Electronically Filed
7/13/2018 1:25 PM
Steven D. Grierson
CLERK OF THE COURT

		CLERK OF THE COOK
1	RAHUL RAVIPUDI	Claud, Strum
2	Nevada Bar No. 14750 ravipudi@psblaw.com	
3	GREGORIO SILVA Nevada Bar No. 13583	
4	gsilva@psblaw.com ROBERT GLASSMAN (pro hac vice pending) glassman@psblaw.com PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP	
5		
6	8816 Spanish Ridge Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89148	
7	Telephone: 702.560.5520 Facsimile: 702.975.2515	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Monika I. Nourmand	
9	and Firuzeh Nourmand	
	DIGITAL	T. COLUMN
10	DISTRICT COURT	
11	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
12		A-18-777634-C
13	MONIKA I. NOURMAND, an Individual; and FIRUZEH NOURMAND, an Individual,	Case No. Department 23
14	Plaintiffs,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
15	·	JURY TRIAL DEMAND
16	V.	
17	GREAT LAKES DRONE COMPANY, LLC, a Corporation; CAESARS	
18	ENTERTAINMENT CORPORATION d/b/a CAESAR'S PALACE HOTEL AND	
19	CASINO, a Corporation; MATT QUINN, an Individual; DOES I through X; ROE	
20	CORPORATIONS XI through XX,	
21	Defendants.	
22		
23	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES COMES NOW Plaintiffs MONIKA I. NOURMAND and FIRUZEH NOURMAND hereby file this Complaint for Damages for their claims for relief against Defendants GREAT LAKES DRONE COMPANY, LLC, a Corporation; CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT CORPORATION d/b/a	
24		
25		
26		
27		Corporation; MATT QUINN, an Individual; DOES I
28	Cricornico i rica ico no incomo, a c	201 portution, 1911 11 QUI 111, an individual, DOES 1

3

4

1

1. Plaintiff Monika I. Nourmand is and was at all relevant times mentioned herein a resident of California.

PARTIES

5

2. Plaintiff Firuzeh Nourmand is and was at all relevant times mentioned herein a resident of California.

On information and belief, Defendant Caesars Entertainment Corporation d/b/a as

The true names and/or capacities, whether individual or corporate, associate or

7 8

9

3.

6.

same have been ascertained.

Caesar's Palace Hotel and Casino is a Delaware Corporation with its principal place of business in Nevada and at all relevant times mentioned herein was authorized to and did conduct business in the State of Nevada.

10

11

4. On information and belief, Defendant Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC is a limited liability company with its principal place of business in Michigan and at all relevant times mentioned herein was conducting business in the State of Nevada.

13 14

5. On information and belief, Defendant Matt Quinn is an individual residing in Michigan and was working in Nevada at the time of this incident.

16 17

15

otherwise of Defendants DOES I through X and ROE CORPORATIONS XI through XX, and each of them, are presently unknown to Plaintiffs who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believes and therefore alleges that each of the Defendants

1920

18

fictitiously named herein as a DOE or ROES are the owners, operators, officers, directors, partners, or

2122

agents of the other defendants, or were legally responsible, negligently or in some other actionable manner, for the events and happenings hereinafter referred to, and therefore, proximately caused the

23

injuries and damages to Plaintiffs as herein alleged. Plaintiffs will seek leave of Court to amend this

24

Complaint and state the true names and/or capacities of such fictitiously named Defendants when the

2526

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

27

28

7. The exercise of jurisdiction by this Court over each and every Defendant in this action is appropriate because each and every Defendant has done, and continues to do, business in the State

2

4

5

6

8

9

7

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

21

20

23 24

25 26

27 28 of Nevada, and committed a tort in the State of Nevada.

