



1 **CMPL**
2 ROBERT T. EGLET, ESQ.
3 Nevada Bar No. 3402
4 CASSANDRA S.M. CUMMINGS, ESQ.
5 Nevada Bar No. 11944
6 **EGLET ADAMS**
7 400 S. Seventh St., Suite 400
8 Las Vegas, NV 89101
9 (702) 450-5400; Fax: (702) 450-5451
10 eservice@egletlaw.com

CASE NO: A-21-829892-C
Department 21

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
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
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

MATTHEW L. SHARP, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 4746
MATTHEW L. SHARP, LTD.
432 Ridge Street
Reno, NV 89501
(775) 324-1500; Fax: (775) 284-0675
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

MELVIN EGYPT, individually and on behalf of all
those similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ACUITY A MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY,
DOES 1 through 10,

Defendants.

Case No.:
Dept. No.:

COMPLAINT

**REQUEST FOR BUSINESS
COURT**

**EXEMPT FROM
ARBITRATION**

Jury Trial Demanded

Plaintiff, Melvin Egypt, by and through undersigned counsel and on behalf of himself and
all other similarly situated, hereby submits this Class Action Complaint against Defendant, Acuity
a Mutual Insurance Company (hereinafter "Acuity"), and DOES 1 through 10.

1
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

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This action seeks class-wide relief for Defendant Acuity’s failure to provide and charge a fair and appropriate insurance premium and to provide premium reduction to its Nevada automobile insurance policyholders amid the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of all Nevada residents who held automobile insurance policies through Acuity as of March 1, 2020, and who have thereafter continued to be Acuity automobile policyholders.

3. Plaintiff and the class, along with everyone in this country, have faced substantial life changes since March 1, 2020 because of the COVID-19 pandemic, including reduced driving time and miles. The reduction of driving time and miles driven reduces the risk associated with insuring Plaintiff and the class members’ vehicles. Acuity has not taken the appropriate action to reduce Plaintiff and the class members’ premiums to accurately reflect the decreased risk.

II. PARTIES

4. Plaintiff, Melvin Egypt, is a resident of the State of Nevada, and a current automobile insurance policyholder of Acuity.

5. Defendant, Acuity a Mutual Insurance Company, is a Wisconsin company, with offices at 2800 South Taylor Drive, Sheboygan, WI, 53081, licensed to sell automobile insurance policies within the State of Nevada.

6. Defendants DOE 1 through 10 are insurance companies that fall within the Acuity Insurance umbrella that provide policies of automobile insurance to Nevada residents.

7. That the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of the Defendants herein designated as DOE are unknown to Plaintiff at this time who therefore sue said Defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff alleges that each named Defendant herein designated as DOE is negligently, willfully, contractually, or otherwise legally responsible for the events and happenings herein referred to and proximately caused damages to Plaintiff as herein alleged. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of such Defendants when same have been ascertained and will further seek leave

1 to join said Defendant in these proceedings. Plaintiff believes each Defendant named as DOE was
2 responsible for contributing to Plaintiff’s damages as set forth herein.

3
4 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 8. That exercise of jurisdiction by this Court over each and every Defendant in this action is
6 appropriate because each and every Defendant has done, and continues to do business in the State
7 of Nevada, and contracted with Nevada residents, breached contracts with Nevada residents, and
8 violated Nevada laws.

9 9. Acuity is an insurance company licensed to do business in Nevada, and it sells automobile
10 insurance to Nevada residents and charges and collects premiums from those citizens.

11 10. Acuity sold a Nevada insurance policy to Plaintiff where he resides in Clark County,
12 Nevada.

13 11. That exercise of jurisdiction by this Court is further appropriate where Plaintiff resides in
14 the County of Clark, State of Nevada.

15 12. That this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action. That exercise of the
16 jurisdiction by this Court over Acuity in this action is appropriate because Acuity has done, and
17 continues to do, business in the State of Nevada, and committed the wrongdoings alleged in this
18 Complaint in the State of Nevada. Additionally, this Court has jurisdiction over the claims alleged
19 herein as they arise out of contracts entered into with Nevada residents and Acuity’s actions
20 violate Nevada law.

21 **IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND APPLICABLE TO THE PROPOSED CLASS**

22 13. Acuity is a prolific underwriter of automobile insurance in Nevada.

23 14. On information and belief, and throughout the entirety of the COVID-19 pandemic,
24 Acuity has enjoyed a substantial share of the auto insurance market in Nevada. At all times
25 relevant to this case, Acuity has derived substantial revenues and profits from the sale of
26 automobile insurance to Nevada residents, including Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated.

