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

- That at all times relevant hereto, Defendant, RAISER, LLC, was, and now is, a 3. Delaware Corporation licensed and doing business in the County of Clark, State of Nevada.
- That at all times relevant hereto, Defendant, RAISER, LLC, was operating as a rideshare company in the County of Clark, State of Nevada, known commonly as "UBER."
- That at all times relevant hereto, Defendant, RAISER, LLC, was doing business in 5. the County of Clark, State of Nevada.
- That hereafter Defendant, RAISER, LLC, will be referred to in this Complaint by its 6. commonly used name of "UBER."
- That the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or 7. otherwise, of the Defendant DOES I through V and ROE CORPORATIONS VI through X, inclusive, is presently unknown to Plaintiff who, therefore, sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants designated herein as Doe and/or Roe is negligently, recklessly, and/or intentionally responsible in some manner for the events and happenings herein referred to and negligently, recklessly, and/or intentionally caused injuries and damages proximately thereby to the Plaintiff as herein alleged; that at the time of the incident, which is the subject of this Complaint, these unknown individuals or entities may have been responsible for the hiring, training, supervision of Defendant, BIENIEMY, in the operation of a motor vehicle, and his interaction and assault of Plaintiff on May 15, 2018. When the names of these entities or individuals become known, that Plaintiff will ask leave of this Court to amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of said Defendants, Does and/or Roes, when same have been ascertained by Plaintiff, together with appropriate charging allegations, and to join such Defendants in this action.
- That at all times relevant hereto, Defendant, BIENIEMY, was operating a motor 8. vehicle, picking up and dropping off passengers, and interacting with passengers in his employment role as a driver for Defendant, UBER.
- That at all times relevant hereto, Defendant, UBER, held itself out to the general 9. public on their website stating the process for a driver to earn money from UBER is as follows: "Open the app. Tap GO and you will be matched with a rider nearby. Swipe to accept a request. Get

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

easy-to-follow directions for a smooth pickup. Earn after every trip. Easily track your progress toward your daily and weekly goals."

- That at all times relevant hereto, Defendant, UBER, held itself out to the general 10. public regarding driver employment screenings as follows: "Before anyone can drive with Uber, they must undergo a multi-point review of driving history and criminal history. Screenings check for moving violations, drinking- and drug-related offenses, violent crime, and felonies. If a potential driver qualifies, they still have to remain in good standing with the law to stay in the Uber community."
- That on or about May 15, 2018, Plaintiff was a passenger in an Uber-purchased ride 11. in a vehicle operated by Defendant, BIENIEMY.
- That the ride was purchased from UBER by non-party, Mr. Buck Bower, with a trip 12. beginning at Larry Flint's Hustler Club in the County of Clark, State of Nevada.
- That non-party, Mr. Bower, at some point exited the vehicle with the UBER app 13. remaining on and charging the credit card of Mr. Bower.
- That upon Mr. Bower exiting the vehicle, he authorized the trip to continue with 14. UBER to take Plaintiff to his residence, located at or near 8450 West Charleston Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nevada 89117.
- That upon arriving at the residence for Plaintiff, a verbal altercation began 15. concerning the ride to the residence and the amount of tip that Defendant, BIENIEMY, was requesting from Plaintiff.
- That, at some point, Defendant, BIENEMY, physically attacked Plaintiff, causing 16. bodily injuries to Plaintiff.
- That the attack by Defendant, BIENIEMY, to Plaintiff caused Plaintiff to be on the 17. ground with the limited ability to move.
- That the attack occurred over a dispute about the amount of money for Plaintiff to 18. tip Defendant, BIENIEMY, for the UBER ride.
- That Defendant, BIENIEMY, fled the location of the attack, and did not report the 19. attack or the injuries to Plaintiff to law enforcement, or to medical personnel.