8. Jurisdiction in the Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada is further appropriate because the acts and omission alleged hereafter occurred within Clark County, State of Nevada and venue is proper.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every foregoing paragraph set forth above and incorporates the same be reference as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 10. On information and belief, on and prior to June 30, 2018, Defendant Caesars Entertainment Corporation d/b/a Caesar's Palace Hotel and Casino (hereinafter "Caesars"), and its employees and agents, were entities and individuals which engaged in the business of owning, promoting, operating, securing, overseeing, managing, controlling, providing safety service, providing security, and maintaining the property located at 3570 S. Las Vegas Blvd, Las Vegas, NV 89109 commonly referred to as Caesars Palace, including but not limited to the pool area.
- 11. On information and belief, at all times mentioned herein, Defendants and each of them, including those named as DOES and ROE CORPORATIONS were agents, servants, employees, partners distributors, or joint venturers of their Co-Defendants and in doing the acts herein alleged, were acting within the course and scope of said agency, employment, partnership or joint venture. Each and every Defendant aforesaid was acting as a principal and was negligent or grossly negligent in the selection, hiring and training of each and every other Defendant or ratified the conduct of every other Defendant as an agent, employee, or joint-venturer.
- 12. At all relevant times mentioned herein Defendants and each of them, including those named as DOES and ROE ENTITIES had advance knowledge that their Co-Defendants were unfit for the purposes of employment and employed the Co-Defendants with a conscious disregard of the rights or safety of others.
- 13. On information and belief, on and prior to June 30, 2018 Defendants Matt Quinn and Great Lakes Drone Company were individuals and entities who engaged in the business of providing entertainment and related services using unmanned aerial vehicles for the benefit of and on direction of Caesars.

- 14. On information and belief, on June 30, 2018 around 9:00 p.m. Defendant Matt Quinn was operating one or more unmanned aerial vehicles ("Subject Drones") owned by Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC on the premises of Caesars Palace at or near the pool area.
- 15. On information and belief, the Subject Drones were being used as entertainment to provide a light show display at the pool area of the Caesars Palace to celebrate the 4th of July.
 - 16. On June 30, 2018 Plaintiffs were lawfully on the premises of Caesars Palace.
- 17. On June 30, 2018 Plaintiffs arrived at the pool area of the Caesars Palace to attend the Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party at approximately 8:00 p.m.
- 18. On June 30, 2018 at approximately 9:00 p.m. Plaintiffs were at the pool area of the Caesars Palace to view a fireworks display.
- 19. At all times relevant herein Caesars Palace had a duty to exercise due care in ensuring the safety of all patrons or other persons on the premises of the Caesars Palace including, but not limited to, patrons or other persons at or near the pool area.
- 20. At all times relevant herein Defendants, and each of them, had a duty to ensure the Subject Drones were operated in a manner safe to all patrons and other person on the premises of Caesars Palace.
- 21. On information and belief at approximately 9:00 p.m. Matt Quinn began operating the subject drones to provide a light show as entertainment to the patrons and other persons attending the Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party.
- 22. At approximately 9:10 p.m. the Subject Drones began flying near and around the patrons and other persons attending the Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party.
- 23. Defendants, and each of them, failed to exercise due care in allowing operation of the Subject Drones in a manner unsafe to patrons and other persons attending the Caesars Palace

Fireworks Viewing Party on the premises of Caesars Palace.

24. At approximately 9:15 p.m. one or more of the Subject Drones was operated in a manner that caused it to collide with patrons and other guests, including Plaintiffs,



attending the Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party (hereinafter "Subject Incident").

25. As a direct result of Subject Drones unsafe operation Plaintiffs were struck by the Subject Drones causing severe and permanent physical and mental injuries.