27
28

V. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

15. Coronavirus disease 2019 (“COVID-19”), is a novel, virus-borne, and potentially deadly illness that impacts various systems within the body of those infected with the disease. Since its emergence in late 2019, it has spread rapidly across the globe, reaching pandemic levels. On January 20, 2020, it was declared a “public health emergency of international concerns” by the World Health Organization. A week later, the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services declared the virus a public health emergency in the United States.

16. COVID-19 is highly contagious and appears capable of spreading exponentially through transmission by persons who are symptomatic, asymptomatic, or pre-symptomatic.

17. As of the date of this complaint, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has recorded over 28 million cases of COVID-19, and over 497,000 COVID-related deaths in the U.S. alone.

18. The State of Nevada suffered over 4,700 COVID-related deaths as of the date of this Complaint.¹

19. On March 12, 2020, Nevada Governor Steve Sisolak issued the Declaration of Emergency for COVID-19.² In that declaration, the Governor “determined that the State of Nevada is experiencing events that require a coordinated response for the health and safety of the public.”³ The declaration “will remain in effect until the Chief Medical Officer notifies the Governor that the health event has been abated and the Governor issues an order terminating the emergency.”⁴

20. On March 15, 2020, Governor Sisolak issued the COVID-19 Declaration of Emergency Directive 001 closing all “public, community, and private K-12 schools in the state” until the Order is rescinded.⁵

¹ <https://nvhealthresponse.nv.gov/> (last visited February 22, 2021).

² https://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/2020/2020-03-12_-_COVID-19_Declaration_of_Emergency/ (last visited January 38, 2021).

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ https://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/2020/2020-03-15_-_COVID-19_Declaration_of_Emergency_Directive_001/ (last visited February 22, 2021).

1 21. On March 19, 2020, Governor Sisolak issued COVID-19 Declaration of Emergency
2 Directive 002 closing all in-person gaming establishments.⁶

3 22. On March 20, 2020, Governor Sisolak issued COVID-19 Declaration of Emergency
4 Directive 003 closing all “non-essential businesses” that promote social gatherings and prolonged
5 interactions between individuals where risk of transmission is high.⁷ These businesses included
6 recreation centers, clubhouses, nightclubs, movie theaters, massage parlors, adult entertainment
7 establishments, brothels, live entertainment venues, gyms and studios, and aesthetic services (i.e.
8 beauty shops, tanning salons, wax salons).⁸

9 23. On March 24, 2020, Governor Sisolak issued COVID-19 Declaration of Emergency
10 Directive 007, which stated that “[t]he Nevada general public shall not gather in groups of ten or
11 more in any indoor or outdoor area,” and directing local governments to limit the general public’s
12 use of “recreational equipment, including, without limitation, playground equipment, basketball
13 courts, volleyball courts, baseball fields, beaches, or football fields, in a manner that causes the
14 congregation of ten or more persons.”⁹

15 24. On November 10, 2020, Governor Sisolak once again urged all Nevadans to restrict their
16 activities outside the home to only those essential activities for two (2) weeks, dubbed “Stay at
17 Home 2.0.” This request is a direct result of the rising numbers of COVID-19 infections within
18 the State. The Governor warned that, if the infection numbers do not decrease, the State will likely
19 be subject to another mandatory shut-down.

20 25. The practical effect of the COVID-19 crisis and the State of Nevada’s response thereto
21 has been to dramatically reduce the vehicle traffic on Nevada’s roads. With non-essential
22 businesses and schools closed as well as the limitation on the size of gatherings and people forced
23
24

25 ⁶ [https://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/2020/2020-03-18 - COVID-
19_Declaration_of_Emergency_Directive_002/](https://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/2020/2020-03-18_-_COVID-19_Declaration_of_Emergency_Directive_002/) (last visited January 28, 2021).

26 ⁷ [https://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/2020/2020-03-20 - COVID-
19_Declaration_of_Emergency_Directive_003_\(Attachments\)/](https://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/2020/2020-03-20_-_COVID-19_Declaration_of_Emergency_Directive_003_(Attachments)/) (last visited January 28, 2021).

27 ⁸ *Id.*

28 ⁹ [https://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/2020/2020-03-24 - COVID-
19_Declaration_of_Emergency_Directive_007_\(Attachments\)/](https://gov.nv.gov/News/Emergency_Orders/2020/2020-03-24_-_COVID-19_Declaration_of_Emergency_Directive_007_(Attachments)/) (last visited January 28, 2021).

