evidence regarding an incident (*Wolfe v. McNeil-PPC, Inc.*, 773 F.
8 Supp. 2d 561 (ED Pa. 2011). Plaintiff also referred to a case where admission of prior incident reports
9 was properly excluded under FRE 403 (*Hill v. United States Truck, Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 39197,
10 2007 WL 1574545). Yet, there are numerous cases in California and Nevada which hold otherwise.³

11
12 Missing from Plaintiff's legal discussion before the Discovery Commissioner below is any
13 Nevada law supporting her contention that a punitive damages claim allowed to go forward in a
14 negligence slip and fall case arising from an alleged foreign substance on the floor entitles her to
15 evidence of subsequent incident reports. Using NRCP 26(b)(1) as a measuring stick, what possible
16 relevance is there of prior incident reports in a negligence case? Further, how does production of this
17 information meet the proportionality requirement of NRCP 26(b)(1)? Plaintiff did not say, and the
18
19

20 ³In *Rackliffe v. Rocha*, U.S. Dist. LEXIS 57394, *5 (E.D. CA April 24, 2012), the United States
21 District Court for the Eastern District of California denied the plaintiff's motion to compel the
22 production of subsequent incident reports, the plaintiff failing "to demonstrate how evidence regarding
23 incidents that happened after the alleged incident against Plaintiff would demonstrate any motive or
24 intent by Defendant." Also, there are numerous cases in the United States District Court, District of
25 Nevada, where discovery regarding other incident reports has been denied in slip and fall accidents
26 caused by a foreign substance or other temporary condition. (*See, e.g., Caballero v. Bodega Latina*
27 *Corp.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116869, 2017 WL 3174931 (D.Nev. July 25, 2017) (plaintiff slipped
28 on a wet substance in produce department of supermarket); *Smith v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 2014 U.S.
Dist. LEXIS 83005, 2014 WL 2770691 (D.Nev. June 17, 2014) (plaintiff slipped on a piece of wet
produce near the checkout registers); *Winfield v. Wal-Mart Stores*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 127639,
2017 WL 3476243, *4 (D. Nev. Aug. 10, 2017) (plaintiff was not permitted to introduce evidence of
prior accidents allegedly caused by wet substances on the floor; the court earlier having denied
discovery regarding other prior incidents); and *Smith v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, Case. No.
2:11-cv-1520-MMD-RJJ, Order (ECF No. 39) (plaintiff slipped on a liquid substance on floor).

1 Discovery Commissioner did not ask. She simply ordered the production of unredacted subsequent
2 incident reports throughout the casino level of the Venetian property based solely on the fact that there
3 is an existing punitive damages claim.

4 Plaintiff is creating a template for all future litigants in this litigation in slip and fall claims -
5 file for leave to add a claim of punitive damages, then if/when granted, demand production of
6 unredacted subsequent incident reports to be shared with the entire legal community (both local and
7 abroad).

8
9 Plaintiff, according to her expert, Mr. Jennings, purportedly has evidence of 196 prior incident
10 reports in the Grand Lux rotunda. While Defendants dispute that wild assertion, Plaintiff presently has
11 sufficient evidence to support her claim for punitive damages. If, however, the Court is inclined to
12 uphold the Discovery Commissioner's ruling as to the production of subsequent incidents, Defendants
13 would then move to limit the scope to the Grand Lux rotunda area where the subject incident occurred.
14 Again, Plaintiff walked through this same area safely hundreds of times prior to the subject incident.
15 The only difference on November 4, 2016 was that she allegedly encountered a foreign substance.
16 There is no evidence that Plaintiff typically went to other areas of the Venetian property on a daily
17 basis. Further, Mr. Jennings himself testified that the coefficient of friction in other areas of the
18 property will vary depending on a variety of factors.

19
20 As there is no Nevada law supporting the Discovery Commissioner's order that Defendants
21 produce subsequent incident reports under the circumstances, Defendants respectfully object to that
22 portion of the Report and Recommendation, and hereby move this Honorable Court to strike that
23 portion of the December 2, 2019 DCRR.

24
25 **D. Defendants Renew Objection on Privacy Grounds**

26 As the Court is aware, Defendants have petitioned the Appellate Court to review the issue of
27 privacy related to the disclosure of private guest information found in prior incident reports, which is
28

1 presently pending. Defendants hereby reference the Court to the pleadings on file therein, and attach
2 a copy of their initial petition and reply brief to address this issue. (See Exhibit J, *Petitioners'*
3 *Emergency Petition for Writ of Mandamus and/or Writ of Prohibition Under NRAP Rules 21(a)(6) and*
4 *27(e)* (filed 09.27.19); Exhibit K, *Petitioners' Reply Brief*, Appellate Court No. 79689-COA (filed
5 10.28.19). The present recommendation by the Discovery Commissioner would provide Plaintiff with
6 unredacted subsequent incident reports to ostensibly search for witnesses which, because they could
7 be freely shared beyond this litigation, could be used by others to search for clients. While Defendants
8 contend there is no legal, reasonable or rational basis to produce subsequent incident reports based on
9 Plaintiff's punitive damages claim, if the Court adopts that portion of the DCRR, at a minimum, they
10 should be produced in redacted form.

11
12
13 V.

14 **CONCLUSION**

15 Based on the foregoing, Defendants respectfully submit that the Discovery Commissioner was
16 in error by not limiting the scope of prior incidents from November 4, 2011 to November 16, 2011 to
17 the Grand Lux rotunda area where the subject incident occurred (as she did with respect to other
18 discovery requests regarding coefficient of friction testing and floor remodeling), and further as to the
19 production of subsequent incident reports in this negligence action. Defendants therefore move this
20 Honorable Court to revise the pending discovery order accordingly.

21 DATED this 16 day of December, 2019.

22
23 **ROYAL & MILES LLP**

24 By _____

25 Michael A. Royal, Esq.

26 Nevada Bar No. 4370

27 Gregory A. Miles, Esq.

28 Nevada Bar No. 4336

1522 W. Warm Springs Rd.

Henderson, NV 89014

Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 16 day of December, 2019, and pursuant to NRCP 5(b),

I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **DEFENDANTS' LIMITED OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS DATED DECEMBER 2, 2019** to be served as follows:

_____ by placing same to be deposited for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was prepaid in Las Vegas, Nevada; and/or

_____ to be served via facsimile; and/or

☒ pursuant to EDCR 8.05(a) and 8.05(f), to be electronically served through the Eighth Judicial Court's electronic filing system, with the date and time of the electronic service substituted for the date and place of deposit in the mail; and/or

_____ to be hand delivered;

to the attorneys and/or parties listed below at the address and/or facsimile number indicated below:

Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq.
THE GALLIHER LAW FIRM
1850 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 107
Las Vegas, NV 89104
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Facsimile: 702-735-0204
E-Service: all registered parties

Sean K. Claggett, Esq.
William T. Sykes, Esq.
Geordan G. Logan, Esq.
CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM
4101 Meadows Lane, Suite 100
Las Vegas, NV 89107
Co-Counsel for Plaintiff
Facsimile: 702-655-3763
E-Service: all registered parties




An employee of ROYAL & MILES LLP

EXHIBIT “B”



TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JOYCE SEKERA,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

VENETIAN CASINO RESORT
LLC,

Defendant(s).

Case No. A-18-772761-C

DEPT. XXV

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ERIN TRUMAN,
DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE:
ALL PENDING MOTIONS**

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff(s): KEITH E. GALLIHER, JR., ESQ.

For the Defendant(s): MICHAEL A. ROYAL, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: TRISHA GARCIA, COURT RECORDER

1 **LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2019**

2 [Proceeding commenced at 10:32 a.m.]

3
4 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Sekera versus Venetian.

5 MR. GALLIHER: Good morning, Commissioner. Keith
6 Galliher on behalf of the plaintiff.

7 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Good morning.

8 MR. ROYAL: Mike Royal on behalf of Defendants, Your
9 Honor.

10 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right. We have
11 Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Testimony and Documents. The
12 Countermotion to Strike False Accusations levied by Plaintiff is off
13 calendar, as it does not relate to the motion under EDCR 2.20(f). So
14 I'm not going to consider the countermotion today.

15 So we've got Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Testimony and
16 Defendants' Motion for Protective Order. Where do you guys want
17 to start?

18 MR. ROYAL: I'd like to start with the protective order,
19 since we filed it first.

20 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

21 MR. ROYAL: I mean, I --

22 MR. GALLIHER: Actually, I don't care. If he wants to start,
23 it's fine with me.

24 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right.

25 MR. ROYAL: We're both going to, you know, get our --

1 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: We're going to get to all of
2 it, so --

3 MR. GALLIHER: We'll do what we do.

4 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Yeah, so -- and maybe it
5 would be helpful for me to start by saying Judge Delaney has
6 already made specific rulings in this case that I intend to follow.
7 Obviously, they were inconsistent with the rulings that I made. But
8 is -- as she is the trial judge, her rulings are, for now, the law of the
9 case, and so we're going to comply with what she said.

10 So with regard to Defendants' Motion for Protective
11 Order, as to Plaintiffs' Request for Production, I don't -- of the
12 incident reports from May 1999 to the present, I am -- with that said,
13 that we're going to follow what she's instructed, I will
14 provide 2.34(e) relief if requested by Defendant to -- that you don't
15 have to produce anything until it becomes an order of the Court,
16 this Motion for Protective Order.

17 So with that said, why don't I give you a chance to
18 proceed.

19 MR. ROYAL: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

20 You've -- first of all, by -- you've indicated that we're being
21 asked to produce documents from May 1999 to the present. This is
22 a slip-and-fall. It's a very typical slip-and-fall case. It's very simple
23 negligence case. The plaintiff worked in the Venetian premises for
24 almost a year. Prior to the incident, she walked across this area
25 safely hundreds of times according to her own testimony. She

1 never had any issues until November 4, 2016, when, according to
2 her and according to her counsel, she came into contact with a
3 foreign substance on the floor, which caused her to slip and fall.

4 So this is a case that is -- that relates -- that arises from a
5 temporary transitory condition. She -- according to their own
6 experts, the floor is safe when it's dry. Their only issue is
7 something gets introduced to it, then it becomes a slip hazard, and
8 that's why they claim the plaintiff slipped and fell.

9 To this point, we've produced -- we have produced 68 -- to
10 my count, 66 to 68, I've -- of prior incident reports going back three
11 years. Which, by the way, we produced, which are outside the area
12 of the incident. This incident occurred in the Grand Lux area, and
13 according to their expert, Tom Jennings, he is in possession of 196
14 prior incidents occurring, according to his trial -- or deposition
15 testimony, occurring strictly within the Grand Lux area.

16 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All that 196 are in the
17 Grand Lux area?

18 MR. ROYAL: That was his testimony. That was his
19 testimony.

20 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

21 MR. ROYAL: Okay. Now, he didn't produce any of the
22 documents that he said that he looked at to come to that conclusion
23 and to put that down in his May 30, 2019, report.

24 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Because I thought the 196
25 was a spreadsheet that you provided.

1 MR. ROYAL: No.
2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: No? Okay.
3 MR. ROYAL: That's not correct.
4 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right.
5 MR. ROYAL: The --
6 MR. GALLIHER: We -- just let me interrupt for a minute.
7 We provided the spreadsheet to Mr. Jennings.
8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.
9 MR. GALLIHER: He testified at deposition that reviewed
10 the spreadsheet.
11 MR. ROYAL: Well, he testified that he got something from
12 Mr. Galliher's office that he reviewed -- that he reviewed it, that he
13 didn't save it, and he didn't bring it with him to his deposition. I
14 didn't have an opportunity to review it with him, because he wasn't
15 clear on everything other than he said they all occurred in this area,
16 in this Grand Lux area.
17 Now, I subsequently got the spreadsheet from
18 Mr. Galliher, looked at those 196, if you take out -- there's a whole
19 bunch of duplicates and so forth from things we had already
20 produced and with some -- they're not in addition to the 68, for
21 example. But I could only come up with eight that say Grand Lux --
22 that say Grand Lux.
23 So I don't know where Mr. -- I don't know if he looked at a
24 different list. I don't know what information that they have. All I'm
25 saying is we have produced let's say 68 prior incident reports going

1 back three years preceding the incident, which are not limited to the
2 Grand Lux area. They are -- they go to the Grand Hall or to areas --
3 other areas on the casino level.

4 They -- what they want, what they're asking for,
5 essentially, is any kind of a slip-and-fall involving the marble floors
6 in common areas anywhere within the property. And we think
7 that's -- we just think that's -- it's asking too much, especially when
8 you're going back to 1999.

9 If you --

10 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, I'm going to limit -- if
11 it'll -- I mean, I'm going to tell you this now. I'm going to limit it to
12 five years before the incident at issue.

13 MR. ROYAL: That would be --

14 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, let me let
15 Mr. Galliher speak to that, because he looks like he's about to burst.
16 So --

17 MR. GALLIHER: I'm not -- no, I'm not ready to burst.

18 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

19 MR. GALLIHER: I am far too old to burst.

20 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

21 MR. GALLIHER: Yeah, well, obviously, we're going to
22 have a problem with that order.

23 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

24 MR. GALLIHER: Because as we pointed out in our points
25 and authorities, there's testimony from a casino executive at

1 Venetian, that approximately one year after the Palazzo opened,
2 which would be about 2009, the Venetian actually tore up carpet on
3 the floors in their casino and replaced the carpet with marble.

4 So, quite obviously, if there are a number of falls before
5 this happened, and we believe there are a large number of falls that
6 occurred on marble floors that are wet -- and by the way, that's the
7 issue here. This is not a transient condition. This has already been
8 established in the case. And what bothers me about the argument
9 is Mr. Royal's rearguing things that have already been argued
10 before the district judge, who has -- sustained, first of all, our
11 Motion to Amend, to include the claim for punitive damages, and
12 twice now, that decision has been attacked by Venetian. Both times
13 Judge Delaney had upheld her initial decision. So we now have a
14 viable claim for punitive damages, and she said that discovery will
15 continue on the punitive damage claim. Which is what we're trying
16 to do.

17 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

18 MR. GALLIHER: So if we can establish that the Venetian,
19 when it was built in 1999, when they installed these marble floors,
20 and we have a history of a large number of falls on these marble
21 floors -- and by the way, the marble floors are all uniform. There's
22 no difference between the marble in the lobby versus the marble in
23 the front of the Grand Lux Cafe, versus the marble in the casino.
24 The marble is the same color, the same consistency, it's the same
25 floor.

1 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Did this incident occur in
2 the area in front of the Grand Lux Cafe?

3 MR. GALLIHER: Yes.

4 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

5 MR. GALLIHER: And that is a marble floor.

6 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

7 MR. GALLIHER: And, of course, our position is that
8 marble is marble, and there's no difference in the flooring. So all
9 falls that occur on these marble floors when people come into
10 contact with wet substances, are relevant to the issue of punitive
11 damages. So if we are able to establish, for example, if there
12 are 100, 200, 300 falls on these marble floors between 1999, when
13 the hotel was built, and 2009, when the Venetian made a conscious
14 decision to tear up the carpet and replace it with marble, don't you
15 think that provides a predicate for punitive damages? It shows
16 conscious disregard for the safety of its customers.

17 Therefore, it's not only relevant, it's clearly discoverable.
18 Because we are -- we have a punitive damage claim. The Venetian
19 keeps wanting to limit us in terms of our discovery, but as we
20 pointed out in our briefing punitive damage claim opens up the
21 whole group of possibilities for us to try to prove our punitive
22 damages, and that includes going back to the time the hotel was
23 built and these floors were installed in the first place.

24 But the other thing that's bothering me is that we -- the
25 unredacted incident reports for the three years prior were ordered

1 by Judge Delaney back in May. We still don't have them. And
2 we've had motion practice after motion practice, Motion to Rehear,
3 Motion for Leave for -- to Rehear. And Judge Delaney had
4 remained consistent and she has said, Venetian, you need to
5 produce the unredacted incident reports.

6 The only thing that she said that should not be in the
7 report is a date of birth and a Social Security number, and that
8 information's not in the report anyway. So we're entitled to that
9 information. It's now a filed order from Judge Delaney. There's no
10 other way for the Venetian to attack it. So that's why it's a shame
11 that we have to file a Motion to Compel after we've had a decision
12 from the district judge several times now giving us the right to the
13 unredacted reports.

14 And the other issue, of course, is -- that we've raised, is
15 that we want to do a 30(b)(6) deposition. And we want to find out
16 what the Venetian knew about the safety of its floors and when they
17 knew it. And that is relevant to the punitive damage claim.

18 Just as the subsequent incident reports are relevant to the
19 punitive damage claim. We've given the Court a lot of case
20 authority to support our position. I haven't seen anything that does
21 not support our position. We've even given you a Nevada Supreme
22 Court case that says subsequent incidents are relevant, not only to
23 the question of notice, but certainly relevant in connection with the
24 punitive damage claim.

25 So I don't know, tell you the truth, I'm not sure why we're

1 here other than the fact that we keep, you know, requesting,
2 requesting, requesting, and we keep getting No, we're not giving it
3 to you. No, we're not giving it to you. File a motion, file a motion.
4 So we're here.

5 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, to the extent that you
6 already had an order from Judge Delaney, rather than a Motion to
7 Compel before me, I would recommend that it be refiled as -- I
8 mean, you can file an order to show cause -- a Motion for an Order
9 to Show Cause before the judge. I mean, I'm not going to reverse
10 Judge Delaney on matters she's already determined in this case.

11 MR. GALLIHER: Well, I'm not asking you to do that. What
12 I'm asking is --

13 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I know you're not.

14 MR. GALLIHER: No.

15 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: But I'm just telling you I'm
16 not going to.

17 MR. GALLIHER: No.

18 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: She's the judge in the
19 case.

20 MR. GALLIHER: Right.

21 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: And so if she's already
22 overruled my recommendation, I'm going to follow what she's
23 done. And so if you -- rather than moving --

24 MR. GALLIHER: But you can set a deadline.

25 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry?

1 MR. GALLIHER: But you can set a deadline for the
2 production of the reports, which is what I'm asking you to do.
3 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Oh, that wasn't already
4 done initially?
5 MR. GALLIHER: No.
6 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.
7 MR. GALLIHER: No. And so I'm asking you to set a
8 deadline. And certainly they produced the redacted report, so they
9 have them.
10 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.
11 MR. GALLIHER: So all we're asking for is the unredacted
12 reports, and I'm asking you to set a deadline, say two weeks from
13 now, when these reports --
14 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Well, now we're
15 getting into the Motion to Compel.
16 MR. GALLIHER: Okay.
17 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I haven't given counsel an
18 opportunity --
19 MR. GALLIHER: Understood.
20 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- to finish his Motion for
21 Protection. So.
22 MR. GALLIHER: I'll sit down and shut up.
23 MR. ROYAL: We were in front of Judge Delaney on
24 May 14th. She did not -- the order related to that -- his objection
25 was not filed by the Court until July 31st.

1 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, there's still an order
2 that it hasn't been filed, isn't it? From the Motion for
3 Reconsideration.

4 MR. ROYAL: Well, there was -- well, I filed a Motion for
5 Reconsideration on OSC. Mr. Galliher, she set on a date -- or he --
6 they were in trial and he asked that we continue it. So we
7 continued it out for, it turned out, about 30 days. We just had that
8 hearing yesterday in front of the Court.

9 And during that particular discussion or hearing, she did
10 not grant leave for the consideration. But we did -- she did suggest
11 that we file a writ, which is what we are in the process of doing at
12 this point.

13 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

14 MR. ROYAL: And so it's not as though we're -- it's not as
15 though we're just defiant, you know, with respect to the district
16 judge. This was in front of the district judge yesterday. And so
17 Mr. Galliher certainly could have brought this up and had this
18 discussion and asked the judge to provide a deadline yesterday.

19 I would like to say, you know, something about --
20 something about these motions that have been in front of the judge
21 with respect to punitive damages. I mean, she's just -- she has just
22 ruled that they were allowed to amend the complaint to add
23 punitive damages claim. She never said, has never said that this --
24 or established that this is anything other than a transient -- a
25 temporary transient condition.

1 And so to the extent that counsel is suggesting that to the
2 Court today, that's not correct. She's just simply said -- Tom
3 Jennings, again, their expert has said, I've got 196 incident reports
4 that occurred within a four-and-a-half-year period in the Grand Lux
5 area. I'm not sure what it is, what more they need. But there is no
6 evidence that there was ever any carpet in the area of the Grand
7 Lux Cafe rotunda.

8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: So that's not the area
9 where it was ripped out.

10 MR. ROYAL: Right.

11 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

12 MR. ROYAL: That's correct.

13 And so, further, Mr. Jennings testified he's an expert on
14 another slip-and-fall case that occurred within 80 to 100 feet of this
15 particular accident, also in the Grand Lux area. He testified that his
16 findings on that particular area of the marble floor were much
17 different than they were on our floor. And when I asked him about,
18 Well, why would that be different? And he gave all kinds of reasons
19 from care of the floor to amount of traffic and so forth.

20 So what Mr. Galliher's suggesting, that the floor's the
21 same everywhere and it's going to test the same everywhere, I
22 mean, that's just not -- that's not accurate.

23 What we're really looking for from the Court is some
24 direction, some relief, so that we can go -- for example, we had
25 this 30(b)(6) -- they set this 30(b)(6) deposition with 18 topics that

1 I've gone through with the Court.

2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

3 MR. ROYAL: Topics 6 to 18 all relate to management of
4 the computer system going back to 1999. What kind of -- who
5 manages the system internally, externally, consultants and so forth,
6 employees, who's involved with all this. It's extremely broad.

7 They -- and one of the things that I expect counsel will say
8 is that, Well, we can't trust them. We can't trust the Venetian,
9 because they've withheld report, they've withheld information from
10 us. And the Court will recall that previously when they brought a
11 motion, they very inaccurately represented to the Court that we did
12 not disclose 65 reports over the same period of time of those 66
13 and 68 reports that we previously produced. And then they had to
14 come and say -- and advise the Court, okay, we're sorry, that's not
15 accurate.

16 So they're not here today saying that they have any
17 evidence that we're not producing documents, that we're doing
18 something improper. We have produced 68 prior incident reports
19 that are outside -- that are within and outside the Grand Lux area.
20 What we're asking the Court is just limit the scope in the area where
21 this occurred, limit it to five years, and we're fine. And we have no
22 problem with that.

23 Now, is -- with respect to some of these other things, the
24 carpeting, I mean, they're asking for --

25 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, let's go through the

1 issues and I'll give you my recommendation and if you want to both
2 discuss it, we can.

3 But with regard to Plaintiffs' Demand for Information
4 Related to Incidents from May 1999 to the Present, I am going to
5 protect that as written, but I think it's appropriate for -- given Judge
6 Delaney's rulings, for Defendant to provide, from
7 November 4th, 2011, to the present. Counsel in his affidavit stated
8 that there was no water at the scene. And so I think that that -- with
9 a permanent condition, which I think is, you know, if there's no
10 water, it's not a transient condition, it's a permanent condition, that
11 I think they're entitled to prior and subsequent. So I think for five
12 years --

13 MR. ROYAL: But, Your Honor, that's --

14 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- prior to the present time.

15 MR. ROYAL: -- that's not their claim. Their claim is that
16 there was water there. They have a witness who says there was
17 water there. Just -- by the mere fact that we dispute their report
18 doesn't mean -- I mean, the complaint itself says that there was a
19 liquid substance. That doesn't -- just because we dispute their facts
20 doesn't turn it into a permanent condition. They have a witness,
21 Gary Schulman, who they -- who says, I saw it there.

22 And the plaintiff, in her own deposition testimony, I
23 slipped. Not only did she slip, but her pants were wet. So it's not
24 their contention that there was nothing there. The fact that we
25 dispute it doesn't turn it into a permanent condition and certainly

1 shouldn't burden my client from having -- from now he has to
2 produce subsequent incident reports.

3 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Mr. Galliher?

4 MR. GALLIHER: My goodness, the law's so clear. We
5 have a punitive damage claim. It needs to be recognized by
6 Venetian. It's a punitive damage claim that's going to survive up
7 until the time of trial. Now, whether it survives trial, I don't know,
8 because we haven't discovered it yet. But the case law makes it
9 very clear. Subsequent incident reports are discoverable and even
10 admissible when you have a punitive damage claim. So that
11 should be the end of the argument.

12 MR. ROYAL: That --

13 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. I'm going to -- my
14 recommendation is going to be from November 4th, 2011, to the
15 present, the reports. And because Judge Delaney had -- her ruling
16 has been that they be unredacted, so that's what it will be.

17 With regard to number 2, Electronic Computer Data
18 Information Related to Communications Pertaining to the Subject
19 Floor with Consultants Other Than Experts Disclosed, Pursuant
20 to 16.1. I think that that is too vague. I'm going to protect that as
21 written. If there's some kind of alternative -- so I'm going to grant
22 the motion as to that request.

23 If there's some alternative relief we can craft, I'm willing to
24 entertain that, Mr. Galliher. But I think -- I'm not even sure what
25 you're asking for there. Consulting experts, I'm not giving you that

1 information.

2 MR. GALLIHER: Understood. And I -- we don't want
3 consulting experts.

4 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: So what -- well, because
5 you said with consultants other than experts disclosed pursuant to
6 NRCP 16.1.

7 MR. GALLIHER: Here's what --

8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: It sounds like you're
9 asking for consulting experts.

10 MR. GALLIHER: Yeah. Here's what we don't know. I
11 mean, we've got --

12 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: What do you want? And
13 let's see if we can craft it --

14 MR. GALLIHER: What I want --

15 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Yes.

16 MR. GALLIHER: -- is this. The Venetian, we're talking
17 about what a great burden it is for the Venetian to produce this
18 information. They have a computerized system. My recall, it's
19 called Alliance.

20 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

21 MR. GALLIHER: It's been identified by a PMK in a
22 deposition of the Venetian. And according to the PMK, every single
23 bit of information regarding what we're looking for is contained on
24 that computer system. And it can be accessed with the push of a
25 button.

1 So if that is true, we'd be --

2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: That seems a little
3 oversimplified in my experience. But in any event, I'm listening.

4 MR. GALLIHER: All right. Again, I'm not a computer whiz.
5 All I know is that it was -- according to this PMK person, it can be
6 accessed very quickly.

7 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

8 MR. GALLIHER: And if that's the case, I'll be more than
9 happy with that information from the computer system. And again,
10 we're going to quarrel --

11 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Regarding what? What
12 information in the computer system? Because you've asked for
13 electronic computer data information related to communications
14 pertaining to the subject flooring with consultants other than
15 experts disclosed pursuant to NRCP 16.1.

16 MR. GALLIHER: Well, first of all, I don't know -- when we
17 talk about consultants, I do not know whether the Venetian has had
18 someone examine their floors and say, Look, there's a problem with
19 these floors. I have recommendations to make concerning how we
20 can make them safer. I don't know whether that's happened,
21 because that information has not been disclosed. We've requested
22 it.

23 So when we talk about -- I'm not talking about consulting
24 experts; I'm talking about the Venetian hiring somebody that knows
25 floors to come in, look at the floors, and say, Okay, what can we do

1 improve these floors and make them safer for our customers and
2 guests? And if they haven't hired somebody to do that, very simple
3 response: We haven't hired anybody.

4 If they have, that's not consulting expert stuff; that is
5 simply business situation where they hired someone to look at their
6 floors, and I'm entitled to find out whether that person that was
7 hired came to the Venetian management and said, These marble
8 floors are a problem. I recommend either, A, they be taken out and
9 replaced with something safer, or, B, there are some substances out
10 there that we can use to coat the floors to make them safer.

11 I don't know whether any of that's happened, because
12 that's why we've made that request.

13 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Mr. Royal?

14 MR. ROYAL: We already went through something like this
15 with Mr. Elliott. And the Court will recall that they made these kind
16 of allegations that Mr. Elliott was going to provide this kind of
17 testimony. The very kind of testimony. Then we got his deposition
18 and found out that he didn't -- that that wasn't the case at all, that
19 he thought the Venetian -- and this was in 2009, and he thought the
20 Venetian floors were fine, were -- in fact, they were exemplary.
21 That was his testimony in that particular deposition.

22 I don't know what it is, necessarily, that he's asking for
23 and I agree that it's vague. I'm not aware -- I can't -- I don't know
24 who to bring to put on and present.

25 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I'm going to protect this as

1 written. I think it's overly vague. If you want to depose someone,
2 any -- I mean, if you want to craft something that says, like, any
3 person who has knowledge that an expert told you to do X, Y, or Z
4 to your floors, put -- it needs to be tailored to -- because as it's
5 written, I think it's overly broad and vague, and I'm going to protect
6 Number 2 as written.

7 MR. GALLIHER: We'll try to fine tune it.

8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. So fine tune it, try
9 to work together on it.

10 Number 3, Information Related to the Testing, Replacing
11 Flooring that is Not Within the Grand Lux Rotunda Area Where the
12 Incident Occurred, all right. If testing occurred in the Grand Lux
13 area anytime between 2011 to the present, I'm going to allow it.
14 But not if it's in an area that's not at issue in this litigation.

15 MR. GALLIHER: So that would include all the remaining
16 marble floors at the Venetian?

17 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Yes.

18 MR. GALLIHER: Okay.

19 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I think any testing that was
20 done in the Grand Lux area for -- be prepared to testify regarding
21 any testing that was done in the Grand Lux area from 2011 -- I'm
22 sorry, till 2016.

23 MR. ROYAL: Okay. Testing done from November 4, 2011
24 to --

25 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: To the date of the incident

1 at issue.

2 MR. ROYAL: And -- okay. And I want to make sure I'm
3 clear on the record, it's the Grand Lux area?

4 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, what are -- where --
5 the incident area, is that the --

6 MR. ROYAL: That's the -- it's called the Grand Lux
7 rotunda.

8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. The Grand Lux
9 rotunda. Anything that was done in that area. Okay?

10 Information About Casino Flooring Changes on or
11 About 2008 Which Did Not -- okay. And Defendant's position is that
12 this did not impact the subject area. If there were not -- if there
13 were not changes made -- were there any changes made to the area
14 where the impact -- or where the incident occurred?

15 MR. GALLIHER: We don't know that yet, because we
16 haven't been able to depose the person to find out exactly where
17 the carpet was taken up and the marble was replaced.

18 MR. ROYAL: There's no testimony whatsoever that there
19 was ever any carpeting in the Grand Lux rotunda. It's always been
20 marble. The testimony he's referring to is testimony by someone
21 who worked in the casino area. This is not the casino area. This is
22 the Grand Lux rotunda.

23 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. I think that that's
24 better. I'm going to protect that. I think that a better way to get at
25 that discovery would be to ask questions regarding whether the

1 area at issue had ever been remodeled or had ever previously had
2 carpet in it. So I'm going to protect 4.

3 Number 5, there is no -- I'm going to allow -- because
4 discovery has already included reports -- so this is dealing with an
5 order limiting the scope of Plaintiffs' discovery to the Grand Lux
6 rotunda area where the subject incident occurred. I am going to
7 allow any prior or subsequent reports that deal with slips and falls
8 on the marble flooring.

9 MR. ROYAL: Within the Grand Lux area?

10 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Within -- I'm going to let
11 Mr. Galliher speak to that.

12 MR. GALLIHER: Well, as I --

13 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: They've already been
14 produced. I mean, the documents have already been produced --

15 MR. GALLIHER: Yes.

16 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- to my understanding.

17 MR. GALLIHER: Some of them have. And we -- we're not
18 sure how many more exist. But, certainly, we have requested all of
19 the others, however many there may be. And the documents that
20 have been produced already include slips and falls on marble
21 flooring.

22 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

23 MR. GALLIHER: And that's exactly what we're looking for.

24 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: And that's what the prior
25 ruling was in this case. So I am going to allow it to be any incident

1 reports -- limited to the five years prior, going backwards, any
2 incident -- prior incident reports five years prior to the present time
3 for slips and falls on marble flooring at the Venetian.

4 MR. ROYAL: Well, Your Honor, I want to make sure I'm
5 clear. I thought your initial order was that it was limited to the
6 Grand Lux area. And this -- what you just said is all encompassing
7 of the entire property.

8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Yeah. To the
9 Grand -- I'm sorry, to the Grand Lux rotunda.

10 MR. GALLIHER: So you're not going to give us the reports
11 regarding all of the other marble flooring?

12 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Just to the area, to this
13 Grand Lux marble flooring. I think that that's -- but you've
14 already -- my understanding is you've already were produced the
15 reports --

16 MR. ROYAL: We --

17 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- for all the marble
18 flooring.

19 MR. GALLIHER: They have. Well --

20 MR. ROYAL: Well --

21 MR. GALLIHER: -- we don't know what they produced, but
22 they produced floor falls --

23 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, that was --

24 MR. GALLIHER: -- in other areas of the hotel on marble
25 flooring.

1 MR. ROYAL: Okay. Your Honor, they're asking for --
2 again, they claim to have 106 -- 90 -- 196 prior incident reports over
3 a five-year period for just the Grand Lux. Okay. So we're saying
4 okay, that's fine. We'll go through and we'll find whatever we can,
5 going back five years for the Grand Lux area.

6 The fact is that when we initially -- when we initially did
7 this, we limited it to the casino level. And -- but, Your Honor,
8 we've -- since then -- since then, Mr. Jennings has testified that his
9 testing outside the Grand Lux area was way different than what we
10 found in the Grand Lux area. And so we're just asking the Court to
11 limit it. To limit it to five years within the Grand Lux area, the
12 marble flooring there, and just --

13 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: So Jennings has already --
14 their expert has already said that the testing is different in the
15 Grand Lux area than the other areas of the marble flooring casinos?

16 MR. ROYAL: Than in other area of the marble floor, that's
17 correct.

18 MR. GALLIHER: Yeah. We're not in agreement with that.
19 And unless -- it's interesting how this continues to be discussed.
20 But Mr. Jennings made it very clear that he reviewed summaries of
21 reports. And it was his understanding that the summary reports
22 had to do with the Grand Lux area; they don't. He is now in the
23 possession of the reports that have been produced, so he actually
24 sees the actual reports, but he made it very clear. I reviewed his
25 summary.

