

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

WYNN LAS VEGAS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CIGAR ROW, LLC,

Defendant.

2:15-cv-01079-RJC-CWH

ORDER

This case arises from an alleged breach of contract between a vendor and vendee.

Pending before the Court is a Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 22) filed by Plaintiff Wynn Las Vegas, LLC (“Wynn”). For the reasons given herein, the Motion is granted in part and denied in part.

I. FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Cigar Row, LLC (“Cigar Row”) is a South Carolina company that wholesales cigars and cigar-related products to businesses that then sell those products to consumers. In late 2011, Cigar Row solicited Wynn to wholesale cigars and related products for Wynn’s properties in Las Vegas. (Brown Dep. 20:2–23, ECF No. 22 at 29.) Wynn requires prospective vendors to register online to provide certain information and guarantees. (*Id.* at 28:8–19, ECF No. 22 at 33; Registration Portal, ECF No. 22 at 105.) Vendors that register online agree to follow the terms and instructions of the Wynn Las Vegas Retail Vendor Compliance Guide (“Compliance

1 Guide”). (Registration Portal, ECF No. 22 at 105.) Cigar Row registered online with Wynn,
2 indicating it was licensed to operate only in South Carolina. (Registration, ECF No. 24 at 16.)
3 Cigar Row sold cigars to Wynn from 2012 to 2014.

4 The Compliance Guide contains several provisions that require vendors to comply with
5 applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. For example, it requires vendors to
6 obtain licenses necessary for conducting business in the State of Nevada. (Compliance Guide 8,
7 22–23, ECF No. 22 at 110, 124–25.) It also requires vendors to inform Wynn if at any time they
8 are not in compliance with the terms of the Compliance Guide. (*Id.* at 23.) Nevada law prohibits
9 wholesale dealers of “other tobacco products” (“OTP”) from engaging in business in Nevada
10 without obtaining a license as a wholesale dealer, *see* NRS 370.445, and it requires wholesale
11 dealers to collect and pay a thirty percent tax on OTP purchased in the state, *see* NRS 370.450.

12 Wynn alleges that Cigar Row breached its contract with Wynn by failing to obtain a
13 license to operate in Nevada and by failing to pay \$136,008.99 in OTP taxes, which Wynn was
14 required to pay to the state. (Lawrence Decl. ¶ 4, ECF No. 22 at 184; Check, ECF No. 22 at 186.)
15 Wynn also alleges that Cigar Row made various misrepresentations about the taxes and failed to
16 inform Wynn that it was not licensed in Nevada and was not paying OTP taxes. Wynn brings the
17 following claims against Cigar Row: (1) breach of contract; (2) breach of the implied covenant
18 of good faith and fair dealing; (3) intentional misrepresentation; (4) negligent misrepresentation;
19 and (5) unjust enrichment (alternative to breach of contract). Wynn moves the Court to grant
20 summary judgment in its favor as to all claims.

21 **II. LEGAL STANDARDS**

22 A court must grant summary judgment when “the movant shows that there is no genuine
23 dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R.
24 Civ. P. 56(a). Material facts are those which may affect the outcome of the case. *See Anderson v.*

1 *Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). A dispute as to a material fact is genuine if there
2 is sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to return a verdict for the nonmoving party. *See id.* A
3 principal purpose of summary judgment is “to isolate and dispose of factually unsupported
4 claims.” *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323–24 (1986).

5 In determining summary judgment, a court uses a burden-shifting scheme. The moving
6 party must first satisfy its initial burden. “When the party moving for summary judgment would
7 bear the burden of proof at trial, it must come forward with evidence which would entitle it to a
8 directed verdict if the evidence went uncontested at trial.” *C.A.R. Transp. Brokerage Co. v.*
9 *Darden Rests., Inc.*, 213 F.3d 474, 480 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation and internal quotation marks
10 omitted). In contrast, when the nonmoving party bears the burden of proving the claim or
11 defense, the moving party can meet its burden in two ways: (1) by presenting evidence to negate
12 an essential element of the nonmoving party’s case; or (2) by demonstrating that the nonmoving
13 party failed to make a showing sufficient to establish an element essential to that party’s case on
14 which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial. *See Celotex Corp.*, 477 U.S. at 323–24.