Monika Nourmand's Eye Injury

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(JOINT VENTURE LIABILITY AGAINST ALL

DEFENDANTS)

- 26. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege every foregoing paragraph set forth above and incorporates the same by reference as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 27. Defendants Caesars Palace, Great Lakes Drone Company and Matt Quinn participated in a joint venture when it operated the Subject Drones and/or promoted and/or marketed the Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party.
- 28. Defendants, and each of them, and as co-venturers, entered into a contractual relationship with one another in the nature of an informal partnership for purposes of promoting and/or marketing the Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party.
- 29. Defendants, and each of them, as co-venturers, conducted a business enterprise by operating the Subject Drones and/or promoting and/or marketing the Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party.
- 30. Defendants, and each of them, and as co-venturers agreed to share jointly in profits from the Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party.
- 31. Defendants, and each of them, and as co-venturers are joint and severally liable to Palitniff for the wrongful acts committed in furtherance of the joint venture.
- 32. Defendants' negligent acts and/or omissions are imputed to each and every co-venturer of the joint enterprise rendering those participating in the joint venture liable for Plaintiff's injuries.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness and reckless actions and inactions of the Defendants, and their employees, agents and assigns, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have suffered severe and serious personal physical and mental injuries. Plaintiffs

have sustained damages in an amount in excess of Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00).

- 34. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have been limited in occupation and recreational activities, which have caused and shall continue to cause Plaintiffs loss of earning capacity, lost wages, physical impairment, mental anguish, and loss of enjoyment of life, in a presently unascertainable amount.
- 35. As a further direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs incurred expense for medical care and treatment and will incur expenses for medical care and treatment in the future in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 36. Plaintiffs have been required to engage the services of an attorney, incurring attorney's fees and costs to bring this action.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (NEGLIGENCE AGAINST CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT CORPORATION)

- 37. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every foregoing paragraphs as set forth above and incorporates the same be reference as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 38. At all times material hereto, particularly on June 30, 2018, Defendant Caesars owned, promoted, operated secured, oversaw, managed, provided secuirty for, provided safety service for, maintained and controlled the property located at 3570 S. Las Vegas Blvd, Las Vegas, NV 89109 commonly referred to as Caesars Palace, including but not limited to the pool area, and had all duties of due care related thereto.
- 39. At all times material hereto, Defendant Caesars owed a duty of reasonable care for the safety of patrons or other persons entering their property, including Plaintiff.
- 40. At all times material hereto, Caesars owed a duty of reasonable care to ensure that its premises were reasonably safe from dangers.
- 41. At all times material hereto, it was reasonable foreseeable that an unmanned aerial vehicle would be operated in an unsafe manner.
- 42. At all times material hereto, it was reasonable foreseeable that a patron or other guest would be injured by an errantly operated unmanned aerial vehicle.
 - 43. Caesars failed to exercise due care to preventing the operation of unmanned aerial

5

9 10

8

13

14

15

11

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27 28 vehicles in areas near or around patrons or other guests.

- 44. Caesars failed to exercise due care by allowing the errant operation of unmanned aerial vehicles on its premises.
- 45. Due to the actions and inactions of Caesars, it was reasonably foreseeable that Plaintiffs could and would be injured by the errant operation of unmanned aerial vehicles on its premises near or around patrons and other persons.
- 46. Due to the actions and inactions of Caesars, it was reasonably foreseeable that errant operation of unmanned aerial vehicles would occur;
- 47. At all times material hereto Caesars owed a duty of reasonable care in the ownership, promotion, operation, oversight, management, security of, safety services for, maintenance and control of the subject property, including in the pool area, and to otherwise ensure through the use of due care that persons on its property are not injured due to Caesars negligent, wanton, or reckless actions and inaction.
- 48. At all times material hereto, Caesars breached it duties of care and were negligent, wanton and reckless. Caesars, inter alia, failed to prohibit the operation of unmanned aerial vehicles near or around patrons or other guests, failed to ensure unmanned aerial vehicles were operated in a manner in compliance with Federal Safety Rules and Regulations, and failed to ensure unmanned aerial vehicles were operated in a manner safe for patrons or other guests.
- 49. In addition to its direct liability, Caesars is vicariously liable for the acts and omission of any staff, agents, apparent agents, servants, contractors, employees or consultants, independent contractors, or singular person or entities which in any manner caused or contributed to Plaintiffs' injuries and damages.
- 50. On information and belief, Caesars expressly authorized the operation of unmanned aerial vehicles on its premises near or around patrons or other persons.
- 51. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness and reckless actions and inactions of the Defendants, and their employees, agents and assigns, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have suffered severe and serious personal physical and mental injuries. Plaintiffs have sustained damages in an amount in excess of Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00).