1 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right.
2 MR. GALLIHER: And he's going to clarify that.
3 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: The original
4 recommendation was that -- the one that was objected to, and then
5 Judge Delaney changed it to be unredacted, didn't that include all
6 slips and falls on all marble flooring on the casino level?
7 MR. GALLIHER: It did.
8 MR. ROYAL: No, it did not, Your Honor.
9 MR. GALLIHER: Oh, it did too.
10 MR. ROYAL: Your Honor, I'd have to -- you know, I'd --
11 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right. I'm going to pull
12 it up. Just a second. Because I'm not reversing what we've already
13 decided.
14 MR. GALLIHER: Well, we wanted the reports -- we wanted
15 the unredacted reports that were produced to us redacted, and
16 those included falls on the casino floor.
17 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Because I'm not changing
18 from -- we're not rehashing what's already been decided in this
19 case.
20 MR. ROYAL: Well, Your Honor, I'm not asking you to do
21 that. Because what he's asking for now is in addition to what we
22 previously produced. And we previously produced three years'
23 worth of documents to counsel. They were redacted.
24 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Which now need to be
25 unredacted --

1 MR. ROYAL: That's correct.

2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- pursuant to what Judge
3 Delaney has ordered.

4 MR. ROYAL: That's correct. But now he's asking for
5 something in addition. He's asking for another two years' of
6 documents and we're asking the Court to limit that. That's a new
7 ruling that has not been ruled on by this -- by the discovery
8 commissioner or considered by the district court. So we're asking
9 that -- and now, Your Honor, you're also ordering that we produce
10 not just two years before, but then everything up to the present.
11 And so that's new.

12 And so we're asking you to limit it to the Grand Lux area.
13 And that would not be in any way -- it shouldn't have any impact on
14 what you ordered previously as it relates to that three-year period.

15 MR. GALLIHER: And, of course, we respectfully disagree,
16 because it should be -- we should have the order include all the
17 marble flooring at the ground level at the Venetian, which is what
18 was produced in the first place by the defense.

19 MR. ROYAL: And, by the way, they've never requested
20 that. They've never had that specific request.

21 MR. GALLIHER: Actually, we have.

22 MR. ROYAL: We provided that --

23 MR. GALLIHER: Many times.

24 MR. ROYAL: -- as a courtesy. What they asked for was
25 everything within the property.

1 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. All right. I'm going
2 to limit it to the casino floor. That's -- the Grand Lux is on the
3 casino floor, correct?

4 MR. GALLIHER: Yes.

5 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. I'm going to limit it
6 to any slip-and-falls on the marble flooring on the casino level, five
7 years prior to the present, and pursuant to Judge Delaney's ruling,
8 unredacted. Okay.

9 MR. ROYAL: Just -- Your Honor, can I just ask for
10 clarification --

11 Can I?

12 MR. GALLIHER: You -- go ahead.

13 MR. ROYAL: Okay. Thank you.

14 For clarification, the subsequent incidents that are being
15 ordered that -- to be produced, is that based upon their punitive
16 damages claim or is it based upon the Court's determination that
17 it's --

18 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: The punitive damages
19 claim.

20 MR. ROYAL: Okay. All right.

21 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Which is still pending. Is it
22 still active -- an active claim?

23 MR. GALLIHER: Yes. It survived two challenges from the
24 Venetian. The claim is still alive for sure.

25 MR. ROYAL: Okay. It's a punitive damages claim based

1 on a negligence action of a temporary transient condition. I just
2 want to make sure that's clear in front of the Court. This is not a
3 products case, this is not a permanent condition-type case, this is a
4 temporary transitory condition. So I just want to make sure that's
5 clear.

6 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, I think it's unclear.
7 Because you're saying that the slip-and-fall was on the flooring,
8 you're saying with no water, they're saying there is water. I mean,
9 you've --

10 MR. ROYAL: But it's -- but, Your Honor, their complaint,
11 the complaint does not even make the allegation this is a
12 permanent condition. It is a slip-and-fall. It is a foreign substance
13 on the floor. The fact -- again, we dispute facts --

14 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Which you dispute that
15 there was. So you're saying she slipped and fell on the perfectly
16 dry floor, is that you're saying.

17 MR. ROYAL: I'm saying she slipped and fell for some
18 reason other than, you know, I don't know why she slipped and fell.
19 But --

20 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, your affidavit said
21 there was no foreign substance on the floor.

22 MR. ROYAL: Well, that's my opinion. But their experts
23 have both testified that there was a foreign substance on the floor,
24 Your Honor, both of them. And, in fact, their testimony has been --
25 Dr. Baker and Mr. Jennings both said there absolutely was

1 something on the floor. There had to be something on the floor.
2 That's their position.

3 And so for counsel -- I just want to make sure it's very
4 clear to the Court that this is an incident based upon their allegation
5 that it's a foreign substance that caused her to slip and fall. She
6 walked through that area hundreds of --

7 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, I think it's your
8 affidavit that's conflated the issue. Because you're saying there
9 absolutely wasn't a foreign substance on the floor, which makes
10 that, then you're saying she slipped and fell on the way it is all the
11 time.

12 MR. ROYAL: I -- what I've said, Your Honor, it's -- there is
13 a disagreement, there's a dispute in the facts. They've got an
14 eyewitness. The first person who was there on the scene who said
15 there was a big puddle of water. That's his testimony. That's
16 Mr. Schulman's testimony. So we can't just pretend that that
17 doesn't exist because we dispute the facts.

18 And so this is a case based upon a foreign substance. I
19 just want to make it very clear that that is their claim, that's what
20 their experts say, that's what their star witness says, that's what the
21 plaintiff says. The fact that we dispute it doesn't transform it into a
22 permanent condition or nor should it entitle them to subsequent
23 incident reports.

24 I just want to make that clear, that's all.

25 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Mr. Galliher?

1 MR. GALLIHER: Well, what's he's doing is misleading.
2 Because, the bottom line is that -- you saw Commissioner Bulla's
3 prior ruling against the Venetian, and she recognized, correctly, this
4 is a continuing hazard. This is not a transitory condition; that's
5 Mr. Royal's spin on it. The bottom line -- and --

6 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, he's saying it's not a
7 transient condition --

8 MR. GALLIHER: Well, but -- well, he is in his affidavit --

9 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- because there was
10 nothing there.

11 MR. GALLIHER: -- but --

12 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: You're the one who's
13 saying it is a transient condition.

14 MR. GALLIHER: No, no.

15 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: It's a little confusing.
16 Usually, the defendant --

17 MR. GALLIHER: That's not what I'm saying. I'm saying
18 it's not a transient condition. It's a continuous hazard.

19 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: But you're saying there
20 was water present, which is a transient condition.

21 MR. GALLIHER: But he's -- well, it's not a transient
22 condition if it's on an inherently dangerous floor. That's entirely
23 different, as Commissioner Bulla recognized. That's not the same
24 thing. And, by the way, Judge Delaney --

25 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, I disagree.

1 MR. GALLIHER: -- recognized it, as well.
2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I disagree.
3 MR. GALLIHER: Well --
4 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: In my mind, if there's
5 water present, it's a transient condition. If someone slips and falls
6 on a floor that you're saying is always dangerous, whether it's dry,
7 wet -- when it's dry, then that would be a different conversation
8 we're having.
9 MR. GALLIHER: But we're not saying that, and we haven't
10 said that. That's what Mr. Royal just said in his affidavit.
11 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Mr. Royal's saying it.
12 MR. GALLIHER: I know.
13 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Which is making this --
14 that's what's conflating the whole issue.
15 MR. GALLIHER: It -- well, that much I understand. Bottom
16 line is that he's also presented his share of Venetian employees
17 who have testified that the floor was dry. So, all right, so we have a
18 contested issue. It's a jury argument. That's what it is. It's
19 something we present at trial. But it should not affect our ability to
20 discover our case. And that's what we're doing at this juncture,
21 we're trying to discover the case, particularly our punitive damage
22 claim, and we've cited cases all over the place in our motion
23 practice that supports what we're doing here.
24 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Mr. Royal?
25 MR. ROYAL: The plaintiff says it's -- it was due to a

1 foreign substance in the complaint. Even in the amended
2 complaint it says that she slipped and fell due to a foreign
3 substance. She testified she slipped and fell due to a foreign
4 substance.

5 Other witnesses at the scene, Mr. Schulman, testified he
6 saw -- he is the one person who did see it, and that's his testimony.
7 And so, you know, I have a right to dispute the facts, Your Honor,
8 but their own experts say there was water on the floor. And that's
9 what caused the fall.

10 They didn't say -- they haven't testified that this is a
11 dangerous floor that caused her to fall because it was dry; they say
12 she slipped and fell because it was wet.

13 Mr. Jennings actually testified it's a safe floor when it's
14 dry. He tested it that way. It doesn't become dangerous, in his
15 opinion, until it becomes wet. That is the --

16 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

17 MR. ROYAL: And therefore, it is a temporary transitory
18 condition. That's the issue.

19 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: But the punitive damage
20 claims --

21 MR. GALLIHER: I'm not going to bounce up and down.

22 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: The punitive damage --
23 you guys can stay seated -- the punitive damage claim is still at
24 issue. And because of the punitive damage claim, I'm going to
25 allow the subsequent reports.

1 MR. ROYAL: Okay. Thank you.

2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right. You're
3 requesting protection -- no, you're moving for an order, Defendants,
4 directing Plaintiff to produce all information of prior incidents
5 provided to Tom Jennings. Hasn't he already provided the
6 e-mailed spreadsheets -- the e-mailed spreadsheet that he
7 reviewed?

8 MR. ROYAL: The e-mails -- what I received was not what
9 Mr. Jennings described. That's all. That's not what he described.

10 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

11 MR. GALLIHER: I don't agree with that.

12 MR. ROYAL: Well, you weren't at the deposition --

13 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Then I'm -- Tom
14 Jennings is directed to produce all information of prior incidents
15 that were provided to him and he reviewed prior to issuing his
16 opinions.

17 MR. GALLIHER: And we have no problem with that.

18 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Defendants are
19 moving for an order that Plaintiff provide copies of all prior
20 incidents reports in her possession not produced to Defendants.
21 Counsel?

22 MR. ROYAL: They've got this -- they've got these 196
23 reports, they produced those to the expert --

24 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Do you have 196 reports,
25 Mr. --

1 MR. GALLIHER: No, actually, we don't.
2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- Galliher?
3 MR. GALLIHER: We have quite a few reports we've
4 collected in the case from other counsel, as well. We don't have all
5 of those 196, because I understand from Mr. Bochanis's office that
6 he may not have been able to give those to us. So we don't have
7 all of them.
8 However, these are the Venetian's reports.
9 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.
10 MR. GALLIHER: So are they asking us to --
11 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: But if you're using them
12 for impeachment purposes, I mean, you have them. If you have
13 them, produce them to Defendants.
14 MR. GALLIHER: We'll be happy to do that.
15 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.
16 MR. GALLIHER: But again, that was not the -- from our
17 standpoint, Commissioner, that was not a problem. We can
18 produce what we have.
19 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right.
20 MR. GALLIHER: But we pointed out that Venetian,
21 basically, is asking us to produce the reports that they produced in
22 other litigation.
23 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, any reports, any
24 prior incident reports in Defendant -- I'm sorry, in Plaintiffs'
25 possession must be produced to Defendants.

1 And Number 8, Defendants are -- that's on my list,
2 anyway. I don't know if it's Number 8 on yours. My -- I have
3 written down, For Leave to Retake Mr. Jennings' Deposition for One
4 Hour, With Plaintiff Bearing All Costs. That's quite an ask.

5 Mr. Royal?

6 MR. ROYAL: I only want that because he didn't have
7 that -- any of that information present. I wasn't able to
8 cross-examine him on these prior incidents.

9 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

10 MR. ROYAL: Which is a big deal. I mean, he claims they
11 were all there in the Grand Lux area, 196. And I ask him -- I ask him,
12 you know, How did you receive them? What did they look like? I
13 would just like to be able to finish -- to complete my examination of
14 Mr. Jennings, which I could have done at the time had it been
15 produced.

16 MR. GALLIHER: And I have no problem with the
17 deposition. But I do have a problem with having to pay for the
18 deposition, because we didn't anything wrong.

19 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. I --

20 MR. GALLIHER: And of the 30(d)(2), they have not met the
21 standard.

22 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I am going to allow the
23 deposition to continue. I am not going to require Plaintiffs to pay
24 for it, because if you had been able to continue, you would have
25 had to pay for the continued time. So there's really no prejudice to

1 the defendant for having you pay for the deposition to go forward.

2 Have we addressed everything now in your Motion for
3 Protective Order and Motion to Compel?

4 MR. ROYAL: Well, we have -- and I may have missed this.
5 The Topics 6 through 18 all relate to the computer data.

6 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. What day was that
7 filed? I have to pull it up on here. So which date was your motion
8 filed? This -- let's see.

9 MR. ROYAL: It was filed August 5th, 2019.

10 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Let me just pull it up so I
11 can look at the topics. Okay. And what page is that on?

12 [Pause in proceedings.]

13 MR. ROYAL: Excuse me.

14 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Or -- it's an exhibit?
15 Page 22 of the motion?

16 [Pause in proceedings.]

17 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. I see it. I'm here
18 now. 6 through 18.

19 MR. GALLIHER: Is that where we are, page 22?

20 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right. So --

21 MR. ROYAL: I'm there. I'm sorry.

22 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: The identity -- okay.

23 Page -- I'm sorry, page 22:

24 The identity of all employees who were responsible for
25 managing and maintaining Venetian's technology

1 infrastructure.

2 I think that's overly broad. The technology infrastructure
3 at the Venetian has far more components, I'm certain, than the
4 communications area of the -- like, employee communications.
5 What is it you're actually looking for? Because their technology
6 includes all of their security, all of their financial stuff, like, this
7 needs to be tailored.

8 So Topic Number 6 --

9 MR. GALLIHER: Might I suggest this --

10 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Yes.

11 MR. GALLIHER: -- Commissioner, maybe to shortcut
12 things with -- what we're really interested in is the information
13 contained on the computerized Alliance system that the Venetian
14 maintains. All of this -- of the other topics here pertain to us trying
15 to verify that information. But I'm more than happy with simply an
16 order that they produce the information on their Alliance system,
17 by -- which, by the way, relates strictly to fall injury events or injury
18 events.

19 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: So is the Alliance system
20 their claims log system, for lack of a better word? Like how they --

21 MR. GALLIHER: That's --

22 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- how they document
23 injury incident claims in the casinos?

24 MR. GALLIHER: That's my understanding. And it contains
25 relevant information concerning those falls. It may even contain

1 copies of the reports.

2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. So why don't we
3 just tailor it to be able to question the 30(b)(6) witness who has
4 knowledge regarding the documenting of injuries and claims that
5 occur in the Venetian casino property.

6 MR. GALLIHER: I'm fine with that.

7 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: And how those are
8 electronically stored and can be searched and obtained. Is that
9 what you're looking for?

10 MR. GALLIHER: That's what I'm looking for.

11 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Does that take care
12 of all of these different -- 6 through 18, if that's the topic?

13 MR. GALLIHER: It does. It's actually a better idea than we
14 had.

15 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, I'm here to help.

16 MR. ROYAL: Yeah, as long as we're going to --

17 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: If we're limiting it --

18 MR. ROYAL: Are we going to limit it --

19 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: We're limiting it to the
20 person -- the 30(b)(6) witness who has knowledge of how the claims
21 are reported, claims and injuries in the casino, the Venetian casino
22 property are reported, documented, stored electronically, how they
23 can be retrieved and identified. Does that cover it?

24 MR. GALLIHER: Yes. And hopefully there'll be a
25 transcript, since my note-taking isn't so good.

1 MR. ROYAL: Your Honor --

2 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: And that will replace
3 Topics 6 through 18.

4 MR. ROYAL: Right.

5 MR. GALLIHER: We're fine with that.

6 MR. ROYAL: Okay. And that works. Do we have a
7 specified period of time?

8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: The specified period of
9 time would be five years prior to the incident to the present. Okay.

10 Does that cover everything then?

11 MR. GALLIHER: I think it does.

12 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right. Now we just
13 have one more motion, right? Or are we -- is this --

14 MR. GALLIHER: I think it --

15 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: We covered everything in
16 your --

17 MR. GALLIHER: I think it covered our Motion to Compel,
18 as well.

19 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: -- Motion to Compel?

20 MR. GALLIHER: Sure. I think it covered that as well.

21 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay. Because -- pursuant
22 to -- this was the Motion to Compel Testimony and Documents,
23 Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel. So just so we're clear on Defendants'
24 Motion for Protective Order is granted in part, denied in part as
25 stated.

1 And with regard to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Testimony
2 and Documents, it's granted in part, denied in part. The judge has
3 already -- the three main issues in that motion were the prior
4 unredacted incident reports, which Judge Delaney has already
5 determined, so those will be -- will be allowed.

6 The 30(b)(6) we've handled, and the subsequent incident
7 reports we've handled. So that should take care of all of the Motion
8 to Compel.

9 MR. GALLIHER: Yes. The only other thing I'd ask is can
10 we still have, like, a two-week deadline to produce the unredacted
11 reports?

12 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Well, I'm going to provide
13 alternative relief pursuant to EDCR 2.34(e) to Mr. Royal, because
14 he's waiting from a final -- for a final order from Judge Delaney
15 from yesterday, I believe. And so I'm going to provide him relief
16 that those do not need to be produced until it has become a final
17 order. That may be after a writ, since he intends to -- he's already
18 articulated that he intends to take it up.

19 But pursuant to 2.34, he does not need to produce it until
20 that has become a final order.

21 MR. GALLIHER: So can we have a date, then, after the
22 order is signed?

23 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Two weeks after the order
24 is signed.

25 MR. GALLIHER: Okay.

1 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: And the writ would stay
2 that period of time.

3 MR. ROYAL: Okay. Now, this is my last clarification, I
4 want to make sure.

5 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Okay.

6 MR. ROYAL: So it's five years to the present, casino level,
7 marble floors, and not limited to the Grand Lux.

8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Yes.

9 MR. ROYAL: Okay. And --

10 MR. GALLIHER: Unredacted.

11 MR. ROYAL: Right. Unredacted.

12 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Unredacted.

13 MR. ROYAL: And the -- and we're going -- the subsequent
14 incidents are because even if this is a transitory -- temporary
15 transitory condition, he's got a punitive damage claim, and
16 therefore, those are to be produced.

17 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: The transitory, I would not
18 allow them, but because of the punitive allegations that have not --
19 that have survived now two Motions to Dismiss, I'm going to allow.

20 MR. ROYAL: I understand. Okay.

21 And to the -- is this an ongoing duty? Do we have to -- I
22 mean, when -- it says to the present, is it as of today? Is this going
23 to go on through trial? Do I have to keep supplementing this
24 response?

25 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I think -- I would say

1 through today is probably -- or through the date of the production is
2 probably sufficient.

3 MR. GALLIHER: And I'll -- I'm okay with through the date
4 of production.

5 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: All right.

6 MR. ROYAL: Thank you.

7 MR. GALLIHER: Thank you.

8 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Have a great
9 day, both of you.

10 MR. ROYAL: So Mr. Galliher will prepare or -- did I -- I'm
11 sorry, I totally missed that. Who's --

12 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: You know, I didn't say.
13 You know, since his is really all part of yours, I'm going to say -- I'm
14 going to ask you, Mr. Royal, to prepare the report and
15 recommendation.

16 MR. ROYAL: Okay. Thank you.

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21

22

23

24

25

1 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: And please have that
2 submitted to Mr. Galliher for his review as to form and content and
3 have it submitted to me within 14 days.

4 MR. GALLIHER: Thank you.

5 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I am -- thank you.

6 [Proceeding concluded at 11:18 a.m.]

7 ///

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly
19 transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to
20 the best of my ability.

21 
22 Shawna Ortega, CET*562

EXHIBIT “K”

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Appellate Court No. 79689-COA
District Court Case No. A-18-772761-C

Electronically Filed
Oct 28 2019 11:36 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,
LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,
Petitioners,

v.

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN
AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN
DELANEY in her capacity as District Judge,
Respondent,
JOYCE SEKERA, an individual,
Real Party in Interest

PETITIONERS' REPLY BRIEF

Michael A. Royal, Esq. (SBN 4370)
Gregory A. Miles, Esq. (SBN 4336)
ROYAL & MILES LLP
1522 W. Warm Springs Rd.
Henderson, Nevada 89014
Telephone: (702) 471-6777
Facsimile: (702) 531-6777
Email: mroyal@royalmilesllp.com
gmiles@royalmilesllp.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES	1
I. General Reply to Sekera’s Answering Brief.....	1
II. Response to Sekera’s Given Procedural History	5
III. Petitioners Demonstrated “Good Cause” for a Protective Order under NRCP 26(c) and the District Court Failed to Consider NRCP 26(b)(1) and Applicable Case Law When It Reversed the Discovery Commissioner’s Report and Recommendation of April 4, 2019	9
IV. Nevada Favors the Protection of Private Information of Guests Identified in Other Incident Reports under NRCP 26(c).....	11
V. Sekera’s References to Irrelevant and Misleading “Facts” Should be Wholly Disregarded	23
A. Sekera’s references to other pending Venetian matters is inappropriate	23
B. Sekera’s reference to Gary Shulman's testimony is inappropriate	24
C. The District Court’s granting of leave to amend under NRCP 15 to add a punitive damages claim is irrelevant.....	27
VI. CONCLUSION.....	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>A. Farber & Partners, Inc. v. Garber</i> , 234 F.R.D.186 (C.D. Cal. 2006).....	15
<i>Artis v. Deere & Co.</i> , 276 F.R.D. 348 (N.D. Cal. 2011).....	15
<i>Bible v. Rio Props., Inc.</i> , 246 F.R.D. 614 (C.D. Cal. 2007).....	13, 14
<i>Brignola v. Home Props., L.P.</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60282 (E.D. Pa. April 25, 2013).....	18
<i>Busse v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 351 Ill. App. 3d 67, 813 N.E.2d 1013 (2004).....	18
<i>Caballero v. Bodega Latina Corp.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116869 (D. Nev. July 25, 2017)	16
<i>Davis v. Leal</i> , 43 F. Supp. 2d 1102 (E.D. Cal. 1999)	14
<i>Desert Valley Painting & Drywall, Inc. v. United States</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145771 (D.Nev. Oct. 9, 2012).....	10
<i>Eldorado Club, Inv. v. Graff</i> , 78 Nev. 507, 377 P.2d 174 (Nev. 1962)	12, 16
<i>Fosbre v. Las Vegas Sands Corp.</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1073 (D.Nev. Jan. 5, 2016).....	10
<i>Graham v. Casey's General Stores</i> , 206 F.R.D. 251 (S.D.Ind. 2000).....	10
<i>Heller v. Norcal Mut. Ins. Co.</i> , 8 Cal. 4th 30 (1994), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 1059, 115 S. Ct. 669, 130 L. Ed. 2d 602 (1994).....	14
<i>Henderson v. JPMorgan Chase Bank</i> , No. CV113428PSGPLAX, 2012 WL 12888829 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2012).	19, 20

<i>In re Bard IVC Filters Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 317 F.R.D. 562 (D.Ariz. 2016).....	9, 10
<i>Izzo v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12210 (D. Nev. Feb. 2, 2016).....	13, 14
<i>Izzo v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17701 (D. Nev. Feb. 11, 2016).....	10
<i>Keel v. Quality Medical System, Inc.</i> , 515 So.2d 337 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1987)	18
<i>Khalilpour v. Cellco P'ship</i> , 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43885 (N.D. Cal. April 1, 2010).....	17, 18
<i>Knoll v. American Tel. & Tel. Co.</i> , 176 F.3d 359 (6th Cir 1999)	20
<i>Lologo v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , U.S. Dist. LEXIS 100559 (D.Nev July 29, 2016)	12
<i>Marook v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 259 F.R.D. 388 (N.D. Iowa 2009)	10
<i>McArdle v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47099 (N.D. Cal. April 16, 2010).....	20
<i>Mount Holly Gardens Citizens in Action, Inc. v. Twp. of Mount Holly</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 88239 (D.C. N.J. June 24, 2013).....	19
<i>Pioneer Elecs. v. Superior Court</i> , 40 Cal. 4th 360 (2007)	14, 20
<i>Puerto v. Superior Court</i> , 158 Ca. App. 4 th 1242 (2008)	21
<i>RKF Retail Holdings, LLC v. Tropicana Las Vegas, Inc.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104850 (D. Nev. July 6, 2017)	9
<i>Rowland v. Paris Las Vegas</i> , 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105513 (S.D. Cal. Aug 11, 2015).....	14, 15

<i>Schlatter v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court In and For Clark County</i> , 93 Nev. 189, 561 P.2d 1342 (1977).....	12
<i>Shaw v. Experian Info. Solutions, Inc.</i> , 306 F.R.D. 293 (SD. Cal. March 18, 2015).....	15, 16
<i>Stallworth v. Brollini</i> , 288 F.R.D. 439 (N.D. Cal.2012).....	15
<i>Tierno v. Rite Aid Corp.</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58748 (N.D. Cal. July 31, 2008)	20
<i>Wauchop v. Domino’s Pizza, Inc.</i> , 138 F.R.D. 539 (N.D. Ind. 1991).....	17
<i>Wiegele v. Fedex Ground Package Sys.</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9444 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2007).....	15
<i>Zuniga v. Western Apartments</i> , 2014 U.S.Dist. LEXIS 83135 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2014).....	15
Statutes	
NRS § 603A	22
Rules	
FRCP 26(b)(1).....	13, 14
NRCP 1.....	2, 13, 17, 21
NRCP 15.....	28
NRCP 16.1.....	26
NRCP 26(b)(1)	2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 28
NRCP 26(c)	5, 9, 28
Other Authorities	
NV SB 220	22

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. General Reply to Sekera's Answering Brief

Real-Party-in-Interest Joyce Sekera's Answering Brief is all noise with no signal, "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing" (Macbeth, Act 5, Scene 5, Lines 25-27). Petitioners' position is quite simple: the privacy rights of individuals wholly unaffiliated with the present litigation were not given the proper consideration by the District Court. The majority of the discussion in Sekera's Answering Brief is focused on irrelevant mudslinging; she devotes precious little discussion to explaining how her alleged need for this information outweighs the privacy interests of these unaffiliated individuals. Her only stated reason for desiring the private information of these unaffiliated individuals is to refute any claims of comparative fault. However, on its face this argument fails. Sekera does not provide a cogent rationale to explain why individuals who are not witnesses to the alleged slip-and-fall, or the circumstances leading up to the fall, will have any relevant information regarding any argument that she is comparatively at fault. It appears that the only reason Sekera is seeking the private information of these unaffiliated individuals is to disseminate it to other attorneys pursuing claims against Petitioners. This is not valid reason for violating the privacy rights of these unaffiliated individuals.

Sekera has taken the untenable position that NRCP 1 provides her with absolute rights to both obtain the private information of persons wholly unaffiliated with the present litigation and to share it with anyone of her choosing, whenever and however she pleases, without the slightest limitation or regard for the privacy rights of those persons. In so doing, Sekera has entirely avoided any analysis under NRCP 26(b)(1), determining that critical and fundamental discovery rule to be “irrelevant.” (*See* RAB at 20.) Sekera is mistaken. Indeed, a fair reading of the applicable rules, related case law, and plain common sense supports Petitioners’ position that the privacy rights of guests involved in other unrelated incidents – having provided Petitioners with information such as names, addresses, phone numbers, driver’s license, dates of birth, medical history and other health related information associated with an EMT examination, etc. – deserve protection and must be given consideration when a plaintiff, such as Sekera, makes a carte blanche request for such information.

Sekera’s argument to support her alleged need for the private information of perhaps hundreds of persons entirely unrelated to her November 4, 2016 incident is that it is necessary for her to defend against an affirmative defense of comparative fault – suggesting she needs persons involved in unrelated other incidents to testify that they likewise did not see anything on the floor prior to their alleged events occurring somewhere else on the property of Venetian Resort Hotel Casino

(“Venetian”). This purported need is clearly without merit. The facts of completely different incidents, involving different circumstances, different locations, and different accident mechanisms have no tendency whatsoever to prove or disprove whether Sekera was comparatively negligent at the time of her accident.

Sekera also rightly notes that Petitioners dispute her claim that there was a foreign substance on the floor at all. (*See* RAB at 2.) Indeed, Petitioners are not asserting that Sekera should have seen a foreign substance on the floor; instead, Petitioners deny the existence of a foreign substance. Thus, Sekera’s claim that she needs the other incident reports to defend against an affirmative defense of comparative fault is disingenuous and without merit.¹

As nearly every case cited by both parties herein provides, a proper analysis of Rule 26(b)(1) in discovery disputes similar to the instant matter requires Sekera to demonstrate both the relevance and proportionality of the information sought.

Sekera has not done that in either the District Court or her Answering Brief.

Petitioners posit that this is because it would lead directly to a conclusion that

¹ Sekera also argues she needs other incident information so “the public” will “know the magnitude of the problem of Venetian’s floors.” (*See* RAB at 7.) However, this argument appears to be solely directed to the challenge against Sekera circulating the redacted incident reports. While Petitioners dispute that this is a valid reason to permit discovery, it is clear that the redacted incident reports already produced by Petitioners, and already disseminated by Sekera’s attorney, are sufficient to satisfy this “public notice” argument.

supports Petitioners' request to protect the private information of the unaffiliated individuals.

Instead of addressing the merits of the important privacy issues at hand, Sekera has chosen to provide a misleading and distorted view of the litigation and attack the character of Petitioners and their counsel. As discussed below, these are red herrings designed to mislead this Honorable Court by presenting Petitioners as bad actors unworthy of relief. While Petitioners believe these topics are not relevant to the issue before this Honorable Court, in an abundance of caution Petitioners will address these topics at the end of this brief. Suffice to say that while Sekera has repeatedly made improper reference to other cases presently litigated against Venetian, she has not produced one court order supporting her claim that there has been any kind of discovery abuse by Petitioners or Venetian. As for the assertion related to disgruntled former Venetian employee Gary Shulman, that is a matter presently pending before the District Court. It has nothing to do with any issue at hand. That stated, a full reading of the Shulman deposition transcript attached by Plaintiff, as explained briefly below, demonstrates that the facts are not as presented by Sekera in her Answering Brief.

This writ is not about alleged past discovery issues involving the parties, but the right of privacy by those persons involved in other incidents, which Sekera repeatedly demeans and grossly mischaracterizes as “**phonebook** ... plus date of

birth information.” (*See* RAB 4. Emphasis added.) This misleading characterization completely fails to account for the context of the individual’s private information being included in an accident report. The inclusion of the personally identifiable information in the context of an incident report maintained by the Venetian is clearly not the same as the information found in a “phonebook.” Moreover, there is much more personal information within the subject incident reports than contact information, each of which note on every CR-1 form that they include “Protected Health Information.” (*See* RAB, Appendix Vol. 1, APP129,-35, 37-38.) These documents also contain medical history information which, of course, is not found in a “phonebook.” (*See id.* at APP 136.)²

Accordingly, Petitioners hereby implore this Honorable Court to focus on the privacy issues at hand, and not be distracted by Sekera’s tactics.

II. Response to Sekera’s Given Procedural History

Petitioners brought a motion for protective order under NRCP 26(c) before the Discovery Commissioner which was appropriately granted by way of recommendation. (*See* Petitioners’ Appendix, Vol. 1, Tab 14, VEN 201-06.)

² Sekera enclosed only twelve (12) pages of more than 660 pages produced by Petitioners, which include many more examples of Acknowledge of First Aid Assistance & Advice to Seek Medical Care forms with completed medical history information, along with notes provided by the responding emergency medical technician. (*See* RAB, Appendix Vol. 1, APP127-38.) Also, contrary to Sekera’s representation that driver’s license information is not collected by Venetian, that is inconsistent with documents Sekera produced herein. (*See, i.e., id.* at APP130.)

During the March 13, 2019 hearing, the Discovery Commissioner weighed Sekera's alleged need for the private information of persons involved in other incidents against the privacy rights of these unrelated third parties and recommended protection. (*See* Petitioners' Appendix, Vol. 1, Tab 13, VEN 186-200.)

At the March 13, 2019 hearing, the Discovery Commissioner considered Sekera's argument that she needs the ability to contact persons involved in other incidents to respond to a comparative fault affirmative defense. However, the Discovery Commissioner stated: ". . . the comparative negligence of another party versus your own party wouldn't be relevant to this action." (*See id.* at VEN 194, ln 9-11.) The Discovery Commissioner further noted: "I do believe there . . . are privacy and HIPAA issues that are to be considered, and so my inclination is not to disclose the names and contact information for all people on all reports." (*See id.* at VEN 197, ln 24-25; 198, ln 1.) She further stated: "I am going to issue a protective order that the reports that are disclosed in this case are not to be circulated outside of this case and for use only in this case." (*See id.* at VEN 198, ln 1-5.)

In her answering brief, Sekera's counsel admits that the prior incident reports at issue were provided to another attorney, Peter Goldstein, Esq., who was involved in another case against the Venetian property, on February 7, 2019, after

the motion for protective order was filed with the Discovery Commissioner. (*See* RAB at 6.) To Petitioners' knowledge, this is the first time such an admission has occurred.

At the March 13, 2019 hearing before the Discovery Commissioner, Sekera did not advise the court that the information deemed protected was shared with Mr. Goldstein on February 7, 2019 or that it had already all been filed as an exhibit with the court in another proceeding by Mr. Goldstein. (*See id.* at VEN 186-200; Petitioners' Appendix, Appendix, Vol. 1, Tab 12, VEN 140-85 at VEN 141, ln 15-26, VEN 147, ln 12-13, VEN 173.) When the issue of sharing these documents was before the District Court at a hearing held on May 14, 2019, the following exchange between Sekera's counsel and the court occurred:

MR. GALLIHER: What happened when I got my redacted reports, I exchanged them with him (Attorney Peter Goldstein). He sent them to me -- **and by the way, there was no Protective Order in place. There was no motion practice in place, despite what's being represented.**

THE COURT: I was going to say because I do have a counter motion for you --

MR. GALLIHER: Yeah. I know.

THE COURT: -- to comply with the Court order and a counter motion for sanctions related --

MR. GALLIHER: This was done right upfront. **The minute I got the information, I -- I exchanged it with counsel.** George Bochanis also got a set. He exchanged

a set. (Appendix, Vol. 2, Tab 15 at VEN 218, ln 2-13, emphasis added.)