15 If the moving party fails to meet its initial burden, summary judgment must be denied and
16 the court need not consider the nonmoving party’s evidence. *See Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co.*,
17 398 U.S. 144 (1970). If the moving party meets its initial burden, the burden then shifts to the
18 opposing party to establish a genuine issue of material fact. *See Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v.*
19 *Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986). To establish the existence of a factual dispute, the
20 opposing party need not establish a material issue of fact conclusively in its favor. It is sufficient
21 that “the claimed factual dispute be shown to require a jury or judge to resolve the parties’
22 differing versions of the truth at trial.” *T.W. Elec. Serv., Inc. v. Pac. Elec. Contractors Ass’n*, 809
23 F.2d 626, 631 (9th Cir. 1987). In other words, the nonmoving party cannot avoid summary
24 judgment by relying solely on conclusory allegations unsupported by facts. *See Taylor v. List*,

1 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989). Instead, the opposition must go beyond the assertions and
2 allegations of the pleadings and set forth specific facts by producing competent evidence that
3 shows a genuine issue for trial. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e); Celotex Corp.*, 477 U.S. at 324.

4 At the summary judgment stage, a court's function is not to weigh the evidence and
5 determine the truth, but to determine whether there is a genuine issue for trial. *See Anderson*, 477
6 U.S. at 249. The evidence of the nonmovant is "to be believed, and all justifiable inferences are
7 to be drawn in his favor." *Id.* at 255. But if the evidence of the nonmoving party is merely
8 colorable or is not significantly probative, summary judgment may be granted. *See id.* at 249–50.
9 Notably, facts are only viewed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party where there is
10 a genuine dispute about those facts. *Scott v. Harris*, 550 U.S. 372, 380 (2007). That is, even
11 where the underlying claim contains a reasonableness test, where a party's evidence is so clearly
12 contradicted by the record as a whole that no reasonable jury could believe it, "a court should not
13 adopt that version of the facts for purposes of ruling on a motion for summary judgment." *Id.*

14 **III. ANALYSIS**

15 **A. Breach of Contract**

16 **1. Legal Standards**

17 A plaintiff must prove four elements to succeed on a claim of breach of contract: "(1)
18 formation of a valid contract; (2) performance or excuse of performance by the plaintiff; (3)
19 material breach by the defendant; and (4) damages." *Laguerre v. Nevada Sys. of Higher Educ.*,
20 837 F. Supp. 2d 1176, 1180 (D. Nev. 2011). "Basic contract principles require, for an
21 enforceable contract, an offer and acceptance, meeting of the minds, and consideration." *May v.*
22 *Anderson*, 119 P.3d 1254, 1256 (Nev. 2005). "[T]o enforce a contract at law, the offer must be
23 sufficiently definite or must call for such definite terms in the acceptance, that the performance
24 required is reasonably certain." *Laguerre*, 837 F. Supp. 2d at 1180 (quoting *Spellman v. Dixon*,

1 63 Cal. Rptr. 668, 670 (1967)). “In order to be sufficiently definite, the parties must have agreed
2 to all material terms of a contract.” *Id.* (*citing Chung v. Atwell*, 745 P.2d 370, 371 (Nev. 1987)).

3 **2. Analysis**

4 Wynn has proven that Cigar Row breached a contract between them. In late 2011, Cigar
5 Row solicited Wynn to wholesale cigars and related products for Wynn’s properties in Las
6 Vegas. (Brown Dep. 20:2–23, ECF No. 22 at 29.) Wynn requires prospective vendors to register
7 online to provide certain information. (*Id.* at 28:8–19, ECF No. 22 at 33; Registration Portal,
8 ECF No. 22 at 105.) Vendors that register online agree to follow the terms and instructions of the
9 Wynn Las Vegas Retail Vendor Compliance Guide (“Compliance Guide”). (*Id.*) Cigar Row
10 registered online with Wynn and by doing so acknowledged receipt of the Compliance Guide
11 and agreed to follow all of its terms and instructions. (Registration, ECF No. 24 at 16;
12 Registration Portal, ECF No. 22 at 105; Brown Dep. 24:19–26:23, ECF No. 22 at 30–32.) At this
13 point, Cigar Row entered a valid contract with Wynn.