- 52. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have been limited in occupation and recreational activities, which have caused and shall continue to cause Plaintiffs loss of earning capacity, lost wages, physical impairment, mental anguish, and loss of enjoyment of life, in a presently unascertainable amount.
- 53. As a further direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs incurred expense for medical care and treatment and will incur expenses for medical care and treatment in the future in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 54. Plaintiffs have been required to engage the services of an attorney, incurring attorney's fees and costs to bring this action.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (NEGLIGENCE AGAINST DEFENDANTS GREAT LAKES DRONE COMPANY, LLC AND MATT QUINN)

- 55. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every foregoing paragraph set forth above and incorporates the same by reference as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 56. At all times material hereto, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn owed a duty of reasonable care in the operation of the Subject Drones on the premises of Caesars Palace.
- 57. At all times material hereto, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn owed a duty of reasonable care to inspect the Subject Drones prior to operation to ensure operation could be done in a safe manner.
- 58. At all times material hereto, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn breached their duties of care and were negligent, wanton and reckless. Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn, *inter alia*, failed to properly operate the Subject Drones, and failed to follow Federal Safety Regulations.
- 59. On information and belief, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn failed to ensure the Subject Drones were fit for operation prior to initiating the entertainment light show the Subject Drones were intended to be used for.
- 60. On information and belief, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn breached their duty of due care by failing to maintain visual line of sight while operating the

Subject Drones near or around the people, including Plaintiffs, attending Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party.

- On information and belief, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn breached their duty of due care by operating the Subject Drones over the people attending Caesars Palace Fireworks Viewing Party, including Plaintiffs who were not participating in the operation of the Subject Drones.
- 62. On information and belief, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn breached their duty of due care by operating the Subject Drones more than 30 minutes after sunset.
- 63. On information and belief, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn breached their duty of due care by operating more than one of the Subject Drones simultaneously.
- 64. On information and belief, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn breached their duty of due care by operating the Subject Drones in a careless and/or reckless manner.
- 65. On information and belief, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn breached their duty of due care by operating the Subject Drones without performing a preflight inspection.
- 66. On information and belief, Defendants Great Lakes Drone Company, LLC and Matt Quinn breached their duty of due care by operating the Subject Drones in an errant manner causing the Subject Drones to strike Plaintiffs.
- 67. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness and reckless actions and inactions of the Defendants, and their employees, agents and assigns, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have suffered severe and serious personal physical and mental injuries. Plaintiffs have sustained damages in an amount in excess of Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00).
- 68. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have been limited in occupation and recreational activities, which have caused and shall continue to cause Plaintiffs loss of earning capacity, lost wages, physical

impairment, mental anguish, and loss of enjoyment of life, in a presently unascertainable amount.

- 69. As a further direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs incurred expense for medical care and treatment and will incur expenses for medical care and treatment in the future in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 70. Plaintiffs have been required to engage the services of an attorney, incurring attorney's fees and costs to bring this action.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(RES IPSA LOQUITOR AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 71. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every foregoing paragraph set forth above and incorporates the same by reference as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 72. An unmanned aerial vehicle striking and/or crashing into persons attending a fireworks viewing party does not ordinarily occur without negligence.
- 73. Unmanned aerial vehicles striking and/or crashing into persons is uncommon in the course and nature of operating unmanned aerial vehicles.
 - 74. The Subject Drones were within the exclusive control of Defendants.
- 75. The Subject Drones striking Plaintiffs was not the result of any voluntary action or contribution on the part of the Plaintiffs.
- 76. At all times material hereto, Defendants had a duty of reasonable care to prevent the operation of unmanned aerial vehicles in a manner that would allow the Subject Drones to strike and injure Plaintiffs.
- As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness and reckless actions and inactions of the Defendants, and their employees, agents and assigns, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have suffered severe and serious personal physical and mental injuries. Plaintiffs have sustained damages in an amount in excess of Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00).
- 78. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have been limited in occupation and recreational activities, which have caused and shall continue to cause Plaintiffs loss of earning capacity, lost wages, physical impairment, mental anguish, and loss of enjoyment of life, in a presently unascertainable amount.