Accordingly, while Sekera counsel now admits prior incident reports were, in fact, shared with Mr. Goldstein after the motion for protective order was filed and pending before the Discovery Commissioner, no explanation has been given as to why there was a complete failure by Sekera counsel to advise the court below as counsel has here. More importantly, what was the purpose behind Sekera's sharing of the information provided? How did it advance any interests of Sekera in her litigation against Petitioners? The District Judge below, after being advised by Petitioners of the actions taken by Sekera counsel, did not consider the conduct of counsel after determining that the documents at issue are unworthy of any protection whatsoever. (*See id.* at VEN 254, ln 17-23.) In so doing, the judge found that the persons identified in other incident reports have no privacy rights.

At the September 17, 2019 hearing on Petitioners' motion for reconsideration, the District Court judge opened the hearing by stating a belief that some kind of protection was already in place. (*See* Petitioners' Appendix, Vol. 3, Tab 20 at VEN 460, ln 4-25; VEN 461, ln 1-7.) Unfortunately, it was not. The motion for reconsideration was not granted, and this petition followed.

III. Petitioners Demonstrated “Good Cause” for a Protective Order under NRCP 26(c) and the District Court Failed to Consider NRCP 26(b)(1) and Applicable Case Law When It Reversed the Discovery Commissioner’s Report and Recommendation of April 4, 2019

Petitioners respectfully submit that they presented ample evidence that the privacy rights of third parties identified in incident reports regarding other alleged accidents are worthy of protection under NRCP 26(c) below. The District Court overruled the Discovery Commissioner’s granting of a protective order, knowing full well that Sekera had already shared the deemed protected information and that she intends to continue doing so however she chooses, being unable to find any law in support of such protection. However, there is sufficient law in support of the protection recommended by the Discovery Commissioner.

In *RKF Retail Holdings, LLC v. Tropicana Las Vegas, Inc.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104850 (D. Nev. July 6, 2017) (*19-*22) (quoting *In re Bard IVC Filters Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 317 F.R.D. 562, 563 (D.Ariz. 2016)), the court related the following in regards to the application of Rule 26(b)(1) to such issues:

Relevancy alone is no longer sufficient—discovery must also be proportional to the needs of the case. The Advisory Committee Note makes clear, however, that the amendment does not place the burden of proving proportionality on the party seeking discovery. The amendment "does not change the existing responsibilities of the court and the parties to consider proportionality, and the change does not place on the party seeking discovery the burden of addressing all proportionality considerations." Rule 26, Advis. Comm. Notes for 2015 Amends. **Rather, "[t]he parties**

and the court have a collective responsibility to consider the proportionality of all discovery and consider it in resolving discovery disputes." Bard, 317 F.R.D. at 564.

Generally, the party opposing discovery has the burden of showing that it is irrelevant, overly broad, or unduly burdensome. Graham v. Casey's General Stores, 206 F.R.D. 251, 253-4 (S.D.Ind. 2000); Fosbre v. Las Vegas Sands Corp., 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1073, 2016 WL 54202, at *4 (D.Nev. Jan. 5, 2016); Izzo v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17701, 2016 WL 593532, at *2 (D. Nev. Feb. 11, 2016). **When a request is overly broad on its face or when relevancy is not readily apparent, however, the party seeking discovery has the burden to show the relevancy of the request.** Desert Valley Painting & Drywall, Inc. v. United States, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145771, 2012 WL 4792913, at *2 (D.Nev. Oct. 9, 2012) (citing Marook v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. 259 F.R.D. 388, 394-95 (N.D. Iowa 2009)). **The 2015 amendments to Rule 26(b) have not changed these basic rules, although they must now be applied with a greater degree of analysis and emphasis on proportionality.** (Emphasis added.)

Petitioners argued below that the requested information is irrelevant, overly broad and unduly burdensome – based in large part on the privacy issues presented. At that point, under Rule 26(b)(1), the burden then shifted and Sekera had to demonstrate relevance and proportionality. Sekera did not do that below, and has not attempted to do that here. She merely dismissed it as “irrelevant.” (See RAB at 20.)

Keep in mind that Sekera's repeated use of "phonebook" to trivialize and marginalize the privacy rights of persons involved in other incidents in favor of her alleged absolute right to obtain the information is not limited to this litigation, but extends to her right to freely share it. Petitioners respectfully submit that Sekera is wrong, and that the district judge abused her discretion by reversing the Discovery Commissioner and ordering the production of unredacted information to be disclosed to Sekera without recognizing any privacy rights or granting any protection.

IV. Nevada Favors the Protection of Private Information of Guests Identified in Other Incident Reports under NRCP 26(c)

Sekera's repeated use of "phonebook" to refer to the information at issue is inappropriate. A phonebook provides a name, address and phone number; however, it does not provide dates of birth, driver's license information, social security information, health history and medical examination information, nor does it connect the name, address and phone information to a specific event to be freely shared, without limitation.

Sekera asserts that Petitioners are mostly concerned with Sekera's unfettered interest in sharing the private information of Venetian guests. (*See* RAB at 15.) That is an incorrect characterization of the issue. Petitioners are concerned with protecting the privacy rights of Venetian guests involved in other incidents where they have provided information pertaining to injury related events, examination of

their physical condition, documentation of their medical history, etc. These guests have a reasonable expectation of privacy, which rights have not been fairly considered by the lower court.

Sekera asserts that there is no Nevada law protecting the information at issue. (*See* RAB at 21.) That is not only unfounded, but is belied by many of the cases Sekera relies upon in her Answer Brief.

First, in *Eldorado Club, Inv. v. Graff*, 78 Nev. 507, 377 P.2d 174 (Nev. 1962), the Nevada Supreme Court held that the use of prior incident reports in slip and fall cases such as this are inadmissible as evidence of constructive notice.³ Therefore, the relevance of the information sought is questionable. Second, *Schlatter v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court In and For Clark County*, 93 Nev. 189, 192, 561 P.2d 1342, 192-93 (1977), provides that discovery must be carefully tailored to protect privacy interests while meeting the needs of the party requesting the information. That is consistent with the balancing test required under NRCP 26(b)(1).

Sekera suggests that Petitioners did not fairly represent *Izzo v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12210; 2016 WL 409694 (D. Nev. February 2,

³*See Lologo v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, U.S. Dist. LEXIS 100559 (D.Nev. July 29, 2016), the plaintiff (who slipped/fell at a Wal-Mart) sought to introduce evidence of prior incidents. Defendant's motion to exclude the evidence (citing *Eldorado Club, Inc.*, and FRE 402) was granted.

2016), to the Court in the petition. (*See* RAB at 23.) In *Izzo*, the plaintiff sought prior incident reports in slip/fall litigation. The Court, based in part on the defendant's desire to protect the privacy interests of guests, determined that the information previously produced to the plaintiff, which did not identify individuals involved in prior incidents, was sufficient. Similarly, here, Sekera already has the information she seeks. Petitioners argued below and again here that Venetian is likewise unduly burdened by the prospect of having prior guests being contacted not only by Sekera's counsel but by untold others litigating unrelated matters against Venetian. In fact, Plaintiff is now seeking unredacted subsequent incident reports where she likewise plans to contact witnesses and circulate information to other counsel all in the name of NRCP 1.⁴

Sekera also discredits *Bible v. Rio Props., Inc.*, 246 F.R.D. 614, 620-21 (C.D. Cal. 2007), by suggesting the decision is based on the California Constitution. While that is referenced in the body of the decision, the decision is based on a broader review of privacy under the Rule 26(b)(1) analysis:

Finally, defendant objects that responsive documents invade third parties' privacy rights. In California, the right to privacy is set forth in Article I, Section I of the California Constitution, as defendant cites (despite claiming Nevada law applies). *See* Defendant's Supp.

⁴ A Report and Recommendation granting Sekera's motion to compel unredacted subsequent incident reports to Sekera has been issued by the Discovery Commissioner and an objection will be filed once the Report and Recommendation is filed.

Memo. at 4:11-12. However, **privacy is not an absolute right, but a right subject to invasion depending upon the circumstances.** *Heller v. Norcal Mut. Ins. Co.*, 8 Cal. 4th 30, 43-44, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 200, 207-08, 876 P.2d 999 (1994), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 1059, 115 S. Ct. 669, 130 L. Ed. 2d 602 (1994). Thus, "the privilege is subject to balancing the needs of the litigation with the sensitivity of the information/records sought." *Davis v. Leal*, 43 F. Supp. 2d 1102, 1110 (E.D. Cal. 1999); see also *Pioneer Elecs. v. Superior Court*, 40 Cal. 4th 360, 371-75, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 513, 520-24, 150 P.3d 198 (2007) [****17**] (balancing privacy rights of putative class members with discovery rights of civil litigants). Here, the rights of third parties can be adequately protected by permitting defendant to redact the guest's complaints and staff incident reports to protect the guest's name and personal information, such as address, date of birth, telephone number, and the like. With the limitations set forth herein, the Court grants plaintiff's motion to compel, in part, and denies it, in part. (*Id.* at 620-21. Emphasis added.)

The *Bible* decision, therefore, is on point. It imposed the kind of balancing test under FRCP 26(b)(1) that should have been utilized below under NRCP 26(b)(1).

Sekera likewise dismisses *Rowland v. Paris Las Vegas*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105513; 2015 WL 4742502 (S.D. Cal. Aug 11, 2015), as a "rogue decision." (See RAB at 22, note 7.) However, the holding in *Rowland* is consistent with *Izzo* and *Bible* in its application of Nevada law on this issue. The following language is directly on point in support of Petitioners:

Further, **the Court finds that requiring disclosure of the addresses and telephone numbers of prior hotel**

guests would violate the privacy rights of third parties. “Federal courts ordinarily recognize a constitutionally-based right of privacy that can be raised in response to discovery requests.” *Zuniga v. Western Apartments*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83135, at *8 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2014) (citing *A. Farber & Partners, Inc. v. Garber*, 234 F.R.D. 186, 191 (C.D. Cal. 2006)). However, this right is not absolute; rather, it is subject to a balancing test. *Stallworth v. Brollini*, 288 F.R.D. 439, 444 (N.D. Cal. 2012). **“When the constitutional right of privacy is involved, ‘the party seeking discovery must demonstrate a compelling need for discovery, and that compelling need must be so strong as to outweigh the privacy right when these two competing interests are carefully balanced.’”** *Artis v. Deere & Co.*, 276 F.R.D. 348, 352 (N.D. Cal. 2011) (quoting *Wiegele v. Fedex Ground Package Sys.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9444, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2007)). **“Compelled discovery within the realm of the right of privacy ‘cannot be justified solely on the ground that it may lead to relevant information.’”** *Id.* Here, Plaintiff has not addressed these privacy concerns, much less demonstrated that her need for the information outweighs the third party privacy interests. Therefore, the Court will not require Defendant to produce addresses or telephone numbers in response to Interrogatory No. 5. Defendant is directed to file a supplemental response to Interrogatory No. 5, as limited by the Court. (*See id.* at *7-8. Emphasis added.)

Sekera further incorrectly suggests that the case of *Shaw v. Experian Info. Solutions, Inc.*, 306 F.R.D. 293 (SD. Cal. March 18, 2015), cited by Petitioners, does not support the petition before the Court. (*See* RAB at 23.) In so doing, Sekera writes: “The *Shaw* Court actually required the defendants disclose the ‘names, addresses, and telephone number’ of third-parties without a protective

order on the same.” (*See id.*) To the contrary, the *Shaw* court held as follows: “the plaintiffs met the defendant’s stated privacy concerns **by stating that they would accept the information in redacted form.**” (*Shaw, supra*, at 299, emphasis added.) In other words, the *Shaw* court ensured that the privacy rights of third parties, such as those at issue here, were protected, something Sekera failed to note.

Petitioners refer the court to *Caballero v. Bodega Latina Corp.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116869 (D. Nev. July 25, 2017). There, the plaintiff argued that her real issue for a slip/fall on a foreign substance was not just that the foreign substance was present, but that the floor was itself slippery and not appropriate for its intended use. Therefore, plaintiff argued that *Eldorado Club, Inc.* did not apply (as Sekera is arguing here). In *Caballero*, the court denied plaintiff’s motion to compel the production of prior incidents, even in unredacted form, because she did “not meet her threshold burden to show the discovery she seeks to obtain is ‘relevant to any party’s claim or defense’ under Rule 26(b)(1); therefore, the court did not even get to the proportionality part of the balancing test under the rule. (*See id.* at *22-23.) Here, the district court found the information to be relevant, but did not weigh the proportionality based on Plaintiff’s invented need for the information to counter any potential comparative fault argument.

A review of some cases cited by Sekera is necessary. Sekera's reference to *Wauchop v. Domino's Pizza, Inc.*, 138 F.R.D. 539 (N.D. Ind. 1991), for example, misses the mark. There, the defendant sought protection of certain information to protect its own reputation, not because it desired to protect the privacy rights of customers. Further, the *Wauchop* case did not involve the dissemination of protected health information. Here, Petitioners desire to protect Venetian guests from being contacted and harassed not only by Sekera, but by multiple others in connection with some other incident. Petitioners are moving to protect the valued privacy of Venetian guests. That was not an issue in *Wauchop*. As it presently stands, this privacy interest is neither valued nor protected by the District Court below. Sekera has not presented any Nevada case law supporting such a result, nor has Sekera cited any Nevada law supporting the proposition that NRCP 1 trumps all arguments related to the protection of private information.

Sekera also cites to *Khalilpour v. Cellco P'ship*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43885* (N.D. Cal. April 1, 2010), which relates to a class action where information was sought to identify the class members. This case actually supports the pending petition. What Sekera failed to relay in citing to *Khalilpour* is that there was already a protective order in place. Pursuant to this extant protective order the information at issue was to be used strictly within the litigation.

Accordingly, the *Khalilpour* court recognized a protectable privacy interest. (*See id.* at *10-11.)

Sekera's reference to *Busse v. Motorola, Inc.*, 351 Ill. App. 3d 67, 813 N.E.2d 1013 (2004), oddly does not even address the discovery issues at hand, but instead considered a motion for summary judgment on a claim of privacy invasion in a tort action. (*See* RAB at 22.) The *Busse* court held that "Private facts must be alleged" by a plaintiff to meet the elements of the tort, noting: "Without private facts, the other three elements of the tort need not be reached." (*See id.* at 72, 813 N.E.2d at 1017.) The instant matter does not involve any claim for invasion of privacy or its needed elements. Here, the privacy issues involve the production of the private information of individuals unaffiliated with the present litigation, including personal events and health related information tied to each name with contact information, which are by their very nature "private."

The case of *Keel v. Quality Medical System, Inc.*, 515 So.2d 337 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1987), cited by Sekera, is likewise inapplicable. (*See* RAB at 22.) The *Keel* decision (actually consisting of a single paragraph) relates to a restraining order preventing a former employee from contacting customers of his former employer. It has nothing to do with any issues presently before the court here.

The case of *Brignola v. Home Props., L.P.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60282 (E.D. Pa. April 25, 2013), cited by Sekera, relates to a motion to dismiss filed by

the defendant in a cause of action related to debt collection. (See RAB at 22.) It does not address a discovery issue at all and contains no analysis under Rule 26(b)(1).

Sekera's reference to *Mount Holly Gardens Citizens in Action, Inc. v. Twp. of Mount Holly*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 88239 (D.C. N.J. June 24, 2013), also supports Petitioners' position. (See RAB at 22.) While Sekera represents the case to stand for the proposition that concerns about protecting the privacy of contact information were "overblown", Sekera fails to relay that there was already a **confidentiality order** in place; therefore, the court recognized a protectable interest. It should be further noted that the *Mount Holly* case did not involve sensitive private health information provided by guests involved in an incident while visiting a business.

In *Henderson v. JPMorgan Chase Bank*, No. CV113428PSGPLAX, 2012 WL 12888829, at *4 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2012), also cited by Sekera, the information at issue related to employees, not private party guests, and did not involve the dissemination of any private health information; therefore, it is not at all helpful. (See RAB at 24.) Also, Sekera fails to note that in *Henderson* there was already a working protective order in place regarding protection of personal contact information to address privacy concerns. Further, the court there noted that the plaintiff met the balancing test of Rule 26(b)(1) demonstrating a need for this

protected private information. (*See id.* at *16-17, citing *Knoll v. American Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 176 F.3d 359, 365 (6th Cir 1999) (approving protective orders to protect non-parties from “the harm and embarrassment potentially caused by nonconfidential disclosure of their personnel files.”)⁵ Sekera has not done that here.

Sekera’s reference to *Tierno v. Rite Aid Corp.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58748 (N.D. Cal. July 31, 2008), is likewise misplaced. (See RAB at 24.) In citing to this case, Sekera again fails to advise the Court that there was already a protective order in place “to ensure that information is not misused”. (*See id.* at *8-9, citing *Pioneer Electronics, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 40 Cal 4th 360, 371 (2007) [“privacy intrusion is minimized where safeguards that shield information from disclosure are in place”].) No such safeguards were provided by the District Court herein to protect against the misuse of private information.

In citing to *McArdle v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47099 *10 (N.D. Cal. April 16, 2010), Sekera once again failed to advise that the private information at issue there was subject to a protective order “limited to Plaintiff and his counsel in this case.” (See RAB at 24-25.) Again, no such order is in place protecting the privacy rights of Venetian guests here.

⁵The court in *Knoll* upheld the district court's issuance of a protective order to protect the privacy of nonparty personnel files sought by the plaintiff.

The case of *Puerto v. Superior Court*, 158 Ca. App. 4th 1242, 70 Cal.Rptr. 3d 701 (2008), cited by Sekera, is also supportive of Petitioners' position. (See RAB at 25.) There, the California court acknowledged the privacy rights of persons identified in disclosures, stating that "the trial court was well within its discretion in concluding that the witnesses had a reasonable expectation of privacy in their addresses and phone numbers" and that the trial court was free to order protection of the information at issue. (See *Puerto* at 1252, 1259, 70 Cal.Rptr.3d at 708, 714.)

In reality, Sekera has not cited to any case law supporting her position that rights under NRCP 1 are superior to any privacy rights of persons involved in other incidents on Venetian property. Further, Sekera has failed entirely to establish why she needs contact information of persons involved in other incidents at all – other than to rebut a comparative fault defense by Petitioners. Again, since Petitioners deny there was any foreign substance on the floor at the time of Sekera's fall (something she insists is "important to note" at RAB 2), the other incident reports would not be relevant at all to her stated purpose, as Petitioners are not asserting Sekera should have seen something on the floor that did not exist. Regardless, Sekera has not established relevance or proportionality for this unredacted information under NRCP 26(b)(1), and most certainly has not justified

her alleged right to share this private information to whomever she desires, however and whenever she so desires.

Petitioners have demonstrated that the Nevada legislature has expressed an interest in protecting the privacy rights of private parties, referencing NRS § 603A. Further, Senate Bill 220 was recently signed into law, which relates to internet privacy rights, generally prohibiting website and online services from selling of personal data of users against a user's will.⁶ This, again, demonstrates a desire by the Nevada legislature to protect private contact information of individuals, such as the information at issue in this writ proceeding. Most certainly, Sekera's alleged right to share personal data with anyone, anywhere, and in any way she desires is wholly inconsistent with the growing trend to protect this information.

⁶ SB 220, effective October 1, 2019, grants consumers the right to direct operators not to sell their covered information. The operator must honor the request only if the operator can reasonably verify the authenticity of the request and the identity of the consumer using commercially reasonable means. borrows the definition of "covered information" from existing Nevada law. "Covered information" under SB 220 includes the following: (1) a first and last name; (2) a physical address which includes the name of a street and the name of a city or town; (3) an e-mail address; (4) a telephone number; (5) a social security number; (6) an identifier that allows a specific person to be contacted; or (7) any other information concerning a person collected from the person through the Internet website or online service of the operator and maintained in combination with an identifier in a form that makes the information personally identifiable. (NV SB 220.)

V. Sekera's References to Irrelevant and Misleading "Facts" Should be Wholly Disregarded

Sekera has introduced information which is not only irrelevant to the present writ, but which has been used for the sole purpose of distracting the Court from the issue at hand, and to unfairly malign both Petitioners and their counsel, suggesting that Petitioners are unworthy of fair adjudication here. Petitioners will respond to these allegations as briefly as possible.

A. Sekera's references to other pending Venetian matters is inappropriate

Sekera has provided the Court with a false assertion that Venetian is somehow a bad actor because there were variances in incident reports produced in other cases occurring in different areas of the property on different dates and under different circumstances. (*See* RAB 10-11.) In so doing, Sekera has included a copy of a motion filed by Peter Goldstein, Esq., on February 13, 2019. (*See* RAB at 11.) Sekera failed to advise the Court that the motion filed by Mr. Goldstein, attached as APP224-35, was denied. (*See* Petitioners' Appendix, Vol. 4, Tab 23, VEN 496-98.)⁷ In fact, as noted earlier, Sekera has not presented this Honorable Court with one order supporting her contention that Petitioners have been in any

⁷ In attaching this motion, Sekera also failed to advise the Court that Mr. Goldstein filed all 660 pages of documents provided to him by Sekera's counsel on March 12, 2019, which were produced by Sekera counsel on February 7, 2019, after Petitioners' motion for protective order was filed and pending. (*See* Petitioners Appendix, Vol. 1, Tab 12, VEN 140-46.)

way sanctioned or admonished by the court below for alleged discovery abuses. Further, Sekera fails to note that in all other Venetian cases she has referenced, there are protective orders in place protecting the same type of information at issue here. This litigation is, in fact, the anomaly.

B. Sekera's reference to Gary Shulman's testimony is inappropriate

For reasons Sekera cannot articulate or justify, she has dedicated space in her Answering Brief to falsely assert that witness Gary Shulman was instructed "to lie" by Venetian's counsel during a meeting on June 28, 2018. (*See* RAB at 11.) First, this allegation is untrue and is presently the subject of a motion before the District Court. It is therefore improper to raise it in response to this petition. Second, it has nothing to do with the privacy rights at issue before the Court. It is disappointing that Sekera would make this outrageous claim and force Petitioners to address it before this Honorable Court. However, Petitioners will do so out of necessity.

Venetian's counsel first met with Mr. Shulman in his capacity as a Venetian Table Games Supervisor on Venetian property on June 28, 2018. (*See* RAB Appendix 1, APP032, deposition at 21:6-25; 22:1-5; 51:3-25; 52-53; 55:3-25; 56-62.)⁸ On June 29, 2018, Venetian's counsel sent correspondence to Mr. Shulman

⁸ Mr. Shulman initially testified that his meeting with Venetian defense counsel was November 28, 2018. (*See* RAB Appendix 1, APP033, deposition at 21:6-25.)

confirming what Mr. Shulman related regarding his recollection of events during the June 28, 2018 meeting; *to wit*: that he had not identified a foreign substance on the floor, among other things. (*See id.* APP041-42, deposition at 57:8-25; 58-61; 62:1-15.) Mr. Shulman communicated with Venetian's counsel on numerous occasions following the June 28, 2018 meeting and never conveyed to defense counsel or anyone affiliated with Venetian any understanding that he had been told "to lie" in this litigation. (*See id.* APP042, deposition at 62:5-15.)

To Petitioners' knowledge, the first time Mr. Shulman alleged that he was told "to lie" by Venetian's counsel (and thereafter harassed, intimidated and terminated by Venetian for an alleged failure to comply) was in his private conference with Sekera's counsel one week preceding his April 17, 2019 deposition. (*See* deposition at APP040-42, deposition at 51:3-25; 52-61; 62: 1-15.) The first time Mr. Shulman related his scandalous claim to anyone affiliated with the Venetian was, by his own admission, in the April 17, 2018 deposition. (*See id.* APP041, deposition at 55:21-25; 56:1-12; 65:5-15.)

Indeed, Mr. Shulman had received the detailed correspondence of June 29, 2018 confirming defense counsel's understanding of his recollection of events, and despite multiple communications between June 28, 2018 and April 17, 2019, he failed to relay any concerns or convey any assertions to Venetian or its counsel

He later acknowledged that the meeting was, in fact, in June 2018. (*Id.* APP040, deposition at 51:3-25; 52:1-25; 53:1-19.)

regarding his claim that he was told “to lie”. (*See id.* at APP042, deposition at 59:3-25; 60:1-25; 61:1-25; 62:1-15.)⁹

Mr. Shulman was suspended by Venetian on or about November 20, 2018 for threatening a female supervisor. (*See* Petitioners Appendix, Vol. 4, Tab 25, VEN 510-12.) He was terminated on January 23, 2019. (*See id.*) On February 22, 2019, Mr. Shulman filed a complaint with the Nevada Equal Rights Commission (“NERC”) asserting he was wrongfully terminated by Venetian. (*See* Petitioners Appendix, Vol. 4, Tab 25, VEN 513-14.) Interestingly, there is no mention in Mr. Shulman’s NERC complaint of having been told “to lie” by Venetian’s counsel at any time, nor is there any reference to the subject litigation at all. (*See id.*)¹⁰

⁹ Note further that the June 28, 2018 meeting occurred before Petitioners identified any witnesses pursuant to NRCP 16.1 (in which Mr. Shulman was named as a witness), approximately one month prior filing the Joint Case Conference Report. (*See* Petitioners Appendix, Vol. 4, Tab 24, VEN 499-508.)

¹⁰ Mr. Shulman testified in deposition that he had a stellar record at Venetian prior to his meeting with Venetian defense counsel, but that shortly after his June 2018 meeting he was harassed at work and received multiple warnings leading to his termination. (*See* RAB Appendix 1, APP033-34, deposition at 23:2-25; 24:1-25; 25:20-25; 26:1-25; 27:1-25. *See also* Petitioners Appendix, Vol. 4, Tab 25, VEN 509.) Later in the deposition, Mr. Shulman recanted and said he had received a series of warnings prior to his one and only meeting with Venetian’s counsel on June 28, 2018 – therefore completely discrediting his earlier claim of harassment and warnings occurring only after the June 28, 2018 meeting. (*See id.* APP040, deposition at 51:7-25; 52:1-25; 53:1-12.) Mr. Shulman ultimately blamed his termination on Venetian’s alleged failure to appropriately deal with his chronic health issues and time he had taken off work under the Family and Medical Leave Act. (*See id.*, APP034, deposition at 28:1-22.) It should further be noted that Mr.

Sekera well knows that Mr. Shulman's assertion that he was told "to lie" by Venetian's counsel is spurious. Mr. Shulman is a disgruntled former employee who Sekera counsel met with privately to elicit arguably privileged information a week prior to Mr. Shulman's deposition without advising Venetian's defense counsel. This allegation has no place here.

It is very clear from a full and fair reading of the very deposition transcript Sekera produced with her Answering Brief that there is no merit these allegations. Yet, Sekera continues to use it as a weapon whenever possible in an effort to distort the issues and discredit Petitioners. It is off topic and manipulative. Petitioners have given it more attention that it deserves; however, salacious allegations of this nature sadly require a response. This assertion by Sekera should be wholly disregarded as having nothing to do with protecting the privacy rights of Venetian guests having absolutely no knowledge about Sekera's incident.

C. The District Court's granting of leave to amend under NRCp 15 to add a punitive damages claim is irrelevant

Sekera's reference to having received leave to add a claim for punitive damages has nothing to do with the issue of protecting the privacy rights of individuals identified in other incident reports. The fact is that the District Court

Shulman's suspension of November 20, 2018 occurred nearly five months prior to his April 17, 2019 deposition and his termination of January 23, 2019, occurred more than two months before his deposition was noticed by Sekera counsel. (See Petitioners Appendix, Vol. 4, Tab 26, VEN 515-17.)

judge granted leave under the low bar of NRCP 15. This amendment to the Complaint was not before the District Court on the underlying discovery motion and is irrelevant to the matter before this Honorable Court on this Writ Petition. To the extent Sekera introduces a new argument at any hearing on this Writ Petition, claiming she needs information for her punitive damages claim, that argument will not be well taken as the redacted incident reports already produced in this matter provide any information Sekera may need regarding other incidents.

VI. CONCLUSION

This petition for relief relates directly to the privacy rights of guests involved in other incidents reported by owners and innkeepers, to protect them from the dissemination of personal information (*i.e.* incident facts, physical condition, health history, etc.), attached to their names and contact information. This is not “phonebook” information, as Sekera asserts. It is much more than that. Sekera did nothing below to demonstrate her right to this information balanced with the rights of non-employee guests involved in other incidents. Sekera did not meet the required criteria of NRCP 26(b)(1) once Petitioners demonstrated the “good cause” required under NRCP 26(c). The case law cited by both Petitioners and Sekera support protecting the information at issue. The Discovery Commissioner’s recommendation of producing the other incident reports in redacted form with NRCP 26(c) protection by limiting the use of this information

to the present case was consistent with Nevada law and the interests of protecting individual privacy rights. Petitioners respectfully submit that the relief requested should be granted not just for Venetian guests, but for all like situated persons sharing personal information following an incident on the location of a Nevada property owner.

DATED this 28 day of October, 2019.

ROYAL & MILES LLP

By: 

Michael A. Royal, Esq. (SBN 4370)
Gregory A. Miles, Esq. (SBN 4336)
1522 W. Warm Springs Rd.
Henderson, NV 89014
(702) 471-6777
Counsel for Petitioners

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

STATE OF NEVADA)
) ss:
COUNTY OF CLARK)

I, Michael A. Royal, hereby affirm, testify and declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of Nevada, and am a member of the law firm of Royal & Miles LLP, attorneys for Petitioners VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, and LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC.

2. I hereby certify that this brief complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because:

[X] This brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in Times Roman 14 point font.


3. I further certify that this brief complies with the page- or type-volume limitations of NRAP 32(a)(7) because, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by NRAP 32(a)(7)(C), it is either:

[X] Proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more, and contains **6,356 words** in compliance with NRAP 32(a)(1)(A)(ii) (having a word count of less than 7,000 words).

4. Finally, I hereby certify that I have read this Reply, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any


improper purpose. I further certify that this brief complies with all applicable Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure, in particular NRAP 28(e)(1), which requires every assertion in the brief regarding matters in the record to be supported by a reference to the page and volume number, if any, of the transcript or appendix where the matter relied on is to be found. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Further affiant sayeth naught.




MICHAEL A. ROYAL, ESQ.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before
me by Michael A. Royal, Esq., on this
28 day of October, 2019.



NOTARY PUBLIC in and for said
County and State



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that I am an employee of the law firm of Royal & Miles LLP, attorney's for Petitioners, VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC, and that on the 28 day of October, 2019, I served true and correct copy of the foregoing PETITIONERS' REPLY BRIEF, by delivering the same via the Court's CM/ECF system which will send notification to the following:

Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq.
THE GALLIHER LAW FIRM
1850 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 107
Las Vegas, NV 89014
Attorneys for Real Party in Interest

Honorable Kathleen Delaney
Eighth Jud. District Court, Dept. 25
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89155
Respondent


An employee of Royal & Miles LLP

EXHIBIT “H”



1 **OBJ**

2 Michael A. Royal, Esq.

3 Nevada Bar No. 4370

4 Gregory A. Miles, Esq.

5 Nevada Bar No. 4336

6 **ROYAL & MILES LLP**

7 1522 West Warm Springs Road

8 Henderson Nevada 89014

9 Tel: 702-471-6777

10 Fax: 702-531-6777

11 Email: mroyal@royalmilesllp.com

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

13 *VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and*

14 *LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC*

15 **DISTRICT COURT**

16 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

17 JOYCE SEKERA, an Individual;

CASE NO.: A-18-772761-C

DEPT. NO.: XXV

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, d/b/a
21 THE VENETIAN LAS VEGAS, a Nevada
22 Limited Liability Company; LAS VEGAS
23 SANDS, LLC d/b/a THE VENETIAN LAS
24 VEGAS, a Nevada Limited Liability Company;
25 YET UNKNOWN EMPLOYEE; DOES I
26 through X, inclusive,

27 Defendants.

Hearing Requested

28 **DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATIONS DATED AUGUST 9, 2019**

29 Defendants, VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, and LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC
30 (hereinafter collectively "*Venetian*"), by and through their counsel of record, Michael A. Royal, Esq.,
31 of ROYAL & MILES LLP, hereby files DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY
32 COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION DATED AUGUST 9, 2019.

ROYAL & MILES LLP
1522 W Warm Springs Road
Henderson NV 89014
Tel: (702) 471-6777 ♦ Fax: (702) 531-6777

1 This Objection is based upon the Points and Authorities below, the papers and pleadings filed
2 herein, and any oral argument allowed at the hearing on this matter.

3 DATED this 21 day of August, 2019.

4 **ROYAL & MILES LLP**

5
6 By 

7 Michael A. Royal, Esq.
8 Nevada Bar No. 4370
9 1522 W. Warm Springs Rd.
10 Henderson, NV 89014
11 *Attorney for Defendants*
12 *VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and*
13 *LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC*

14 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

15 **I.**

16 **NATURE OF OBJECTION**

17 Defendants' objection relates solely to the issue of whether the communication between former
18 employee Gary Shulman and defense counsel related to the subject litigation during his employment
19 is protected by attorney/client privilege. Mr. Shulman was employed with Venetian as a Table Games
20 Supervisor for approximately eleven (11) years on November 4, 2016 when the subject incident
21 occurred.

22 Mr. Shulman responded to the incident, spoke with Plaintiff, contacted his immediate
23 supervisor, contacted other Venetian employees to respond to the area, and waited at the scene until
24 security arrived. On June 28, 2018, Mr. Shulman met with Venetian defense counsel at the Venetian
25 property during his regular work shift to discuss his recollection of events. There was some follow up
26 correspondence over the next few days, but no further communication between Mr. Shulman until
27 March 2019, when he was contacted by defense counsel about scheduling his deposition.
28 Unbeknownst initially to defense counsel, Mr. Shulman had been terminated on January 23, 2019. Mr.