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

- That at all times relevant hereto, the UBER "app" was on, and Defendant, 20. BIENIEMY, was operating his vehicle as an UBER driver.
- That the attack occurred within the scope of Defendant, BIENIEMY's employment 21. relationship with Defendant, UBER.
- That the attack of Plaintiff by Defendant, BIENIEMY, was committed within the 22. course of providing of a ride to Plaintiff.
- That it is foreseeable that a driver for Defendant, UBER, would have a dispute with 23. a passenger regarding the driver's satisfaction as to if he/she received a tip, and the amount of such tip.
 - That the attack of Plaintiff by Defendant, BIENIEMY, was legally foreseeable. 24.
- That on September 24, 2018, Defendant, BIENIEMY, pled guilty in Las Vegas 25. Justice Court case 18F11071X to Assault, in violation of NRS 200.471.2a and Battery, in violation of NRS 200.481.2a, with Plaintiff, OVERHOLT, as the named victim, and was convicted of both charges.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Negligence as to all Defendants)

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations above, as though fully set forth herein. 26.
- That at said time and place of this incident, Defendants, as aforesaid, and each of 27. them, and/or Defendants' agents or employees, so intentionally, negligently, and/or recklessly interacted with Plaintiff, OVERHOLT, on May 15, 2018, so as to proximately cause said injuries to Plaintiff.
- 28. That as a direct and proximate result of the intentional, negligent and/or reckless conduct of the Defendants, individually, as well as their agents, servants and/or employees, as aforesaid. Plaintiff suffered various injuries to his person, required medical care, and also suffered great pain, suffering, disfigurement and anxiety.
- 29. That as a direct and proximate result of the intentional, negligent, and/or reckless conduct of the Defendants, their agents, servants and/or employees, as aforesaid, Plaintiff was required to seek medical care and to undergo medical treatment, in a sum to be determined at trial.

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

Defendants' acts were willful, malicious, fraudulent and oppressive, and in a 30. conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety. Defendants should be punished by the imposition of punitive damages in an amount to be more specifically determined by the trier of fact at trial, to punish Defendants for their conduct in this case, and also deter Defendants from any further or similar conduct in the future.

That as a direct and proximate result of the intentional, negligent, and/or reckless 31. conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff was required to obtain the services of an attorney to prosecute this action and is, therefore, entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, interest, plus costs incurred herein.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Negligent Hiring, Training, Supervision and Retention)

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs 32. as though fully set forth herein.
- That Defendant, UBER, and DOE/ROE Defendants, and each of them, had a duty to 33. exercise due care in its dealings with the Plaintiff and in the selection, training, supervision, oversight, direction, retention and control of its employees, agents, servants, joint venturers, independent contractors, retained by it to provide secure transportation.
- That Defendants, and each of them, had a duty to exercise due care in selecting, 34. training, supervising, overseeing directing, retaining and controlling its employees, agents, servants, joint venturers, independent contractors in order to provide responsible transportation personnel and supervising the same while performing their duties.
- That Defendants breached their duty to Plaintiff resulting in serious and disabling 35. injuries to Plaintiff.
- That the acts of the employees of each of the Defendants were fully authorized, 36. ratified, and approved by the employer and all other Defendants.
- The acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, were intentional, willful, 37. oppressive, fraudulent and done in a conscious and deliberate disregard of Plaintiff's rights and

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

safety, and Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages in a sum to be determined at the time of trial to punish and deter Defendants' reprehensible conduct in the future.

That as a direct and proximate result of the negligent, intentional, and/or reckless 38. conduct of the Defendants and each of them, as aforesaid, the Plaintiff was required to obtain the services of an attorney in order to prosecute this action, and is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees plus interest and costs of suit.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Battery as to Defendant, Cory Bieniemy)

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs 39. as though fully set forth herein.
- That Defendant, BIENIEMY, made intentional, willful and unlawful use of fact or 40. violence upon the Plaintiff, causing bodily harm while in the course and scope of his employment with Defendant, UBER.
- The acts and omissions of Defendant, BIENIEMY, was intentional, willful, 41. oppressive, fraudulent and done in a conscious and deliberate disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety while in the course and scope of his employment with, Defendant, UBER, and Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages in a sum to be determined at the time of trial to punish and deter Defendants' reprehensible conduct in the future.
- That as a direct and proximate result of the negligent, intentional, and/or reckless 42. conduct of Defendant, BIENIEMY, as aforesaid, Plaintiff was required to obtain the services of an attorney in order to prosecute this action, and is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees plus interest and costs of suit.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Respondeat Superior as to Defendant Raiser, LLC dba Uber)

Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs 43. as though fully set forth herein.