14 When Wynn sends a purchase order to a vendor, the order states that “ALL PURCHASE
15 ORDERS . . . MUST CONFORM TO THE VENDOR COMPLIANCE GUIDE.” (Purchase
16 Order, ECF No. 22 at 132.) Brown has read at least one purchase order from beginning to end.
17 (Brown Dep. 56:19–21, ECF No. 22 at 41.) Also, with each purchase order sent to Cigar Row,
18 Wynn sent the most recent version of the Compliance Guide, which Brown read. (Brown Dep.
19 46:23–47:1, 59:23–60:7, ECF No. 22 at 38–39, 43–44; Catanzaro Decl. ¶ 5, ECF No. 22 at 160.)
20 Wynn performed its part of the contract by maintaining a vendor/vendee relationship with Cigar
21 Row, and by paying for the cigars and related products it purchased from Cigar Row. (*See, e.g.*,
22 Catanzaro Decl. ¶ 3, ECF No. 22 at 160; Purchase Order, ECF No. 22 at 132.)

23 The Compliance Guide contains several provisions that require vendors to comply with
24 applicable laws and regulations:

1 2.17. Vendors represent, warrant and guarantee that all applicable provisions of
2 federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules, codes and regulations which are
3 applicable to the manufacture and/or sale and/or shipping of merchandise
4 purchased by Wynn Las Vegas (i.e. lead content in crystal ware, fire retardant in
5 children's clothing, pre-washed goose down in pillows, etc.) have been complied
6 with

7 (Compliance Guide 8, ECF No. 22 at 110.)

8 20. . . . Vendor represents and warrants that upon execution, and
9 throughout the term of this Purchase Order . . .

10 b. Vendor has obtained or filed all licenses, registrations, statements,
11 compliance certificates and permits as may be required by law or other
12 governmental authority, including without limitation the Nevada Gaming
13 Control Act.

14 . . .

15 d. The merchandise covered by this Purchase Order was not designed,
16 manufactured, shipped, installed, sold or priced in violation of any federal,
17 state, or local law.

18 . . .

19 f. Vendor is a duly organized and validly existing business entity under the
20 laws of its state of incorporation and it has obtained all requisite licenses to
21 conduct business in the State of Nevada.

22 g. . . . In the event that any of the aforementioned representations and
23 warranties ceases to be true, complete and accurate at anytime [sic] during the
24 term of this Purchase Order, Vendor shall promptly notify Wynn Las Vegas in
25 writing of such default and shall promptly take such action as is necessary to
26 cure such default. If such default is not cured in a reasonable amount of time,
27 then in Wynn Las Vegas [sic] sole discretion, this Purchase Order may be
28 terminated immediately upon notice to Vendor.

29 (*Id.* at 22–23, ECF No. 22 at 124–25).

30 Nevada law prohibits wholesale dealers of “other tobacco products”¹ from engaging
31 in business in Nevada without obtaining a license as a wholesale dealer, *see* NRS 370.445,
32 and it requires wholesale dealers to collect and pay a thirty percent tax on other tobacco