- 79. As a further direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs incurred expense for medical care and treatment and will incur expenses for medical care and treatment in the future in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 80. Plaintiffs have been required to engage the services of an attorney, incurring attorney's fees and costs to bring this action.

<u>FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF</u> (NEGLIGENCE PER SE AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 81. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every foregoing paragraph set forth above and incorporates the same by reference as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 82. Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107 requires operators of unmanned aerial vehicles to maintain a visual line of sight at all times during operation.
- 83. Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107 prohibits the operation of unmanned aerial vehicles over any persons not directly participating in the operation, not under a covered structure, and not inside a covered stationary vehicle.
- 84. Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107 prohibits the operation of unmanned aerial vehicles during non-daylight hours.
- 85. Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107 prohibits a single person from operating more than one unmanned aerial vehicle at one time.
- 86. Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107 prohibits careless and reckless operation of unmanned aerial vehicles.
- 87. Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107 requires a preflight inspection be performed prior to the operation of unmanned aerial vehicles before every flight by the remote pilot in command.
- 88. Defendants and each of them violated Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107.
- 89. Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107 was intended to prevent the injuries of person from the operation of unmanned aerial vehicles.
 - 90. Plaintiffs were members of the class of people intended to be protected by enactment of

Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 107.

- 91. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness and reckless actions and inactions of the Defendants, and their employees, agents and assigns, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have suffered severe and serious personal physical and mental injuries. Plaintiffs have sustained damages in an amount in excess of Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00).
- 92. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, in furtherance of the joint venture, Plaintiffs have been limited in occupation and recreational activities, which have caused and shall continue to cause Plaintiffs loss of earning capacity, lost wages, physical impairment, mental anguish, and loss of enjoyment of life, in a presently unascertainable amount.
- 93. As a further direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs incurred expense for medical care and treatment and will incur expenses for medical care and treatment in the future in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 94. Plaintiffs have been required to engage the services of an attorney, incurring attorney's fees and costs to bring this action.

///

16 | / / /

17 | | / / /

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs Monika I. Nourmand and Firuzeh Nourmand, pray for Judgment in their favor and against the Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

- 1) For a judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants, and each of them, on the Complaint and all claims for relief asserted therein;
- 2) For an award of general and special damages in an amount in excess of \$15,000, to be proven at trial;
 - 3) For an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in this action;
- 4) For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, at the rate allowed by law, on all such amounts awarded from the date of filing this Complaint and after judgment is entered; and
 - 5) For any such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 22 day of July, 2018

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP

By

RAHUL RAVIPUDI

Nevada Bar No. 14750

GREGORIO SILVA

Nevada Bar No. 13583 8816 Spanish Ridge Avenue

Las Vegas, NV 89148

Tel: 702.560.5520

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Monika I. Nourmand and Firuzeh Nourmand

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs MONIKA I. NOURMAND and FIRUZEH NOURMAND hereby demand a trial by jury as to all causes of action.

DATED this 12 that day of July, 2018

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP

Ву

RAHUL RAVIPUDI Nevada Bar No. 14750 GREGORIO SILVA Nevada Bar No. 13583 8816 Spanish Ridge Avenue

Las Vegas, NV 89148

Tel: 702.560.5520

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Monika I. Nourmand and Firuzeh Nourmand