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

- Employers, masters, and principals are vicariously liable for the torts committed by 44. their employees, servants, and agents if the tort occurs while the employee, servant, or agent was acting in the course and scope of employment.
- That the Defendant, UBER, and DOE/ROE Defendants, were the employers, 45. masters, and principals of each other, the remaining Defendants, and other employees, agents, independent contractors, and/or representatives who negligently failed to maintain a safe and hazard-free environment for the general public, including the Plaintiff.
- That upon information and belief and at all times herein mentioned, CORY 46. BIENIEMY, was an employee, agent, independent contractor, or similar title of Defendant, UBER, and was acting within the course and scope of said employment and agency, with the knowledge, permission, and consent of Defendant, UBER.
- Any and all liability of Defendant, UBER's employees and/or agents, is imputed to 47. Defendants, and each of them, under the doctrine of respondeat superior and/or NRS 41.130, which states:

Except as otherwise provided in NRS 41.745, whenever any person shall suffer personal injury by wrongful act, neglect, or default of another, the person causing the injury is liable to the person injured for damages; and where the person causing the injury is employed by another person or corporation responsible for his conduct, that person or corporation so responsible is liable to the person injured for damages.

- That Defendant, UBER, is vicariously liable and/or jointly and severally liable for 48. the negligence of Defendant, BIENIEMY, and/or Defendant's agents, or employees, under the doctrine of respondeat superior, which directly and proximately resulted in Plaintiff's aforesaid damages.
- That at said time and place, Defendant, BIENIEMY, and/or Defendant's agents, or 49. employees, so negligently, intentionally, and/or recklessly operated, managed, controlled, performed work, as to proximately cause said injuries to Plaintiff. The act and omissions of the Defendant's agents or employees was done within the scope of their agency and/or employment relationship and Defendant, UBER, is liable under the theory of respondeat superior.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

25

26

27

28

That Defendant, UBER, is liable to the Plaintiff for the negligence of Defendant, 50. BIENIEMY, and/or Defendant's agents, or employees, under the doctrine of respondeat superior, the provisions of NRS 41.130, and/or otherwise by operation of law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief from the Defendants, and each of them, for all causes of actions, as follows:

- For a sum to be determined for past and future medical expenses; 1.
- For a sum to be determined for past and future pain and suffering; 2.
- For a sum to be determined for past and future physical and mental pain, suffering, 3. anguish, and disability;
- For general damages in excess of \$15,000.00; 4.
- For special damages in excess of \$15,000.00; 5.
- For a sum to be determined at trial for punitive damages; 6.
- For reasonable attorney's fees, costs, and interest for having to prosecute this matter. 7.
- 8. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 23rd day of November, 2018.

DRUMMOND LAW FIRM, P.C.

Nevada Bar No. 11109

Liberty A. Ringor, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 14417

810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 101

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorneys for Plaintiff

DRUMMOND LAW FIRM 810 S CASINO CENTER BLVD, STE 101 LAS VEGAS, NV 89101 www.Drummondfirm.com

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, HANNON OVERHOLT, by and through his attorneys, CRAIG W.

DRUMMOND, ESQ., and LIBERTY A. RINGOR, ESQ., of DRUMMOND LAW FIRM, P.C., hereby demand a jury trial of all the issues in the above matter.

DATED this 23^a day of November, 2018.

DRUMMOND LAW FIRM, P.C.

Graig W. Drymmond Fsq.

Nevada Bar No. 11109 Liberty A. Ringor, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 14417

810 S. Casino Center Blvd., Suite 101

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Plaintiff