1 Shulman therefore would not meet with defense counsel prior to his April 17, 2019 deposition. At the
2 April 17, 2019 deposition, Mr. Shulman revealed that he had met privately with Plaintiff's counsel
3 prior to the deposition and revealed his purported communications with defense counsel from the June
4 28, 2018 meeting. Defendants asserted privilege and instructed Mr. Shulman not to answer. Mr.
5 Shulman testified over Defendants' objection. A motion to strike Mr. Shulman as a witness was filed
6 with the Discovery Commissioner on May 17, 2019. During a hearing held on June 26, 2019, the
7 Discovery Commissioner held that the communication between Mr. Shulman and defense counsel was
8 not privileged because, in her view, Mr. Shulman was merely a percipient witness to an event which
9 did not involve his employment. Defendants disagree, and therefore file this objection with the District
10 Court.
11

12 II.

13 PERTINENT FACTS AND EVIDENCE

14 Mr. Shulman was working as a Table Games
15 Supervisor for Venetian on November 4, 2016. (See
16 Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Strike,
17 Exhibit 1, *Transcript of Gary Shulman Deposition* at
18 5, ln 6-8.) Mr. Shulman was in the area of the Grand
19 Lux rotunda when Plaintiff slipped and fell. (See
20 Defendants' Motion to Strike Witness, Exhibit C at
21 12:37:00.) Mr. Shulman responded to Plaintiff in
22 order to assist her. (See Plaintiff's Opposition to
23 Defendants' Motion to Strike, Exhibit 1, *Shulman*
24 *deposition* at 8, ln 2-6.) Mr. Shulman went to alert
25 personnel from Venetian's Public Area Department
26
27
28



Mr. Shulman here at 12:37:01



Shulman at 12:37:51


1 (PAD) to respond. (*See id.* at 8, ln 11-12; 11, ln 7-17.)

2 Mr. Shulman also called Venetian Security Department
3 to advise of the incident and request assistance. (*See id.*
4 at 8, ln 12-14; 10, ln 24-25; 11, ln 1-6.) Mr. Shulman
5 also recalled contacting his manager, Chris Tonemah, to
6 advise her of the incident. (*See id.* at 11, ln 2-6.) Mr.



Shulman at 12:39:39

8 Shulman testified that it is part of his responsibility as a
9 Table Games Supervisor to contact Venetian PAD
10 personnel when he becomes aware of a spill related
11 incident. (*Id.* at 48, ln 15-16.) Mr. Shulman testified
12 that remained at the scene of Plaintiff's fall for
13 approximately ten (10) to fifteen (15) minutes. (*See id.* at



Shulman at 12:43:04

14 10, ln 21-23; 14, ln 10-12.) Mr. Shulman did not leave the scene until after both PAD and security had
15 arrived. (*See id.* at 14, ln 17-23.)

17 On June 28, 2018, defense counsel met with Mr. Shulman at his place of employment for
18 Venetian, during his work shift, to discuss his recollection of events. (*See Defendants' Motion to*
19 *Strike* at 7, ln 26-28; 8, ln 1-6.) Correspondence was sent to Mr. Shulman the following day with a
20 summary of understanding. (*See id.*) This meeting occurred approximately one (1) month prior to the
21 filing of the Joint Case Conference Report.

23 On or about March 15, 2019, defense counsel reached out to Mr. Shulman in response to a
24 request by Plaintiff's counsel to schedule his deposition. (*See id.* at 8, ln 7-14.) On March 25, 2019,
25 defense counsel learned that Mr. Shulman was no longer employed with Venetian. (*See id.* at 8, ln 15-
26 22.) Multiple efforts were made to meet with Mr. Shulman prior to his April 17, 2019 deposition,
27 without success. (*See id.* at 8, ln 23-28; 9, ln 1-3.) At the April 17, 2019 deposition of Mr. Shulman,
28

1 defense counsel learned for the first time that Mr. Shulman had met privately with Mr. Galliher and
2 told him of his alleged conversation with defense counsel on June 28, 2018. (*See id.* at 9, ln 4-17. *See*
3 *also* Plaintiff's Objection to Motion to Strike, Exhibit 1 at 21, ln 6-25; 22, ln 1-25; 23, ln 1-25; 24, ln
4 1.)

5
6 In her deposition of July 12, 2019, former Venetian Casino Pit Manger, Chris Tonemah,
7 testified that she supervised Gary Shulman for seventeen (17) years. (*See Objection* Exhibit A,
8 *Transcript of Chris Tonemah*, taken July 12, 2019, at 10-22; 4, ln 13-16.) Ms. Tonemah testified that
9 it was routine for her to receive calls from Venetian employees like Mr. Shulman when an incident
10 occurs. (*See id.* at 6, ln 13-24.) It was, in fact, Mr. Shulman's responsibility as a Table Games
11 Supervisor to contact her under the circumstances of November 4, 2016 involving the Plaintiff,
12 according to Ms. Tonemah:

13
14 *Q. So as I understand you are telling me, if there's a fall, if there is a spill, it*
15 *would be the obligation of your underlings in the casino to notify you of that*
16 *event?*

17 *A. Uh-huh.*

18 *Q. Is that yes?*

19 *A. Yes.*

20 *Q. And then your obligation at that point in time is to notify whom?*

21 *A. I would notify surveillance.*

22 *Q. And after you notify surveillance, would you notify anyone else?*

23 *A. No . . .*

24 (*See id.* at 7, ln 4-16. Emphasis added.)

25 Sang Han was a Venetian Assistant Director of
26 Housekeeping on November 4, 2016 when he happened to
27 come upon the incident. (*See* Defendants' Motion to
28 Strike Witness, Exhibit H, at 3, ln 14-25; 4, ln 1-2.) Mr.
Han testified that he happened upon the scene and stopped
to see what happened. (*Id.* at 8, ln 17-23.) Mr. Han was



Sang Han at 12:40:37

present at the scene for about three (3) minutes. (*See id.* at 6, ln 8-18.) During his May 6, 2019

1 deposition, Mr. Galliher conceded that Mr. Sang's communications with defense counsel were
2 privileged. (*See id.* at 5, ln 7-16.)

3 At the June 26, 2019 hearing, Mr. Galliher was asked by the Discovery Commissioner why he
4 considered Mr. Sang's communications privileged but not Mr. Shulman's communications. (*See*
5 *Objection Exhibit B, Transcript of Proceeding Before Discovery Commissioner (June 26, 2019)* at 15,
6 ln 21-25; 16, ln 1-9.) Mr. Galliher responded that Mr. Sang "*was the head of housekeeping. He was*
7 *the boss man of the department . . . that investigated the fall.*" (*See id.* at 16, ln 7-24.) However, Mr.
8 Han was neither the head of housekeeping nor did he in any way, shape or form investigate the fall.
9 Again, Mr. Han testified he was only at the scene by happenstance and stayed for about three (3)
10 minutes.
11

12 Contrary to Mr. Galliher's representation at the June 26, 2019 hearing, Mr. Han was literally
13 a bystander/percipient witness, who did nothing but observe, ask a few questions, offered assistance,
14 then departed the scene. (*See Defendants' Motion to Strike Witness Exhibit C (12:39:42 - 12:42:42);*
15 *Exhibit H at 6, ln 8-25; 7, ln 1-10; 8, ln 17-25; 9, ln 1-25; 10, ln 1-5; 11, ln 6-26; 13, ln 22-25; 14-17;*
16 *20, ln 1-25.*) Further, Mr. Sang testified as follows:
17

18 *BY MR. GALLIHER:*

19 *Q. Just a couple more. I think we established earlier that your job title as*
20 *assistant manager of housekeeping did not include any supervisory control*
21 *over the PAD employees; is that right?*

22 *A. As the assistant director of housekeeping, I do not on a daily basis have direct*
23 *control over PAD employees.*

24 *Q. So do you have any managerial control over them at any time?*

25 *A. The answer to the question would be no.*

26 (Defendants' Motion to Strike Witness, Exhibit H at 27, ln 22-25; 28, ln 1-7. Emphasis added.)

27 Further, there has never been any evidence that Mr. Sang did anything other than appear at the scene
28 for three (3) minutes, then depart without further involvement. He did not, as Mr. Galliher argued to
the Discovery Commissioner, perform an investigation of the incident.

At the June 26, 2019 hearing, the Discovery Commissioner made the following findings:

1 *DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER: I don't -- at this point, based on the case law before*
2 *me, where -- I don't think that the reason the Venetian was asking him to meet with you*
3 *was because of his corporate -- something that occurred in the course of his*
4 *employment, like his corporate duties. I believe it was something that he observed, and*
5 *it wasn't that he was the investigator. He was not the one who was responsible for*
6 *cleaning it up. He was not the person who was responsible for monitoring the area.*
7 *He happened to observe the fall or the events surrounding the fall and had knowledge*
8 *as to what happened at the time. It wasn't based on his corporate duties. It was just*
9 *based solely on his proximity to the event. And he wasn't testifying regarding his*
10 *corporate duties or binding the corporation on any of the corporate policies and*
11 *procedures. He was merely a witness as to the event, and so I don't believe, by nature*
12 *of that, the entirety of his testimony was privileged.*

13 (See Objection Exhibit B at 22, ln 6-20.)

14 In the Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation, the Discovery Commissioner
15 wrote the following:

16 *It is determined that Mr. Shulman was merely a percipient witness to an event that*
17 *occurred while he was working at the Venetian in a matter that resulted in litigation*
18 *being filed against Venetian that did not involve Mr. Shulman's employment; therefore,*
19 *Mr. Shulman's communications with defense counsel are not privileged.*

20 (See Objection Exhibit C, *Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation*, filed August 9,
21 2019, at 3, ln 23-25.)

22 Defendants contend that, contrary to the Discovery Commissioner's determination, Mr.
23 Shulman was much more than a percipient witness. Once he came upon the scene, Mr. Shulman was
24 obligated by his employment to contact his direct supervisor, Ms. Tonemah, alert PAD and security,
25 and to stay with Plaintiff at the scene until responders arrived and took over control of the scene.
26 Further, Defendants contend that Mr. Schulman was instructed by his superiors to meet with defense
27 counsel on June 28, 2019 in the course of his employment for the specific purpose of discussing his
28 role in the subject incident and recollection of events. In that capacity, given the totality of the
circumstances, Mr. Schulman's communication with defense counsel was privileged, and Plaintiff's
counsel should not have met privately with him prior to his April 17, 2019 deposition and elicited any

1 information related to Mr. Shulman's alleged communication with defense counsel, then have Mr.
2 Shulman repeat the same on the record.

3
4 **II.**

5 **DECLARATION OF MICHAEL A. ROYAL, ESQ. PURSUANT TO NRS 53.045**

6 STATE OF NEVADA)
7) ss.
8 COUNTY OF CLARK)

9 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada and I am counsel
10 for Defendants in connection with the above-captioned matter.

11 2. I declare that the additional exhibits identified in this Objection are true and correct
12 copies of documents as purported herein.

Exhibit	Document
A	Transcript of Chris Tonemah Deposition, taken July 12, 2019
B	Transcript of Hearing Before the Discovery Commissioner, dated June 26, 2019, selected pages
C	Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation, filed August 9, 2019
D	Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Her Motion For Leave to Amend the Complaint, filed May 15, 2019

17 3. I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of Nevada that the
18 statements of fact as presented in this Objection are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

19 Executed this 21 day of August, 2019.

20
21
22 
23 MICHAEL A. ROYAL, ESQ.

24 **IV.**

25 **DISCUSSION**

26 Pursuant to EDCR 2.34(f), a party is allowed to "file specific written objection to the
27 recommendations" of the Discovery Commissioner. Defendants have timely filed this objection and
28 therefore move this Honorable Court for review.

1 A. **The Discovery Commissioner Incorrectly Determined That Communication Between**
2 **Defense Counsel and Gary Shulman in the Course of His Employment Regarding the**
3 **Subject Litigation are Not Protected as Privileged**

4 It is well settled law that communications between an attorney and the client in the course of
5 a legal proceeding is privileged. That privilege extends to communications between legal counsel and
6 corporate employees related to legal matters. This is especially the case in matters of ongoing
7 litigation, and the privilege is not magically dissolved simply because an employee privy to privileged
8 communication is terminated. In such circumstances, the former employee may certainly testify about
9 facts in controversy; however, the employee is not free to reveal privileged communication.¹

10 While an attorney may claim a privilege on the client's behalf, only the client has the ability to
11 waive a privilege. (Manley v. State, 979 P.2d 703 (Nev. 1999). Corporate employees fall within the
12 definition of “representative” of the client. (See Premiere Digital Access, Inc. v. Cent. Tel. Co., 360
13 F. Supp. 2d 1168 (D. Nev. 2005) (holding that a forwarded e-mail from in-house counsel was protected
14 under Nevada law as a communication between a client's representative and a lawyer, and waiver can
15 only be made by the client); see also Las Vegas Sands Corp. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court of Nev., 331
16 P.3d 905 (Nev. 2014) (attorney-client privilege belongs solely to the corporation).)²

17 The Supreme Court of the United States has held that communications between counsel
18 representing a corporation in litigation and corporate employees are privileged. (See Upjohn Co. v.
19 United States, 449 U.S. 383.) There, the Court related the following on the attorney/client privilege:
20
21

22
23
24 ¹The general rule associated with attorney client privilege related to this matter are found in
25 NRS 49.075, NRS 49.095 and NRS 49.105.

26 ²In Las Vegas Sands Corp., *supra*, the Nevada Supreme Court held that former officers who
27 become adverse to the corporate entity in litigation were not allowed to access and use privileged
28 information. There, the court held to rule otherwise, “would have a perverse chilling effect on candid
communications between corporate managers and counsel.” (See *id.* at 913, citing Whitehead v. Nev.
Comm'n on Judicial Discipline, 873 P.2d 946, 965 (Nev. 1994) (recognizing that the attorney-client
privilege's purpose “is to protect confidential communications between attorney and client”).)

1 *Its purpose is to encourage full and frank communication between attorneys and*
2 *their clients and thereby promote broader public interests in the observance of law*
3 *and administration of justice. The privilege recognizes that sound legal advice or*
4 *advocacy serves public ends and that such advice or advocacy depends upon the*
5 *lawyer's being fully informed by the client. As we stated last Term in Trammel v.*
6 *United States, 445 U.S. 40, 51 (1980): "The lawyer-client privilege rests on the need*
7 *for the advocate and counselor to know all that relates to the client's reasons for*
8 *seeking representation if the professional mission is to be carried out." And in Fisher*
9 *v. United States, 425 U.S. 391, 403 (1976), we recognized the purpose of the privilege*
10 *to be "to encourage clients to make full disclosure to their attorneys." This rationale*
11 *for the privilege has long been recognized by the Court, see Hunt v. Blackburn, 128*
12 *U.S. 464, 470 (1888) (privilege "is founded upon the necessity, in the interest and*
13 *administration of justice, of the aid of persons having knowledge of the law and*
14 *skilled in its practice, which assistance can only be safely and readily availed of when*
15 *free from the consequences or the apprehension of disclosure"). Admittedly*
16 *complications in the application of the privilege arise when the client is a corporation,*
17 *which in theory is an artificial creature of the law, and not an individual; but this*
18 *Court has assumed that the privilege applies when the client is a corporation, United*
19 *States v. Louisville & Nashville R. Co., 236 U.S. 318, 336 (1915) . . .*

20 (*Id.* at 389-90, emphasis added.)

21 The Court in Upjohn held that the privilege applies to communications between corporate
22 counsel and a corporate employee where the communication concerns matters within the scope of the
23 employee's corporate duties and is undertaken for the purpose of enabling counsel to provide legal
24 advice to the corporation. (*See id.* at 394-95.) The same is true of a former employee of a corporation
25 who possesses information within the scope of his or her prior corporate duties that counsel needs in
26 order to advise the corporate client. (*See In re Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings*, 658 F.2d 1355, 1361
27 n.7 (9th Cir. 1981)). The key consideration in Upjohn is that the current or former employee of a
28 corporate client has information of the corporation that the corporation's counsel needs in order to
advise his or her client.

In Wardleigh v. Second Jud. Dist Ct., 891 P.2d 1180 (Nev. 1995), the Nevada Supreme Court
adopted United States Supreme Court's holding in Upjohn Co., *supra*, but rejected the "control group"
test which only applied the privilege to a select group of managerial corporate employees. (*See id.* at
891 P.2d at 1185-85, citations omitted.) Instead, the Wardleigh court focused on the nature of the

1 subject matter sought in discovery for purposes of applying the attorney-client privilege. (*Id.*) The
2 Wardleigh court held:

3 *The Court in Upjohn appropriately noted that **only communications and not facts are***
4 *subject to the privilege. Thus, relevant facts known by a corporate employee of any*
5 *status in the corporation would be discoverable even if such facts were related to the*
6 *corporate attorney as part of the employee's communication with counsel. **The***
7 *communication itself, however, would remain privileged. 449 U.S. at 395-96.*

8 (*See id.* at 1184. Emphasis added.)

9 Here, Mr. Shulman was directed by Venetian to meet with its defense counsel for the express
10 purpose of discussing the subject incident. Mr. Shulman was not just a percipient witness to the event,
11 but remained at the scene for approximately ten (10) minutes and did as he was required by contacting
12 various others to report the event, and to remain on scene until relief arrived. Further, Mr. Shulman
13 was not at liberty to meet with Mr. Galliher prior to the April 17, 2019 deposition and relay the
14 substance of his communications with defense counsel on and/or around June 28, 2018. The privilege
15 was not Mr. Shulman's to waive. (*See Las Vegas Sands Corp. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court of Nev.*,
16 331 P.3d 905 (Nev. 2014) (attorney-client privilege belongs solely to the corporation).)

17 The Ninth Circuit applies an eight-part test for the attorney client privilege:

18 *(1) Where legal advice of any kind is sought, (2) from a professional legal adviser in*
19 *his capacity as such, (3) the communications relating to that purpose, (4) made in*
20 *confidence, (5) by the client, (6) are at his instance permanently protected, (7) from*
21 *disclosure by himself or by the legal adviser, (8) unless the protection be waived.*

22 (*United States v. Ruehle*, 583 F.3d 600, 607 (9th Cir. 2005) (citation omitted).) Here, legal advice was
23 sought by Defendants who engaged their counsel to meet with Mr. Shulman regarding his recollection
24 of events and acts he took in the course and scope of his duty as a Table Games Supervisor on
25 November 4, 2016. Defendants argue that this communication was privileged, which privilege extends
26 to both the confidential disclosures made by a client to an attorney to obtain legal advice and the
27 attorney's advice in response to such disclosures. (*United States v. Bauer*, 132 F.3d 504, 507 (9th Cir.
28 1997).)

1 Where an employer requires an employee to meet with counsel in the course of employment
2 that involves litigation, the communication is privileged. In D.I. Chadbourne, Inc. v. Superior Court,
3 388 P.2d 700 (Cal. 1964), the California Supreme Court held:

4 *Where the employee's connection with the matter grows out of his employment to the*
5 *extent that his report or statement is required in the ordinary course of the*
6 *corporation's business, the employee is no longer an independent witness, and his*
7 *statement or report is that of the employer If, in the case of the employee last*
8 *mentioned, the employer requires (by standing rule or otherwise) that the employee*
9 *make a report, the privilege of that report is to be determined by the employer's*
10 *purpose in requiring the same; that is to say, if the employer directs the making of*
11 *the report for confidential transmittal to its attorney, the communication may be*
12 *privileged;*

13 (*Id.* at 709, emphasis added.)

14 Here, Mr. Shulman was more than just an independent witness on November 4, 2016. Indeed,
15 there were other independent witnesses depicted in the footage responding who, as mere percipient
16 witnesses, were never identified. (See Defendants' Motion to Strike Witness at 12:37:00.) However,
17 Mr. Shulman, as a Venetian Table Games Supervisor, went to the scene, called his supervisor, Ms.
18 Tonemah, contacted surveillance, contacted security, and went into the nearby restroom area to
19 summon PAD personnel to respond. (See Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Strike Witness, Exhibit
20 1 at 8, ln 2-14; 10, ln 24-25; 11, ln 1-17; 41, ln 16-23; 45, ln 12-19.) Mr. Shulman testified: "I
21 remember instructing a PAD person to come over [to the scene]." (See *id.* at 46, ln 3-6. Emphasis
22 added.) Mr. Shulman also spoke with Plaintiff repeatedly and waited at the scene for approximately
23 ten (10) minutes until security arrived and spoke with Plaintiff and did not leave until both PAD and
24 security arrived. (See *id.* at 10, ln 21-23; 14, ln 10-23; 40, ln 15-25; 41, ln 1-5; 42, ln 7-17.) In fact,
25 Mr. Shulman acted in accordance with his duties as a Venetian Table Games Supervisor by following
26 the above procedure. (See *e.g., id.* at 48, ln 11-25; see also Objection Exhibit A at 6, ln 13-25; 7 ln 1-
27 16.)
28

1 On June 28, 2018, defense counsel met with Mr. Shulman at his place of employment for
2 Venetian, during his work shift, to discuss his recollection of events and his involvement in the subject
3 incident. (*See* Plaintiff's Objection to Motion to Strike Witness, Exhibit 1 at 21, ln 11-23; 22, ln 1-5.)
4 This meeting occurred approximately one (1) month prior to the filing of the Joint Case Conference
5 Report.

6
7 Mr. Shulman was terminated on or about January 23, 2019. At his April 17, 2019 deposition,
8 Mr. Shulman, over Defendants' objection, related that he had met privately with Plaintiff's counsel
9 prior to the deposition and related details of his alleged conversation with defense counsel on June 28,
10 2018. (*See id.* at 21, ln 6-25; 22, ln 1-25; 23, ln 1-25; 24, ln 1.)

11 Defendants assert that the communications between its counsel and Mr. Shulman during his
12 employment were and remain privileged. He was not just a percipient witness to the event, but actually
13 took required action in the course and scope of his responsibilities as a Venetian Table Games
14 Supervisor which required him to contact others for the purpose of reporting the incident, directing
15 PAD to the scene, and remaining with Plaintiff until security arrived. Defendants further assert a
16 privilege based on the fact that Mr. Shulman was directed to meet with defense counsel by Defendants
17 in the course and scope of his employment, which June 28, 2018 meeting occurred on Venetian
18 property during Mr. Shulman's shift.

19
20 By contrast, the person Plaintiff's counsel claims to have a privilege, Han Sang, was a mere
21 percipient witness who came upon the scene, spoke with some co-workers and the Plaintiff, then left
22 without taking any further action. Mr. Sang did not investigate further, contrary to Mr. Galliher's
23 representation to the Discovery Commissioner at the June 26, 2019 hearing.

24
25 In Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Strike Witness, she failed to refer to Nevada
26 case law. Instead, Plaintiff ignored Nevada law and looked to cases outside the jurisdiction. For
27 example, Plaintiff cited Samaritan Found v. Goodfarb, 862 P.2d 870, 880 (Ariz. 1993), where the
28

1 Arizona Supreme Court held that statements made by hospital staff were not subject to attorney/client
2 privilege. (See Plaintiff's Opposition at 5, ln 8-9.) However, Plaintiff failed to advise the Court that
3 the Goodfarb decision was overturned by the Arizona Legislature in 1994, which addressed these
4 circumstances as follows:

5
6 *A. In a civil action an attorney shall not, without the consent of his client,
7 be examined as to any communication made by the client to him, or his advice given
8 thereon in the course of professional employment. An attorney's paralegal, assistant,
9 secretary, stenographer or clerk shall not, without the consent of his employer, be
10 examined concerning any fact the knowledge of which was acquired in such capacity.*

11 *B. For purposes of subsection A, any communication is privileged
12 between an attorney for a corporation, governmental entity, partnership, business,
13 association or other similar entity or an employer and any employee, agent or member
14 of the entity or employer regarding acts or omissions of or information obtained from
15 the employee, agent or member if the communication is either:*

16 *1. For the purpose of providing legal advice to the entity or employer or
17 to the employee, agent or member.*

18 *2. For the purpose of obtaining information in order to provide legal
19 advice to the entity or employer or to the employee, agent or member.*

20 *C. The privilege defined in this section shall not be construed to allow the
21 employee to be relieved of a duty to disclose the facts solely because they have been
22 communicated to an attorney.*

23 (See Salvation Army v. Bryson, 273 P.3d 656, 661-62 (Ariz 2012) (emphasis added) (holding that a
24 district judge abused his discretion when ordering a nonprofit corporation to disclose summaries of
25 interviews of corporation employees prepared by an investigator at the direction of legal counsel for
26 the corporation).

27 The case of Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 197 (Tex. 1993), also cited by
28 Plaintiff in the Opposition does not apply to the present circumstances. There, a non-lawyer took
statements from four employee witnesses then later turned them over to an attorney in pre-litigation.
The issue there surrounded the company's usual practice of obtaining statements as opposed to
specifically collecting them in anticipation of litigation. The totality of the circumstances revealed the
former; hence, the court found that no privilege attached. That reasoning is not remotely applicable
here.

1 Plaintiff also cited the Court to Keefe v. Bernard, 774 N.W.2d 663 (Iowa 2009) in her
2 Opposition, representing that it stands for the following proposition: “*interview between corporate*
3 *counsel and corporate employee about events and actions witnessed not protected by attorney-client*
4 *privilege.*” (See Objection to Motion to Strike Witness at 5, ln 15-17.) In fact, the Keefe case arises
5 from a defense attorney improperly meeting with a plaintiff’s treating physician without notice to the
6 other party under Iowa law in the course of the litigation which meeting was memorialized by the
7 attorney’s notes. The Court held that the communications between defense counsel and the doctor
8 were protected but for anything the doctor related which were specific facts related to his recollection
9 as a witness. Any other communications with legal were protected. While the notes prepared by
10 defense were considered protected as work product, the defense was ordered to produce them for *in*
11 *camera* review by the court and a redacted version was produced as a sanction for violation of Iowa
12 law related to notice of the meeting. The case does not stand for the proposition represented by
13 Plaintiff in the Opposition.

14
15
16 Plaintiff also cited to Monah v. W. Pennsylvania Hosp., 44 Pa. D&C.3d 513 (Pa. Com. Pl.
17 1987), which relates to a written statement provided by a nurse prior to litigation, which was provided
18 to corporate counsel. (See Objection to Motion to Strike Witness at 5, ln 17-18.) This case did not
19 address the issue of whether an employee meeting with corporate counsel in the course of litigation
20 is protected communication under the Upjohn case. There, the court held that the pre-litigation written
21 factual statements and observations by the nurse were discoverable. Here, Defendants are not
22 suggesting that Mr. Shulman’s testimony of facts and circumstances regarding his observations of the
23 incident is privileged, they are asserting that his alleged exchange with defense counsel on June 28,
24 2019 and around thereto is privileged.

25
26 Plaintiff also cited to Diversified Indus., Inc. V. Meredith, 572 F.2d 596 (8th Cir. 1977), for the
27 proposition that attorney/client privilege applies to “*an employee’s corporate duties*” and not where
28

1 "the employee functions merely as a fortuitous witness." (See Objection to Motion to Strike Witness
2 at 5, ln 18-21.) However, the facts of that case related to certain communications between a
3 corporation and outside counsel which were not made in anticipation of litigation or in the course of
4 litigation. In fact, the page cited by Plaintiff in the Opposition, 609, does not even exist and the
5 language placed in quotes by Plaintiff likewise is not found in the case.³
6

7 **B. Defendants Assert that Plaintiff's Counsel Improperly Elicited Privileged**
8 **Communication From Gary Shulman and Agreed to Have Him Repeat It in Deposition**

9 If the Court agrees that a privilege exists, then it needs to move onto the next part of the motion
10 before the Discovery Commissioner which she did not address related to the conduct of Plaintiff's
11 counsel and impact on the litigation.

12 As noted, Mr. Galliher met with Mr. Shulman prior to the deposition and not only obtained Mr.
13 Shulman's recollection of events, but obtained details of the alleged conversation Mr. Shulman had
14 with defense counsel on June 28, 2018. Thus, Plaintiff's counsel orchestrated events to have Mr.
15 Shulman testify in his April 17, 2019 deposition of communications he knew Defendants would assert
16 to be privileged by Venetian.
17
18
19

20 ³The dissent in the Meredith case provides the following:

21 *I would adopt the Seventh Circuit approach together with modifications suggested in*
22 *2 Weinstein's Evidence P503(b) [04] (1975). I would first require the corporation to*
23 *show that the lawyer was acting as a legal adviser when the communication was*
24 *made. The mere receipt by a lawyer of a routine report would not make the*
25 *communication privileged. Second, I would require that the subject matter of the*
26 *communication be the performance by the employee of the duties of his employment.*
27 *This would remove from the scope of the privilege any communication which is within*
28 *the employee's knowledge solely because he happened to witness or observe an event.*
Third, the corporation must establish that the communication was not disseminated
beyond those with the need to know. I think it is clear that all of the requirements are
met here.

(Meredith, *supra*, at 572 F.2d at 606. (Emphasis added.).)

1 Pursuant to the Rule 4.2, Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct, Plaintiff's counsel was
2 prohibited from eliciting confidential information from Mr. Shulman regarding the June 28, 2018
3 meeting with defense counsel. Comment 3 the ABA Model Rule 4.2 provides in pertinent part:

4 *The Rule applies even though the represented person initiates or consents to the*
5 *communication. A lawyer must immediately terminate communication with a person*
6 *if, after commencing communication, the lawyer learns that the person is one with*
7 *whom communication is not permitted by this Rule.*

8 Comment 7 of ABA Model Rule 4.2 reads as follows:

9 *In the case of a represented organization, this Rule prohibits communications with a*
10 *constituent of the organization who supervises, directs or regularly consults with the*
11 *organization's lawyer concerning the matter or has authority to obligate the*
12 *organization with respect to the matter or whose act or omission in connection with the*
13 *matter may be imputed to the organization for purposes of civil or criminal liability.*
14 *Consent of the organization's lawyer is not required for communication with a former*
15 *constituent. If a constituent of the organization is represented in the matter by his or*
16 *her own counsel, the consent by that counsel to a communication will be sufficient for*
17 *purposes of this Rule. Compare Rule 3.4(f). In communicating with a current or former*
18 *constituent of an organization, a lawyer must not use methods of obtaining evidence*
19 *that violate the legal rights of the organization. See Rule 4.4.*

20 Plaintiff's counsel was free to meet with Mr. Shulman prior to his April 17, 2019 deposition.
21 However, counsel should have immediately stopped Mr. Shulman from revealing privileged
22 communication during that meeting. Most certainly, Plaintiff's counsel should not have orchestrated
23 an ambush by having Mr. Shulman testify of the same on the record. It unfairly placed Venetian in the
24 position of having to prove up Mr. Shulman's perjured testimony by crossing him with other
25 information that is otherwise deemed confidential.

26 **C. Mr. Shulman Should Be Stricken as a Witness**

27 Based on the foregoing, Venetian moves this Honorable court to strike Mr. Shulman from
28 testifying in this matter as a witness. Again, the Discovery Commissioner did not get to this portion
of Defendants' motion. Therefore, Defendants move the District Court for relief. Under the
circumstances, if Mr. Shulman testifies, Defendants will be forced to impeach him with information
that is otherwise deemed confidential. This also puts counsel for both parties in the position of

1 potentially having to testify as fact witnesses in the case. Defendants would be entitled to know what
2 details Mr. Shulman provided to Plaintiff's counsel and defense counsel would have to testify
3 regarding direct communications with Mr. Shulman to refute some of his baseless allegations.

4 At a minimum, Mr. Shulman's testimony regarding his alleged communication with defense
5 counsel should be stricken. Plaintiff's counsel has filed his testimony with the court on numerous
6 occasions. Plaintiff even used Mr. Shulman's deposition testimony regarding the June 28, 2018
7 meeting with defense counsel to support her motion for leave to amend the complaint to add a claim
8 of punitive damages. (*See* Objection Exhibit D, *Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Her Motion for Leave*
9 *to Amend the Complaint*, filed May 15, 2019, at 5, ln 3-17.) In so doing, Plaintiff knowingly made
10 false allegations that Mr. Shulman had never received a written warning in the thirteen (13) years
11 preceding his June 28, 2018 meeting with defense counsel and that he was terminated sixty (60) days
12 thereafter. (*See id.*) Plaintiff's allegations are belied by Mr. Shulman's own deposition testimony,
13 where he acknowledged on direct examination by Mr. Galliher that he began having problems,
14 including warnings for his work performance, "*around March of 2018,*" at least three (3) months
15 before his meeting with defense counsel. (*See* Plaintiff's Objection to Motion to Strike, Exhibit 1 at
16 16, ln 10-16. *See also id.* at 51, ln 20-25; 52, ln 1-9 (Mr. Shulman later noting he received three (3)
17 warnings in May 2018, more than a month preceding his initial meeting with defense counsel in this
18 matter).) Thus, the representations of Plaintiff in her May 15, 2019 filing with the Court were wholly
19 untrue. Such salacious misrepresentations intended to place Defendants in a bad light for the purpose
20 of persuading the court are inexcusable.

21 Mr. Shulman is an agitated former employee with an ax to grind, and Plaintiff's counsel took
22 advantage of the situation. Plaintiff has exploited it even to inflame the Court to support a motion for
23 leave to assert a claim of punitive damages.

24 Plaintiff should not be rewarded for this conduct. Defendants therefore respectfully submit that
25
26
27
28

1 this Court enter an order striking Mr. Shulman as a witness as a sanction under the given
2 circumstances.

3 V.

4 **CONCLUSION**

5 Based on the foregoing, Defendants respectfully submit that the Discovery Commissioner was
6 in error by not recognizing that a privilege existed in regards to the June 28, 2018 communication
7 between Mr. Shulman and defense counsel, and that relief should have been granted by way of Mr.
8 Shulman being stricken as a witness.

9
10 DATED this 21 day of August, 2019.

