Electronically Filed 2/10/2021 10:42 PM Steven D. Grierson **CLERK OF THE COURT COMPB** 11 Shan Davis (SBN 9323) DAVIS|STIBOR 21 10845 Griffith Peak Drive Second Floor 3 Las Vegas, NV 89135 CASE NO: A-21-829284-B Telephone: (702) 718-9940 41 Facsimile: (702) 933-1464 Email: shandavis@davisstibor.com 5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 6 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 7 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 8 NAKASH SHOWCASE II, LLC; SG VEGAS Case No.: 9 OWNER, LLC; and GC VEGAS RETAIL, Dept. No.: LLC, 10 **COMPLAINT** Plaintiffs, 111 VS. Excess of \$50,000] 12 FEDERAL INSURANCE COMPANY. 13 Defendant.

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

221

24

25

26

27

28

Exempt from Arbitration, Amount in

Department 13

Business Court Requested: EDCR 1.61(a)(2)(ii) – Business Tort Claim/Enhanced Case Management

COMES NOW, PLAINTIFFS NAKASH SHOWCASE II, LLC, SG VEGAS OWNER, LLC, and GC VEGAS RETAIL, LLC (collectively "Plaintiffs"), by and through their attorney, Shan Davis, Esq. of the law firm Davis|Stibor, and file their Complaint as follows:

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff NAKASH SHOWCASE II, LLC ("SG Island") is a Delaware limited liability company duly licensed and registered with the Nevada Secretary of State to conduct business in the State of Nevada and owns/rents/is a tenant in common/has an insurable interest in the properties known as and located at 3791 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, Las Vegas, NV 89109.1
- Plaintiff SG VEGAS OWNER, LLC ("SG Vegas") is a Delaware limited liability company duly licensed and registered with the Nevada Secretary of State to

¹ The properties identified in this complaint as 3791 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, 3743 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, 3755 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, 3759 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, and 3767 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, Las Vegas, NV 89109 are herein referred to as the "Subject Properties".

conduct business in the State of Nevada and owns/rents/is a tenant in common/has an insurable interest in the property known as and located at 3743 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, 3755 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, and 3759-3765 LAS VEGAS BLVD S.

- 3. Plaintiff GC VEGAS RETAIL, LLC, ("GC Retail") is a Delaware limited liability company duly licensed and registered with the Nevada Secretary of State to conduct business in the State of Nevada and owns/rents/is a tenant in common/has an insurable interest in the property known as and located at 3767 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, Las Vegas, NV 89109.
- 4. Defendant FEDERAL INSURANCE COMPANY (hereinafter "Defendant" or "Federal") is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal place of business at 202 N. Illinois St., Ste. 2600, Indianapolis, IN, 46204. Upon information and belief Defendant is authorized to do business in, and is doing business in, the State of Nevada.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This Court has jurisdiction because this matter arises out of events that occurred in and that relate to properties located in Clark County, Nevada.
- 6. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to NRS 13.040 because, among other reasons, the acts and omissions giving rise to this Complaint took place in Clark County, Nevada.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendant for breach of contract.
- 8. This action arises from the failure of Defendant to indemnify Plaintiffs pursuant to an all risk policy of Insurance, issued by Defendant to Plaintiffs with policy number 3602-87-89 EUC ("Subject Policy").
- 9. On or about March 2020, while the Subject Policy was in full force and effect, Plaintiffs suffered losses due to the Covid-19 outbreak and its effects, which subsequently resulted in various government orders effectively shutting down Plaintiffs' rental income.

- 10. Plaintiffs, on or about April 23, 2020, timely provided notice and subsequently submitted an insurance claim to the Defendant in connection with the damages suffered.
- 11. Notwithstanding the terms of the all-risk Subject Policy, Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiffs for their losses.
- 12. As a result of Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs the damages they have suffered, Plaintiffs have commenced this action for breach of contract.