1 to remain at home due to the public health crisis, Nevada residents have been driving less
 2 frequently and shorter distances.

3 26. Vehicular traffic throughout Nevada has been greatly reduced during the COVID-19
 4 pandemic. For example, in April 2020, the vehicular traffic at the Nevada-California border was
 5 sixty-six percent (66%) lower than it was in April 2019. Traffic volumes decreased between sixty
 6 percent (60%) to seventy percent (70%) compared to the same time periods in 2019. These
 7 reductions have been statewide.

8 27. With fewer people driving fewer miles, there are fewer automobile accidents and,
 9 therefore, fewer automobile insurance claims. The COVID-19 pandemic has thus led to a
 10 dramatic reduction in automobile insurance claims by Nevada residents. For example, there was
 11 a sixty percent (60%) reduction in automobile accidents in Southern Nevada in March 2020 from
 12 the prior year. This significant drop in driving, collisions, and automobile insurance claims during
 13 the pandemic will almost certainly continue for the foreseeable future, and for as long as the
 14 COVID-19 crisis continues.

15 28. In particular, the COVID-19 pandemic has led to a dramatic reduction in the number of
 16 Nevada automobile insurance claims that have been submitted and will be submitted to Acuity.

17 29. Insurance companies have provided varying forms of premium refunds or credits during
 18 the COVID-19 pandemic ranging from nothing at all to the 35% CHUBB provided to its insureds.
 19 These refunds or credits are arbitrary and inconsistent in amount and duration. In fact, the only
 20 consistency among the refunds or credits is that they are arbitrary and capricious, as well as
 21 insufficient to provide fair, actual, and meaningful relief to the insureds as illustrated in the
 22 following table:

Insurance Company	Quantity	Duration
Acuity	\$50 - \$100 one time refund (amount depends on the number of insured vehicles)	One time
Allstate	15% discount	2 months (April & May 2020)

28

Insurance Company	Quantity	Duration
Farmers Insurance	25% credit for 1 month and 15% for 1 month	2 months (April & May 2020)
Geico	15% credit	For an entire policy, but ONLY upon insurance renewal between April 8 – Oct 7, 2020.
Liberty Mutual	15% refund	2 months (April & May 2020)
Nationwide	\$50	One time
Progressive	20% credit	2 months (April & May 2020)
State Farm	25% credit	3 months (March – May 2020)
Travelers	15% credit	3 months (April - June 2020)
USAA	20% credit for 3 months then reduced to a 10% credit for 2 months	5 months (March – July 2020)

Though each insurance provider represented to its insureds that it understood the challenges individuals are facing during the COVID-19 pandemic and presented that fair refunds and credits were being issued, yet, none of them offered any meaningful relief that actually reflects the reduction in cars on the road and reduced driving during the pandemic.

A. Acuity’s Wrongdoing

30. Personal insurance rates are set to cover future expected claims and expenses. Auto insurers, including the Defendant Acuity, develop such rates by extrapolating from recent historical experience with premium payments, claims submitted, claim settlement expenses, and non-claim selling and administrative expenses, and then projecting future claims and costs from that data.

31. Under Nevada law, Defendant Acuity may not charge an insurance premium that is excessive.

32. A premium is based, in part, upon what Defendant Acuity anticipates for future claims payments both in severity and frequency, and premiums are calculated based upon the extent of the insured’s normal driving routine.

1 33. As a result of COVID-19 restrictions, the frequency and severity of claims incurred by
2 Acuity were dramatically reduced and significantly less than what was anticipated when the
3 premium was charged.

4 34. As a result of COVID-19 restrictions, Acuity insureds drove significantly less than what
5 was anticipated by Acuity when it developed the premium. As an example, Plaintiff’s driving
6 time and mileage has been, and continues to be, greatly reduced because of the COVID-19
7 pandemic.

8 35. As a result of COVID-19 restrictions, Acuity has and will incur significantly less expenses
9 in claim payments than what was anticipated when the premium was charged.

10 36. As a result of COVID-19 restrictions, Acuity has charged and collected an excessive
11 premium to its insureds in the past and into the future.

12 37. Acuity is aware that it cannot charge an excessive premiums, and it has an affirmative
13 duty under the law to return any excessive premiums that were collected.