11 **ROYAL & MILES LLP**

12
13 By _____

14 Michael A. Royal, Esq.
15 Nevada Bar No. 4370
16 1522 W. Warm Springs Rd.
17 Henderson, NV 89014
18 *Attorneys for Defendants*
19 *VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and*
20 *LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 22 day of August, 2019, and pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I
3 caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY**
4 **COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS DATED AUGUST 9, 2019** to be
5 served as follows:

6
7 _____ by placing same to be deposited for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed
8 envelope upon which first class postage was prepaid in Las Vegas, Nevada; and/or

9 _____ to be served via facsimile; and/or

10 ☒ pursuant to EDCR 8.05(a) and 8.05(f), to be electronically served through the Eighth
11 Judicial Court's electronic filing system, with the date and time of the electronic service
12 substituted for the date and place of deposit in the mail; and/or

12 _____ to be hand delivered;

13 to the attorneys and/or parties listed below at the address and/or facsimile number indicated below:

14 Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq.
15 THE GALLIHER LAW FIRM
16 1850 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 107
17 Las Vegas, NV 89014

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Facsimile: 702-735-0204

18 E-Service: kgalliher@galliherlawfirm.com
19 dmooney@galliherlawfirm.com
20 gramos@galliherlawfirm.com
21 sray@galliherlawfirm.com


22 
23 _____
24 An employee of ROYAL & MILES LLP
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT “I”

Deposition of:

Thomas A. Jennings

Case:

Joyce Sekera v. Venetian Casino Resort, LLC, d/b/a The Venetian Las Vegas, et al.
A-18-772761-C

Date:

07/02/2019



OASIS
REPORTING SERVICES

400 South Seventh Street • Suite 400, Box 7 • Las Vegas, NV 89101
702-476-4500 | www.oasisreporting.com | info@oasisreporting.com

COURT REPORTING | NATIONAL SCHEDULING | VIDEOCONFERENCING | VIDEOGRAPHY

1 occur when coefficient of friction was above .50?

2 A. Well, I believe I've talked with counsel about
3 that following the result of the testing, that there are
4 multiple reasons why people lose their balance and
5 suddenly fall.

6 The layperson usually attributes it to a slip
7 when, in fact, it is everything from a misstep to a
8 scuff slip to a change of directional slip. All produce
9 something similar to a slip. But it wasn't due to the
10 fact that the walking surface fell below the standard
11 for a slip-resistant walking surface.

12 Q. Okay. In those cases?

13 A. In those cases.

14 Q. Let me ask you about some of the other cases
15 you've had.

16 Peter Goldstein -- or is it Goldberg?

17 A. Goldstein.

18 Q. Peter Goldstein, you're presently a retained
19 expert in a case he's handling against the Venetian?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. The plaintiff's name is Carol Smith?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. You've been deposed in that case?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. You have done an inspection in that case?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And you've prepared reports in that case?

3 A. Yes, sir.

4 Q. Okay. How many times have you been retained by
5 Peter Goldstein in any cases against the Venetian?

6 A. Would be the first, I believe.

7 Q. Okay. How many cases with Peter Goldstein
8 total where he's retained you as an expert?

9 A. Two or three over a 15-year period.

10 Q. Okay. And do they all relate to slip-and-falls
11 or do they have various fact scenarios?

12 A. Good question, and I can't honestly recall.

13 Q. What other attorneys have you worked with on
14 the plaintiff side in any cases you've handled against
15 the Venetian? Let's just keep it related to marble
16 floors.

17 A. Well, that would simply be Mr. Goldstein, as I
18 recall, and Mr. Galliher. I've only done the two on
19 that.

20 Q. Okay. So you've done two -- so you've been
21 retained as an expert for the plaintiff in two cases
22 against the Venetian related to slip-and-falls on marble
23 floors?

24 A. Best of my recollection, that's correct.

25 Q. Okay. And you don't recall being retained by

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Now, you did test it at .40 at least one
3 direction; correct?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. And according to the study that we just
6 reviewed, in the 1983 study, .40 would have been -- at
7 least they determined to be adequate; correct?

8 A. Under controlled conditions.

9 Q. Got it. Okay.

10 Now, let me ask you about the Smith case.

11 Where did the slip-and-fall occur in Smith,
12 because I'm not actually familiar with that?

13 The Carol Smith case versus Venetian.

14 A. Oh, I believe it was over by the escalator to
15 the right -- you know the escalator where you come down
16 from the upper level?

17 Q. Yes.

18 Well, is this from the parking garage?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Okay. So I'm going to ask you a few landmarks.

21 Do you know where the JuiceFarm is, the Bouchon
22 Bakery?

23 A. You're testing my memory. I don't pay
24 attention to the occupancy by name.

25 Q. The reason I ask is because you make reference

1 to -- on page 3 of your report, you say, "Food courts,
2 cafés, coffee bars, and other operations" --

3 A. Right.

4 Q. -- "that dispense beverages."

5 I'm wondering, did you observe that or were you
6 told that information?

7 A. No, no, no. I've observed that. I've been to
8 that property multiple times. I can't tell you the
9 names of all those.

10 Q. Okay. All right. I got it.

11 You just say this happened -- the Carol Smith
12 slip-and-fall you say happened somewhere around the base
13 of the escalator that comes down from the parking garage
14 escalator in the Venetian?

15 A. If you went down to the base of the escalator
16 and turned right and then you walked a little bit
17 towards the -- they have, like, a coffee bar that sits
18 sort of behind the escalator, then there's, like, a
19 little general store at the back, it would be right in
20 that general vicinity as I recall the location.

21 Q. There's a shoe shine place there.

22 Do you remember that?

23 A. I do.

24 Q. Is that -- was it near the shoe shine place?

25 A. Near, but near to me is...

1 Q. Okay. Is it between the shoe shine place and
2 the entry to the gift shop?

3 A. Approximately. That's close.

4 Q. Okay. So this would be maybe -- would it be,
5 like, 100 feet or so away from the slip-and-fall that
6 occurred in the Sekera case?

7 A. It's reasonable. Close.

8 Q. So the Smith case did not happen in the Grand
9 Lux rotunda?

10 A. The same area where we're here today?

11 Q. Right.

12 A. No.

13 Q. Now, my understanding is when you did the dry
14 test of the Smith case, it was .90 coefficient of
15 friction?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. When you did the wet test, it was .40
18 coefficient of friction?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. Okay. And any explanation as to why it would
21 be different -- your testing would be different in the
22 Smith case versus the Sekera case?

23 A. Well --

24 MR. KUNZ: Speculation.

25 Go ahead.

1 THE WITNESS: From an engineering standpoint,
2 sure, there's possibilities that can explain that.
3 Mostly it would be: Is this area more transited by
4 pedestrian traffic than the Sekera incident? Was the
5 floor application put on by Venetian at the same level
6 in that case as in this case?

7 So, yeah, there's multiple possibilities as to
8 why you would have a discrepancy between 0.4 and 0.33.
9 Frankly, it's not that far off.

10 BY MR. ROYAL:

11 Q. Okay. Now, you talk about floor applications,
12 and you make mention of that on page 2 of your initial
13 report?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. You don't identify the floor applications
16 specifically.

17 What floor applications are you talking about?

18 A. There are a number of commercial products by
19 the dozen that can be applied to any walking surface
20 that will increase the slip resistance level to 0.5 or
21 higher. And depending on the product, it will retain
22 that level even with a heavy volume of pedestrian
23 traffic. It depends on the volume of traffic, it
24 depends on the surface to which it's being applied, but
25 there are those products out there. There's numbers of

1 A. It tells us that the English XL Tribometer, or
2 the XL Tribometer as it's called, is a recognized valid
3 instrument for slip resistance testing.

4 Q. I looked at that and maybe I missed it. I
5 didn't see that particular equipment identified
6 specifically there.

7 Is it or is it just about calibration?

8 A. No, no, no. F2508-11 is about the validation
9 of variable instrument tribometers as an objective
10 testing instrument for slip resistance. There's a
11 history behind all of that, which I think you're
12 probably aware of that.

13 Q. I wanted to ask you about -- can you just tell
14 me, what's the DCOF versus the SCOF?

15 A. DCOF is the dynamic coefficient of friction and
16 SCOF is the static coefficient of friction. The
17 difference between the two is static coefficient of
18 friction is the amount of force necessary to incipiate
19 [sic] motion across the surface.

20 A dynamic coefficient of friction is the amount
21 of force necessary to continue motion across the
22 surface. Quite different.

23 Q. Okay. Which one applies here?

24 A. Static coefficient of friction.

25 Q. And explain why that is.

1 A. Because most heels slip first, simply cases of
2 a walking surface not having the appropriate level of
3 slip resistance to prevent a sudden slip.

4 And dynamic friction slip-and-falls would mean
5 that you're on a sheet of ice and you're sort of skating
6 across and you ultimately lose your balance and fall.

7 All studies that I have reviewed and all
8 lectures I've attended through every engineering course
9 at every school, static coefficient of friction is the
10 primary -- in fact, 90-some percent cause of slips and
11 falls, not dynamic friction.

12 Q. I'm just looking at an article from 2008 that
13 makes reference to the dynamic coefficient of friction
14 with a -- they have a wet value of .42 or greater
15 coefficient of friction.

16 What would that relate to?

17 A. To me, that is a dynamic friction level. How
18 they got it, what they used, how many tests did they
19 provide, what was the surface, you really can't compare
20 dynamic coefficient of friction and static coefficient
21 of friction mathematically or in terms of reliability in
22 predicting slip-and-fall events. They are two
23 completely different physical efforts.

24 Q. Are you aware of the .42 coefficient of
25 friction recommended level for flooring related to the

1 dynamic coefficient of friction that's been -- they make
2 reference to a 2014 --

3 A. Yes. I have seen multiple articles like that,
4 but, again, that presumes that someone is sliding across
5 the floor and then proceeds to slip. No relation to
6 static friction.

7 Q. Okay. All right. Let's go to the last page of
8 your May 30th, 2019, report. Look at the last
9 paragraph.

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. It reads, "It should also be noted that the
12 Venetian Hotel Casino has experienced 196 slip-and-fall
13 events between January 1st, 2012, to August 5th, 2016,
14 with the majority of those events occurring on the
15 marble flooring within the same approximate area as
16 plaintiff's slip-and-fall."

17 Did I read that correctly?

18 A. You did.

19 Q. What information are you drawing from?

20 A. I'm drawing from -- and this is post-December
21 report. And everything that I base my initial opinions
22 and conclusions are based on the materials sent to me at
23 that time.

24 When I prepared this report, I was provided by
25 Mr. Galliher's office a spreadsheet, a run sheet of

1 slip-and-fall events within that referenced time period
2 at that same approximate area as Plaintiff's
3 slip-and-fall.

4 Q. Did you bring that with you today?

5 A. I don't believe so. It was sent to me via an
6 e-mail.

7 Q. Okay. If you relied on that, why didn't you
8 make reference to that document, that information at the
9 outset of your report of May 30th, 2019?

10 A. Just seemed the appropriate place to put it was
11 at the end of the report.

12 Q. I mean, this is a rebuttal report.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And so as a rebuttal report, it is intended to
15 rebut, as you're understanding --

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. -- opinions provided by Dr. Hayes; correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. This information of 196 slip-and-fall events
20 was not provided in Dr. Hayes' initial report; correct?
21 That's not where you got the information?

22 A. Correct. That is true.

23 Q. This is additional information that you
24 received from Mr. Galliher; correct?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. You didn't look at the actual reports, you just
2 saw a spreadsheet?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. Is that a spreadsheet that you can produce?
5 You can produce it, right, after this deposition today?

6 A. If it has not auto-erased itself, yes, sir, I
7 can do that.

8 Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you to do that --

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. -- since it's referenced in your report.

11 A. Sure.

12 Q. You make the comment here, "same approximate
13 area."

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. What are you talking about? What area? Is it
16 the whole property or is it just in the Grand Lux
17 rotunda? Where is it?

18 A. Within the Grand Lux area, based on what I
19 reviewed in the details of each recorded incident.

20 Q. So you're -- I'm sorry. You say, "The details
21 of each recorded incident."

22 Tell me what the spreadsheet looks like.

23 A. Well, a spreadsheet is a typical spreadsheet.
24 It starts at a certain date and month, year. It
25 specifies a location. It shows a slip-and-fall and it

1 just continues on like that within that same general
2 location. That's how it was arranged as a spreadsheet.

3 Q. Okay. So did it identify people by name?

4 A. That, I don't recall. I think it was more
5 event oriented, but it could have.

6 Q. Would it have included Lobby 1, Lobby 2, Lobby
7 3, that kind of information?

8 A. Yes, sir, I believe it did.

9 Q. Would it have included areas like the Grand
10 Hall, the front desk, the porte-cochère?

11 A. No. It was simply addressed to the marble
12 flooring, and as I recall, the vast majority were in the
13 same general areas as Plaintiff's fall. I would have to
14 pull the spreadsheet out to refresh my memory.

15 Q. Would you consider the Carol Smith fall to be
16 in the same general area as Plaintiff's fall?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. So in your opinion, at least, based on your
19 testimony, so I understand, when you say "same
20 approximate area," the area where Carol Smith fell would
21 be within this Grand Lux rotunda area?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. Okay. So you're saying, then, as I understand
24 it, you received information from Mr. Galliher that
25 there were 196 slip-and-fall events between January 1st,

1 2012, and August 5th, 2016, occurring in the vicinity of
2 the Grand Lux rotunda?

3 A. Essentially that's correct, yes, sir.

4 Q. Okay. So I'm clear, do you know where the
5 Grand Hall is, the entryway to the property?

6 A. To the property, yes, sir.

7 Q. So when you enter the property, there's a
8 fountain, there's the front desk --

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. -- there's a concierge desk to the right, and
11 then if you go to the left as you enter, there's a huge
12 grand hall with paintings on the ceiling.

13 A. There is, sir.

14 Q. Right?

15 A. Yep.

16 Q. All right. So when you say "same approximate
17 area," if there were slip-and-falls there, they would be
18 separate from the 196 slip-and-falls.

19 Would that be right?

20 A. I believe that's accurate.

21 Q. And if somebody slipped and fell somewhere in
22 the front desk area, that would not be part of this
23 196 --

24 A. I believe --

25 Q. -- number?

1 A. I believe that's accurate, yes, sir.

2 Q. And if somebody slipped and fell at the Palazzo
3 on a marble floor, that's not part of the 196?

4 A. That would be correct.

5 Q. And if somebody slipped and fell at a
6 convention area on a marble floor, that would not be
7 part of the 196?

8 A. As I recall. I'm going back on memory reading
9 line after line. I believe that would be correct.

10 Q. Okay. Did you ask Mr. Galliher where he got
11 this information?

12 A. No, sir. He said it was just provided to him
13 under discovery and that was it.

14 Q. Okay. Are they numbered 1 through 96?

15 A. No. They're by date. I think I testified to
16 that to start with. You have to start out with the date
17 and then work your way out.

18 Q. Did you count them?

19 A. Yes, I did.

20 Q. Okay. So this is something you counted?

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. All right. And did you see -- did you notice
23 that all of these 196 slip-and-fall events, did they
24 occur due to foreign substances on the floor?

25 A. Mostly that was the case, yes, sir. As I

1 recall, they were all due to liquid contaminants.

2 Q. Okay. No trip-and-falls, nobody fainting, no
3 drunks, you know, swaying and falling to the floor that
4 you can recall?

5 A. No, sir.

6 Q. And that's something that if you still have it,
7 you will produce?

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. When is the last time that you looked at that?

10 A. It would have been about a month ago prior to
11 preparing the rebuttal report.

12 Q. All right. So you would have received it,
13 what, about five to six weeks ago?

14 A. That's fair.

15 Q. Okay. Why would you think it would be erased?

16 A. Well, I have an auto-erase on my computer that
17 after a certain period of time, the e-mails are
18 discarded.

19 Q. What's it set for?

20 A. Usually 30 days.

21 Q. Okay. Is there any other information that
22 Mr. Galliher's provided you with that you think may have
23 been erased by your auto-erase?

24 A. No, sir.

25 Q. Is there any other information that you've been

EXHIBIT “J”

In the Matter Of:

LIVIA FARINA vs DESERT PALACE, INC.

A542232

DAVID A. ELLIOTT, P.E.

February 13, 2009



ESQUIRE
DEPOSITION SOLUTIONS

800.211.DEPO (3376)
EsquireSolutions.com

1 foreseeable conditions are there.

2 Q. How about ANSI? First of all, the 0.6, is
3 that a recommendation in ANSI or a requirement?

4 A. They don't mention .6 at all in ANSI.

5 Q. So they don't even have a measurement, a
6 required measurement, for the friction rating?

7 A. No, sir. It just has to be slip resistant
8 under the foreseeable conditions.

9 Q. And is there anything in ANSI that you
10 believe mandates that the floor pass a wet test at 0.5
11 as opposed to a dry test?

12 MR. ZIMMERMAN: This is the floor in the
13 vestibule?

14 BY MR. McGRATH:

15 Q. Any marble flooring in a public
16 accomodation.

17 A. You know, I think we're just beating a
18 dead horse here. I understand the definition of slip
19 resistance, and what is slip resistant.

20 Being a pedestrian safety professional, I
21 can tell you exactly what number, in my opinion, and
22 the same opinion of everybody else that does this, is
23 slip resistant.

24 It wouldn't do you any good to test a
25 floor dry, because I can already tell you it's going to

1 be slip resistant when it's dry, but it's not going to
2 do you any good, again, to take that same floor and run
3 sprinklers on it all the time and tell people to walk
4 across it, because we tested it dry. It makes no
5 sense.

6 Q. Have you ever tested marble flooring in a
7 casino in the Las Vegas area using the wet test where
8 the marble flooring passed the 0.6 standard?

9 A. Never.

10 Q. How about the 0.5 standard?

11 A. No, sir. Marble is a horrible choice.

12 Q. Essentially if you don't have carpet down,
13 it's slippery when it's wet, right?

14 A. No, sir. There's other tile that you can
15 use that is very aesthetically pleasing that will meet
16 that standard.

17 Q. Give me some examples, if you don't mind.

18 A. You can go into the Venetian. I do a lot
19 of work for the Venetian and consulting and litigation,
20 and their tile is slip resistant when wet, and it looks
21 good.

22 Q. But it's not marble flooring?

23 A. No, it's not marble flooring.

24 Q. Is it tile?

25 A. It's a ceramic tile.

1 Q. Any other properties that you can give me
2 a specific example of where they don't use marble?

3 A. Well, no pool deck uses marble, obviously,
4 and sidewalks accessing pool decks are concrete, and
5 they usually have a very rough surface on them.


6 Whenever I've had a client that has had
7 marble in their casino and I'm working for the defense,
8 I've just told them that "Hey, this is slippery when
9 it's wet. You shouldn't be using it. If you want to
10 continue using it, you got to take certain things into
11 account. You have to take other preventive measures to
12 prevent slipping."

13 And sometimes they're receptive to those
14 ideas and sometimes they're not. These are just my
15 opinions as a pedestrian safety consultant.

16 Q. What are you assuming in terms of how far
17 in terms of feet the plaintiff slipped -- withdraw the
18 question.

19 I'm trying to ask you about the location
20 of the slip-and-fall incident. How far into the
21 property past the entrance door are you assuming that
22 it occurred?

23 A. Well, if I remember right, the depth of
24 that vestibule is about 12 feet, and it looks like
25 she's maybe halfway, maybe a hair over halfway, so



1 Sean K. Claggett, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 008407
2 William T. Sykes, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 009916
3 Geordan G. Logan, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 013910
4 CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM
5 4101 Meadows Lane, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89107
6 (702) 655-2346 – Telephone
7 (702) 655-3763 – Facsimile
sclaggett@claggettlaw.com
8 wsykes@claggettlaw.com
glogan@claggettlaw.com
9

10 Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 220
11 Jeffrey L. Galliher, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8078
12 Kathleen H. Gallagher, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 15043
13 THE GALLIHER LAW FIRM
14 1850 East Sahara Avenue, Suite 107
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104
15 (702) 735-0049 – Telephone
(702) 735-0204 – Facsimile
16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

19 JOYCE SEKERA, an Individual,
20
21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, d/b/a THE
VENETIAN LAS VEGAS, a Nevada Limited
24 Liability Company; LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC
d/b/a THE VENETIAN LAS VEGAS, a Nevada
25 Limited Liability Company; YET UNKNOWN
EMPLOYEE; DOES I through X, inclusive,
26

27 Defendants.
28

CASE NO.: A-18-772761-C

DEPT. NO.: XXV

Hearing Requested

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S LIMITED
OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY
COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATIONS DATED
DECEMBER 2, 2019

1 Pursuant to NRCP 16.3, Plaintiff JOYCE SEKERA submits her Response to Defendant's
2 Limited Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendations from December 2,
3 2019.

4 DATED this 23rd day of December 2019.

5 CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM

6 /s/ Geordan G. Logan

7 Sean K. Claggett, Esq.

8 Nevada Bar No. 008407

9 William T. Sykes, Esq.

10 Nevada Bar No. 009916

11 Geordan G. Logan, Esq.

12 Nevada Bar No. 013910

13 4101 Meadows Lane, Suite 100

14 Las Vegas, Nevada 89107

15 (702) 655-2346 – Telephone

16 Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq.

17 Nevada Bar No. 220

18 Jeffrey L. Galliher, Esq.

19 Nevada Bar No. 8078

20 Kathleen H. Gallagher, Esq.

21 Nevada Bar No. 15043

22 THE GALLIHER LAW FIRM

23 1850 East Sahara Avenue, Suite 107

24 Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

25 (702) 735-0049 – Telephone

26 (702) 735-0204 – Facsimile

27 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

28 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

I.

INTRODUCTION

24 On August 5, 2019, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Compel Testimony and Documents, and on the
25 same day, Defendants filed a Motion for Protective Order as to Plaintiff's Request for Production of
26 Incident Reports from May 1999 to Present. The Discovery Commissioner heard these matters on
27 September 18, 2019. On December 16, 2019, both Plaintiff and Defendant filed objections in response
28 to the Discovery Commissioner's recommendations regarding discoverable material. Defendant made

1 two objections to the Discovery Commissioner's recommendations. Defendant objects to producing
2 records of prior similar incidents outside of the Grand Lux Rotunda and also objects to producing
3 records of similar incidents from the date of the subject incident forward to the present.

4 It should be noted that Plaintiff's Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report and
5 Recommendations Dated December 2, 2019 was filed on December 16, 2019, and the arguments
6 presented there are fully incorporated in Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Limited Objection to
7 Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendations Dated December 2, 2019.

8 II.

9 LEGAL ARGUMENT

10 Plaintiff opposes Venetian's objection in its entirety. Venetian's reluctance to produce
11 documents is little more than a calculated attempt to frustrate the Plaintiff and subvert this Court.
12 Generally, a party "may obtain discovery regarding any . . . matter that is relevant to any party's claims
13 or defenses and proportional to the needs of the case."¹ The Nevada rule on scope of discovery is
14 modeled after the Federal rule, and federal interpretations are considered strongly persuasive.²
15 Documents may be considered relevant for discovery purposes even if they will be inadmissible as
16 not relevant for evidentiary purposes.³

17 Accordingly, Plaintiff argues that Venetian should produce reports of all similar incidents
18 occurring on all marble flooring in public areas of the Venetian's premises. The marble flooring
19 extends well beyond the arbitrarily defined borders encircling the Grand Lux Rotunda, and the marble
20 on one side of the border does not lose its dangerous nature simply by virtue of its location.
21 Furthermore, the extent of Venetian's knowledge as to the dangerous quality of its marble floors arises
22 from its experiences with the marble flooring throughout the Venetian. This extensive knowledge is
23 central to this case. What is more, reports should be produced up to the present because Plaintiff
24 alleges that the floors are a dangerous condition.

26 ¹ NRCp 26(b)(1).

27 ² See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1); Exec. Mgmt. v. Ticor Title Ins. Co., 118 Nev. 46, 53, 38 P.3d 872,
876 (2002).

28 ³ Renfrow v. Redwood Fire & Cas. Ins. Co., 288 F.R.D. 514, 521 (D. Nev. 2013).

1 **A. DEFENDANT’S PRODUCTION OF INCIDENT REPORTS MUST NOT BE CONFINED**
2 **TO THE GRAND LUX ROTUNDA BECAUSE THE ADDITIONAL REPORTS**
3 **ESTABLISH DEFENDANT’S FULL KNOWLEDGE OF THE DANGEROUS**
4 **CONDITION OF ITS MARBLE FLOORING.**

5 Venetian cites Eldorado Club, Inc. v. Graff for the proposition that requesting prior incidents
6 in areas outside of the Grand Lux Rotunda is “overly broad and unnecessary.”⁴ Venetian misconstrues
7 the holding in Eldorado Club. The issue there was whether it was an error to allow testimonial evidence
8 at trial.⁵ Furthermore, the hazard in Eldorado Club was the uncommon presence of a lettuce leaf on a
9 loading ramp.⁶ Here, Plaintiff alleges the hazard is a marble floor which becomes unreasonably and
10 unnecessarily dangerous when it is wet, and as a result, people routinely slip and fall and injure
11 themselves on the wet marble floor. Yet, even knowing of this dangerous condition, the Venetian
12 persists in maintaining its marble floors in the same manner that it always has—indifferent to the
13 floor’s dangerous nature. It is Plaintiff’s position that a reasonable property owner would either put in
14 place policies and procedures to eliminate the hazard or change the floors so that they would be safe
15 for the foreseeable capacity and type of traffic consistently navigating the property.

16 Plaintiff needs access to incident reports beyond the narrowly defined area of the Grand Lux
17 Rotunda because the full extent of Venetian’s knowledge of the dangerous condition of its polished
18 marble flooring is a central issue in this case. Plaintiff needs incident reports of the slip and fall
19 incidents which occurred on all marble floors in Venetian’s public areas because Plaintiff needs to
20 know what level of notice Venetian had with regard to the dangerous nature of its marble flooring. By
21 limiting discovery to only one narrow area of the casino, the extent of Venetian’s knowledge of its
22 dangerous marble flooring would be confined to an illogical area near the subject incident. This
23 arbitrary boundary presumes marble flooring within the boundary has dissimilar properties when wet
24 than marble flooring outside the boundary. Consequently, this arbitrary boundary does not allow
25 Plaintiff or the court to consider the full extent to which Venetian was aware of the danger created by
26 either its choice of flooring or its policies and procedures to maintain the marble floors.

27 ⁴ Def.’s Objection, p. 11:2–8.

28 ⁵ Eldorado Club v. Graff, 78 Nev. 507, 509, 377 P.2d 174, 175 (1962).

⁶ Id.

1 Therefore, given the strong public policy of this State,⁷ the Ninth Circuit,⁸ and the United
2 States Supreme Court⁹ to hear cases on their merits, this Court should compel production of records
3 of similar incidents occurring on the Venetian's premises in public areas with marble flooring.

4 **B. DEFENDANT'S PRODUCTIONS MUST EXTEND TO THE PRESENT BECAUSE**
5 **PLAINTIFF ALLEGES THAT THE MARBLE FLOORS ARE A DANGEROUS**
6 **CONDITION.**

7 Plaintiff should have access to incident reports through the present because Plaintiff alleges
8 that the polished marble floors at Venetian are a dangerous condition. The Nevada Supreme Court has
9 held that evidence of subsequent similar incidents may be admissible in premise liability cases when
10 that evidence shows the existence of a dangerous defective condition.¹⁰ While past incident reports
11 establish a property owner's knowledge of the hazard, subsequent incidents can be used to show the
12 existence of a defective and dangerous condition.¹¹ Plaintiff alleges that the marble flooring at
13 Venetian presents a dangerous condition. She will need subsequent similar incidents to prove the
14 extent and nature of the dangerous condition.

15 In its objection, Venetian makes a point of emphasizing Plaintiff's status as a "pseudo-
16 employee" who walked the area "many hundreds of times without incident" until the day she slipped
17 and fell on the wet marble floor.¹² Venetian seemingly argues that Plaintiff's good luck in not having
18 previously encountered a slick marble floor at the Venetian somehow demonstrates that Venetian's
19 marble flooring is not a hazard. The subsequent incident reports for the slip and falls occurring on the
20 marble flooring in Venetian's public areas will likely refute Venetian's claim that one person's good

21 ⁷ See, e.g., Yochum v. Davis, 98 Nev. 484, 487, 653 P.2d 1215, 1217 (1982) (noting the strong public
22 policy favoring resolution of disputes on their merits).

23 ⁸ See, e.g., Allen v. Bayer Corp., 460 F.3d 1217, 1248 (9th Cir. Wash. 2006) (recognizing the public
policy in favor of deciding disputes on the merits).

24 ⁹ See, e.g., Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178, 181–82 (1962) (stating that it is "entirely contrary to the
25 spirit of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for decisions on the merits to be avoided on the basis of
mere technicalities").

26 ¹⁰ Reingold v. Wet 'n Wild Nev., Inc., 113 Nev. 967, 969–70, 944 P.2d 800, 802 (1997) *overruled on*
27 *other grounds by* Bass-Davis v. Davis, 122 Nev. 442, 454, 134 P.3d 103, 110 (2006).

28 ¹¹ Id. (citing Ginnis v. Mapes Hotel Corp., 86 Nev. 408, 415, 470 P.2d 135, 139 (1970)).

¹² Def.'s Objection, p. 7:12–18.

1 luck in traversing Venetian's marble floor without injury establishes that the Venetian's marble
2 flooring is not dangerous.

3 Furthermore, the scope of discovery in Nevada is broader than the standard for admissibility
4 at trial.¹³ Therefore the production of subsequent incident reports recommended by the Discovery
5 Commissioner is reasonable and likely to produce admissible evidence to the extent that it shows the
6 dangerous condition of the marble flooring at Venetian.

7 **III.**

8 **CONCLUSION**

9 Based upon the foregoing, Plaintiff requests that the Court deny Defendant's Limited
10 Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendations.

11 DATED THIS 23rd day of December 2019.

12
13 CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM

14 /s/ Geordan G. Logan

15 Sean K. Claggett, Esq.

16 Nevada Bar No. 008407

17 William T. Sykes, Esq.

18 Nevada Bar No. 009916

19 Geordan G. Logan, Esq.

20 Nevada Bar No. 013910

21 4101 Meadows Lane, Suite 100

22 Las Vegas, Nevada 89107

23 (702) 655-2346 – Telephone

24 Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq.

25 Nevada Bar No. 220

26 Kathleen H. Gallagher, Esq.

27 Nevada Bar No. 15043

28 THE GALLIHER LAW FIRM

1850 East Sahara Avenue, Suite 107

Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

(702) 735-0049 – Telephone

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

¹³ Renfrow v. Redwood Fire & Cas. Ins. Co., 288 F.R.D. 514, 521 (D. Nev. 2013).

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 23rd day of December 2019, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S LIMITED OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS DATED DECEMBER 2, 2019** on the following person(s) by the following method(s) pursuant to NRCP 5(b):


Via E-Service

Michael A. Royal, Esq.
Gregory A. Miles, Esq.
Royal & Miles LLP
1522 W. Warm Springs Road
Henderson, Nevada 89014
Attorney for Defendants

CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM

/s/ Maria Alvarez

An Employee of CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM



1 Michael A. Royal, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 4370
2 Gregory A. Miles, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 4336
3 **ROYAL & MILES LLP**
4 1522 West Warm Springs Road
Henderson Nevada 89014
5 Tel: (702) 471-6777
Fax: (702) 531-6777
6 Email: mroyal@rovalmilesllaw.com
7 *Attorneys for Defendants*
8 *VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and*
LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC

9 **DISTRICT COURT**

10 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

11 JOYCE SEKERA, an Individual;

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, d/b/a
15 THE VENETIAN LAS VEGAS, a Nevada
Limited Liability Company; LAS VEGAS
16 SANDS, LLC d/b/a THE VENETIAN LAS
VEGAS, a Nevada Limited Liability Company;
17 YET UNKNOWN EMPLOYEE; DOES I
through X, inclusive,

18 Defendants.
19

CASE NO.: A-18-772761-C
DEPT. NO.: XXV


DEPARTMENT XXV
NOTICE OF HEARING
DATE 1/21/20 TIME 9:00 am
APPROVED BY JG

Hearing Date: September 18, 2019
Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.

20 **ORDER**

21 The Court, having reviewed the above report and recommendations prepared by the
22 Discovery Commissioner and,

23 _____ No timely objection having been filed,

24  After reviewing the objections to the Report and Recommendations and good cause
25 appearing,

26 * * *

Case Name: Sekera v. Venetian Casino Resort, LLC

Case No.: A-18-772761-C

AND

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED the Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendations are affirmed and adopted.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED the Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendations are affirmed and adopted as modified in the following manner. (attached hereto)

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED this matter is remanded to the Discovery Commissioner for reconsideration or further action.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a hearing on the Discovery Commissioner's Report is set for January 21, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

DATED this 27th day of Dec., 2019.


DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Steven D. Grierson

ROYAL & MILES LLP

1522 W Warm Springs Road

Henderson NV 89014

Tel: (702) 471-6777 ♦ Fax: (702) 531-6777

DCRR

Michael A. Royal, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 4370

Gregory A. Miles, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 4336

ROYAL & MILES LLP

1522 West Warm Springs Road

Henderson Nevada 89014

Tel: (702) 471-6777

Fax: (702) 531-6777

Email: mroyal@rovalmilesllp.com

Attorneys for Defendants

VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and

LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JOYCE SEKERA, an Individual;

Plaintiff,

v.

VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, d/b/a
THE VENETIAN LAS VEGAS, a Nevada
Limited Liability Company; LAS VEGAS
SANDS, LLC d/b/a THE VENETIAN LAS
VEGAS, a Nevada Limited Liability Company;
YET UNKNOWN EMPLOYEE; DOES I
through X, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: A-18-772761-C

DEPT. NO.: XXV

**DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Date of Hearing: September 18, 2019

Time of Hearing: 9:00 a.m.

Appearance: Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq., for Plaintiff, JOYCE SEKERA

Michael A. Royal, Esq., Royal & Miles LLP, for Defendants
VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC
(collectively "*Venetian*")

I.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. Venetian filed DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM IMPROPERLY SERVED PURSUANT TO NRCP 45(A)(4)(A) AND MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER UNDER NRCP 26(c) RELATED TO PLAINTIFF'S DEMAND DEPOSITION AND DOCUMENTS FROM DEFENDANTS UNDER NRCP NRCP 30(B)6) AND NRCP 34 AND MOTION TO COMPEL PLAINTIFF TO PRODUCE ALL EVIDENCE OF PRIOR INCIDENTS AT VENETIAN NOT RECEIVED FROM DEFENDANTS IN THIS LITIGATION on August 5, 2019.

2. Plaintiff filed PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL TESTIMONY AND DOCUMENTS on August 5, 2019.

3. Venetian and Plaintiff filed oppositions which included countermotions for sanctions; the Discovery Commissioner refused to consider the countermotions pursuant to EDCR 2.20(f) as being insufficiently related to the subject matter of the pending motions.

II.

FINDINGS

1. Plaintiff claims to have fallen on Venetian premises on November 4, 2016 due to a temporary transitory condition which caused her to slip.

