27

28

1

2

3

Electronically Filed 1/31/2025 9:27 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

Michael W. Sanft (8245)

SANFT LAW

411 E. Bonneville Ave., Ste 360 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 497-8008 (office) (702) 297-6582 (facsimile) michael@sanftlaw.com Attorney for Plaintiff Daniel Wang

CASE NO: A-25-911410-C Department 9

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DANIEL WANG aka WANG JIANPING OR WANG JENPING, an individual,

Plaintiff.

vs.

KENT WU, an individual; JIA HUA, an individual; CRYSTAL HSIUNG; LAS VEGAS CHINESE NEWSPAPER aka LAS VEGAS CHINESE NEWS NETWORK (LVCNN) a corporation; DOES I through X; and ROES XI through XX,

Case No.: Dept. No.:

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

AND

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Defendants.

Plaintiff DANIEL WANG aka WANG JIANPING, (referred to hereinafter as "Plaintiff") by and through his attorney, Michael Sanft, Esq. of SANFT LAW, complains as follows against Defendants KENT WU ("Defendant Wu"), JIA HUA ("Defendant Hua"), CRYSTAL HSIUNG ("Defendant Hsiung") LAS VEGAS CHINESE NEWSPAPER aka LAS VEGAS CHINESE NEWS NETWORK LVCNN ("Defendant LVCNN"), and DOES I through X AND ROES XI through XX as follows:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

- 1. Plaintiff is an individual residing in Clark County, Nevada.
- 2. Upon information and belief, Defendants Wu, Crystal Hsiung, and Hua are individuals who reside in Clark County, Nevada.

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

- 3. Defendant LVCNN is a Nevada corporation conducting business as a newspaper in Clark County, Nevada, with its principal place of business located at 6450 Spring Mountain Rd., Ste 9, Las Vegas, NV 89146. Service of process can be perfected upon the LAS VEGAS CHINESE NEWS NETWORK by service of the Complaint and Summons upon its registered agreed agent Wei Tan at is registered office 3552 Wynn Rd., Las Vegas, NV 89103. 4. Defendant Wu is president of LVCNN. 5.
 - Defendant Hua is a news reporter for LVCNN.
- 6. Defendant Hsiung formerly dated Plaintiff, prior to the allegations contained in this Complaint.
- 6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of DOE or ROE Defendants I through X, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that each of the Defendants designated as a DOE Defendant is responsible in some manner for the events and happenings described herein. As such, Plaintiff will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of said Defendants as they become identified and known to Plaintiff.
- 7. Jurisdiction of the Eighth Judicial District Court is proper in the matter, as the amount in damages is in excess of Fifteen Thousand Dollars and No Cents (\$15,000).
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over the Defendants.
- 9. Venue is proper in this Court because the events giving rise to this claim occurred in Clark County, Nevada.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS RELATED TO ALL CLAIMS

10. Upon information and belief, on or about May 2, 2024, Defendant Hua wrote the article at issue slandering Plaintiff.

11.	Defendant Wu approved the article for publication, and caused it to be published
in the LVCNN	newspaper on

- 12. Defendants' actions were tortious, negligent, reckless, and intentional, and were not protected by any form of privilege.
- 13. Plaintiff's reputation, business, and mental health suffered significant injury as a result
- 14. On or about May 2, 2024, Defendants made false statements about Plaintiff, which were published to third parties without privilege.
- 15. These statements were made negligently, recklessly, or intentionally and were not protected by any form of privilege.
- 16. As a direct and proximate result of these statements, the Plaintiff has suffered damages, including, but not limited to, loss of business and harm to reputation.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

17. Plaintiff incorporates every allegation contained in the previous paragraphs, and incorporates them in each following paragraph below.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Defamation (Against All Defendants)

- 18. Defendants' publishing of the article was a false and disparaging statement that interfered with Plaintiff's business as a real estate agent;
 - 19. The statements in the article were not privileged;
 - 20. The statement was made with malice; and
- 21. Plaintiff has suffered special and actual damages as a result of Defendants' defamatory statements.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
Portraying Plaintiff in a False Light
(Against All Defendants)

SANFT LAW

	22.	Defendants created publicity to a matter concerning Plaintiff that placed Plaintiff
before	the pub	lic in a false light and with at least an implicit felse statement of objective fact
when t	hey pub	lished the article;

- 23. The false light would be highly offensive to a reasonable person:
- 24. Defendants had knowledge of, or acted in reckless disregard as to, the falsity of the publicized matter and the false light in which Plaintiff would be placed; and
 - 25. Plaintiff suffered emotional harm as a result.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION Tortious Interference with Business Relations (Against All Defendants)