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
8010
8011
8012
8013
8014
8015
8016
8017
8018
8019
8020
8021
8022
8023
8024
8025
8026
8027
8028
8029
8030
8031
8032
8033
8034
8035
8036
8037
8038
8039
8040
8041
8042
8043
8044
8045
8046
8047
8048
8049
8050
8051
8052
8053
8054
8055
8056
8057
8058
8059
8060
8061
8062
8063
8064
8065
8066
8067
8068
8069
8070
8071
8072
8073
8074
8075
8076
8077
8078
8079
8080
8081
8082
8083
8084
8085
8086
8087
8088
8089
8090
8091
8092
8093
8094
8095
8096
8097
8098
8099
80100
80101
80102
80103
80104
80105
80106
80107
80108
80109
80110
80111
80112
80113
80114
80115
80116
80117
80118
80119
80120
80121
80122
80123
80124
80125
80126
80127
80128
80129
80130
80131
80132
80133
80134
80135
80136
80137
80138
80139
80140
80141
80142
80143
80144
80145
80146
80147
80148
80149
80150
80151
80152
80153
80154
80155
80156
80157
80158
80159
80160
80161
80162
80163
80164
80165
80166
80167
80168
80169
80170
80171
80172
80173
80174
80175
80176
80177
80178
80179
80180
80181
80182
80183
80184
80185
80186
80187
80188
80189
80190
80191
80192
80193
80194
80195
80196
80197
80198
80199
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80300
80301
80302
80303
80304
80305
80306
80307
80308
80309
80310
80311
80312
80313
80314
80315
80316
80317
80318
80319
80320
80321
80322
80323
80324
80325
80326
80327
80328
80329
80330
80331
80332
80333
80334
80335
80336
80337
80338
80339
80340
80341
80342
80343
80344
80345
80346
80347
80348
80349
80350
80351
80352
80353
80354
80355
80356
80357
80358
80359
80360
80361
80362
80363
80364
80365
80366
80367
80368
80369
80370
80371
80372
80373
80374
80375
80376
80377
80378
80379
80380
80381
80382
80383
80384
80385
80386
80387
80388
80389
80390
80391
80392
80393
80394
80395
80396
80397
80398
80399
80400
80401
80402
80403
80404
80405
80406
80407
80408
80409
80410
80411
80412
80413
80414
80415
80416
80417
80418
80419
80420
80421
80422
80423
80424
80425
80426
80427
80428
80429
80430
80431
80432
80433
80434
80435
80436
80437
80438
80439
80440
80441
80442
80443
80444
80445
80446
80447
80448
80449
80450
80451
80452
80453
80454
80455
80456
80457
80458
80459
80460
80461
80462
80463
80464
80465
80466
80467
80468
80469
80470
80471
80472
80473
80474
80475
80476
80477
80478
80479
80480
80481
80482
80483
80484
80485
80486
80487
80488
80489
80490
80491
80492
80493
80494
80495
80496
80497
80498
80499
80500
80501
80502
80503
80504
80505
80506
80507
80508
80509
80510
80511
80512
80513
80514
80515
80516
80517
80518
80519
80520
80521
80522
80523
80524
80525
80526
80527
80528
80529
80530
80531
80532
80533
80534
80535
80536
80537
80538
80539
80540
80541
80542
80543
80544
80545
80546
80547
80548
80549
80550
80551
80552
80553
80554
80555
80556
80557
80558
80559
80560
80561
80562
80563
80564
80565
80566
80567
80568
80569
80570
80571
80572
80573
80574
80575
80576
80577
80578
80579
80580
80581
80582
80583
80584
80585
80586
80587
80588
80589
80590
80591
80592
80593
80594
80595
80596
80597
80598
80599
80600
80601
80602
80603
80604
80605
80606
80607
80608
80609
80610
80611
80612
80613
80614
80615
80616
80617
80618
80619
80620
80621
80622
80623
80624
80625
80626
80627
80628
80629
80630
80631
80632
80633
80634
80635
80636
80637
80638
80639
80640
80641
80642
80643
80644
80645
80646
80647
80648
80649
80650
80651
80652
80653
80654
80655
80656
80657
80658
80659
80660
80661
80662
80663
80664
80665
80666
80667
80668
80669
80670
80671
80672
80673
80674
80675
80676
80677
80678
80679
80680
80681
80682
80683
80684
80685
80686
80687
80688
80689
80690
80691
80692
80693
80694
80695
80696
80697
80698
80699
80700
80701
80702
80703
80704
80705
80706
80707
80708
80709
80710
80711
80712
80713
80714
80715
80716
80717
80718
80719
80720
80721
80722
80723
80724
80725
80726
80727
80728
80729
80730
80731
80732
80733
80734
80735
80736
80737
80738
80739
80740
80741
80742
80743
80744
80745
80746
80747
80748
80749
80750
80751
80752
80753
80754
80755
80756
80757
80758
80759
80760
80761
80762
80763
80764
80765
80766
80767
80768
80769
80770
80771
80772
80773
80774
80775
80776
80777
80778
80779
80780
80781
80782
80783
80784
80785
80786
80787
80788
80789
80790
80791
80792
80793
80794
80795
80796
80797
80798
80799
80800
80801
80802
80803
80804
80805
80806
80807
80808
80809
80810
80811
80812
80813
80814
80815
80816
80817
80818
80819
80820
80821
80822
80823
80824
80825
80826
80827
80828
80829
80830
80831
80832
80833
80834
80835
80836
80837
80838
80839
80840
80841
80842
80843
80844
80845
80846
80847
80848
80849
80850
80851
80852
80853
80854
80855
80856
80857
80858
80859
80860
80861
80862
80863
80864
80865
80866
80867
80868
80869
80870
80871
80872
80873
80874
80875
80876
80877
80878
80879
80880
80881
80882
80883
80884
80885
80886
80887
80888
80889
80890
80891
80892
80893
80894
80895
80896
80897
80898
80899
80900
80901
80902
80903
80904
80905
80906
80907
80908
80909
80910
80911
80912
80913
80914
80915
80916
80917
80918
80919
80920
80921
80922
80923
80924
80925
80926
80927
80928
80929
80930
80931
80932
80933
80934
80935
80936
80937
80938
80939
80940
80941
80942
80943
80944
80945
80946
80947
80948
80949
80950
80951
80952
80953
80954
80955
80