THE NOVEL CORONAVIRUS AND ITS EFFECTS

- 13. It is beyond cavil that the world is currently experiencing a global pandemic from a disease caused by a novel coronavirus (specifically, SARS-COV-2) and commonly referred to as Covid-19.
- 14. From at least as early as December 2019, Covid-19 began spreading, first in China and then, because the disease is highly contagious, rapidly around the globe.
- 15. On January 30, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the Covid-19 outbreak constituted a public health emergency of international concern.
- 16. Not only is SARS-COV-2 transmitted via human-to-human, but the WHO and scientific studies have confirmed that the virus can remain infectious on objects or surfaces.
- 17. By February 25, 2020, the Center for Disease Control ("CDC") warned Americans that the world was on the brink of a global pandemic, effectively dismantling any notion that SARS-COV-2 would not affect the population of the United States.
- 18. From that point forward, COVID-19 and its damaging consequences received widespread media attention.
- 19. As a result of this outbreak the Center for Disease Control began recommending that individuals stay at home and those who are not sick engage in preventive measures such as constant hand washing and the avoidance of activities that would bring them into close proximity of people or surfaces where the virus resides.
 - 20. Given the commercial nature of the Subject Properties, the spread of the

18I

Covid-19 virus led to physical loss and damage both within and within the vicinity of the insured locations. This physical loss and damage directly led to Plaintiff's subsequent economic damages.

- 21. The physical loss and damage existed both on surfaces found within the insureds and surrounding premises as well as in the breathable air circulating within the insureds and surrounding premises.
- 22. Scientific studies suggest that the virus may remain active on surfaces for times varying from hours to days. Indeed, following an outbreak on a cruise ship, the CDC confirmed that the virus was still alive on surfaces within cabins on the ship up to seventeen days after the passengers departed the ship.²
- 23. In addition, human beings spread Covid-19 through the simple act of breathing in air that contains viral droplets. The New York Times recently reported that "[a]n infected person talking for five minutes in a poorly ventilated space can also produce as many viral droplets as one infectious cough."³
- 24. Moreover, studies have verified that many individuals remain asymptomatic despite infection by Covid-19.⁴
- 25. Consequently, while it is possible to identify certain individuals who are suffering from obvious symptoms of the coronavirus, absent significant medical testing, it is impossible to distinguish between infected and non-infected members of the general public.
- 26. In addition to a decrease in revenue as a result of the desire of patrons to avoid contracting the virus while visiting the Subject Properties, civil authority orders began to be issued by various states and localities wherein Plaintiff maintained their commercial establishments, all of which required those properties to either close their

² https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6912e3.htm.

https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/04/14/science/coronavirus-transmission-cough-6-feet-arul.html.

https://www.usnews.com/news/health-news/articles/2020-05-28/studies-detail-rates-of-asymptomatic-cases-of-coronavirus (observing that 42% of infected persons in Wuhan, China were asymptomatic).

doors to the public or suspend their normal business operations.

- 27. These orders were all predicated, in part, on the effect of the presence of Covid-19 within enclosed, highly trafficked locations.
- 28. Of relevance here, on or about March 20, 2020, Nevada Governor Sisolak signed the Order, in which he directed that all non-essential businesses and operations to cease. After issuing the Order, Governor Sisolak explained that these drastic shut-down measures were necessary in light of "the ability of the novel coronavirus that causes COVID-19 to survive on surfaces for indeterminate periods of time, [which] renders some property unusable" and contributes to "damage . . . and property loss."
- 29. Additionally, the following relevant orders were issued by authorities in Nevada based localities where the Plaintiffs operate their commercial spaces:

"WHEREAS, the World Health Organization and United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have advised that there is a correlation between density of persons gathered and the risk of transmission of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, close proximity to other persons is currently contraindicated by public health and medical best practices to combat COVID-19; [. . .]

