



Ellen S. Bowman

Of Counsel

ellen.bowman@wilsonelser.com

Las Vegas, NV – 702.727.1397

Ellen Bowman handles a wide range of civil litigation cases, including insurance defense and professional liability matters. Ellen also has defended senior living and other health care facilities.

Prior to working at Wilson Elser, Ellen represented national insurance companies in defense and insurance coverage matters involving bad faith and unfair claims practices. She also defended professional liability claims against lawyers, insurers, brokers and agents, and litigated tort claims, including product liability claims, premises liability actions and catastrophic transportation claims. Following law school, Ellen completed a judicial clerkship with the Honorable Judge Nancy Oesterle.

Education

- California Western School of Law (J.D., 2010)
- University of Nevada at Reno (B.A., 2007)
 - with distinction

Bar Admissions

- Nevada

Court Admissions

- Supreme Court of Nevada
- U.S. District Court, District of Nevada

Professional Affiliations

Services

- Complex Tort & General Casualty
- Insurance & Reinsurance Coverage
- National Trial Team
- Medical Malpractice & Health Care
- Product Liability, Prevention & Government Compliance

- Nevada State Bar Association

Representative Matters

Obtained summary judgment for a commercial lessor in a premises liability case in which the plaintiff claimed to have suffered lifelong debilitating injuries when a hammer allegedly fell from the roof of the commercial premises onto his neck. Through discovery, Wilson Elser obtained testimony from witnesses that established the plaintiff's entire "flying hammer" injury was bogus.

Client Wins

Vignali & Bowman Prevail in Nevada Supreme Court on Certified Question; Set New Nevada Law on Licensor's Risk in Product Liability Cases

Russ Vignali (Senior Counsel-White Plains, NY) and Ellen Bowman (Of Counsel-Las Vegas, NV) represented several clients involved in a product's design and manufacture in a case involving an allegedly defective nail gun venued in the U.S. District Court, District of Nevada. On behalf of another client – the entity that licensed its well-known trade name to the nail gun's retailer – Russ and Ellen moved for summary judgment on the grounds that, as a mere "licensor," the entity was not truly in the nail gun's chain of distribution and could not therefore be strictly liable for any design or manufacturing defect. The issue was one of first impression for Nevada courts. For that reason, the District Court certified the following question to the Supreme Court of Nevada:

Does Nevada impose strict products liability on an entity whose only involvement with a defective or unreasonably dangerous product is to license its trademark to be used to market the product and where the product and packaging prominently display its trademark?

Russ and Ellen emphasized a modern trend around the country that has protected companies that merely license their trade name but otherwise play no role in the product's design and development. They cited the importance of product licensing in the modern American economy and the chilling effect that an adverse ruling would have in Nevada, where the gaming industry in particular relies so heavily on licensing and the use of trademarks. After significant briefing on both sides of the issue, including the filing of amicus briefs, the Nevada Supreme Court (in a 5-2 decision issued on May 1, 2025) answered the certified question in the **negative** – marking a major victory for trademark owners operating in Nevada who license their trade names but exercise no control over the product's final design and quality control.

The underlying case will continue against the remaining defendants.

Bowman and Lovett Prevail for Dental Practice against Claim of Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

Ellen Bowman (Of Counsel-Las Vegas, NV) and James Lovett (Associate-Las Vegas, NV)

obtained a dismissal of all of claims against a dental practice and its parent holding company. The plaintiff alleged that he had entered into a contract with staff of the practice for a full replacement of his teeth, but the treatment stopped after his existing teeth were removed. The plaintiff brought multiple contract claims and claims for intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress against the practice, the holding company, and the dentist that performed the initial procedure. Ellen and James filed a motion to dismiss the plaintiff's claims against the practice and the holding company, arguing that the claims were properly assessed under NRS 41A, Nevada's professional negligence statutes, which would have imposed a one-year statute of limitation. After James argued the motion, the court granted the motion in its entirety, finding that the case did sound in professional negligence, and found that the plaintiff did not file the complaint within the statute of limitations, dismissing all claims against Wilson Elser's clients.

Bowman and Verde Gain Dismissal for Hospital Client with Denial of Ordinary Negligence and Vulnerable Person Abuse Claims

Ellen Bowman (Of Counsel-Las Vegas) and Brandon Verde (Associate-Las Vegas) obtained a dismissal of Plaintiff's vulnerable abuse and ordinary negligence claims in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada, for Wilson Elser's client, a specialty acute care hospital. The plaintiff alleged he developed a sacral pressure wound during a stay at our client's hospital. In addition to alleging professional negligence/medical malpractice concerning the prevention and maintenance of the wound during the hospital stay, the plaintiff brought claims for vulnerable person abuse and ordinary negligence.

Ellen and Brandon filed a motion to dismiss the plaintiff's claim for ordinary negligence, asserting the allegations more reflect a professional negligence and medical malpractice cause of action requiring medical judgment. Additionally, Defendants moved to dismiss the plaintiff's claim for vulnerable person abuse, arguing the facts do not rise to the level of vulnerable person abuse. The Court granted Wilson Elser's motion to dismiss, concurring with Ellen and Brandon's arguments and dismissing both causes of action.