1 products purchased in the state, *see* NRS 370.450. It is unlawful to sell other tobacco
2 products without paying the tax. NRS 370.460. When wholesale dealers pay the tax, they
3 must also submit to the state a report of the products they sell. NRS 370.465.

4 Wynn has adduced evidence showing that from 2012 to 2014 Cigar Row sold cigars
5 to Wynn without being licensed in Nevada and without remitting mandatory OTP taxes.
6 David Brown, CEO of Cigar Row, stated that Cigar Row was aware of Nevada's OTP
7 guidelines but chose not to obtain a license with the state and did not pay any OTP tax to
8 the state from 2011 to 2014. (Brown Dep. 114:18–116:25, 184:25–185:3, ECF No. 22 at
9 58–60, 77–78; *see also* Catanzaro Decl. ¶ 6, ECF No. 22 at 161; Registration, ECF No. 24
10 at 22 (indicating that Cigar Row was licensed only in South Carolina).) As a result, Wynn
11 paid \$136,008.99 in taxes to the State of Nevada for the cigars that Cigar Row wholesaled
12 to Wynn. (Lawrence Decl. ¶ 4, ECF No. 22 at 184; Check, ECF No. 22 at 186.) Thus,
13 Cigar Row breached its contract with Wynn by failing to comply with state law as it agreed
14 to do by accepting the terms of the Compliance Guide. Cigar Row has not reimbursed
15 Wynn for the taxes as required by an indemnification clause in the Compliance Guide. (*See*
16 Compliance Guide ¶ 13, ECF No. 22 at 124.)²

17 The evidence Wynn has presented would entitle it to a directed verdict on this claim
18 if the evidence went uncontested at trial. Cigar Row has failed to present a genuine issue
19 of material fact that would require the claim to go to trial. Cigar Row does not dispute the
20 facts identified above; instead, it argues that “the contractual provisions at issue in this case
21 . . . are so vague and indefinite as to render them unenforceable.” (Resp. 4–5, ECF No. 24.)

22

23 2 The indemnification clause requires vendors to “indemnify, defend, and hold harmless Wynn Las Vegas . . . from
24 and against any and all claims, demands, losses, liabilities, damages, causes of action or expenses (including
reasonable costs and attorney's fees, which shall be reimbursed as incurred), caused by, resulting from, or in any
way connected with . . . the acts or omissions of Vendor or Vendor's agents, employees, or contractors in
conjunction with this Purchase Order.” (Compliance Guide, ¶ 13, at 124).

1 It notes the Compliance Guide does not specifically mention a requirement that vendors
2 register as OTP dealers with the state. Cigar Row’s argument fails, however, because the
3 Compliance Guide clearly states in definite terms that vendors represent that by registering
4 as vendors with Wynn they are already in compliance with all applicable laws and
5 regulations. The Compliance Guide specifically requires vendors to obtain all licenses
6 required to conduct business in Nevada. (See Compliance Guide 8, 22–23, ECF No. 22 at
7 110, 124–25.) Although the Compliance Guide does not specifically require vendors to pay
8 OTP taxes, any vendor who obtains a license to sell OTP would be aware of the OTP tax
9 associated with the license. Indeed, David Brown admitted that Cigar Row was aware of
10 Nevada’s guidelines for OTP but chose not to obtain a license with the state and did not
11 pay any OTP tax to the state from 2011 to 2014. (Brown Dep. 114:18–116:25, 184:25–
12 185:3, ECF No. 22 at 58–60, 77–78.) Nothing about the provisions of the Compliance
13 Guide at issue is vague or indefinite.

14 Cigar Row also argues that a genuine issue of material fact exists regarding the
15 parties’ understanding and interpretation of their obligations because Brown testified that
16 he did not understand the provisions of the Compliance Guide to require Cigar Row to
17 register as an OTP dealer. This argument is based on an assertion the Court has already
18 rejected—that the contractual terms are vague and indefinite. The Compliance Guide
19 clearly requires vendors to be licensed by the state and to comply with all other applicable
20 laws and regulations. Any alleged misunderstanding on Brown’s part might have resulted
21 from a misunderstanding of the laws with which Cigar Row agreed to comply, but not a
22 misunderstanding of the Compliance Guide’s provisions, which were clear. And even if
23 Brown misunderstood the contractual provisions of the Compliance Guide, Cigar Row
24 would not be excused from honoring them. *See Upton v. Tribilcock*, 91 U.S. 45, 50 (1875)

1 (“It will not do for a man to enter into a contract, and, when called upon to respond to its
2 obligations, to say that he did not read it when he signed it, or did not know what it
3 contained.”); *Wallace v. Chafee*, 451 F.2d 1374, 1377 (9th Cir. 1971) (“One who enters a
4 contract is on notice of the provisions of the contract. If he assents voluntarily to those
5 provisions after notice, he should be presumed, in the absence of ambiguity, to have
6 understood and agreed to comply with the provisions as written. This is hornbook contract
7 law.”).

8 Wynn has met its burden on summary judgment, and Cigar Row has failed to
9 present a genuine issue of material fact. The Court grants the motion for summary
10 judgment in Wynn’s favor as to this claim.³

11 **B. Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing**

12 **1. Legal Standards**

13 All contracts contain an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. *A.C. Shaw*
14 *Const., Inc. v. Washoe Cty.*, 784 P.2d 9, 9 (Nev. 1989). A contractual breach of the covenant of
15 good faith and fair dealing arises when “terms of a contract are literally complied with but one
16 party to the contract deliberately countervenes the intention and spirit of the contract”
17 *Hilton Hotels Corp. v. Butch Lewis Prods., Inc.*, 808 P.2d 919, 922–23 (Nev. 1991).

18 //
19 //
20

21 3 During oral argument on October 6, 2016, the Court noted its inclination to grant summary judgment for Wynn on
22 the breach of contract claim, but expressed reservation with respect to the correct measure of damages. Under NRS
23 370.450(3), OTP taxes “must be collected and paid by the wholesale dealer” Therefore, Cigar Row had an
24 obligation to collect OTP taxes from Wynn, meaning that Wynn would have ended up paying the disputed taxes
anyway. Notwithstanding the question of damages, however, the Court indicated it would enter its order granting
summary judgment for breach of contract in favor of Wynn, the result of which would be to award Wynn damages
in the amount of OTP taxes paid, and that it would be up to Cigar Row to attempt to counterclaim for the
“collection” of the taxes. On October 11, 2016, Cigar Row filed a motion for leave to amend its Answer to assert
this counterclaim. (ECF No. 31.) The Court will consider Cigar Row’s motion at the close of briefing.

2. Analysis

Wynn cannot prevail on this claim because it argues, and the Court has found, that Cigar Row did not comply with the literal terms of the contract. The determination that Cigar Row breached its contract with Wynn precludes the possibility of a valid claim of breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The Court denies Wynn's motion for summary judgment as to this claim.