14 38. Many auto insurers have provided what the industry refers as “premium relief” to their
15 policyholders, but the so-called “relief” is actually designed to allow insurers to retain excessive
16 premiums in light of COVID-19 restrictions.

17 39. Acuity knows that the premiums it charged and collected following COVID-19
18 restrictions is grossly excessive.

19 40. Specifically, in statements posted on its website (and still shown on the website as of the
20 filing of this Complaint), Acuity promised its customers a one time “reduced-driving discount”
21 on their policies. Acuity offered a one-time fifty dollar (\$50.00) to one-hundred dollar (\$100.00)
22 premium credit on policies with two (2) cars and, upon information and belief, the credit on
23 policies with one (1) car was even lower. Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, have not received
24 any other reduction from Acuity even though COVID-19 continues to wreak havoc in Nevada 11
25 months after the emergency declaration and will continue for the foreseeable future.

26 41. This premium credit is inadequate such that even if the credit is applied to the Plaintiff
27 and those similarly situated, the Plaintiff has paid and will continue to pay a grossly excessive
28 premium.

1 action than in piecemeal individual determinations. There is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy
2 other than by maintenance of this lawsuit as a class action because individual actions for premium
3 refunds are relatively small, making it economically infeasible for Class Members to pursue
4 remedies individually. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Members of the Class,
5 even if theoretically possible, would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with
6 respect to the individual Class Members against Defendants and would establish incompatible
7 standards of conduct for the Defendants. There are several questions of law or fact common to
8 all Class members including, but not limited to:

- 9 a. Whether each member of the proposed class was a policyholder under an existing
10 Acuity automobile insurance policy as of March 1, 2020, and has since continued
11 to be a Acuity policyholder;
- 12 b. Whether Acuity has charged each member an excessive premium following
13 COVID-19 restrictions;
- 14 c. Whether each member of the proposed class has been offered or provided with the
15 inadequate premium reduction described in paragraph 40 above;
- 16 d. Whether the fairness and/or reasonableness of Acuity’s program of premium
17 reduction, as described above, is governed by the terms of its automobile policies
18 and Nevada law;
- 19 e. Whether Acuity’s offer or provision of premium reduction, as described in
20 paragraph 40 above, constitutes an unfair or deceptive act or practice;
- 21 f. Whether Acuity implemented its offer of premium reduction, as described in
22 paragraph 40 above, with the expectation that others would rely upon any
23 misrepresentation, or any concealment or omission of material fact, subsumed
24 within such offer;
- 25 g. Whether Acuity’s program of premium reduction, as described in paragraph 40
26 above, is unfair and/or unreasonable;

27
28

1
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

- h. Whether Acuity’s program of premium reduction, as described in paragraph 40 above, constitutes a breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing contained in each of the company’s Nevada automobile insurance policies;
- i. Whether Acuity’s program of premium reduction, as described in paragraph 40 above, results in a violation of Nevada law; and
- j. Whether Acuity owes greater COVID-related premium reduction to its Nevada automobile insurance policyholders.

50. Adequacy of Representation: Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the other members of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly, adequately, and vigorously represent and protect the interests of the members of the Class and have no interests antagonistic to the members of the Class. Plaintiff has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in the prosecution of complex consumer class action litigation. Plaintiff’s attorneys have the resources, expertise, and experience to prosecute this action, and do not have knowledge of any conflicts among the members of Plaintiff’s Class, or any conflicts between the Class and Plaintiff’s attorneys.

51. Superiority: The class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because: (a) the prosecution of a multitude of separate actions would be inefficient and wasteful of judicial resources; (b) the members of the Class may be scattered throughout Nevada and are not likely to be able to enforce their rights unless this action is maintained as a class action; (c) the issues raised can be more fairly and efficiently resolved in the context of a single action rather than through piecemeal litigation in the context of separate actions; (d) the resolution of litigation in a single forum will avoid the danger and resultant confusion of possible inconsistent determinations; (e) the prosecution of separate actions would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications; (f) Defendants have acted and will act on grounds applicable to all Class members; (g) individual Class members’ premium refund claims are relatively small and the expense and burden of individual litigation makes it impossible for Class members to individually redress the wrongs done to them; and (h) questions of law

1 and/or fact common to the Class, especially on issues of liability, predominate over any individual
2 question.

3
4 **VII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Declaratory Relief Pursuant to NRS 30.040**

7 52. Plaintiff, Melvin Egypt, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, repeats and
8 incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 51 above.

9 53. Acuity has charged an excessive premium following COVID-19 restrictions.