2. On January 4, 2019, Venetian produced to Plaintiff copies of sixty-four (64) prior incident reports from November 4, 2013 to November 4, 2016, redacted by Venetian to protect the identification of non-employees, responsive to Plaintiff's Production Request No. 7 requesting other incident reports on the Venetian property from November 4, 2011 to the present. (Venetian objected to producing incident reports occurring subsequent to the November 4, 2016 incident.)

1 3. On February 1, 2019, Venetian filed a motion for protective order as to the redacted
2 prior incident reports produced on January 4, 2019, which was granted by the Discovery
3 Commissioner in a Report and Recommendation filed April 4, 2019, with reports to remain
4 redacted and to be protected under NRCP 26(c).

5 4. The District Court entered an order reversing the Discovery Commissioner's Report
6 and Recommendation of April 4, 2019 in an order filed July 31, 2019, directing Venetian to
7 provide Plaintiff with unredacted copies of all prior incident reports, with no protections requested
8 by Venetian under NRCP 26(c). Venetian filed a motion for reconsideration, heard on September
9 17, 2019, which Judge Delaney denied.

11 5. The District Court's ruling related to Venetian's request for protection under NRCP
12 26(c) is the law of the case; therefore, no relief requested related to the protection of Venetian prior
13 incident reports can be further considered by the Discovery Commissioner in this matter.

14 6. Plaintiff was granted leave by the District Court to file a First Amended Complaint
15 to add a claim of punitive damages, which was filed on June 28, 2019.

16 7. Venetian filed a motion for protective order and Plaintiff filed a motion to compel
17 on August 5, 2019 regarding Plaintiff's request for the production of certain information and
18 documents from May 1999 to the present.

19 8. On May 31, 2019, Plaintiff served her sixth request for production with the
20 following requests:

21 REQUEST NO. 23: True and correct copies of any and all reports, documents,
22 memoranda, or other information describing or referring to slip testing performed
23 on the marble floors at the Venetian Hotel and Casino by any Plaintiff, or the
24 Venetian, from January 1, 2000 to date.

25 REQUEST NO. 24: Any and all communications, including correspondence,
26 emails, internal communication, or other memoranda which refers to the safety of
27 marble floors located within the Venetian Hotel and Casino from January 1, 2000 to
28 date.

1 REQUEST NO. 25: Any and all transcripts, minutes, notes, emails, or
2 correspondence which has as a subject matter, any meetings held by and between
3 Venetian personnel, including management personnel, where the subject of the
4 safety of the marble floors at the Venetian was discussed and evaluated from
5 January 1, 2000 to date.

6 REQUEST NO. 26: Any and all correspondence, emails, memoranda, internal
7 office correspondence, or other documents directed to the Venetian from a
8 Contractor, Subcontractor, Flooring Expert, or similar entity which discusses or
9 refers to the safety of marble floors located within the Venetian Hotel and Casino
10 from January 1, 2000 to date.

11 REQUEST NO. 29: Any and all complaints submitted by guests or other individuals
12 regarding safety of the marble floors.

13 REQUEST NO. 30: Any and all quotes and estimates and correspondence regarding
14 quotes and estimates relating to the modification of the marble floors to increase
15 their slip resistance.

16 9. On June 20, 2019, Plaintiff served Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to
17 Defendants with the following request:

18 INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Please identify by Plaintiff's name, case number and
19 date of filing all complaints filed against the Venetian Casino Resort, LLC d/b/a
20 The Venetian Las Vegas and/or Las Vegas Sands, LLC d/b/a The Venetian Las
21 Vegas in the Clark County District Court for any and all slip and fall and/or trip and
22 fall incidents occurring on marble flooring anywhere within The Venetian Casino
23 Resort, LCC d/b/a The Venetian Las Vegas and/or Las Vegas Sands, LLC d/b/a The
24 Venetian Las Vegas from January 1, 2000 to the present.

25 10. On July 17, 2019, Plaintiff served Plaintiff's Ninth Request for Production of
26 Documents and Materials to Venetian. Request No. 35 sought the following production from
27 Venetian:

28 REQUEST NO. 35: True and correct copies of any and all claim forms, legal
actions, civil complaints, statements, security reports, computer generated lists,
investigative documents or other memoranda which have, as its subject matter, slip
and fall cases occurring on marble floors within the subject VENETIAN CASINO
RESORT from the May 3, 1999 to the present.

11. On July 19, 2019, Plaintiff served Plaintiff's Tenth Request for Production of
Documents and Materials to Defendant with the following request:

1 REQUEST NO. 36: True and correct copies of any and all entries and information
2 contained in the Venetian's Alliance System regarding injury falls on marble
flooring within the Venetian Las Vegas from January 1, 2000 to present.

3 12. On July 22, 2019, Plaintiff served Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories to
4 Defendants which reads as follows:

5 INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Please identify names, addresses and phone numbers of any
6 and all individuals designated as safety engineers who perform(ed) accident checks at the
7 Venetian from the year 2000 to the present.

8 13. On July 29, 2019, Plaintiff served Plaintiff's Eleventh Request for Production of
9 Documents and Materials to Defendant with the following request.

10 REQUEST NO. 37: Any and all quotes, estimates, correspondence, emails,
11 memorandums, minutes, file notes and/or other documentation related to Venetian's
12 decision to remove and replace the carpet with marble flooring and Venetian's
removal and replacement of carpet with marble flooring as referenced by Christina
Tonemah in her deposition. (25: 9-26; 26; 1-6)

13 14. On July 30, 2019, Plaintiff served notice of an NRCP 30(b)(6) deposition under
14 NRCP 45 issuance of a subpoena with eighteen (18) topics, as follows.

15 1) Total number of injury falls on marble floors located within The
16 Venetian Las Vegas from November 4, 2013 to present.

17 2) Actions taken by The Venetian Las Vegas to change the coefficient
18 of friction with respect to the marble floors within The Venetian Las Vegas from
19 November 4, 2013 to present.

20 3) Measures taken to locate and produce security/incident injury fall
21 reports by The Venetian Las Vegas as requested by Plaintiff in this Litigation.

22 4) Slip testing performed by The Venetian Las Vegas or it's
23 representatives with respect to the marble floors within The Venetian Las Vegas
24 from November 4, 2013 to present.
25
26
27
28

1 5) Any invoices or work orders with respect to the removal of carpet in
2 pedestrian walkways and replaced with marble and/or granite flooring from
3 November 4, 2006 to present.

4 6) The identity of all employees who were responsible for managing
5 and maintaining Venetian's technology infrastructure.

6 7) The name, address and phone number of the specific
7 employee(s) tasked with retrieving incident reports from Venetian's system for this
8 litigation, the litigation in Smith v. Venetian (A-17-753362-C), Cohen v. Venetian
9 (A-17-761036-C) and Boucher v. Venetian (A-18-773651-C) and the name address
10 and phone number of the individual who assigned them this task.

11 8) The identity of all non-employee consultants, consulting firms,
12 contractors or similar entities that were responsible for managing and maintaining
13 Venetian's technology infrastructure.

14 9) Software used, including dates they were in use and any software
15 modifications.

16 10) Identity of, description of and policies and procedures for the use of
17 all internal systems for data management, complaint and report making, note
18 keeping, minute/transcript taking and employee e-mail, messaging and other
19 communication systems and description of all employee accounts for said systems.

20 11) Description of all cell phones, PDAs, digital convergence devices or
21 other portable electronic devices and who they were/are issued to.

22 12) Physical location of electronic information and hard files and
23 description of what information is kept in electronic form and what is kept in hard
24 files.
25
26
27
28

- 1 13) Description of policies and procedures for performing back-ups.
- 2 14) Inventory of back-ups and when they were created.
- 3 15) User permissions for accessing, modifying, and deleting data.
- 4 16) Utilization of data deletion programs.
- 5 17) A listing of current and former personnel who have or had access to
- 6 network resources, technology assets, back-up, and other systems operations.
- 7
- 8 18) Electronic records management policies and procedures.

9 15. Venetian sought relief from the scope of discovery requested by Plaintiff,
10 contending that it was overbroad and unwarranted in a slip and fall case arising from a temporary
11 transitory condition. Venetian further asserted that Plaintiff is not entitled to any incident reports
12 occurring after November 4, 2016 based on the facts plead by Plaintiff in the Complaint and
13 further as evidenced by Plaintiff's testimony, and the testimony of her experts and eyewitness at
14 the scene, all of whom opined that Plaintiff slipped and fell due to a foreign substance on the
15 marble floor. Therefore, Venetian moved for protection.
16

17 16. Venetian also moved to compel the production of all incident reports and
18 information related to incident reports obtained by Plaintiff from any source, including but not
19 limited to those produced to expert Thomas Jennings supporting his May 30, 2019 report, which
20 documents were not produced to Venetian by Plaintiff prior to the time of Mr. Jennings' deposition
21 taken July 2, 2019. Venetian further moved for an order compelling Mr. Jennings to appear again
22 for deposition at Plaintiff's cost.
23

24 17. Plaintiff argued in her motion to compel that she is entitled to the broad scope of
25 discovery requested because it is necessary to prove up her punitive damages claim allowed by the
26 District Court and therefore moved to compel Venetian to produce the information at issue.
27
28

1 18. The parties also filed countermotions for sanctions which the Discovery
2 Commissioner refused to hear pursuant to EDCR 2.20(f).

3 After reviewing the papers and pleadings on file, and consideration of arguments presented
4 by counsel for the parties, the following recommendations are made.

5
6 **III.**

7 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

8 IT IS RECOMMENDED that the pending motions and countermotions filed by Plaintiff
9 and Venetian (other than those not adjudicated pursuant to EDCR 2.20(f)), are GRANTED IN
10 PART and DENIED IN PART as set forth specifically herein below.

11 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that, regarding Plaintiff's Production Request Nos. 7,
12 24, 29, 35, and 36, Interrogatory Nos. 1, 2, and NRCP 30(b)(6) Topic 1, based on Plaintiff's
13 pending claim for punitive damages claim arising from the operative facts of a slip and fall on a
14 liquid substance, in accordance with Judge Delaney's July 31, 2019 order, Venetian be ordered to
15 produce to Plaintiff unredacted records related to other incidents involving guests slipping and
16 falling on the Venetian common area marble floor on the casino level of the Venetian property due
17 to the existence of a foreign substance from November 4, 2013 to the present (only as of the date
18 of production).

19
20 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that, as to Plaintiff's request for documents and
21 information from Venetian regarding actions to change the coefficient of friction of the marble
22 flooring, Venetian's motion for protection be GRANTED as this request is vague and overly broad
23 as written in the NRCP 30(b)(6) Topic 2 and Production Request No. 30.

24
25 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that, as to Plaintiff's request for information and
26 documents related to the testing of Venetian marble flooring, as set forth in to NRCP 30(b)(6)
27 Topic 4 and Production Request Nos. 23, 25, 26, Plaintiff's motion to compel be GRANTED to the
28 extent that any testing for coefficient of friction was accomplished in the Grand Lux area of the

1 Venetian property from November 4, 2011 to November 4, 2016, where such information was
2 disclosed by Venetian pursuant to NRCP 16.1 or which is not otherwise protected in accordance
3 with NRCP 26.

4 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that, as to Plaintiff's request for information related
5 to the removal of carpeting on the Venetian casino floor set forth in Production Request No. 37,
6 and NRCP 30(b)(6) Topic 5, Venetian's motion for protection be GRANTED to the extent that the
7 inquiry related the removal of carpeting be limited to the Grand Lux area of the Venetian property
8 from November 4, 2011 to November 4, 2016.

10 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that, as to Production Request Nos. 35 and 36,
11 together with NRCP 30(b)(6) Topics and 3, 6-18 regarding information related to computer data at
12 the Venetian, the motion for protection be GRANTED, as this request is vague and overly broad;
13 however, that Plaintiff be allowed to inquire of Venetian generally about the reporting of slip and
14 fall claims on the casino level marble floor from November 4, 2011 to the present, how the
15 information is collected and stored, and how it can be retrieved.

17 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that Venetian's motion to compel Plaintiff expert
18 Thomas Jennings to produce all documents and information of prior incidents he has reviewed (as
19 represented by Mr. Jennings in his May 30, 2019 report and in his July 2, 2019 deposition) be
20 GRANTED.

22 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that Venetian's motion to retake the deposition of Mr.
23 Jennings upon receipt of the prior incident information be GRANTED to the extent that Venetian
24 is allowed to redepose Mr. Jennings; however, it is DENIED as to Venetian's request that Plaintiff
25 pay the costs associated with the second Jennings deposition.

26 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that Venetian's motion to compel Plaintiff's
27 production of all Venetian incident reports in her possession beyond those which have been
28 produced by Venetian to Plaintiff in this litigation be GRANTED.

1 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that Venetian be granted relief from production of
2 unredacted documents until fourteen days after Notice of Entry of Order related to the District
3 Court's denial of Venetian's motion for reconsideration of the July 31, 2019 order.

4 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that Venetian be granted relief from production of
5 documents related to the issues herein until it becomes a final order of the District Court.

6 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that all remaining issues in the pending motions are
7 otherwise DENIED.
8

9 DATED this 27th day of November, 2019.


10 
11 DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER


12 Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

13 **Royal & Miles LLP**

THE GALLIHER LAW FIRM

14 
15
16 Michael A. Royal, Esq.
17 Nevada Bar No. 4370
18 1522 W. Warm Springs Road
19 Henderson, NV 89014
20 *Attorneys for Defendants*
21 *VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and*
22 *LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC*


Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 220
1850 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 107
Las Vegas, NV 89014
Attorney for Plaintiff

Case Name: Sekera v. Venetian Casino Resort, LLC

Case No.: A-18-772761-C

NOTICE

Pursuant to NRC 16.3(c)(2), you are hereby notified that within fourteen (14) days after being served with a report any party may file and serve written objections to the recommendations. Written authorities may be filed with objections, but are not mandatory. If written authorities are filed, any other party may file and serve responding authorities within seven (7) days after being served with objections.

Objection time will expire on Dec. 16 2019.

A copy of the foregoing Discovery Commissioner's Report was:

_____ Mailed to Plaintiff/Defendant at the following address on the _____ day of _____ 2019;

_____ Electronically filed and served counsel on Dec. 2, 2019, Pursuant to N.E.F.C.R. Rule 9.

Natilie Lee
Commissioner Designee

REGISTER OF ACTIONS

CASE NO. A-18-772761-C

Joyce Sekera, Plaintiff(s) vs. Venetian Casino Resort LLC, Defendant(s) §
§
§
§
§
§

Case Type: **Negligence - Premises Liability**
Date Filed: **04/12/2018**
Location: **Department 25**
Cross-Reference Case Number: **A772761**

PARTY INFORMATION

Defendant	Las Vegas Sands LLC <i>Doing Business As</i> Venetian Las Vegas	Lead Attorneys Michael A Royal <i>Retained</i> 7024716777(W)
Defendant	Venetian Casino Resort LLC <i>Doing Business As</i> Venetian Las Vegas	Michael A Royal <i>Retained</i> 7024716777(W)
Plaintiff	Sekera, Joyce	Keith E. Galliher, Jr. <i>Retained</i> 7027350049(W)

EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT

01/21/2020 **Objection to Discovery Commissioner's Report** (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer Delaney, Kathleen E.)

Minutes

01/21/2020 9:00 AM

- Extensive arguments regarding the Discovery Commissioners recommendation Deft's. provide unredacted and unprotected reports for a period of 8 years, inclusive of reports up to the current date, the sharing of those documents, and ongoing Appeal. Additional arguments regarding subsequent changes to the flooring, testing of the surfaces, and the area to be tested. COURT STATED FINDINGS, and ADVISED, it was an error on the part of the Discovery Commissioner to extend the requirements for reports beyond the date of incident in the case. COURT ORDERS the limitation will be to the date of the incident and FIVE (5) years prior as originally determined by the Discovery Commissioner and not subsequent to that date. ADDITIONAL FINDINGS STATED. The scope of the area will be the Grand Lux Cafe area, that is where the incident occurred. To the extent the Discovery Commissioner's determinations allow for discovery of anything beyond the date of the incident or outside the Grand Lux area, that will be REVERSED. Whatever else the Discovery Commissioner allowed or ruled on, that will REMAIN. Additional argument regarding reports already provided and areas tested. COURT STATED FURTHER FINDINGS, and CLARIFIED, no discovery or reports on the area or timeframe outside what the Court has stated; unredacted, unprotected reports are to be provided, no information regarding testing outside the Grand Lux Cafe dome area to be included. Mr. Royal requested a Stay. COURT FURTHER ORDERED, Mr. Royal's Oral Request for a Stay, DENIED. Mr. Sykes is to prepare the Order, provide a copy to opposing counsel for review as to form and content, and return it back to the Court within 10 days. Competing Orders can be submitted if there is a dispute.

[Parties Present](#)

[Return to Register of Actions](#)

1 TRAN

2
3
4
5
6 IN THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
7 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
8

9 JOYCE SEKERA,)
10 Plaintiff,)
11 vs.)
12 VENETIAN CASINO RESORT,)
13 LLC, ET AL,)
14 Defendants.)

Case No. A-18-772761-C
Dept. No. 25

15
16 OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

17 Before the Honorable Kathleen Delaney

18 Tuesday, January 21, 2020, 9:00 a.m.

19 Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings
20
21
22

23 REPORTED BY:

24 BILL NELSON, RMR, CCR #191
25 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

1
2
3 APPEARANCES:
4

5 For the Plaintiff: William Sykes, Esq.
6 George Kunz, Esq.

7 For the Defendants: Michael Royal, Esq.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Las Vegas, Nevada, Tuesday, January 21, 2020

2 * * * * *

3 THE COURT: Page 3, Sekera versus Venetian
4 Casino.

5 MR. SYKES: William Sykes for the
6 Plaintiff, and George Kunz.

7 MR. ROYAL: Mike Royal for the Defendants,
8 Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Good morning, everybody.

10 Good to see you.

11 Thank you.

12 So I guess I just want to make sure I'm not
13 missing something, and there's not some confusion.

14 I just realized I probably should have
15 called another matter.

16 The Discovery Commissioner's report
17 recommendation has been disputed in some degree by
18 both sides, and the concern's over the limitations
19 placed on it on by both counsel on the discovery, and
20 some limitations placed on the protection.

21 So we need to unpack that and kind of
22 figure out where the dust is going to lay on that.

23 Obviously the easiest thing would be, you
24 know the Discovery Commissioner did her job all good,
25 especially in this case, but when it comes to these

1 type of things, these sort of nuances, it helps to
2 have a complete record.

3 I do think it helps to have an opportunity
4 to be heard from counsel where their concerns were.

5 But what is happening on the stay side on
6 the appeals, or the appeals side?

7 MR. ROYAL: Your Honor, everything has been
8 submitted, been briefed, and the Court of Appeals is
9 still considering the issue related to discovery.

10 THE COURT: No indication of the oral
11 argument or anything like that?

12 MR. SYKES: Not at this time.

13 THE COURT: So I should know this answer.

14 But you don't perceive that has any affect
15 on this, and everything else is going forward?

16 Because I -- just there was some --
17 obviously what you're challenging is some overlapping
18 with this.

19 MR. ROYAL: We certainly think that at
20 least some of the issues at play here definitely are
21 bootstrapping to what we have there.

22 THE COURT: That was my concern because as
23 I went through the pleadings, as very thorough now as
24 they are in this case, very thorough, I didn't really
25 see a lot of acknowledgment like, oops, we want to

1 wait on this because the stay's out there, and we
2 have all the arguments about why we shouldn't be more
3 than five years, or should be less than five years,
4 or shouldn't go forward in time, and all of those
5 nuances, but I didn't really see how this might be
6 impacted.

7 Of course I have no insight as to whether
8 the Appellate Courts might do anything. It would be
9 nice if we had some idea, but we have no idea.

10 MR. SYKES: Your Honor, with regard to
11 that, I think the main issue that is up on the writ
12 in front of Court of Appeals is whether or not the
13 reports are going to be redacted or not is one of the
14 primary issues.

15 THE COURT: But the Discovery Commissioner
16 Truman did order unredacted here in response to some
17 of these things.

18 So would your agreement be to provide them
19 redacted, until it can be decided, or allow them to
20 be -- I guess I'm looking at you -- but allow them to
21 be provided redacted until decided, or hold off on
22 that piece?

23 That's my concern.

24 MR. SYKES: It's my understanding, and
25 counsel can correct me if I'm wrong, but there's no

1 real dispute as to producing unredacted reports, at
2 least some have already been produced, and I think
3 there is a dispute as to whether or not the reports
4 should be provided subsequent to this incident, that
5 is going to be a big issue.

6 I think we can address that today.

7 I don't know that we need to wait for the
8 Court of Appeals to rule on the redaction issue.

9 MR. ROYAL: Your Honor, if I can respond to
10 that.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. ROYAL: We do not agree that we should
13 produce documents in an unredacted form.

14 And the other issue before the Court of
15 Appeals is, whether or not they should be protected.

16 So if we were to -- What the Discovery
17 Commissioner essentially recommended is, that we
18 produce unredacted reports for over a period of eight
19 years, which would include reports up to today in
20 unredacted form --

21 THE COURT: Right.

22 MR. ROYAL: -- and in an unprotected form.

23 So that they would have access to what
24 happened today, or what have you, and do what they
25 have done previously, which is share it with whoever

1 they want to share it with.

2 THE COURT: Here's the tricky part about
3 the protection.

4 I get what you're saying, counsel, but I
5 thought we had had a discussion about how that would
6 be -- that information would be utilized, but maybe
7 we didn't clarify our intent there, but if they get
8 redacted, they can't follow up with the people and
9 can't figure out what really happened in the cases,
10 and that is clearly part of the need for discovery.

11 If you are just giving them a date and a
12 brief synopsis, or whatever it is you're giving them,
13 and have no way to contact anybody because you have
14 no idea who these people are, it doesn't mean
15 anything to the Plaintiffs.

16 The Court did allow punitive damages to
17 remain, and these things are arguably relevant to
18 that.

19 So I mean that is why it was ordered to be
20 unredacted.

21 I don't know that when we previously
22 ordered it we anticipated it being fully unprotected,
23 but that's a different issue.

24 I guess my concern is, how do we do this?

25 One of the ways we could do this is, we

1 could just make a decision on everything the
2 Discovery Commissioner ordered, and then to the
3 extent that you have a concern about how what we
4 ordered here today impacts what you're challenging,
5 you add that to what is up on appeal.

6 I mean, that is generally what happens,
7 right, you have your judgment, and that's challenged,
8 and then you get a ruling on the fees and costs and
9 retaxing of costs, and somebody doesn't like that
10 outcome, and then they go and consolidate it, and the
11 Court of Appeals deals with all of it, that almost
12 seems like that is how we should do it just to have
13 the cleanest record, because if I hold out, don't
14 rule on some things waiting to see what the Court of
15 Appeals does, and then I rule on other things, I
16 don't know in practical terms how that is going to
17 work anyway given one of the largest is the
18 redaction.

19 I can certainly make a determination on the
20 time scope, and certainly make a determination on
21 location of incident scope, that seems to also be in
22 dispute, whether it's limited to The Grand Lux area
23 or casino as well, and make those rulings, but I
24 think if we don't do the whole kit and caboodle, you
25 don't have what you're going to have anything further

1 if you wish to based on the outcome to challenge, and
2 then we don't really have a full understanding from
3 the Court of Appeals either.

4 So the last thought on how we might
5 structure today -- or just wait -- but that doesn't
6 serve anybody's purposes I don't think.

7 You got to keep going forward with what
8 you're doing.

9 MR. ROYAL: I think, Your Honor, in light
10 of what we're both arguing for, I think the scope is
11 obviously the biggest issue.

12 MR. SYKES: Yes.

13 MR. ROYAL: And the Court may determine if
14 the Court -- depending on the Court's ruling today if
15 -- it may not, it may or may not impact the issues
16 that are presently before the Court of Appeals.

17 THE COURT: Right.

18 I think we should just go forward and make
19 a decision on all of what is before us today without
20 trying to carve out anything we think may be
21 implicated by a future determination by the Court of
22 Appeals, and if the outcome is such that you feel,
23 counsel, that it should be added to what is before
24 the Court of Appeals, then that would make sense to
25 me and make the cleanest record.

1 So let's deal with all of it, and as I
2 said, I sort of generalized it as to this time scope,
3 and then the location scope, and that seems to be the
4 biggest arguments the Plaintiff raises, and then with
5 any further objections and response seems to be kind
6 of what we're focusing on.

7 So you do want to start, counsel?

8 MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor.

9 Just briefly, we thoroughly briefed this
10 issue, but our objection is fairly limited as to our
11 primary objection to the Discovery Commissioner's
12 report and recommendations is, she limits our ability
13 to obtain coefficient of friction testing to the
14 Grand Lux area, and there was also an issue of where
15 they removed carpet, intentionally put the slick
16 polished marble surface in this area, as well as
17 other areas throughout casino, and she limited that
18 to the Grand Lux area as well.

19 THE COURT: Let's hit the points as we go
20 along what is being argued in opposition to your
21 objection on that subject as pointed out by counsel.

22 Is there not some acknowledgment by the
23 experts that different areas have different testing
24 up to this point, and that it doesn't make sense to
25 go beyond the scope of the area where the incident

1 occurred?

2 MR. SYKES: Yeah, I wanted to clarify that
3 as well.

4 So the testimony, at least of our expert,
5 there's a representation that our expert said this
6 was a unique area.

7 Our expert didn't say that.

8 Our expert, what he said was, depending on
9 the area, the slip resistance could change depending
10 on different variables.

11 However, we would at least like the
12 opportunity to determine what type of flooring they
13 have throughout the Venetian. It's my understanding
14 it's all polished marble.

15 If they want to make a distinction that
16 it's not the same polished marble, has different slip
17 resistance characteristics, coefficient of friction
18 testing would prove or disprove that. I think it
19 would be fairly simple for our expert to go out, do
20 that testing, but it's my understanding the surfaces
21 throughout the Venetian, at least the marble
22 surfaces, if not identical, are substantially similar
23 to the point were similar enough where we could
24 consider slip-and-falls in those areas as well as
25 giving notice to the Venetian, but they had a

1 hazardous condition, a continuous hazardous condition
2 on their premises, so that was the basis to our
3 objection of the Discovery Commissioner's ruling.

4 If they, the Venetian, wants to focus
5 specifically on the Grand Lux rotunda area, I think
6 there needs to be some type of showing the marble
7 flooring elsewhere is somehow different,
8 substantively different, with different slip
9 resistance values, and I don't mean within a
10 percentage point, I mean 20 percent different, 30
11 percent different, something like that, with a
12 substantial difference between the marble because
13 there's marble floors throughout, and I believe
14 slip-and-falls throughout the property would provide
15 notice to the Venetian that this polished marble
16 floor presents a continuous hazard, and a defective
17 condition on the premises.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 What about the timing?

20 It is a little hard for at first blush to
21 take a look at this and say, there's any relevance to
22 what occurred subsequent.

23 If your argument is when this incident
24 occurred, they were on notice that this was a
25 problem, they had been arguably from your perspective

1 were not acknowledging, not dealing with what they
2 needed to see as a recurring problem, how would what
3 occurred subsequent have anything to do with that
4 argument?

5 MR. SYKES: Yes, to address that question
6 there's three main issues that go to that issue.

7 First, the reason why it's relevant, it's a
8 continuous hazard and a defective condition on the
9 premises, and there were slip-and-falls occurring
10 subsequent to our client's slip-and-fall would tend
11 to prove that -- or show it's an ongoing hazard, a
12 continuous hazard, and a defective condition on the
13 premises. So there's that.

14 Second, it goes to punitive damages as to
15 the reprehensibility of the conduct of the Venetian.

16 If the Venetian is continuing to allow the
17 dangerous condition to exist, and people are
18 continuing to fall, slip-and-fall on the premises and
19 get injured, and be taken away in an ambulance, or at
20 least report injuries to the EMTs, I think that goes
21 to the reprehensibility of the Venetian's conduct,
22 and we provided case law in support of that in the
23 brief.

24 THE COURT: Now, were you also asking to go
25 further back in time since five years prior to the

1 incident?

2 MR. SYKES: We were.

3 And the reason for that is, that we did
4 have some testimony from employees of the Venetian,
5 one former EMT said they responded to 150 and 175
6 falls, and that started in 2008.

7 Then there was evidence that the floor was
8 changed from carpet to marble I think as early as
9 2013, maybe a little later than that, and it's my
10 understanding that the slip-and-falls, the amount of
11 slip-and-falls significantly increased, and the
12 Venetian did nothing to fix it, so that was our
13 client's, our concern with that particular issue as
14 well.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 Anything else you want to highlight?

17 MR. SYKES: Yes.

18 The third point, I don't know to the extent
19 this was addressed in the briefing, but I wanted to
20 bring it up, the Venetian seems to have an
21 affirmative defense in this case, Judge, that our
22 client walked through this area hundreds of times
23 before she slipped and fell and never had a problem,
24 and therefore the floor is safe. That is kind of the
25 argument they are making, even include it -- they

1 reference it a couple times in their briefing.

2 We should be allowed to rebut that argument
3 and rebut that affirmative defense, and bring up the
4 totality of the falls, not only from before the
5 incident, but after the incident, and show there's a
6 pattern here, a trend here, of people slipping and
7 falling throughout the casino floor, it wasn't just
8 my client just because she didn't -- or slipped once,
9 and in 200 steps, or whatever their argument is, it
10 doesn't mean other people didn't slip in that very
11 same area, or throughout the casino floor.

12 So it's our position they opened the door,
13 Judge.

14 If they are going to make that argument at
15 trial, they are going to argue we didn't have actual
16 notice, didn't have constructive notice -- and by the
17 way, the Plaintiffs walked through there hundreds of
18 times and didn't slip and fall before, therefore it's
19 safe.

20 We should be able to bring up the total
21 number of falls both before and after her incident
22 because they will try to make it sound like she
23 wasn't paying attention, she was being clumsy, and it
24 was just an isolated incident, where I think we can
25 demonstrate it's not an isolated incident, people

1 slipped before and after, and we don't mean a couple,
2 hundreds before, and probably hundreds after.

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 Counsel.

5 MR. ROYAL: The representations there was
6 an increase in slip-and-falls after some change in
7 flooring is completely unfounded.

8 I think what we have to remember is, that
9 the Plaintiff has testified, and we know she worked
10 at the property for almost a year prior to the
11 incident, and yes, she made probably more than a
12 thousand trips through this Grand Lux area
13 successfully, not only without slipping and falling
14 herself, but without ever seeing any kind of a
15 foreign substance on the floor, without seeing anyone
16 slip and fall, without hearing about any kind of
17 slip-and-falls, and yes, that is we certainly want to
18 bring that up.

19 We also want to bring up the fact that in
20 this particular case all 11 of the people who were
21 present at the scene after the incident -- or rather
22 of the 11 -- Let me say that again.

23 All 11 of the people present at the scene
24 have been deposed in this case. Of those 11, 10 have
25 verified -- or at least they verified they did not

1 see anything on the floor.

2 There's one person who testified there was
3 something on the floor, and his testimony is
4 completely rebutted just by reviewing the video
5 evidence.

6 Now, as to some of these issues, I think
7 the fact is that the testimony that Plaintiff has
8 given is that she reported to her post daily, she
9 walked through this Grand Lux area back and forth at
10 least twice daily for hundreds of days prior to the
11 incident, that is the area in question.

12 There's no testimony that she was walking
13 up and down other areas of the property, and so that
14 particular information about other slip-and-falls in
15 other areas of the property is simply from our
16 position not relevant.

17 Also, the testimony of Tom Jennings in his
18 deposition in the Smith case he performed coefficient
19 of friction testing in an area which he said was
20 within 80 to 100 feet of the area where Miss Sekera
21 fell. His coefficient of friction testing was
22 different, and was significantly different.

23 He tested dry point 90, tested dry in the
24 area of 0.070, that is a significant difference, and
25 so he testified that -- I asked him what the

1 differences would be, and he testified there is a lot
2 of them, it could be pedestrian traffic, could be how
3 the floors are cleaned, could be the shoes and so
4 forth that are worn, and he tested this area -- and
5 by the way this their expert has tested the area
6 where the Plaintiff fell, so where -- or where is it
7 going to get us from a relevancy standpoint for
8 expert testing in other areas outside The Grand Lux?

9 They are going to want testing done on the
10 10th floor, testing done in the front desk area,
11 testing done wherever, which is not anywhere near
12 where the Plaintiff at least testified she's been in
13 this case.

14 THE COURT: You brought up Mr. Jennings.
15 There were obviously a couple of aspects of the
16 Discovery Commissioner's report and recommendation
17 dealt with Mr. Jennings being able to be re-deposed,
18 getting additional information.

19 Is that in dispute here?

20 I didn't see that being disputed here.

21 MR. SYKES: Not necessarily, Judge.

22 And I think what it was, there's a number
23 of incident reports out there we have possession of,
24 some I believe they have possession of, additional
25 reports that have yet to be produced, and so I think

1 what it was, was once those reports were produced,
2 that they would have an opportunity to depose Mr.
3 Jennings at least on those, that new information is
4 my understanding.

5 THE COURT: Okay.

6 MR. SYKES: I don't know if there's a
7 dispute as to that, but that's my understanding.

8 THE COURT: I didn't see that being really
9 referenced here.

10 MR. ROYAL: What is supposed to occur under
11 the Discovery Commissioner's report and
12 recommendation is, that the Plaintiff is supposed to
13 produce every single report that they gave -- that
14 they have in their possession, they've obtained,
15 we're supposed to get those, that is not in dispute,
16 there's no objection to that, and we haven't received
17 those yet.

18 MR. SYKES: That's correct.

19 MR. ROYAL: We're waiting to get those
20 before we take Mr. Jennings' deposition, but since
21 you brought up Mr. Jennings, he testified that in a
22 four year -- or four-and-a-half year period that
23 there were 196 incidents in The Grand Lux area, that
24 was his testimony.

25 Now we dispute that, but that's his

1 testimony, and we don't have those documents yet, and
2 when we get those, we will retake his deposition, but
3 I think that goes to -- again, it goes to our
4 position that the scope should be limited to The
5 Grand Lux area, the scope of all the issues related
6 to the flooring in this case.

7 You know the Discovery Commissioner
8 actually initially limited the scope of the other
9 incident reports to The Grand Lux area, until she was
10 advised by counsel that in our initial disclosure we
11 produced some reports outside the area of the Grand
12 Lux, which we did as a courtesy to counsel.

13 We did not feel we had to do that the
14 second time around in this battle, and she changed
15 her mind, she essentially made a waiver kind of an
16 argument, well if you produce some stuff outside
17 before, now you have to produce another five years.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 Anything else you want to tell us?

20 MR. ROYAL: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

21 I just wanted to say, as far as the
22 subsequent incident reports, that is all based on the
23 Discovery Commissioner -- remember this is a
24 transient condition.

25 Now they keep using the word, defective.

1 There's nothing defective about it for
2 millions of people that walked through the Venetian
3 that don't slip and fall. But that is what this is.

4 So the Discovery Commissioner indicated she
5 would not provide or order or recommend subsequent
6 incident reports under circumstances of a transient
7 condition such as what we have here.

8 The only reason she ordered that is because
9 of the fact there's a punitive damages claim the
10 Court has allowed to be filed, and I just, Your Honor
11 -- there's no -- at least I can't find any -- Nevada
12 Law that supports that.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 Anything else, counsel?

15 MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor.

16 Just as a reminder, this was something
17 addressed in prior motion practice, and was stated
18 the Plaintiff should be allowed to conduct discovery
19 to support the punitive damages claim.

20 Again, it goes back too reprehensibility of
21 conduct of the Venetian.

22 I don't understand why the Venetian is
23 attempting to hide these additional slip and fall
24 reports, it's quite concerning to me because it tends
25 to indicate to me that they have a lot more actual

1 constructive notice than they are representing to the
2 Court and will represent to the jury if this goes to
3 a trial. I have a very strong concern with that.

4 If their question -- or issue is
5 admissibility, that is not the standard.

6 The standard is, whether it's proportional
7 and whether it's relevant to the case, and it most
8 certainly is, particularly with regard to their
9 argument our client walked through there hundreds of
10 times, and now they are saying thousands of times,
11 and didn't slip before, therefore the floor is safe.

12 If that's the argument, we should be
13 entitled to rebut that argument, know how many people
14 have slipped and fallen on the casino floor.

15 If they want to argue the slip resistance
16 is different, we can send experts out to do that
17 testing, it wouldn't be that difficult to perform,
18 and they can argue over whether or not it's similar
19 enough, and we can hash that out.

20 But this is a case where there was a
21 significant injury. The client is scheduled to have
22 a fusion surgery, she did have a spinal injury,
23 there's an indication she hit her head on a pillar
24 and did sustain significant injuries as a result of
25 this slip-and-fall, so it's not -- we're not arguing

1 on a sprain/strain here, and at this point this is
2 information that needs to be provided, we need to
3 have the opportunity to rebut their argument.

4 Otherwise, we go into trial with one arm
5 behind our backs, they get to say our client walked
6 through the area thousands of time, but we don't get
7 to talk about all the slip-and-falls that happened.

8 So at a minimum it's discovery, whether or
9 not it comes down to being admissible, that depends
10 on what is ultimately discovered, so I think at a
11 minimum we should be entitled to at least see the
12 information.

13 If the Defendant's asking for some type of
14 protective order, that is something we can address,
15 but at a minimum we should be at least be able to see
16 the information, the slip-and-falls, and go from
17 there.

18 THE COURT: All right.

19 I want to make sure I address each of the
20 topics, so I'm going to tell you my thoughts, and if
21 I miss anything, you let me know, so we can get your
22 verification.

23 I do think that it's an error on the part
24 of the Discovery Commissioner to extend the
25 requirement for reports beyond the date of the

1 incident in the case. I don't understand coming
2 forward to the present, I really don't.

3 I understand the argument that we're trying
4 to show that this was, or is, a defective condition,
5 that this is reprehensible conduct, but the reality
6 is your argument about that what was existing prior
7 to your client's incident, what occurred subsequent
8 to that I don't see being relevant, and think it
9 blows this thing up to a different proportion to
10 where we originally argued we were -- as far as all
11 of the instances occurred prior they had not
12 revealed, and arguably again I'm not saying these are
13 the findings made, but the arguments about all these
14 incidents prior to, they knew this condition and
15 should have corrected the condition before my client
16 fell and didn't do that, the subsequent you still get
17 where you need to go counsel for your client with
18 what the Discovery Commissioner or what was allowed
19 in terms of the five years prior to the incident, but
20 the additional up to the present, I think that is in
21 error, so the limitation will be to the date of the
22 incident and five years prior, as originally
23 determined by the Discovery Commissioner, and not
24 subsequent to that date.

25 To the extent that addresses any other

1 issues with regard to the arguments about whether
2 testing should be produced, or the concern the
3 Discovery Commissioner granted protection, at least
4 so far as to the vagueness of the coefficient of
5 friction testing, I don't think that that is
6 necessary really to anything subsequent.

7 The only issue about -- the other issue of
8 scope, which is does it stay in The Grand Lux area,
9 or also implicates the casino, I think it stays in
10 the Grand Lux area, that is where the incident
11 occurred, where the situation is, I don't think they
12 need to prove the other areas are different.

13 The point is, you got a client fell in a
14 particular area, you got an argument there were lots
15 of other slip-and-falls in that area, it's not
16 addressed, it creates a condition for folks, it's
17 hazardous, and they knew about it, didn't fix it,
18 this case needs to be limited to that area, not the
19 other areas of the casino where they might have put
20 down carpet or similar marble.

21 I already -- I think it was the right thing
22 to do, so I'm not questioning that, but I already
23 allowed the scope of this case -- I think it is far
24 beyond what other folks might have allowed in the
25 sense of saying, yes, of course you can look at it,

1 you got a punitive damages claim, you can look at all
2 of these other things in these reports and know they
3 shouldn't have to be redacted because you should be
4 able to contact these folks, find out what occurred
5 in those cases, but it's still a relevant time period
6 that you need to be looking at, and to me that is
7 when the incident occurred, and prior, and in the
8 area where the incident occurred.

9 So to the extent the Discovery Commissioner
10 determinations -- allows for discovery of anything
11 beyond the date of the incident, or outside of the
12 Grand Lux area, that will be reversed.

13 Whatever else the Discovery Commissioner
14 allowed to take place or ruled on should remain.

15 Do you need further clarification on that?

16 We can go one by one on the report and
17 recommendations.

18 I think it's understood once I find those
19 limitations what is impacted there.

20 MR. SYKES: They did produce slip-and-fall
21 reports occurred outside of the Grand Lux area
22 initially in this case.

23 Are we still allowed to reference those
24 areas?

25 In their initial disclosures they did

1 disclose slip-and-falls on marble outside of the
2 Grand Lux area. Are we still allowed to conduct
3 discovery into those incidence?

4 THE COURT: To what end, counsel?

5 I'm not likely to revisit this issue, and
6 whether they produced those things or not, I don't
7 think it is a waiver to open the door because again
8 you are still under the umbrella of what is relevant.

9 If the Court made a determination the only
10 thing relevant is the Grand Lux area, whatever else
11 they produced is irrelevant, I don't see why you
12 should be able to conduct discovery in that area --
13 or why it would be have some utility to you they
14 produced documentation. I guess arguably you could
15 conduct discovery on whatever it is they produced to
16 you, but at this point seems to me that the Court's
17 determination here in dealing with this Discovery
18 Commissioner's report and recommendation is to say,
19 the relevant areas, and what is even calculated to
20 lead to relevant information is the Grand Lux area
21 only, and that time frame only. I don't see where
22 you get a benefit looking at the others.

23 If you're looking for me to have a ruling
24 that you can't do discovery on those things, show me
25 in the Discovery Commissioner's report and

1 recommendation where that is addressed, and I can
2 tell you how I think that should be resolved, but
3 it's not addressed in there.

4 I know it was addressed in there as perhaps
5 some justification to allow the other discovery, but
6 I'm not allowing that now, but in terms of just
7 dealing with what already is produced, that may need
8 to be like subject to how you conduct your discovery
9 in the future in some requested protection in the
10 future.

11 I just want to keep this record clean by
12 dealing with the Discovery Commissioner's report and
13 recommendation, not okay, what does this mean to that
14 because that muddies the waters, I think.

15 MR. SYKES: One other question.

16 To the extent there's coefficient of
17 friction testing from another part of the casino
18 floor, that is substantially similar or identical to
19 that of the Grand Lux Cafe, are we allowed to conduct
20 discovery into that?

21 THE COURT: How would you have that?

22 You mean something they already produced
23 indicates they have done that testing?

24 Because at this point again if the Court's
25 saying the primary findings if you will is the Grand

1 Lux area only, and time frame is incident prior only,
2 then would you be saying you would want to do
3 coefficient friction in these other areas as part of
4 your discovery, or have you already been provided
5 evidence that has occurred?

6 MR. SYKES: Probably a little bit of both.

7 I don't know the answer at this point in
8 time, but it's possible one of our expert may have
9 access to that information, I don't know, I'd have to
10 go ask.

11 And we would obviously like the opportunity
12 to conduct full coefficient of friction testing of
13 other parts of the casino to see if the floors are
14 identical or similar.

15 THE COURT: Let me give counsel an
16 opportunity to say anything you want to say.

17 MR. ROYAL: Your Honor, we produced --
18 Obviously I questioned Mr. Jennings about some prior
19 testing he did at the property that was close by the
20 Grand Lux, but it was technically outside it, but
21 beyond that we maybe produced maybe one other report
22 also from the Smith case, but that is all the
23 production we've done.

24 I should add that -- Strike that.

25 I won't add that.

1 The only thing I would add is, as relates
2 to the two years beyond the five years, can I just
3 suggest that they be -- or we can produce those
4 timely to counsel, if they can be produced in
5 redacted form with a protective order, at least
6 temporarily until we get some kind of a ruling from
7 the Court of Appeals?

8 THE COURT: The way it's going to go is,
9 the time frame that was decided by the Discovery
10 Commissioner, which as I understand it was from the
11 incident, five years prior, but not the time frame
12 forward.

13 And it's unredacted is how the Court
14 ordered the stuff to go before, and it's I guess you
15 used the term unprotected, it's also that, and -- but
16 it's not the future, it's only from the incident
17 prior.

18 And I guess to eliminate any -- I guess to
19 try to continue to shape this properly, I will say,
20 no testing of any areas outside the Grand Lux dome
21 area that is irrelevant to this area where the
22 slip-and-fall occurred.

23 And I would say, no to conducting discovery
24 on what might have been produced related to that
25 area.

1 Now the Court's making a determination for
2 clarification purposes. Its intent was the discovery
3 be to the area in question.

4 This idea that we're going to say, wait a
5 minute, they have now placed -- or might have the
6 same or some similar marble in other areas that
7 aren't implicated by this slip-and-fall is part of
8 the thing that stands out, counsel forms my decision,
9 there is a lot of the discussion about like, look,
10 you got fast food areas, and people can go get drinks
11 and are walking through here, and they are spilling
12 things, and you should know all of that, it's very
13 unique to this area that you are asking.

14 This idea now to go and say, we want to
15 look at marble in the casino, and marble other
16 places, and think it's the same, and would be the
17 same problem, and have issues, and they should have
18 known this, that it's relevant to this, it's too much
19 of a stretch.

20 I have already given you what you need to
21 have to show of that particular area and those
22 particular circumstances in that particular area why
23 on that particular day you argue it wasn't safe, it
24 was a condition that they should have known and had
25 fixed, and it's a problem because of the marble,

1 because of spillage, because of whatever, and they
2 knew it because all these things occurred prior and
3 didn't fix it, but it's limited to that.

4 So I don't see any discovery being relevant
5 or appropriate to any marble areas outside that area,
6 and for any testing to take place to try to show
7 similarity to that marble outside that area.

8 MR. SYKES: One thing I wanted to clarify,
9 Judge, and I know it was represented in a brief our
10 expert said the Grand Lux was in the area, he did not
11 say that, one thing to keep in mind is that there's
12 no public area in the Venetian I'm aware of where
13 drinks are banned, it's my understanding drinks are
14 served on the casino floor, drinks are served at the
15 tables --

16 THE COURT: I get all that.

17 MR. SYKES: -- throughout.

18 THE COURT: But that is not the point,
19 counsel.

20 I understand what you want to do, but I
21 have to have some semblance of structure on this
22 thing, and this is not a discovery on the entire
23 Venetian Casino where they might have marble.

24 This is a discovery of an area of the
25 Venetian Hotel where a slip-and-fall occurred, and

1 your concerns about that period, because whether or
2 not drinks are served elsewhere, and whether or not
3 there might be similar marble elsewhere, it's the
4 confluence of all of the things unique to that area
5 that matter, not all these other areas.

6 So I really do think that is a sufficient
7 explanation, goes far beyond the scope of what is
8 necessary, and I think you have more than enough
9 information looking at the five years prior, and in
10 that area, and the unredacted to be able to go and do
11 follow-up with those people to see what that is to
12 try to prove your theory of the case, and I think
13 otherwise it keeps it to a reasonable limitation.

14 This idea of there's marble other places in
15 the Venetian, and there might have been
16 slip-and-falls other places in the Venetian, and
17 might be drinks served other places, that is really
18 neither here nor there for this incident, and what
19 occurred related to this incident, and where it
20 occurred.

21 I have to reign it in now for everybody.

22 MR. SYKES: With regard to the two years, I
23 think the missing reports counsel was mentioning at
24 this point, we would agree to accept the unredacted
25 copies, be willing not to produce those outside of

1 the case, until we get a ruling from the Court of
2 Appeals.

3 THE COURT: I think that seems fair.

4 You can write that up in your order.

5 I'm going to -- because I mean, I know both
6 sides sort of objected, but I guess at this point
7 I'll put the burden on Plaintiffs to let Mr. Royal
8 have a chance to see the order obviously, and add
9 anything, the reports for the missing time frame that
10 need to be produced unredacted, at least until the
11 Court of Appeals makes a ruling in your case.

12 Anything else?

13 MR. ROYAL: Yeah.

14 Could we just redact them and produce them
15 as they were previously if that's our stipulation?

16 That way I won't have to ask the Court for
17 a stay and file something --

18 THE COURT: No.

19 I understand why you want to redact them,
20 but that is not the ruling in the case, and until the
21 Court of Appeals Court says so, it's not the ruling
22 in the case, and if that's what they say, that's what
23 they say, I'll live with that, but they need to get
24 it, this case needs to move forward.

25 And if they are not going to go outside the

1 case, your bigger concern is they are sharing with
2 other members of the Plaintiff's bar they are not
3 going to do that, that will be written in the order,
4 so it needs to be provided.

5 MR. ROYAL: I just want to for the record
6 ask the Court if we could get like a brief stay from
7 the order allowing us to bring this up --

8 THE COURT: It's going to take a while for
9 the order to be printed, and I want it in ten days,
10 you got basically ten days, it's not going to take a
11 long time, you have written very voluminous
12 briefings, got a good staff there, know what to do.

13 If you want to try to dispute it, you can
14 put something together, so the second it's signed you
15 can take something up.

16 The Court of Appeals already granted the
17 stay related to that stuff.

18 If you're adding more to it, I'm sure they
19 will do the same thing, but you can put in if you
20 want in the order the Court declined your oral
21 request for a stay at this time, so it already shows
22 because I think that is how Rule 8 or 9, whichever
23 one it is that sort of says, you don't have to come
24 back to the District Court and ask for the stay if
25 there's a futile issue, and it would be basically

1 futile, you can go get it from them.

2 Okay. I think we got what we need.

3 MR. ROYAL: Thank you.

4 THE COURT: If there are any disputes about
5 the order, send me your competing letter, and we'll
6 take care of it.

7 MR. SYKES: Thank you, Judge.

8 THE COURT: Thank you.

9 (Proceedings concluded.)

1
2
3 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
4

5 I, Bill Nelson, a Certified Court Reporter
6 in and for the State of Nevada, hereby certify that
7 pursuant to NRS 2398.030 I have not included the
8 Social Security number of any person within this
9 document.

10 I further Certify that I am not a relative
11 or employee of any party involved in said action, not
12 a person financially interested in said action.
13
14

15 /s/ Bill Nelson

16 Bill Nelson, RMR, CCR 191
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF NEVADA)

) ss.

CLARK COUNTY)

I, Bill Nelson, RMR, CCR 191, do hereby
certify that I reported the foregoing proceedings;
that the same is true and correct as reflected by my
original machine shorthand notes taken at said time
and place.

/s/ Bill Nelson

Bill Nelson, RMR, CCR 191
Certified Court Reporter
Las Vegas, Nevada

#	a.m [1] - 1:18 ability [1] - 10:12 able [6] - 15:20, 18:17, 23:15, 26:4, 27:12, 33:10 accept [1] - 33:24 access [2] - 6:23, 29:9 acknowledging [1] - 13:1 acknowledgment [2] - 4:25, 10:22 action [2] - 37:11, 37:12 actual [2] - 15:15, 21:25 add [5] - 8:5, 29:24, 29:25, 30:1, 34:8 added [1] - 9:23 adding [1] - 35:18 additional [4] - 18:18, 18:24, 21:23, 24:20 address [4] - 6:6, 13:5, 23:14, 23:19 addressed [6] - 14:19, 21:17, 25:16, 28:1, 28:3, 28:4 addresses [1] - 24:25 admissibility [1] - 22:5 admissible [1] - 23:9 advised [1] - 20:10 affect [1] - 4:14 agree [2] - 6:12, 33:24 agreement [1] - 5:18 AL [1] - 1:12 allow [5] - 5:19, 5:20, 7:16, 13:16, 28:5 allowed [10] - 15:2, 21:10, 21:18, 24:18, 25:23, 25:24, 26:14, 26:23, 27:2, 28:19 allowing [2] - 28:6, 35:7 allows [1] - 26:10 almost [2] - 8:11, 16:10 ambulance [1] - 13:19 amount [1] - 14:10 answer [2] - 4:13, 29:7 anticipated [1] - 7:22 anyway [1] - 8:17 appeal [1] - 8:5 appeals [2] - 4:6 Appeals [15] - 4:8, 5:12, 6:8, 6:15, 8:11, 8:15, 9:3, 9:16, 9:22, 9:24, 30:7, 34:2, 34:11, 34:21, 35:16 APPEARANCES [1] - 2:3 Appellate [1] - 5:8 appropriate [1] - 32:5 area [51] - 8:22, 10:14, 10:16, 10:18, 10:25, 11:6, 11:9, 12:5, 14:22, 15:11, 16:12, 17:9, 17:11, 17:19, 17:20, 17:24, 18:4, 18:5, 18:10, 19:23, 20:5, 20:9, 20:11, 23:6, 25:8, 25:10, 25:14, 25:15, 25:18, 26:8, 26:12, 26:21, 27:2, 27:10, 27:12, 27:20, 29:1, 30:21, 30:25, 31:3, 31:13, 31:21, 31:22, 32:5, 32:7, 32:10, 32:12, 32:24, 33:4, 33:10 areas [16] - 10:17, 10:23, 11:24, 17:13, 17:15, 18:8, 25:12, 25:19, 26:24, 27:19, 29:3, 30:20, 31:6, 31:10, 32:5, 33:5 arguably [4] - 7:17, 12:25, 24:12, 27:14 argue [4] - 15:15, 22:15, 22:18, 31:23 argued [2] - 10:20, 24:10 arguing [2] - 9:10, 22:25 argument [15] - 4:11, 12:23, 13:4, 14:25, 15:2, 15:9, 15:14, 20:16, 22:9, 22:12, 22:13, 23:3, 24:3, 24:6, 25:14 arguments [4] - 5:2, 10:4, 24:13, 25:1 arm [1] - 23:4 aspects [1] - 18:15 attempting [1] - 21:23 attention [1] - 15:23 aware [1] - 32:12	16:18, 16:19, 35:7 brought [2] - 18:14, 19:21 burden [1] - 34:7 BY [1] - 1:23
/		C
/s [2] - 37:15, 38:18		caboodle [1] - 8:24 Cafe [1] - 28:19 calculated [1] - 27:19 care [1] - 36:6 carpet [3] - 10:15, 14:8, 25:20 carve [1] - 9:20 Case [1] - 1:11 case [23] - 3:25, 4:24, 13:22, 14:21, 16:20, 16:24, 17:18, 18:13, 20:6, 22:7, 22:20, 24:1, 25:18, 25:23, 26:22, 29:22, 33:12, 34:1, 34:11, 34:20, 34:22, 34:24, 35:1 cases [2] - 7:9, 26:5 casino [11] - 8:23, 10:17, 15:7, 15:11, 22:14, 25:9, 25:19, 28:17, 29:13, 31:15, 32:14 Casino [2] - 3:4, 32:23 CASINO [1] - 1:12 CCR [4] - 1:24, 37:16, 38:10, 38:19 certainly [5] - 4:19, 8:19, 8:20, 16:17, 22:8 CERTIFICATE [1] - 37:3 CERTIFIED [1] - 1:25 Certified [2] - 37:5, 38:20 certify [2] - 37:6, 38:11 Certify [1] - 37:10 challenge [1] - 9:1 challenged [1] - 8:7 challenging [2] - 4:17, 8:4 chance [1] - 34:8 change [2] - 11:9, 16:6 changed [2] - 14:8, 20:14 characteristics [1] - 11:17 circumstances [2] - 21:6, 31:22 claim [3] - 21:9, 21:19, 26:1 clarification [2] - 26:15, 31:2 clarify [3] - 7:7, 11:2, 32:8 CLARK [2] - 1:6, 38:7 clean [1] - 28:11 cleaned [1] - 18:3 cleanest [2] - 8:13, 9:25 clearly [1] - 7:10 client [8] - 14:22, 15:8, 22:9, 22:21, 23:5, 24:15, 24:17, 25:13 client's [3] - 13:10, 14:13, 24:7
0		B
0.070 [1] - 17:24		backs [1] - 23:5 banned [1] - 32:13 bar [1] - 35:2 based [2] - 9:1, 20:22 basis [1] - 12:2 battle [1] - 20:14 behind [1] - 23:5 benefit [1] - 27:22 between [1] - 12:12 beyond [7] - 10:25, 23:25, 25:24, 26:11, 29:21, 30:2, 33:7 big [1] - 6:5 bigger [1] - 35:1 biggest [2] - 9:11, 10:4 BILL [1] - 1:24 Bill [6] - 37:5, 37:15, 37:16, 38:10, 38:18, 38:19 bit [1] - 29:6 blows [1] - 24:9 blush [1] - 12:20 bootstrapping [1] - 4:21 brief [4] - 7:12, 13:23, 32:9, 35:6 briefed [2] - 4:8, 10:9 briefing [2] - 14:19, 15:1 briefings [1] - 35:12 briefly [1] - 10:9 bring [6] - 14:20, 15:3, 15:20,
1		
10 [1] - 16:24 100 [1] - 17:20 10th [1] - 18:10 11 [4] - 16:20, 16:22, 16:23, 16:24 150 [1] - 14:5 175 [1] - 14:5 191 [3] - 37:16, 38:10, 38:19 196 [1] - 19:23		
2		
20 [1] - 12:10 200 [1] - 15:9 2008 [1] - 14:6 2013 [1] - 14:9 2020 [2] - 1:18, 3:1 21 [2] - 1:18, 3:1 2398.030 [1] - 37:7 25 [1] - 1:11		
3		
3 [1] - 3:3 30 [1] - 12:10		
8		
8 [1] - 35:22 80 [1] - 17:20		
9		
9 [1] - 35:22 90 [1] - 17:23 9:00 [1] - 1:18		
A		
A-18-772761-C [1] - 1:11		


<p>close ^[1] - 29:19 clumsy ^[1] - 15:23 coefficient ^[8] - 10:13, 11:17, 17:18, 17:21, 25:4, 28:16, 29:3, 29:12 coming ^[1] - 24:1 Commissioner ^[14] - 3:24, 5:15, 6:17, 8:2, 20:7, 20:23, 21:4, 23:24, 24:18, 24:23, 25:3, 26:9, 26:13, 30:10 COMMISSIONER'S ^[1] - 1:16 Commissioner's ^[8] - 3:16, 10:11, 12:3, 18:16, 19:11, 27:18, 27:25, 28:12 competing ^[1] - 36:5 complete ^[1] - 4:2 completely ^[2] - 16:7, 17:4 concern ^[8] - 4:22, 5:23, 7:24, 8:3, 14:13, 22:3, 25:2, 35:1 concern's ^[1] - 3:18 concerning ^[1] - 21:24 concerns ^[2] - 4:4, 33:1 concluded ^[1] - 36:9 condition ^[13] - 12:1, 12:17, 13:8, 13:12, 13:17, 20:24, 21:7, 24:4, 24:14, 24:15, 25:16, 31:24 conduct ^[11] - 13:15, 13:21, 21:18, 21:21, 24:5, 27:2, 27:12, 27:15, 28:8, 28:19, 29:12 conducting ^[1] - 30:23 confluence ^[1] - 33:4 confusion ^[1] - 3:13 consider ^[1] - 11:24 considering ^[1] - 4:9 consolidate ^[1] - 8:10 constructive ^[2] - 15:16, 22:1 contact ^[2] - 7:13, 26:4 continue ^[1] - 30:19 continuing ^[2] - 13:16, 13:18 continuous ^[4] - 12:1, 12:16, 13:8, 13:12 copies ^[1] - 33:25 correct ^[3] - 5:25, 19:18, 38:12 corrected ^[1] - 24:15 costs ^[2] - 8:8, 8:9 counsel ^[18] - 3:19, 4:4, 5:25, 7:4, 9:23, 10:7, 10:21, 16:4, 20:10, 20:12, 21:14, 24:17, 27:4, 29:15, 30:4, 31:8, 32:19, 33:23 COUNTY ^[2] - 1:6, 38:7 couple ^[3] - 15:1, 16:1, 18:15 course ^[2] - 5:7, 25:25 Court ^[29] - 4:8, 5:12, 6:8,</p>	<p>6:14, 7:16, 8:11, 8:14, 9:3, 9:13, 9:14, 9:16, 9:21, 9:24, 21:10, 22:2, 27:9, 30:7, 30:13, 34:1, 34:11, 34:16, 34:21, 35:6, 35:16, 35:20, 35:24, 37:5, 38:20 COURT ^[34] - 1:6, 1:25, 3:3, 3:9, 4:10, 4:13, 4:22, 5:15, 6:11, 6:21, 7:2, 9:17, 10:19, 12:18, 13:24, 14:15, 16:3, 18:14, 19:5, 19:8, 20:18, 21:13, 23:18, 27:4, 28:21, 29:15, 30:8, 32:16, 32:18, 34:3, 34:18, 35:8, 36:4, 36:8 Court's ^[4] - 9:14, 27:16, 28:24, 31:1 courtesy ^[1] - 20:12 Courts ^[1] - 5:8 creates ^[1] - 25:16</p>	<p>determined ^[1] - 24:23 difference ^[2] - 12:12, 17:24 differences ^[1] - 18:1 different ^[15] - 7:23, 10:23, 11:10, 11:16, 12:7, 12:8, 12:10, 12:11, 17:22, 22:16, 24:9, 25:12 difficult ^[1] - 22:17 disclose ^[1] - 27:1 disclosure ^[1] - 20:10 disclosures ^[1] - 26:25 discovered ^[1] - 23:10 Discovery ^[22] - 3:16, 3:24, 5:15, 6:16, 8:2, 10:11, 12:3, 18:16, 19:11, 20:7, 20:23, 21:4, 23:24, 24:18, 24:23, 25:3, 26:9, 26:13, 27:17, 27:25, 28:12, 30:9 DISCOVERY ^[1] - 1:16 discovery ^[19] - 3:19, 4:9, 7:10, 21:18, 23:8, 26:10, 27:3, 27:12, 27:15, 27:24, 28:5, 28:8, 28:20, 29:4, 30:23, 31:2, 32:4, 32:22, 32:24 discussion ^[2] - 7:5, 31:9 disprove ^[1] - 11:18 dispute ^[8] - 6:1, 6:3, 8:22, 18:19, 19:7, 19:15, 19:25, 35:13 disputed ^[2] - 3:17, 18:20 disputes ^[1] - 36:4 distinction ^[1] - 11:15 DISTRICT ^[1] - 1:6 District ^[1] - 35:24 document ^[1] - 37:9 documentation ^[1] - 27:14 documents ^[2] - 6:13, 20:1 dome ^[1] - 30:20 done ^[6] - 6:25, 18:9, 18:10, 18:11, 28:23, 29:23 door ^[2] - 15:12, 27:7 down ^[3] - 17:13, 23:9, 25:20 drinks ^[6] - 31:10, 32:13, 32:14, 33:2, 33:17 dry ^[2] - 17:23 dust ^[1] - 3:22</p>	<p>employees ^[1] - 14:4 EMT ^[1] - 14:5 EMTs ^[1] - 13:20 end ^[1] - 27:4 entire ^[1] - 32:22 entitled ^[2] - 22:13, 23:11 error ^[2] - 23:23, 24:21 especially ^[1] - 3:25 Esq ^[3] - 2:5, 2:5, 2:7 essentially ^[2] - 6:17, 20:15 ET ^[1] - 1:12 evidence ^[3] - 14:7, 17:5, 29:5 exist ^[1] - 13:17 existing ^[1] - 24:6 expert ^[9] - 11:4, 11:5, 11:7, 11:8, 11:19, 18:5, 18:8, 29:8, 32:10 experts ^[2] - 10:23, 22:16 explanation ^[1] - 33:7 extend ^[1] - 23:24 extent ^[5] - 8:3, 14:18, 24:25, 26:9, 28:16</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p>daily ^[2] - 17:8, 17:10 damages ^[5] - 7:16, 13:14, 21:9, 21:19, 26:1 dangerous ^[1] - 13:17 date ^[5] - 7:11, 23:25, 24:21, 24:24, 26:11 days ^[3] - 17:10, 35:9, 35:10 deal ^[1] - 10:1 dealing ^[4] - 13:1, 27:17, 28:7, 28:12 deals ^[1] - 8:11 dealt ^[1] - 18:17 decided ^[3] - 5:19, 5:21, 30:9 decision ^[3] - 8:1, 9:19, 31:8 declined ^[1] - 35:20 defective ^[6] - 12:16, 13:8, 13:12, 20:25, 21:1, 24:4 Defendant's ^[1] - 23:13 Defendants ^[3] - 1:13, 2:7, 3:7 defense ^[2] - 14:21, 15:3 definitely ^[1] - 4:20 degree ^[1] - 3:17 Delaney ^[1] - 1:17 demonstrate ^[1] - 15:25 depose ^[1] - 19:2 deposed ^[2] - 16:24, 18:17 deposition ^[3] - 17:18, 19:20, 20:2 Dept ^[1] - 1:11 desk ^[1] - 18:10 determination ^[6] - 8:19, 8:20, 9:21, 27:9, 27:17, 31:1 determinations ^[1] - 26:10 determine ^[2] - 9:13, 11:12</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <p>early ^[1] - 14:8 easiest ^[1] - 3:23 eight ^[1] - 6:18 EIGHTH ^[1] - 1:6 either ^[1] - 9:3 eliminate ^[1] - 30:18 elsewhere ^[3] - 12:7, 33:2, 33:3 employee ^[1] - 37:11</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>fact ^[3] - 16:19, 17:7, 21:9 fair ^[1] - 34:3 fairly ^[2] - 10:10, 11:19 fall ^[12] - 13:10, 13:18, 15:18, 16:16, 21:3, 21:23, 22:25, 26:20, 30:22, 31:7, 32:25 fallen ^[1] - 22:14 falling ^[2] - 15:7, 16:13 falls ^[16] - 11:24, 12:14, 13:9, 14:6, 14:10, 14:11, 15:4, 15:21, 16:6, 16:17, 17:14, 23:7, 23:16, 25:15, 27:1, 33:16 far ^[5] - 20:21, 24:10, 25:4, 25:23, 33:7 fast ^[1] - 31:10 fees ^[1] - 8:8 feet ^[1] - 17:20 fell ^[5] - 14:23, 17:21, 18:6, 24:16, 25:13 figure ^[2] - 3:22, 7:9 file ^[1] - 34:17 filed ^[1] - 21:10 financially ^[1] - 37:12 findings ^[2] - 24:13, 28:25 first ^[2] - 12:20, 13:7 five ^[9] - 5:3, 13:25, 20:17, 24:19, 24:22, 30:2, 30:11, 33:9 fix ^[3] - 14:12, 25:17, 32:3 fixed ^[1] - 31:25 floor ^[13] - 12:16, 14:7, 14:24, 15:7, 15:11, 16:15,</p>

