



## Chris J. Richardson

Partner

[chris.richardson@wilsonelser.com](mailto:chris.richardson@wilsonelser.com)

Las Vegas, NV – 702.727.1269

Chris Richardson represents clients in all aspects of civil litigation. His practice focuses on defending against claims related to general liability, professional liability, personal injury, and business and real estate litigation. Chris has extensive experience representing companies of diverse backgrounds in all aspects of litigation and business planning. In addition to prosecuting and defending matters in various lawsuits, he has handled numerous cases before the Nevada Real Estate Commission, the Nevada Contractor's Board and various other administrative governing bodies.

Prior to working at Wilson Elser, Chris clerked for the Honorable Kenneth Cory, Nevada Eighth Judicial District Court, in addition to working for two Las Vegas law firms.

### Education

- University of Nebraska College of Law (J.D., 2004)
- University of Nebraska School of Business (M.B.A., 2004)
- Mount Marty College, South Dakota (B.A., 2001)

### Bar Admissions

- Nevada

### Court Admissions

- U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit
- U.S. District Court, District of Nevada
- Supreme Court of Nevada

### Services

- Commercial Contracts & Agreements
- Commercial Litigation
- Complex Tort & General Casualty
- Construction
- Employment & Labor
- Professional Liability & Services

## Awards & Honors

- Selected for inclusion in *The Best Lawyers in America® Ones to Watch™*, 2024-2025
- Selected for inclusion in *The Best Lawyers in America®: Ones to Watch* in the areas of Commercial Litigation; Litigation – Real Estate; Personal Injury Litigation – Defendants, 2021-2023

## Client Wins

### **Lowry & Richardson Obtain Summary Judgment in Malicious Prosecution Case**

Michael Lowry (Partner-Las Vegas) and Chris Richardson (Of Counsel-Las Vegas) obtained summary judgment in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Las Vegas, in a malicious prosecution case against Wilson Elser's client, a security services provider contracted to work in a hospital. The plaintiff is a hospital nurse whom our client's employees observed interacting with a patient they believed the nurse physically abused. The employees reported their observations to superiors resulting in a police investigation, a grand jury hearing, and criminal charges against the nurse. The charges were dismissed, however, due to an error in the grand jury hearing, and the plaintiff sued our client and its employees for malicious prosecution and other related causes of action.

After significant discovery, Michael and Chris moved for summary judgment, arguing that the malicious prosecution cause of action failed as a matter of law because the dismissal of criminal charges didn't prevent the state from re-filing them. The court concurred that dismissal with prejudice is required to support malicious prosecution. It also concluded that the security personnel had probable cause to report their observations, a defense defeating a malicious prosecution claim.

The court further agreed that our client's security personnel are immune from suit and qualify for statutory immunity under NRS 200.5096. The statute creates mandatory and permissive reporting obligations for certain persons and immunizes them from civil liability arising from their reporting. This ruling is thought to be among the first where the statute has been applied to security personnel working in a hospital. The plaintiff later voluntarily dismissed his case in lieu of an appeal.

### **Lowry & Richardson Win Summary Judgment for Equipment Rental Client**

A Las Vegas district court granted summary judgment to a client that rents traffic control devices after the plaintiffs failed to correctly add the client to the case. Michael Lowry (Partner-Las Vegas) and Chris Richardson (Of Counsel-Las Vegas) were hired to defend the client, who rented devices to a festival that were allegedly involved in an accident. The plaintiffs sued numerous other parties who could have been responsible but initially did not sue the client. As discovery commenced, the other parties disclosed documentation expressly identifying the client and its role with the devices at issue. However, the plaintiffs did not try to add the client as a party for months, long after the statute of limitations expired. The only way for the plaintiffs to get around the statute of limitations was if their amended complaint "related back" to the original, timely complaint utilizing one of two alternative methods. The judge granted the motion because the plaintiffs failed to satisfy

either option.

**Lowry & Richardson Achieve Nuisance Settlement for National Private Security Contractor**

Michael Lowry (Partner-Las Vegas, NV) and Chris Richardson (Of Counsel-Las Vegas, NV) achieved a favorable settlement before the Eighth Judicial District Court on behalf of a national private security contractor providing services for a hospital. . During an intake, a patient became violent, injured her mother and assaulted a nurse. The mother sued, alleging the security contractor should have better protected her from her daughter. Michael and Chris collaborated with the hospital to identify video obtained through the discovery process that recorded the event showing the mother trying to intervene when the daughter injured her. The mother's case then collapsed and she accepted a nuisance settlement.

**Lowry & Richardson's Discovery Strategies Net Nuisance Settlement for National Private Security Contractor**

Michael Lowry (Partner-Las Vegas, NV) and Chris Richardson (Of Counsel-Las Vegas, NV) achieved a favorable settlement on behalf of a national private security contractor before the Eighth Judicial District Court. The client was one of several security contractors hired to work at a large, outdoor festival in Las Vegas, Nevada, where two people were injured. The plaintiffs sued all of the security companies because they were unable to identify the correct one. Michael and Chris used the security contractor's own documents to pursue targeted discovery from other vendors involved with the festival, which eventually confirmed that the client was not even assigned to the area of the festival where the injuries occurred. The plaintiffs accepted a nuisance settlement in lieu of a motion for summary judgment.