10 54. Acuity's program of premium reduction, as described in paragraph 40 above, continues
11 to unlawfully deprive its Nevada automobile insurance policyholders of the full and fair COVID-
12 related premium relief to which they are entitled.

13 55. Acuity's program of premium reduction, as described in paragraph 40 above, is designed
14 to secure for Acuity, and has secured and will continue to secure for Acuity, an unfair windfall at
15 the expense of Acuity's Nevada automobile insurance policyholders.

16 56. Acuity's program of premium reduction, as described in paragraph 40 above, is unlawful.

17 57. An actual controversy of a justiciable nature exists regarding the contractual relationship
18 between the Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, and Acuity,
19 concerning the parties' rights and obligations with respect to Acuity's program of COVID-related
20 premium reduction.

21 58. The controversy is of sufficient immediacy to justify the entry of a declaratory judgment
22 regarding the contracts between the Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, and Acuity.

23 59. An actual controversy of a justiciable nature exists regarding Acuity's statutory
24 responsibilities to provide automobile insurance and to not charge excessive premiums.

25 60. An award of declaratory relief by this Court will terminate some or all the existing
26 controversy between the parties.

27 ///

28 ///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Contract

61. Plaintiff, Melvin Egypt, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 60 above.

62. Plaintiff, and Class members, each entered into an insurance contract for automobile insurance with Acuity.

63. The insurance contract is governed by Nevada law.

64. Acuity agreed to charge a premium that was reasonable in relation to the risk and was not excessive.

65. Acuity committed to its insureds to provide the right protection at a fair price.

66. Acuity is aware of that the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions materially changed the nature of the risk being insured because there was a material decrease in the claims frequency and severity.

67. In light of the change of the risk being insured, the pre-COVID-19 premium is excessive in relation to the COVID-19 risks.

68. Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, paid an excessive premium when they paid the premium Acuity charged.

69. Acuity breached the insurance contract when it collected an excessive premium from Plaintiff and those similarly situated.

70. As a direct result of Acuity's breach of contract, Plaintiff Melvin Egypt, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, have been damaged as they paid an excessive premium and will continue to pay an excessive premium into the future.

71. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing and as a result of the breach by Defendants, Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, have sustained damages in an amount exceeding Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00).

72. It has been necessary for Plaintiff to retain the services of counsel to represent him, and those similarly situation, to bring this action, and Plaintiff is entitled to recovery of attorneys' fees and costs incurred herein.

1
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

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing (Contract)

73. Plaintiff, Melvin Egypt, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 72 above.

74. Each existing automobile insurance policy Acuity has issued in the State of Nevada contains an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

75. Acuity owes a duty of good faith and fair dealing to Plaintiff and those similarly situated, to act in a manner that is faithful to the purpose and spirit of the contract.

76. In order to fulfill the purpose and spirit of the contract, Acuity must charge a premium that is reasonable in relation to the risk insured against and is not excessive.

77. Acuity is aware that the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions materially changed the nature of the risk being insured because there was a material decrease in the claims frequency and severity.

78. In light of the change of the risk being insured, the pre-COVID-19 premium is excessive in relation to the COVID-19 risks.

79. Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, paid an excessive premium when they paid the premium Acuity charged.

80. Acuity has deliberately contravened the intention and spirit of the contract by collecting and retaining the excessive premium.

81. Acuity breached its duty of good faith and fair dealing when it collected and collected and retained an excessive premium from Plaintiff and those similarly situated.

82. As a direct result of Acuity's breach of contract, Plaintiff Melvin Egypt, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, have been damaged as they paid an excessive premium and will continue to do so into the future.

83. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing and as a result of the breach by Defendants, Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, have sustained damages in an amount exceeding Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000.00).

1 84. It has been necessary for Plaintiff to retain the services of counsel to represent him, and
2 those similarly situation, to bring this action, and Plaintiff is entitled to recovery of attorneys’ fees
3 and costs incurred herein.

4
5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Bad Faith**

7 85. Plaintiff, Melvin Egypt, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, repeats and
8 incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 84 above.

9 86. Acuity owes a duty of good faith and fair dealing to Plaintiff, and all others similarly
10 situated insureds, and the duty is imposed by law.

11 87. As part of its duty of good faith and fair dealing, Acuity has a fiduciary-like relationship
12 to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated insureds.

13 88. Under the law, Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated insureds, have the right to expect
14 trust and confidence in the integrity and fidelity of Acuity.