- 26. As a direct result of Defendant's actions, Plaintiff has suffered a loss of business.
- 27. As a direct result of Defendant's actions, Plaintiff has suffered a loss of future business.
- 28. Defendants' action interfered and caused actual harm, such as loss of current and future clients for Plaintiff.
 - 29. Defendant's conduct was a direct and proximate cause of the Plaintiff's damages.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress (Against All Defendants)

- 30. Defendants published an article full of false and defamatory statements;
- 31. Defendants had a duty to not publish false and defamatory statements;
- 32. Defendants were negligent in publishing false and defamatory statements in their newspaper;
- 33. The publication of these false and defamatory statements caused Plaintiff to suffer emotional and mental distress; and
 - 31. Defendants' conduct was a direct and proximate cause of Plaintiff's damages.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (Against All Defendants)

SANFT LAW

32	. Defendants intentionally published a blatantly untrue article about Plaintiff;							
33	This publication was in reckless disregard;							
34	Plaintiff suffered extreme emotional distress; and							
35	. Defendants' conduct was the actual cause of Plaintiff's emotional distress.							
	SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION Invasion of Privacy							
	(Against All Defendants)							
36. Defendant's negligent action of making false and defamatory statements car								
injury to the	mental well-being of the plaintiff.							
37	. Defendant's conduct was a direct and proximate cause of the Plaintiff's damages.							
	>							
	SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Negligence							
	(Against All Defendants)							
38.	Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained within all							
previous par	agraphs and by this reference, incorporates the same as though fully set forth herein							
39.	Defendant's negligent action of making false and defamatory statements caused							

- 38. contained within all previous pa ough fully set forth herein
- 39. natory statements caused injury to the mental well-being of the plaintiff.
- 40. Defendants' failed to fact-check claims and this directly led to harm of Plaintiff's personal and professional life.
 - 41. Defendant's conduct was a direct and proximate cause of the Plaintiff's damages.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION Libel (Against All Defendants)

- 42. Defendants made a false and defamatory written or printed communication concerning Plaintiff.
 - 43. The communication was published to a third party;
- 44. Defendants acted in reckless disregard of these matters, and acted negligently in failing to ascertain them and it defamed Plaintiff; and,

59.	Plaintiff is	entitled	to	double	actual	damages:	and
37.	1 101111111 15	Cittitica	w	double	actuai	uamages,	autu

60. Since Defendants acted with recklessness, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of attorney fees and costs of the suit.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION Negligent Hiring, Retention, and Supervision (Against LVCNN)

- 61. LVCNN had a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm resulting from its employment of Defendant Wu and Defendant Hua;
- 62. LVCNN breached that duty by hiring, retaining, failing to train, supervise, or discipline Defendant Wu and/or Defendant Hua;
 - 63. This breach is the proximate cause for Plaintiff's injuries; and
 - 64. Plaintiff has suffered damages as a result.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Intrusion Upon the Seclusion of Another (Against LVCNN)

- 65. Defendants intentionally published a false article about Plaintiff;
- 66. This article intruded into Plaintiff's solitude or seclusion;
- 67. This intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person; and
- 68. This intrusion caused Plaintiff to suffer damages as a result.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Defamation Per Se (Against All Defendants)

- 69. Each Defendant made at least one false statement of fact to a third party concerning Plaintiff;
 - 70. Each false statement was a non-privileged publication to that third party;
- 71. Defendants, and each of them, made at least one false and defamatory statement to a third party that would tend to injury Plaintiff's business and/or profession;
- 71. Defendants, and each of them, made at least one false and defamatory statement to a third party that Plaintiff committed a sexual assault;

	72.	Defendants	either	knew	each	Defamator	ry	Statement	was	false	and	that
Defen	dants d	lefamed Plaint	tiff, acto	ed in re	eckless	disregard	of	the truth, o	or acte	d neg	ligentl	ly in
failing to ascertain the truth;												

73. Plaintiff suffered damages as a result of the defamatory statements made by each Defendant.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against each Defendant as follows:

- 1. For general damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
- 2. For special damages, including loss of earnings and business, in an amount to be proven at trial;
 - 6. For punitive damages;
 - 7. For costs of suit herein incurred; and
 - 8. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

V. <u>JURY DEMAND</u>

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

DATED this 23rd day of January, 2025.

SANFT LAW

MICHAEL W. SANFT (8245)

411 E. Bonneville Ave., Ste 360

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I Daniel Wang, aka DANIEL WANG aka WANG JIANPING OR WANG JENPING, have read the foregoing Verified Complaint and know that the contents are true and correct of my own knowledge except for those matters therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the Law of the State of Nevada that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 23rd day of January, 2025.

DANIEL WANG

Plaintiff