C. Intentional Misrepresentation

1. Legal Standards

A plaintiff must establish three elements to prove a claim of intentional misrepresentation: “(1) a false representation that is made with either knowledge or belief that it is false or without a sufficient foundation, (2) an intent to induce another’s reliance, and (3) damages that result from this reliance.” *Nelson v. Heer*, 163 P.3d 420, 426 (Nev. 2007). With regard to the first element, “the suppression or omission of a material fact which a party is bound in good faith to disclose is equivalent to a false representation, since it constitutes an indirect representation that such fact does not exist.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). With regard to the third element, “the damages alleged must be proximately caused by reliance on the original misrepresentation or omission.” *Id.*

2. Analysis

To begin, Cigar Row argues that this claim is barred by a three-year statute of limitations; however, Cigar Row waived this affirmative defense by not affirmatively stating it in its Answer. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(c)(1). (*See also* Answer 6, ECF No. 4).

Wynn argues that Cigar Row intentionally misrepresented that it was complying with Nevada law by being a licensed OTP wholesale dealer and remitting required OTP taxes to the state. As evidence of this misrepresentation, Wynn points to Cigar Row's registration as a vendor

1 and its agreement to follow the Compliance Guide. However, when Cigar Row registered as a
2 vendor, it specifically disclosed that it did not have a Nevada business license and that it was
3 licensed only in South Carolina. (*See* Registration, ECF No. 24 at 16.) And although Cigar Row
4 certified that it would comply with Nevada law requiring the remittance of OTP taxes, at the
5 time it registered as a vendor it had not sold any products to Wynn and, thus, was not yet
6 required to remit taxes to the state. In other words, by simply registering with Wynn, Cigar Row
7 did not falsely represent that it was paying OTP taxes because at that point it had no duty to pay
8 them. Wynn also presents testimony that Brown told Jessica Catanzaro that Cigar Row was
9 licensed in Nevada as an OTP wholesale dealer and had been paying all its taxes.⁴ (Catanzaro
10 Decl. ¶¶ 7–8, ECF No. 22 at 161.) However, Brown made these statements on May 27, 2014, a
11 week after Wynn was contacted by the Nevada Department of Taxation, told that Cigar Row had
12 not been paying OTP tax, and canceled all pending purchase orders with Cigar Row. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 6–
13 8.) Because Brown’s misrepresentations came after Wynn had already cut business ties with
14 Cigar Row, Wynn cannot establish that any damages proximately flowed from its reliance
15 thereon.

16 Wynn also argues that Cigar Row intentionally concealed the fact that it was not in
17 compliance with Nevada law. Again, Cigar Row did disclose to Wynn that it was only licensed
18 to do business in South Carolina. With the knowledge that Cigar Row was not licensed in
19 Nevada, Wynn might have inferred that Cigar Row also would not be paying OTP taxes, but
20 Cigar Row did not affirmatively represent that it would not be paying taxes. Wynn presents
21 evidence to show that it first became aware that Cigar Row was not paying OTP taxes on May
22 20, 2014, when an auditor from the Nevada Department of Taxation contacted Wynn. (*Id.* at ¶
23

24 4 The Court can consider Catanzaro’s testimony regarding Brown’s statements because the statements are not
hearsay under Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2). Brown was speaking as the CEO of Cigar Row when he made
the statements and they therefore qualify as statements of an opposing party.

1 6.). Also, Brown testified that Cigar Row did not reveal whether it was paying OTP taxes on its
2 invoices to Wynn because it does not itemize the OTP tax on its invoices. (Brown Dep. 182:16–
3 183:22, ECF No. 22 at 75–76.)

4 Although this evidence shows that Cigar Row failed to disclose to Wynn that it was not
5 paying the OTP tax, it does not show that Cigar Row intentionally concealed or withheld that
6 fact. It also does not show that Cigar Row concealed its lack of OTP payment to induce Wynn’s
7 reliance. Wynn argues simply that “[c]ertainly, Cigar Row intended to induce Wynn to rely upon
8 the material misrepresentations and omission,” (Mot. Summ. J. 12, ECF No. 22), without
9 adducing any evidence to support its argument. Also, Brown states that Cigar Row believed it
10 was not required to pay the OTP tax and that the responsibility to pay the tax would pass on to
11 the customer. (Brown Dep. 182:25–184:16, ECF No. 22 at 75–77.) This evidence could negate
12 evidence that Cigar Row intentionally induced Wynn’s reliance.