15 89. Acuity contracted with Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, to provide protection,
16 peace of mind, and security as it relates to their automobile insurance.

17 90. As set forth herein, Acuity, as part of its fiduciary-like duties, cannot charge or retain an
18 excessive premium.

19 91. Acuity has breached its duty of good faith and fair dealing by charging and collecting
20 from Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, an excessive premium.

21 92. Acuity has acted unreasonably with knowledge there is no unreasonable basis for its
22 conduct.

23 93. Acuity represented to its customers, including Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated,
24 that it was taking measures to reduce costs to Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, during the
25 COVID-19 crisis.

26 94. Acuity misrepresented the nature of any relief it may offer to its customers, including
27 Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated.

28

1 95. Acuity offered a one-time fifty dollar (\$50.00) to one-hundred dollar (\$100.00) premium
2 credit on policies with two (2) cars and, upon information and belief, the credit on policies with
3 one (1) car was even lower. Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, have not received any other
4 reduction from Acuity even though COVID-19 continues to wreak havoc in Nevada 11 months
5 after the emergency declaration and will continue for the foreseeable future.

6 96. The one-time credit provided by Acuity amounted to a credit of approximately seven
7 percent (7%) of the policy-holder's premium where driving in the State has declined between
8 forty percent (40%) and seventy percent (70%) depending on the week.

9 97. In so doing, Acuity is taking advantage of its insureds, including Plaintiff and those
10 similarly situated, by continuing to collect and charge excessive premiums despite the greatly
11 reduced risk and enjoying substantial profits as a result.

12 98. Acuity has acted in bad faith in breaching the fiduciary responsibility it owes to Plaintiff
13 and all those similarly situated.

14 99. Acuity's actions were not keeping with the relationship of trust and confidence with its
15 insureds, including Plaintiff and all those similarly situated.

16 100. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing and as a result of the breach by
17 Defendants, Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, have sustained damages as they have paid and
18 will continue to pay into the future in an amount exceeding Fifteen Thousand Dollars
19 (\$15,000.00).

20 101. Defendant made intentional misrepresentations to its insureds and acted with
21 conscious disregard to the rights of its insureds thus entitling Plaintiff, and all those similarly
22 situated, to an award of punitive damages.

23 102. It has been necessary for Plaintiff to retain the services of counsel to represent him,
24 and those similarly situation, to bring this action, and Plaintiff is entitled to recovery of attorneys'
25 fees and costs incurred herein.

26 ///
27 ///
28 ///

1
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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Nevada’s Deceptive Trade Practices Act (NRS §§ 598.0903 to 598.0999)

103. Plaintiff, Melvin Egypt, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, repeats, and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 102 above.

104. At all times relevant herein, Defendants violated the Nevada Deceptive Trade Practices Act, §§ 598.0903 to 598.0999, by representing to its automobile insurance policyholders that they will receive premium rates based upon risk factors, offering an inadequate premium reduction in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, and failing to take into consideration the ongoing decrease in risk due to the decreased volume of vehicle traffic on all roads throughout Nevada.

105. Defendants made false or misleading statements of fact concerning the price and cost of their automobile insurance policies, as set forth above, in violation of NRS 598.0915(13) and otherwise knowingly made false representations in their communications with automobile insurance policyholders regarding the COVID-19 premium reduction described above.

106. In making its offer of premium reduction, Acuity represented to its Nevada automobile insurance policyholders (implicitly, if not explicitly) that such offer is fair and reasonable, when in fact it is neither.

107. In making its offer of premium reduction, Acuity concealed from its Nevada automobile insurance policyholders, or omitted to share with such policyholders, the inadequacy and unfairness of that offer. Acuity engaged in such conduct with the intent that others rely upon such concealment and/or omission.

108. In making its offer of premium reduction, Acuity expressly represented to its Nevada automobile insurance policyholders that “protecting you [the customer] is our top priority” and that Acuity “will be there after accidents, storms, and other losses.” This was a misrepresentation of Acuity’s intent as the premium credit was only provided once even though Governor Sisolak’s March 12, 2020 emergency declaration has been ongoing for 11 months, and may continue for several months.

1
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

G. Award such other and further relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.
DATED this 23rd day of February, 2021.

EGLET ADAMS

MATTHEW L. SHARP, LTD.



/s/ Matthew L. Sharp

ROBERT T. EGLET, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 3402
CASSANDRA S.M. CUMMINGS, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 11944
Attorneys for Plaintiff

MATTHEW L. SHARP, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 4746