WHEREAS, NRS 414.060 outlines powers and duties delegated to the Governor during the existence of a state of emergency, including without limitation, directing and controlling the conduct of the general public and the movement and cessation of movement of pedestrians and vehicular traffic during, before and after exercises or an emergency or disaster, public meetings or gatherings; and [...]

WHEREAS, non-essential businesses continue to operate and avail themselves to the general public, further exacerbating the public health emergency:

NOW, THEREFORE, by the authority vested in me as Governor by the Constitution and the laws of the State of Nevada and the United States, and pursuant to the March 12, 2020, Emergency Declaration, [...]

Section 1: Non-Essential Businesses, as further defined in regulations promulgated under this Directive, that promote recreational social gathering activities including, but not limited to, recreation centers, clubhouses, nightclubs, movie theaters, massage parlors, adult entertainment establishments, brothels, and live entertainment venues, and

any other such Non-Essential Business shall close effective March 20, 2020, at 11:59 p.m., for the duration that this Directive shall be in effect.

Section 2: Non-Essential Businesses that promote extended periods of public interaction where the risk of transmission is high, including fitness establishments such as gyms and studios; aesthetic services such as beauty shops, barber shops, nail salons, tanning salons, and wax salons; and any other such Non-Essential Business shall close effective March 20, 2020, at 11:59 p.m., for the duration that this Directive shall be in effect. [...]

Section 8: Businesses not delineated above or in regulations promulgated under this Directive may continue operations, not to include retail sales, if they are able to implement social distancing safeguards for the protection of their employees and:

- Perform operations without contact with the Nevada general public; or
- To the extent practicable, provide services without causing members of the Nevada general public to congregate in a manner contrary to social distancing goals of a minimum of six feet of separation for more than incidental contact; or
- Provide services without causing more than ten members of the Nevada general public to congregate."

Declaration of Emergency for Covid-19 – Directive 003.5

THE SUBJECT POLICY AND PLAINTIFFS' CLAIM

- 30. The commencement of this lawsuit resulted from a breach of insurance contract arising from Defendant's failure to provide any payment to Plaintiffs for their losses resulting from the global pandemic commonly referred to as the coronavirus or Covid-19.
- 31. On or about November 30, 2019, for good and valuable consideration, Plaintiff procured the Subject Policy.
- 32. The Subject Policy provides coverage for, *inter alia*, physical loss or damage, as well as losses of income due to business interruption.
- 33. The Subject Policy bears effective dates from November 30, 2019 to November 30, 2020 (the "Policy Period").

⁵ Nevada Emergency Orders, *available at* http://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/.

- 34. The Subject Policy was in full force and effect during the Policy Period.
- 35. The Subject Policy provided coverage for Business Income and Extra Expense losses, including but not limited to coverage for loss of rental income.
 - 36. The Subject Policy provides in relevant part:

We will pay for the actual **business income** loss you incur due to the actual impairment of your **operations**; and **extra expense** you incur due to the actual or potential impairment of your **operations** during the **period of restoration**, not to exceed the applicable Limit of Insurance for Business Income With Extra Expense shown in the Declarations. (emphasis in original)

- 37. The Subject Policy defines "business income" in pertinent part as "net profit or loss, including rental income from tenants and net sales value of production, that would have been earned or incurred before income taxes…"
- 38. The Subject Policy also insures against **business income** losses resulting from:
 - (a) Civil Authority: we will pay for the actual:

business income loss you incur due to the actual impairment of your operations; and

extra expense you incur due to the actual or potential impairment of your **operations**, directly caused by the prohibition of access to:

your premises; or a **dependent business premises**, by a civil authority.