13 Wynn has not established that it would be entitled to a directed verdict at trial. The Court
14 denies the motion as to this claim.

15 **D. Negligent Misrepresentation**

16 **1. Legal Standards**

17 A plaintiff must establish the following elements to prove a claim of negligent
18 misrepresentation:

19 (a) a representation that is false;
20 (b) this representation was made in the course of the defendant’s business, or in
any action in which he has pecuniary interest;
21 (c) the representation was for the guidance of others in their business transactions;
22 (d) the representation was justifiably relied upon;
23 (e) this reliance resulted in pecuniary loss to the relying party; and
24 (f) the defendant failed to exercise reasonable care or competence in obtaining
or communicating the information.

1 ///

1 *Ideal Elec. Co. v. Flowserve Corp.*, 357 F. Supp. 2d 1248, 1255 (D. Nev. 2005) (citing *Bill*
2 *Stremmel Motors, Inc., v. First Nat'l Bank of Nevada*, 575 P.2d 938 (Nev. 1978)). Nondisclosure
3 of material facts that one party has a duty to disclose to the other party is the functional
4 equivalent of a misrepresentation. *In re Agribiotech, Inc.*, 291 F. Supp. 2d 1186, 1191–92 (D.
5 Nev. 2003).

6 **2. Analysis**

7 To begin, Cigar Row argues that this claim is barred by a two-year statute of limitations;
8 however, Cigar Row waived this affirmative defense by not affirmatively stating it in its Answer.
9 *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(c)(1). (*See also* Answer 6, ECF No. 4).

10 Wynn has presented sufficient evidence to show that Cigar Row made a false
11 representation. The Compliance Guide required Cigar Row to promptly notify Wynn in writing if
12 at any time it was not in compliance with the applicable laws and regulations. (*See* Compliance
13 Guide ¶ 20(g), ECF No. 22 at 125). State law required Cigar Row to pay OTP taxes on the
14 products it was wholesaling to Wynn, which it failed to do. Although Cigar Row initially
15 informed Wynn that it was not licensed to do business in Nevada, it failed throughout their
16 business relationship to inform Wynn that it was not paying OTP taxes, which Cigar Row had a
17 duty to do. This nondisclosure is the functional equivalent of a misrepresentation.

18 Cigar Row argues that Wynn did not justifiably rely on the misrepresentation, however,
19 because Cigar Row notified Wynn that it was not licensed in Nevada. The Court agrees. Wynn
20 knew that Cigar Row did not hold a Nevada license; therefore, it could not have justifiably relied
21 on Cigar Row's nondisclosure of its lack of compliance with the OTP tax law. Although Cigar
22 Row failed in its duty to inform Wynn that it was not paying the tax, Wynn had reason to believe
23 Cigar Row was not paying the tax, and no evidence shows that Wynn investigated whether Cigar
24 Row was paying the tax. Thus, even if Wynn relied on Cigar Row's misrepresentation, its

1 reliance was not justified because it knew Cigar Row was not licensed and, therefore, was likely
2 not paying OTP taxes.

3 Wynn has not established that it would be entitled to a directed verdict at trial. The Court
4 denies the motion as to this claim.

5 **E. Unjust Enrichment**

6 Wynn asserts its unjust enrichment claim only inasmuch as the Court does not grant the
7 motion as to its claim of breach of contract. Because the Court is granting the motion as to
8 Wynn's claim of breach of contract, it does not need to address the unjust enrichment claim at
9 this time.

10 **F. Punitive Damages**

11 Wynn asks the Court to award punitive damages. Under Nevada law, the Court may
12 award punitive damages "in an action for the breach of an obligation not arising from contract,
13 where it is proven by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant has been guilty of
14 oppression, fraud or malice, express or implied." NRS 42.005(1). Wynn's claims of breach of
15 contract and breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing arise from contract;
16 thus, punitive damages are not available for those claims. Arguably, the other claims arise from
17 obligations separate from the contract at issue here, but Wynn has not proven those claims or
18 shown by clear and convincing evidence that Cigar Row is guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice.
19 The Court denies the request.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

CONCLUSION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 22) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

IT IS SO ORDERED December 6, 2016.

ROBERT C. JONES
United States District Judge