17:1, 17:3, 18:10, 22:11, 22:14, 28:18, 32:14 flooring [4] - 11:12, 12:7, 16:7, 20:6 floors [3] - 12:13, 18:3, 29:13 focus [1] - 12:4 focusing [1] - 10:6 folks [3] - 25:16, 25:24, 26:4 follow [2] - 7:8, 33:11 follow-up [1] - 33:11 food [1] - 31:10 foregoing [1] - 38:11 foreign [1] - 16:15 form [4] - 6:13, 6:20, 6:22, 30:5 former [1] - 14:5 forms [1] - 31:8 forth [2] - 17:9, 18:4 forward [7] - 4:15, 5:4, 9:7, 9:18, 24:2, 30:12, 34:24 four [2] - 19:22 four-and-a-half [1] - 19:22 frame [5] - 27:21, 29:1, 30:9, 30:11, 34:9 friction [8] - 10:13, 11:17, 17:19, 17:21, 25:5, 28:17, 29:3, 29:12 front [2] - 5:12, 18:10 full [2] - 9:2, 29:12 fully [1] - 7:22 fusion [1] - 22:22 futile [2] - 35:25, 36:1 future [4] - 9:21, 28:9, 28:10, 30:16	13:11, 13:12 hazardous [3] - 12:1, 25:17 head [1] - 22:23 heard [1] - 4:4 hearing [1] - 16:16 helps [2] - 4:1, 4:3 hereby [2] - 37:6, 38:10 herself [1] - 16:14 hide [1] - 21:23 highlight [1] - 14:16 hit [2] - 10:19, 22:23 hold [2] - 5:21, 8:13 Honor [10] - 3:8, 4:7, 5:10, 6:9, 9:9, 10:8, 20:20, 21:10, 21:15, 29:17 Honorable [1] - 1:17 Hotel [1] - 32:25 hundreds [6] - 14:22, 15:17, 16:2, 17:10, 22:9	intent [2] - 7:7, 31:2 intentionally [1] - 10:15 interested [1] - 37:12 involved [1] - 37:11 irrelevant [2] - 27:11, 30:21 isolated [2] - 15:24, 15:25 issue [16] - 4:9, 5:11, 6:5, 6:8, 6:14, 7:23, 9:11, 10:10, 10:14, 13:6, 14:13, 22:4, 25:7, 27:5, 35:25 issues [8] - 4:20, 5:14, 9:15, 13:6, 17:6, 20:5, 25:1, 31:17	likely [1] - 27:5 limitation [2] - 24:21, 33:13 limitations [3] - 3:18, 3:20, 26:19 limited [7] - 8:22, 10:10, 10:17, 20:4, 20:8, 25:18, 32:3 limits [1] - 10:12 live [1] - 34:23 ILC [1] - 1:12 location [2] - 8:21, 10:3 look [5] - 12:21, 25:25, 26:1, 31:9, 31:15 looking [5] - 5:20, 26:6, 27:22, 27:23, 33:9 Lux [23] - 8:22, 10:14, 10:18, 12:5, 16:12, 17:9, 18:8, 19:23, 20:5, 20:9, 20:12, 25:8, 25:10, 26:12, 26:21, 27:2, 27:10, 27:20, 28:19, 29:1, 29:20, 30:20, 32:10
G	I	J	M
generalized [1] - 10:2 generally [1] - 8:6 George [2] - 2:5, 3:6 given [3] - 8:17, 17:8, 31:20 Grand [23] - 8:22, 10:14, 10:18, 12:5, 16:12, 17:9, 18:8, 19:23, 20:5, 20:9, 20:11, 25:8, 25:10, 26:12, 26:21, 27:2, 27:10, 27:20, 28:19, 28:25, 29:20, 30:20, 32:10 granted [2] - 25:3, 35:16 guess [8] - 3:12, 5:20, 7:24, 27:14, 30:14, 30:18, 34:6	idea [6] - 5:9, 7:14, 31:4, 31:14, 33:14 identical [3] - 11:22, 28:18, 29:14 impact [1] - 9:15 impacted [2] - 5:6, 26:19 impacts [1] - 8:4 implicated [2] - 9:21, 31:7 implicates [1] - 25:9 IN [1] - 1:6 incidence [1] - 27:3 incident [30] - 6:4, 8:21, 10:25, 12:23, 14:1, 15:5, 15:21, 15:24, 15:25, 16:11, 16:21, 17:11, 18:23, 20:9, 20:22, 21:6, 24:1, 24:7, 24:19, 24:22, 25:10, 26:7, 26:8, 26:11, 29:1, 30:11, 30:16, 33:18, 33:19 incidents [2] - 19:23, 24:14 include [2] - 6:19, 14:25 included [1] - 37:7 increase [1] - 16:6 increased [1] - 14:11 indicate [1] - 21:25 indicated [1] - 21:4 indicates [1] - 28:23 indication [2] - 4:10, 22:23 information [10] - 7:6, 17:14, 18:18, 19:3, 23:2, 23:12, 23:16, 27:20, 29:9, 33:9 initial [2] - 20:10, 26:25 injured [1] - 13:19 injuries [2] - 13:20, 22:24 injury [2] - 22:21, 22:22 insight [1] - 5:7 instances [1] - 24:11	January [2] - 1:18, 3:1 Jennings [6] - 17:17, 18:14, 18:17, 19:3, 19:21, 29:18 Jennings' [1] - 19:20 job [1] - 3:24 JOYCE [1] - 1:9 Judge [5] - 14:21, 15:13, 18:21, 32:9, 36:7 judgment [1] - 8:7 JUDICIAL [1] - 1:6 jury [1] - 22:2 justification [1] - 28:5	machine [1] - 38:13 main [2] - 5:11, 13:6 marble [20] - 10:16, 11:14, 11:16, 11:21, 12:6, 12:12, 12:13, 12:15, 14:8, 25:20, 27:1, 31:6, 31:15, 31:25, 32:5, 32:7, 32:23, 33:3, 33:14 matter [2] - 3:15, 33:5 mean [10] - 7:14, 7:19, 8:6, 12:9, 12:10, 15:10, 16:1, 28:13, 28:22, 34:5 members [1] - 35:2 mentioning [1] - 33:23 Michael [1] - 2:7 might [11] - 5:5, 5:8, 9:4, 25:19, 25:24, 30:24, 31:5, 32:23, 33:3, 33:15, 33:17 Mike [1] - 3:7 millions [1] - 21:2 mind [2] - 20:15, 32:11 minimum [3] - 23:8, 23:11, 23:15 minute [1] - 31:5 Miss [1] - 17:20 miss [1] - 23:21 missing [3] - 3:13, 33:23, 34:9 morning [1] - 3:9 most [1] - 22:7 motion [1] - 21:17 move [1] - 34:24 MR [37] - 3:5, 3:7, 4:7, 4:12, 4:19, 5:10, 5:24, 6:9, 6:12, 6:22, 9:9, 9:12, 9:13, 10:8,
H		K	
half [1] - 19:22 hard [1] - 12:20 hash [1] - 22:19 hazard [4] - 12:16, 13:8,		Kathleen [1] - 1:17 keep [4] - 9:7, 20:25, 28:11, 32:11 keeps [1] - 33:13 kind [7] - 3:21, 10:5, 14:24, 16:14, 16:16, 20:15, 30:6 kit [1] - 8:24 known [2] - 31:18, 31:24 Kunz [2] - 2:5, 3:6	
		L	
		largest [1] - 8:17 Las [2] - 3:1, 38:20 last [1] - 9:4 law [1] - 13:22 Law [1] - 21:12 lay [1] - 3:22 lead [1] - 27:20 least [16] - 4:20, 6:2, 11:4, 11:11, 11:21, 13:20, 16:25, 17:10, 18:12, 19:3, 21:11, 23:11, 23:15, 25:3, 30:5, 34:10 less [1] - 5:3 letter [1] - 36:5 light [1] - 9:9	

11:2, 13:5, 14:2, 14:17, 16:5, 18:21, 19:6, 19:10, 19:18, 19:19, 20:20, 21:15, 26:20, 28:15, 29:6, 29:17, 32:8, 32:17, 33:22, 34:13, 35:5, 36:3, 36:7 muddies ^[1] - 28:14	once ^[3] - 15:8, 19:1, 26:18 one ^[14] - 5:13, 7:25, 8:17, 14:5, 17:2, 23:4, 26:16, 28:15, 29:8, 29:21, 32:8, 32:11, 35:23 ongoing ^[1] - 13:11 oops ^[1] - 4:25 open ^[1] - 27:7 opened ^[1] - 15:12 opportunity ^[6] - 4:3, 11:12, 19:2, 23:3, 29:11, 29:16 opposition ^[1] - 10:20 oral ^[2] - 4:10, 35:20 order ^[11] - 5:16, 21:5, 23:14, 30:5, 34:4, 34:8, 35:3, 35:7, 35:9, 35:20, 36:5 ordered ^[6] - 7:19, 7:22, 8:2, 8:4, 21:8, 30:14 original ^[1] - 38:13 originally ^[2] - 24:10, 24:22 otherwise ^[2] - 23:4, 33:13 outcome ^[3] - 8:10, 9:1, 9:22 outside ^[12] - 18:8, 20:11, 20:16, 26:11, 26:21, 27:1, 29:20, 30:20, 32:5, 32:7, 33:25, 34:25 overlapping ^[1] - 4:17	placed ^[3] - 3:19, 3:20, 31:5 places ^[4] - 31:16, 33:14, 33:16, 33:17 Plaintiff ^[10] - 1:10, 2:5, 3:6, 10:4, 16:9, 17:7, 18:6, 18:12, 19:12, 21:18 Plaintiff's ^[1] - 35:2 Plaintiffs ^[3] - 7:15, 15:17, 34:7 play ^[1] - 4:20 pleadings ^[1] - 4:23 point ^[13] - 10:24, 11:23, 12:10, 14:18, 17:23, 23:1, 25:13, 27:16, 28:24, 29:7, 32:18, 33:24, 34:6 pointed ^[1] - 10:21 points ^[1] - 10:19 polished ^[4] - 10:16, 11:14, 11:16, 12:15 position ^[3] - 15:12, 17:16, 20:4 possession ^[3] - 18:23, 18:24, 19:14 possible ^[1] - 29:8 post ^[1] - 17:8 practical ^[1] - 8:16 practice ^[1] - 21:17 premises ^[5] - 12:2, 12:17, 13:9, 13:13, 13:18 present ^[4] - 16:21, 16:23, 24:2, 24:20 presently ^[1] - 9:16 presents ^[1] - 12:16 previously ^[3] - 6:25, 7:21, 34:15 primary ^[3] - 5:14, 10:11, 28:25 printed ^[1] - 35:9 problem ^[5] - 12:25, 13:2, 14:23, 31:17, 31:25 proceedings ^[2] - 36:9, 38:11 Proceedings ^[1] - 1:19 produce ^[9] - 6:13, 6:18, 19:13, 20:16, 20:17, 26:20, 30:3, 33:25, 34:14 produced ^[16] - 6:2, 18:25, 19:1, 20:11, 25:2, 27:6, 27:11, 27:14, 27:15, 28:7, 28:22, 29:17, 29:21, 30:4, 30:24, 34:10 producing ^[1] - 6:1 production ^[1] - 29:23 properly ^[1] - 30:19 property ^[5] - 12:14, 16:10, 17:13, 17:15, 29:19 proportion ^[1] - 24:9 proportional ^[1] - 22:6 protected ^[1] - 6:15 protection ^[4] - 3:20, 7:3,	25:3, 28:9 protective ^[2] - 23:14, 30:5 prove ^[4] - 11:18, 13:11, 25:12, 33:12 provide ^[3] - 5:18, 12:14, 21:5 provided ^[6] - 5:21, 6:4, 13:22, 23:2, 29:4, 35:4 public ^[1] - 32:12 punitive ^[5] - 7:16, 13:14, 21:9, 21:19, 26:1 purposes ^[2] - 9:6, 31:2 pursuant ^[1] - 37:7 put ^[5] - 10:15, 25:19, 34:7, 35:14, 35:19
N		Q	
near ^[1] - 18:11 necessarily ^[1] - 18:21 necessary ^[2] - 25:6, 33:8 need ^[13] - 3:21, 6:7, 7:10, 23:2, 24:17, 25:12, 26:6, 26:15, 28:7, 31:20, 34:10, 34:23, 36:2 needed ^[1] - 13:2 needs ^[5] - 12:6, 23:2, 25:18, 34:24, 35:4 NELSON ^[1] - 1:24 Nelson ^[6] - 37:5, 37:15, 37:16, 38:10, 38:18, 38:19 NEVADA ^[2] - 1:6, 38:5 Nevada ^[4] - 3:1, 21:11, 37:6, 38:20 never ^[1] - 14:23 new ^[1] - 19:3 nice ^[1] - 5:9 notes ^[1] - 38:13 nothing ^[2] - 14:12, 21:1 notice ^[6] - 11:25, 12:15, 12:24, 15:16, 22:1 NRS ^[1] - 37:7 nuances ^[2] - 4:1, 5:5 number ^[3] - 15:21, 18:22, 37:8	P	questioned ^[1] - 29:18 questioning ^[1] - 25:22 quite ^[1] - 21:24	
O		R	
objected ^[1] - 34:6 OBJECTION ^[1] - 1:16 objection ^[5] - 10:10, 10:11, 10:21, 12:3, 19:16 objections ^[1] - 10:5 obtain ^[1] - 10:13 obtained ^[1] - 19:14 Obviously ^[1] - 29:18 obviously ^[6] - 3:23, 4:17, 9:11, 18:15, 29:11, 34:8 occur ^[1] - 19:10 occurred ^[17] - 11:1, 12:22, 12:24, 13:3, 24:7, 24:11, 25:11, 26:4, 26:7, 26:8, 26:21, 29:5, 30:22, 32:2, 32:25, 33:19, 33:20 occurring ^[1] - 13:9 OF ^[1] - 38:5	page ^[1] - 3:3 part ^[6] - 7:2, 7:10, 23:23, 28:17, 29:3, 31:7 particular ^[8] - 14:13, 16:20, 17:14, 25:14, 31:21, 31:22, 31:23 particularly ^[1] - 22:8 parts ^[1] - 29:13 party ^[1] - 37:11 pattern ^[1] - 15:6 paying ^[1] - 15:23 pedestrian ^[1] - 18:2 people ^[12] - 7:8, 7:14, 13:17, 15:6, 15:10, 15:25, 16:20, 16:23, 21:2, 22:13, 31:10, 33:11 perceive ^[1] - 4:14 percent ^[2] - 12:10, 12:11 percentage ^[1] - 12:10 perform ^[1] - 22:17 performed ^[1] - 17:18 perhaps ^[1] - 28:4 period ^[4] - 6:18, 19:22, 26:5, 33:1 person ^[3] - 17:2, 37:8, 37:12 perspective ^[1] - 12:25 piece ^[1] - 5:22 pillar ^[1] - 22:23 place ^[3] - 26:14, 32:6, 38:14	raises ^[1] - 10:4 rather ^[1] - 16:21 re ^[1] - 18:17 re-deposed ^[1] - 18:17 real ^[1] - 6:1 reality ^[1] - 24:5 realized ^[1] - 3:14 really ^[9] - 4:24, 5:5, 7:9, 9:2, 19:8, 24:2, 25:6, 33:6, 33:17 reason ^[3] - 13:7, 14:3, 21:8 reasonable ^[1] - 33:13 rebut ^[4] - 15:2, 15:3, 22:13, 23:3 rebutted ^[1] - 17:4 received ^[1] - 19:16 recommend ^[1] - 21:5 recommendation ^[6] - 3:17, 18:16, 19:12, 27:18, 28:1, 28:13 recommendations ^[2] - 10:12, 26:17 recommended ^[1] - 6:17 record ^[5] - 4:2, 8:13, 9:25, 28:11, 35:5 recurring ^[1] - 13:2 redact ^[2] - 34:14, 34:19 redacted ^[6] - 5:13, 5:19, 5:21, 7:8, 26:3, 30:5 redaction ^[2] - 6:8, 8:18 reference ^[2] - 15:1, 26:23 referenced ^[1] - 19:9 reflected ^[1] - 38:12 regard ^[4] - 5:10, 22:8, 25:1,	

<p>33:22 reign ^[1] - 33:21 related ^[5] - 4:9, 20:5, 30:24, 33:19, 35:17 relates ^[1] - 30:1 relative ^[1] - 37:10 relevance ^[1] - 12:21 relevancy ^[1] - 18:7 relevant ^[12] - 7:17, 13:7, 17:16, 22:7, 24:8, 26:5, 27:8, 27:10, 27:19, 27:20, 31:18, 32:4 remain ^[2] - 7:17, 26:14 remember ^[2] - 16:8, 20:23 reminder ^[1] - 21:16 removed ^[1] - 10:15 REPORT ^[1] - 1:16 report ^[11] - 3:16, 10:12, 13:20, 18:16, 19:11, 19:13, 26:16, 27:18, 27:25, 28:12, 29:21 reported ^[2] - 17:8, 38:11 REPORTED ^[1] - 1:23 Reporter ^[2] - 37:5, 38:20 REPORTER ^[1] - 1:25 REPORTER'S ^[1] - 37:3 Reporter's ^[1] - 1:19 reports ^[18] - 5:13, 6:1, 6:3, 6:18, 6:19, 18:23, 18:25, 19:1, 20:9, 20:11, 20:22, 21:6, 21:24, 23:25, 26:2, 26:21, 33:23, 34:9 reprehensibility ^[3] - 13:15, 13:21, 21:20 reprehensible ^[1] - 24:5 represent ^[1] - 22:2 representation ^[1] - 11:5 representations ^[1] - 16:5 represented ^[1] - 32:9 representing ^[1] - 22:1 request ^[1] - 35:21 requested ^[1] - 28:9 requirement ^[1] - 23:25 resistance ^[4] - 11:9, 11:17, 12:9, 22:15 resolved ^[1] - 28:2 RESORT ^[1] - 1:12 respond ^[1] - 6:9 responded ^[1] - 14:5 response ^[2] - 5:16, 10:5 result ^[1] - 22:24 retake ^[1] - 20:2 retaxing ^[1] - 8:9 revealed ^[1] - 24:12 reversed ^[1] - 26:12 reviewing ^[1] - 17:4 revisit ^[1] - 27:5 RMR ^[4] - 1:24, 37:16, 38:10, 38:19</p>	<p>rotunda ^[1] - 12:5 ROYAL ^[16] - 3:7, 4:7, 4:19, 6:9, 6:12, 6:22, 9:9, 9:13, 16:5, 19:10, 19:19, 20:20, 29:17, 34:13, 35:5, 36:3 Royal ^[2] - 2:7, 3:7 royal ^[1] - 34:7 Rule ^[1] - 35:22 rule ^[3] - 6:8, 8:14, 8:15 ruled ^[1] - 26:14 ruling ^[9] - 8:8, 9:14, 12:3, 27:23, 30:6, 34:1, 34:11, 34:20, 34:21 rulings ^[1] - 8:23</p> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <p>safe ^[4] - 14:24, 15:19, 22:11, 31:23 scene ^[2] - 16:21, 16:23 scheduled ^[1] - 22:21 scope ^[12] - 8:20, 8:21, 9:10, 10:2, 10:3, 10:25, 20:4, 20:5, 20:8, 25:8, 25:23, 33:7 second ^[3] - 13:14, 20:14, 35:14 Security ^[1] - 37:8 see ^[17] - 3:10, 4:25, 5:5, 8:14, 13:2, 17:1, 18:20, 19:8, 23:11, 23:15, 24:8, 27:11, 27:21, 29:13, 32:4, 33:11, 34:8 seeing ^[2] - 16:14, 16:15 SEKERA ^[1] - 1:9 Sekera ^[2] - 3:3, 17:20 semblance ^[1] - 32:21 send ^[2] - 22:16, 36:5 sense ^[3] - 9:24, 10:24, 25:25 serve ^[1] - 9:6 served ^[4] - 32:14, 33:2, 33:17 shape ^[1] - 30:19 share ^[2] - 6:25, 7:1 sharing ^[1] - 35:1 shoes ^[1] - 18:3 shorthand ^[1] - 38:13 show ^[6] - 13:11, 15:5, 24:4, 27:24, 31:21, 32:6 showing ^[1] - 12:6 shows ^[1] - 35:21 side ^[2] - 4:5, 4:6 sides ^[2] - 3:18, 34:6 signed ^[1] - 35:14 significant ^[3] - 17:24, 22:21, 22:24 significantly ^[2] - 14:11, 17:22</p>	<p>similar ^[8] - 11:22, 11:23, 22:18, 25:20, 28:18, 29:14, 31:6, 33:3 similarity ^[1] - 32:7 simple ^[1] - 11:19 simply ^[1] - 17:15 single ^[1] - 19:13 situation ^[1] - 25:11 slick ^[1] - 10:15 slip ^[30] - 11:9, 11:16, 11:24, 12:8, 12:14, 13:9, 13:10, 13:18, 14:10, 14:11, 15:10, 15:18, 16:6, 16:16, 16:17, 17:14, 21:3, 21:23, 22:11, 22:15, 22:25, 23:7, 23:16, 25:15, 26:20, 27:1, 30:22, 31:7, 32:25, 33:16 slip-and-fall ^[7] - 13:10, 13:18, 22:25, 26:20, 30:22, 31:7, 32:25 slip-and-falls ^[13] - 11:24, 12:14, 13:9, 14:10, 14:11, 16:6, 16:17, 17:14, 23:7, 23:16, 25:15, 27:1, 33:16 slipped ^[4] - 14:23, 15:8, 16:1, 22:14 slipping ^[2] - 15:6, 16:13 Smith ^[2] - 17:18, 29:22 Social ^[1] - 37:8 sorry ^[1] - 20:20 sort ^[4] - 4:1, 10:2, 34:6, 35:23 sound ^[1] - 15:22 specifically ^[1] - 12:5 spillage ^[1] - 32:1 spilling ^[1] - 31:11 spinal ^[1] - 22:22 sprain/strain ^[1] - 23:1 ss ^[1] - 38:6 staff ^[1] - 35:12 standard ^[2] - 22:5, 22:6 standpoint ^[1] - 18:7 stands ^[1] - 31:8 start ^[1] - 10:7 started ^[1] - 14:6 State ^[1] - 37:6 STATE ^[1] - 38:5 stay ^[7] - 4:5, 25:8, 34:17, 35:6, 35:17, 35:21, 35:24 stay's ^[1] - 5:1 stays ^[1] - 25:9 steps ^[1] - 15:9 still ^[6] - 4:9, 24:16, 26:5, 26:23, 27:2, 27:8 stipulation ^[1] - 34:15 stretch ^[1] - 31:19 Strike ^[1] - 29:24 strong ^[1] - 22:3 structure ^[2] - 9:5, 32:21</p>	<p>stuff ^[3] - 20:16, 30:14, 35:17 subject ^[2] - 10:21, 28:8 submitted ^[1] - 4:8 subsequent ^[10] - 6:4, 12:22, 13:3, 13:10, 20:22, 21:5, 24:7, 24:16, 24:24, 25:6 substance ^[1] - 16:15 substantial ^[1] - 12:12 substantially ^[2] - 11:22, 28:18 substantively ^[1] - 12:8 successfully ^[1] - 16:13 sufficient ^[1] - 33:6 suggest ^[1] - 30:3 support ^[2] - 13:22, 21:19 supports ^[1] - 21:12 supposed ^[3] - 19:10, 19:12, 19:15 surface ^[1] - 10:16 surfaces ^[2] - 11:20, 11:22 surgery ^[1] - 22:22 sustain ^[1] - 22:24 SYKES ^[21] - 3:5, 4:12, 5:10, 5:24, 9:12, 10:8, 11:2, 13:5, 14:2, 14:17, 18:21, 19:6, 19:18, 21:15, 26:20, 28:15, 29:6, 32:8, 32:17, 33:22, 36:7 Sykes ^[2] - 2:5, 3:5 synopsis ^[1] - 7:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <p>tables ^[1] - 32:15 technically ^[1] - 29:20 temporarily ^[1] - 30:6 ten ^[2] - 35:9, 35:10 tend ^[1] - 13:10 tends ^[1] - 21:24 term ^[1] - 30:15 terms ^[3] - 8:16, 24:19, 28:6 tested ^[4] - 17:23, 18:4, 18:5 testified ^[6] - 16:9, 17:2, 17:25, 18:1, 18:12, 19:21 testimony ^[8] - 11:4, 14:4, 17:3, 17:7, 17:12, 17:17, 19:24, 20:1 testing ^[19] - 10:13, 10:23, 11:18, 11:20, 17:19, 17:21, 18:8, 18:9, 18:10, 18:11, 22:17, 25:2, 25:5, 28:17, 28:23, 29:12, 29:19, 30:20, 32:6 THE ^[33] - 1:6, 3:3, 3:9, 4:10, 4:13, 4:22, 5:15, 6:11, 6:21, 7:2, 9:17, 10:19, 12:18, 13:24, 14:15, 16:3, 18:14, 19:5, 19:8, 20:18, 21:13, 23:18, 27:4, 28:21,</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>29:15, 30:8, 32:16, 32:18, 34:3, 34:18, 35:8, 36:4, 36:8</p> <p>theory ^[1] - 33:12</p> <p>therefore ^[3] - 14:24, 15:18, 22:11</p> <p>they've ^[1] - 19:14</p> <p>third ^[1] - 14:18</p> <p>thorough ^[2] - 4:23, 4:24</p> <p>thoroughly ^[1] - 10:9</p> <p>thoughts ^[1] - 23:20</p> <p>thousand ^[1] - 16:12</p> <p>thousands ^[2] - 22:10, 23:6</p> <p>three ^[1] - 13:6</p> <p>throughout ^[8] - 10:17, 11:13, 11:21, 12:13, 12:14, 15:7, 15:11, 32:17</p> <p>timely ^[1] - 30:4</p> <p>timing ^[1] - 12:19</p> <p>TO ^[1] - 1:16</p> <p>today ^[7] - 6:6, 6:19, 6:24, 8:4, 9:5, 9:14, 9:19</p> <p>together ^[1] - 35:14</p> <p>Tom ^[1] - 17:17</p> <p>topics ^[1] - 23:20</p> <p>total ^[1] - 15:20</p> <p>totality ^[1] - 15:4</p> <p>traffic ^[1] - 18:2</p> <p>TRAN ^[1] - 1:1</p> <p>Transcript ^[1] - 1:19</p> <p>transient ^[2] - 20:24, 21:6</p> <p>trend ^[1] - 15:6</p> <p>trial ^[3] - 15:15, 22:3, 23:4</p> <p>tricky ^[1] - 7:2</p> <p>trips ^[1] - 16:12</p> <p>true ^[1] - 38:12</p> <p>Truman ^[1] - 5:16</p> <p>try ^[5] - 15:22, 30:19, 32:6, 33:12, 35:13</p> <p>trying ^[2] - 9:20, 24:3</p> <p>Tuesday ^[2] - 1:18, 3:1</p> <p>twice ^[1] - 17:10</p> <p>two ^[2] - 30:2, 33:22</p> <p>type ^[4] - 4:1, 11:12, 12:6, 23:13</p>	<p>30:13, 33:10, 33:24, 34:10</p> <p>up ^[19] - 5:11, 6:19, 7:8, 8:5, 10:24, 14:20, 15:3, 15:20, 16:18, 16:19, 17:13, 18:14, 19:21, 24:9, 24:20, 33:11, 34:4, 35:7, 35:15</p> <p>utility ^[1] - 27:13</p> <p>utilized ^[1] - 7:6</p>
V	
	<p>vagueness ^[1] - 25:4</p> <p>values ^[1] - 12:9</p> <p>variables ^[1] - 11:10</p> <p>Vegas ^[2] - 3:1, 38:20</p> <p>Venetian ^[19] - 3:3, 11:13, 11:21, 11:25, 12:4, 12:15, 13:15, 13:16, 14:4, 14:12, 14:20, 21:2, 21:21, 21:22, 32:12, 32:23, 32:25, 33:15, 33:16</p> <p>VENETIAN ^[1] - 1:12</p> <p>Venetian's ^[1] - 13:21</p> <p>verification ^[1] - 23:22</p> <p>verified ^[2] - 16:25</p> <p>versus ^[1] - 3:3</p> <p>video ^[1] - 17:4</p> <p>voluminous ^[1] - 35:11</p> <p>vs ^[1] - 1:11</p>
W	
	<p>wait ^[4] - 5:1, 6:7, 9:5, 31:4</p> <p>waiting ^[2] - 8:14, 19:19</p> <p>waiver ^[2] - 20:15, 27:7</p> <p>walked ^[6] - 14:22, 15:17, 17:9, 21:2, 22:9, 23:5</p> <p>walking ^[2] - 17:12, 31:11</p> <p>wants ^[1] - 12:4</p> <p>waters ^[1] - 28:14</p> <p>ways ^[1] - 7:25</p> <p>whichever ^[1] - 35:22</p> <p>whole ^[1] - 8:24</p> <p>William ^[2] - 2:5, 3:5</p> <p>willing ^[1] - 33:25</p> <p>wish ^[1] - 9:1</p> <p>word ^[1] - 20:25</p> <p>worn ^[1] - 18:4</p> <p>writ ^[1] - 5:11</p> <p>write ^[1] - 34:4</p> <p>written ^[2] - 35:3, 35:11</p>
Y	
	<p>year ^[3] - 16:10, 19:22</p> <p>years ^[12] - 5:3, 6:19, 13:25, 20:17, 24:19, 24:22, 30:2, 30:11, 33:9, 33:22</p>
U	
<p>ultimately ^[1] - 23:10</p> <p>umbrella ^[1] - 27:8</p> <p>under ^[3] - 19:10, 21:6, 27:8</p> <p>understood ^[1] - 26:18</p> <p>unfounded ^[1] - 16:7</p> <p>unique ^[3] - 11:6, 31:13, 33:4</p> <p>unpack ^[1] - 3:21</p> <p>unprotected ^[3] - 6:22, 7:22, 30:15</p> <p>unredacted ^[10] - 5:16, 6:1, 6:13, 6:18, 6:20, 7:20,</p>	



ORDR

Michael A. Royal, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 4370

Gregory A. Miles, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 4336

ROYAL & MILES LLP

1522 West Warm Springs Road

Henderson Nevada 89014

Tel: (702) 471-6777

Fax: (702) 571-6777

Email: mroyal@royalmilesllp.com

Attorneys for Defendants

VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and

LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JOYCE SEKERA, an Individual;

Plaintiff,

v.

VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, d/b/a
THE VENETIAN LAS VEGAS, a Nevada
Limited Liability Company; LAS VEGAS
SANDS, LLC d/b/a THE VENETIAN LAS
VEGAS, a Nevada Limited Liability Company;
YET UNKNOWN EMPLOYEE; DOES I
through X, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: A-18-772761-C

DEPT. NO.: 24

**ORDER ON OBJECTIONS TO THE
DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
DATED DECEMBER 2, 2019**

Plaintiff JOYCE SEKERA by and through her counsel of record, Claggett & Sykes Law Firm and The Galliher Law Firm, filed PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO THE DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS DATED DECEMBER 2, 2019 ON DECEMBER 16, 2019 on December 16, 2019, and Defendants VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC and LAS VEGAS SANDS, LLC (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Venetian"), by and through their counsel of record, Royal & Miles LLP, filed DEFENDANTS' LIMITED OBJECTION TO DISCOVERY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS DATED DECEMBER

ROYAL & MILES LLP
1522 W Warm Springs Road
Henderson NV 89014
Tel: (702) 471-6777 ♦ Fax: (702) 531-6777

1 2, 2019. Both parties timely filed responses to the respective objections. This matter came before the
2 Court for hearing at 9:00 am on January 21, 2020. William T. Sykes, Esq., and Geordan G. Logan,
3 Esq., of the Claggett & Sykes Law Firm, appeared on behalf of the Plaintiff, and Michael A. Royal,
4 Esq., of Royal & Miles LLP appeared on behalf of the Defendants.

5 The issues raised by the parties in the Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation
6 of December 2, 2019 go to the scope of discovery to be allowed regarding the subject incident of
7 November 4, 2016, which occurred within the Grand Lux rotunda dome of the Venetian property.
8 (The Discovery Commissioner's Report and Recommendation of December 2, 2019 is hereinafter
9 referenced as "DCRR".)
10

11 Plaintiff moved the Discovery Commissioner to order that Venetian produce documents related
12 to prior and subsequent incident reports of slip and falls on marble flooring, along with other
13 information related to the installation, care and coefficient of friction testing of marble flooring on the
14 Venetian property (including the alleged removal of carpeting in the casino area and replacement with
15 a marble flooring in 2008), from January 2000 to the present. Plaintiff further moved to expand the
16 scope of other marble floor slip and fall incident reports beyond the casino level of the Venetian
17 property. Plaintiff argued that this broad scope of discovery is necessary for her to establish a case
18 for punitive damages under NRS 42.005 (more specifically to address "the reprehensibility of conduct"
19 by Venetian).
20

21 Venetian moved the Discovery Commissioner to limit the scope of all discovery regarding the
22 Venetian marble flooring to the Grand Lux rotunda dome area where the subject incident occurred,
23 and to limit the production of Grand Lux rotunda dome area marble floor guest incident reports to the
24 preceding five years, from November 4, 2011 to November 4, 2016.
25

26 The Discovery Commissioner recommended the following pertaining to contested issues raised
27 herein by the parties:
28

- 1 1. Plaintiff's request that Venetian produce evidence of coefficient of friction testing is
2 limited to the Grand Lux rotunda dome area from November 4, 2011 to November 4,
3 2016 to the extent it was disclosed pursuant to NRCP 16.1 and which is not otherwise
4 protected in accordance with NRCP 26;
5
6 2. Plaintiff's request that Venetian produce evidence of changes to the casino level
7 flooring is limited to the Grand Lux rotunda dome area from November 4, 2011 to
8 November 4, 2016;
9
10 3. Plaintiff's request for evidence of other incidents extends to all slip and falls on marble
11 flooring on the Venetian casino level and limited in time from November 4, 2011 to the
12 present; and
13
14 4. All documents produced by Venetian related to incident reports from November 4,
15 2011 to the present are to be produced unredacted without protections sought by
16 Venetian under NRCP 26(c).
17
18 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Objections filed by the parties are GRANTED IN PART
19 and DENIED IN PART.
20
21 IT IS FURTHER HEREBY ORDERED that the DCRR is hereby modified and adopted as
22 follows: Venetian must produce prior incident reports limited to the Grand Lux rotunda dome area
23 from November 4, 2011 to November 4, 2016. Plaintiff's request for documents outside this given
24 scope is hereby DENIED.
25
26
27
28


1 IT IS FURTHER HEREBY ORDERED that the DCRR is otherwise adopted by the Court,
2 including the order requiring that Venetian produce reports of prior incidents in unredacted form
3 without requested NRCP 26(c) protection. Venetian's motion to stay this part of the Order pending
4 a decision by the Nevada Court of Appeals in a writ presently before it to address this issue (case no.
5 79689-COA) is hereby DENIED.

6 DATED this 11th day of MARCH, 2020.

7
8
9 
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
10 JG

11 Submitted by:

12 **ROYAL & MILES LLP**


13 
14 Michael A. Royal, Esq.
15 Nevada Bar No. 4370
16 Gregory A. Miles, Esq.
17 Nevada Bar No. 4336
18 1522 W. Warm Springs Road
19 Henderson, NV 89014
20 Attorneys for Defendants

Reviewed by:

CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM

21 Sean K. Claggett, Esq.
22 William T. Sykes, Esq.
23 Geordan G. Logan, Esq.
24 CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM
25 4101 Meadows Lane, Suite 100
26 Las Vegas, NV 89107
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff

THE GALLIHER LAW FIRM

28 
Keith E. Galliher, Jr., Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 220
1850 E. Sahara Avenue, Suite 107
Las Vegas, NV 89014
Attorneys for Plaintiff