This prohibition of access by a civil authority must be the direct result of direct physical loss or damage to property away from such premises or such **dependent business premises** by a **covered peril**, provided such property is within:

one mile; or the applicable miles shown in the Declarations,

from such premises or **dependent business premises** whichever is greater. (emphasis in original)

39. No exclusions contained in the Subject Policy are applicable to the dispute set forth herein.

- 40. Throughout the life of the Subject Policy, Plaintiffs continuously paid their premiums and as such expected Defendant to investigate and adjust their claims in good faith.
- 41. The Subject Policy provides coverage for multiple locations, including 3791 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, 3743 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, 3755 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, 3759 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, and 3767 LAS VEGAS BLVD S, Las Vegas, NV 89109.
- 42. The MGM Grand and other large hotel and casinos are located within one mile of the Subject Premises.
- 43. As a result of the covered losses stemming from Covid-19 and its effects, Plaintiffs experienced a significant loss in rental income. Specifically, unable to generate revenue from their businesses, virtually all of Plaintiff's tenants informed Plaintiffs that they could not pay rent and requested abatements and/or other accommodations. Plaintiffs have suffered, and will continue to suffer, significant business interruption.
- 44. Plaintiffs, on or about April 23, 2020, timely provided notice and subsequently submitted an insurance claim to the Defendant in connection with the damages suffered.
- 45. In contrast to Plaintiffs' expectations and demand for coverage, on or around May 29, 2020, Defendant issued a denial letter, disclaiming coverage for Plaintiffs' loss.
- 46. Thereafter, on or about July 21, 2020, Plaintiffs submitted a partial sworn statement in proof of loss ("Proof of Loss") in the amount of \$3,163,436.00 for the actual and project damages suffered through August 2020.
- 47. The Subject Properties, are insurable properties under the Subject Policy and suffered physical loss or damage as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and its effect, including, but not limited to the issuance of Nevada's Emergency Orders.
- 48. The Subject Properties, are insurable properties under the Subject Policy and suffered economic loss as a result of physical loss or damage suffered to hotels and casinos situated within one mile of the Subject Properties.

- 49. Defendant failed to thoroughly investigate the claim to determine if coverage was available under the policy, despite a duty to do so.
- 50. An insurer cannot reasonably and in good faith deny payments to its insured without thoroughly investigating the foundation for a denial of payment in whole or in part.
- 51. When determining the amount of coverage available, Defendant failed to consider any information that was submitted with the insureds' Proof of Loss.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract)

- 52. The Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege paragraphs "1" through "51", with the same force and effect as if set forth at length herein.
- 53. The Subject Policy constituted a binding contract between Plaintiffs and Defendant.
- 54. As described above, Plaintiffs have sustained, and is continuing to sustain, losses covered under the Subject Policy and during the Subject Policy period.
- 55. Plaintiffs complied with all of the obligations under the Subject Policy, including through timely notification of a loss and the filing of the Proof of Loss.
- 56. To date, Defendants have failed to compensate Plaintiffs for their losses with regards to the Proof of Loss.
- 57. Defendant's failure to compensate Plaintiffs for their loss constitutes a breach of the Subject Policy.
- 58. As a result of Defendant's breach of the Subject Policy, Plaintiffs have suffered damages in the amount of \$3,163,436.00 together with such additional and subsequent damages as may be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendant as follows:

1. On the First Cause of Action, a money judgment against Defendant in the amount of \$3,163,436.00 together with such additional and subsequent damages as may be proven at trial;

	١
1	
2	2
3	,
4	ŀ
5	,
6	5
7	,
8	3
9	
10	
11	
12	2
13	;
14	ŀ
15	;
16	5
17	,
18	
19	
20	ı
21	ı
22	ı
23	ı
24	ı
25	ı
26	ı
27	ı
<i>∠ I</i>	- 1

- 2. Reasonable fees and costs of this action; and
- 3. For such other and further relief as to which this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 10, 2021.

DAVIS|STIBOR

/s/ Shan Davis Shan Davis (SBN 9323) 10845 Griffith Peak Drive Second Floor Las Vegas, NV 89135
Telephone: (702) 718-9940
Facsimile: (702) 933-1464
Email: shandavis@davisstibor.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs