



Robert Cassity

Partner

9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor, Las Vegas, NV 89134

P 702.222.2556

bcassity@hollandhart.com

Bob Cassity effectively and efficiently guides his business clients through complex corporate and commercial disputes and litigation.

He works strategically with clients to resolve cases involving a broad range of business torts and contractual disputes.

Complex Litigation: Bob provides practical, strategic advice to clients in complex commercial litigation, securities litigation, bank litigation, and CMBS special servicer representation, including class actions.

A Wide Range of Clients and Industries: Bob's clients include national, regional, and local businesses, banks and financial institutions, hotel/casinos, entertainers, technology firms, land developers, gaming manufacturers, commercial firms, CMBS special servicers, and business owners (including directors and officers) in a wide range of industries.

PRACTICES

Commercial Litigation
Securities Enforcement and Shareholder Litigation
Banking Litigation

EDUCATION

J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, J.D., 2005
cum laude

Weber State University, B.S., 2002
summa cum laude

BAR ADMISSIONS

Nevada
Utah

EXPERIENCE

Complex Commercial Litigation

Bob handles a full spectrum of commercial litigation cases involving:

- Business torts, including claims for:
 - Fraud
 - Negligent misrepresentation
 - Breach of fiduciary duty
 - Conversion
 - Breach of contract
 - Interference with contractual relations
 - Fraudulent transfer
 - Defamation
 - Trade secret misappropriation
 - Unfair competition claims

Securities Litigation

Bob represents corporations and their directors and officers in all aspects of securities litigation, including:

- Shareholder derivative suits
- Shareholder class actions

- Representation of special litigation committees
- SEC enforcement actions

Bank Litigation and CMBS Special Servicer Representation

Bob represents banks, financial institutions and CMBS special servicers in matters concerning:

- Commercial loan disputes
- Lender liability lawsuits
- Leasing disputes
- Receivership appointments
- FINRA Arbitration

CLIENT RESULTS

Complex Commercial Litigation

Represented Japanese clients in a case against a large international gaming corporation involving claims of breach of fiduciary duty, tortious interference, breach of contract, and gaming law “suitability” issues based upon allegations of Foreign Corrupt Practices Act violations, ultimately resulting in the client's companies obtaining a \$2.6 billion settlement. Prior to settlement, obtained a substantial sanctions award, including adverse inferences, against the gaming corporation based upon discovery violations under the Macau Personal Data Protection Act (MPDPA).

Represented large international casino resort operator and its subsidiary involving former executive's claims of breach of contract and wrongful termination.

Represented a prominent local entertainer in contract dispute against partners in a business venture formed to establish and operate a museum and attractions on the grounds of his estate.

Represented prominent sports and entertainment company in breach of contract claims against a subsidiary of Sony Music Entertainment relating to a 51-episode anime series. The jury trial lasted nearly three weeks, and we obtained a favorable settlement just before the jury verdict.

Obtained a \$1 million judgment plus \$3 million in punitive damages on behalf of a client who had been defrauded in connection with the purchase of a private jet aircraft.

Successfully represented prominent local entertainer against claims of defamation, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and negligent infliction of emotional distress in a lawsuit brought by a former employee.

Represented operator of casino venues in litigation involving breach of contract and breach of fiduciary duty claims and double-derivative claims by investors.

Represented Australian child care center operator pursuing fraud and breach of contract claims against business partners regarding

development of child care centers.

Securities Litigation

Represented directors of public company challenging reverse merger transaction and alleging breaches of fiduciary duty.

Successfully represented a special litigation committee of a public corporation regarding claims asserted by a derivative plaintiff. The special litigation committee recommended dismissal of the derivative litigation and, upon its motion, the district court dismissed all claims and the Supreme Court later affirmed.

Represented officers and directors of telecommunication company defending against various securities fraud claims.

Represented a special litigation committee of public gaming manufacturing company regarding claims against officers and directors for breach of fiduciary duty, mismanagement, and waste.

Bank Litigation and CMBS Special Servicer Representation

Obtained judgment on the pleadings in favor of large national bank against \$1 million negligence claim.

Obtained \$1.8 million judgment in favor of a national bank in a contested deficiency action.

Successfully defended a large national bank in obtaining summary judgment on all claims in a case involving the processing of over \$400,000 in forged commercial checks.

Obtained dozens of receivership appointments for banks and CMBS special servicers regarding multimillion dollar commercial real property assets.

Recent Case Decisions

Okada v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court et al., 134 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 2, 408 P.3d 566 (2018) (holding, as a matter of first impression, that the “gaming privilege” provided in NRS 463.120(6) does not apply to information requested through discovery before that statute’s effective date) [View Court Opinion](#)

In re DISH Network Derivative Litigation, 133 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 61, 401 P.3d 1081 (2017) (adopting the standard set forth in *Auerbach v. Bennett*, 47 N.Y.2d 619 (1979) and concluding, as a matter of first impression, that Nevada courts should defer to the business judgment of a special litigation committee’s decision concerning whether pursuing a derivative suit is in the best interests of the corporation so long as the committee acts independently and conducts a good-faith, thorough investigation). [View Court Opinion](#)

Parametric Sound Corp. et al. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court et al., 133 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 59, 401 P.3d 1100 (2017) (establishing Nevada’s test for

distinguishing direct from derivative shareholder claims for purposes of determining if the shareholder has standing to bring suit) [View Court Opinion](#)

Wynn Resorts, Ltd. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court et al., 133 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 52, 399 P.3d 334 (2017) (recognizing that the business judgment rule precludes judicial interference with corporate decision-making when a director or board acts in good faith and adopting the “because of” test for determining whether, for purposes of the work product doctrine, work was done in anticipation of litigation) [View Court Opinion](#)

Okada v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court et al., 131 Nev. 834, 359 P.3d 1106 (2015) (establishing the test for evaluating whether a protective order is warranted to change the location or duration of a party's deposition) [View Court Opinion](#)

Las Vegas Sands v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court et al., 130 Nev. 118, 319 P.3d 618 (2014) (holding as a matter of first impression that NRS 50.125 requires disclosure of any document used to refresh a witness's recollection before or while testifying, regardless of privilege, and granting writ of prohibition directing district court to halt production of purportedly privileged documents) [View Court Opinion](#)

Las Vegas Sands v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court et al., 130 Nev. 578, 331 P.3d 876 (2014) (concluding that the existence of an applicable foreign, international privacy statute does not, by itself, prohibit Nevada state courts from ordering foreign parties to comply with Nevada's discovery rules and accordingly civil litigants may not use such foreign statutes to excuse their compliance with discovery obligations in Nevada courts) [View Court Opinion](#)

Las Vegas Sands v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court et al., 130 Nev. 643, 331 P.3d 905 (2014) (recognizing that because a corporation's current management is the sole holder of its attorney-client privilege, Nevada law does not permit any judicially created class of persons exempt from that privilege's protections) [View Court Opinion](#)

Compartment IT2, LP v. Fir Tree, Inc., No. 17-cv-1035, 2018 WL 1567841 (D. Nev. Mar. 30, 2018) (dismissing with prejudice all of plaintiffs' claims on the ground that they were derivative and not direct or dual direct and derivative).

RECOGNITION

- Mountain States Super Lawyers® Rising Stars, Business Litigation, 2012-2018
- *The Best Lawyers in America*© Litigation - Banking and Finance, 2016-2019

PROFESSIONAL AND CIVIC AFFILIATIONS

- State Bar of Nevada, Member, 2006-present
- Clark County Bar Association, Member, 2006-present
- American Bar Association, Litigation Section, Member, 2005-

present

- Utah State Bar, Member, 2005-present
- J. Reuben Clark Law Society, Member, 2005-present