

# Nevada Confirms Its Restrictive Covenant Law, But Rejects Blue Penciling

By **Elayna J. Youchah**, **Paul T. Trimmer**, **Deverie J. Christensen** and **Lisa A. McClane**

July 26, 2016

In the first decision to reach the Nevada Supreme Court on whether state district courts may modify or “blue pencil” non-competition agreements, the high court has concluded that doing so would violate Nevada law. *Golden Road Motor Inn Inc. d/b/a Atlantis Casino Resort Spa v. Islam*, 132 Nev. Adv. Op. 49 (July 21, 2016). The 4-3 decision signals a clear change in direction that affects the enforceability of non-competition agreements in Nevada.

The Court explained that under Nevada law, an overly broad term prohibiting an employee from “employment, affiliation, or service” with a competitor, which “extends beyond what is necessary” to protect the former employer’s interests, is unreasonable and “renders the noncompete agreement wholly unenforceable.”

Distinguishing this case from prior published decisions, the Court reasoned that exercising “judicial restraint when confronted with the urge to pick up the pencil is sound public policy ... as our use of the pencil should not lead us to the place of

## Meet the Authors



**Elayna J. Youchah**

Principal  
Las Vegas

702-921-2474  
YouchahE@jacksonlewis.com

drafting.” The Court explained its role as interpreting contracts, not writing them, and that altering a contract, even minimally, would “conflict[] with the impartiality that is required of the bench....”

Further, the Court stated that “[a] strict test for reasonableness is applied to restrictive covenants in employment cases because the economic hardship imposed on employees is given considerable weight.” Employers clearly hold a superior bargaining position when such contracts are presented to employees and, in the context of a restraint of trade, the Court said that “a good faith presumption benefiting the employer is unwarranted.”

This clear change in direction affects the enforceability of non-competition agreements in Nevada. Employers must ensure that non-competition provisions are drafted clearly and are reasonable in all respects. Employers must be mindful of whether the provisions “extends beyond what is necessary” to protect their interests. Questions to ask include:

- Is the period of non-competition longer than necessary?
- Is the geographic scope (the territory in which competition is prohibited) larger than needed when compared to the work the former employee performed and information to which the employee was exposed?
- Does the non-competition clause prevent the former employee from being employed in the same industry generally, or is the restriction limited to the same or substantially similar type of work the former employee performed while employed with the former employer?
- Does the language in the non-competition provision (or the contract in which it appears) provide factual support upon which a court may rely to assess the reasonableness of the time, territory, and job restrictions?

Similar courts in many other states, the Nevada Supreme Court has stated that non-competition agreements generally are disfavored and will not be enforced unless narrowly drafted. By following an “all or nothing” approach to overbroad agreements, Nevada is in the minority when compared to courts that take either the strict *blue pencil* approach (*see, e.g.*, our article, [North Carolina Supreme Court Reiterates Limited Blue Pencil Approach to Overbroad Non-Competes](#)) or the reasonable reformation approach (*see, e.g.*, our article, [Missouri Cases Illustrate Enforceability of Well-Drafted Non-Competition Agreements](#)). Accordingly, careful drafting is required.



**Paul T. Trimmer**

Principal  
Las Vegas

702-921-2460  
TrimmerP@jacksonlewis.com



**Deverie J. Christensen**

Office Managing Principal and Office  
Litigation Manager  
Las Vegas

702-921-2466  
christensend@jacksonlewis.com



**Lisa A. McClane**

Of Counsel  
Las Vegas

702-921-2460  
Lisa.McClane@jacksonlewis.com

Employers, particularly those seeking to use non-compete agreements in a multistate environment, should take the time to review and revise form and contract-specific non-competition agreements to ensure the agreements are enforceable.

Jackson Lewis attorneys in our Las Vegas office are available to answer inquiries regarding this case and assist employers with non-competition agreements in Nevada.

---

©2016 Jackson Lewis P.C. This Update is provided for informational purposes only. It is not intended as legal advice nor does it create an attorney/client relationship between Jackson Lewis and any readers or recipients. Readers should consult counsel of their own choosing to discuss how these matters relate to their individual circumstances. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without the express written consent of Jackson Lewis.

This Update may be considered attorney advertising in some states. Furthermore, prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

Jackson Lewis P.C. represents management exclusively in workplace law and related litigation. Our attorneys are available to assist employers in their compliance efforts and to represent employers in matters before state and federal courts and administrative agencies. For more information, please contact the attorney(s) listed or the Jackson Lewis attorney with whom you regularly work.

---

## Related Articles You May Like

July 27, 2016



### **Down to the Wire for Proposed Non-Compete Reform Legislation in Massachusetts**

Massachusetts finally may enact non-compete reform legislation. The current session of the General Court, the state's legislature, ends on July 31, and the House and Senate have passed versions of non-compete reform legislation limiting non-compete agreements that differ on important points. If non-compete reform is to become a... [Read More](#)

June 16, 2016



## The Florida Employer Summer 2016

A bulletin on employment, labor, benefits, and immigration law. In this issue: The Inexplicit Requirement and Definitive Necessity for Employers to Implement Privacy Policies Changes Coming for Florida's Workers' Comp Law Court Permits Discrimination Claims on Behalf of Deceased Employees Federal Court Requires...

[Read More](#)

May 12, 2016



## Defend Trade Secrets Act Becomes Law, Opening Federal Courts to Aggrieved Companies

For the first time, companies have a federal private right of action for misappropriation of trade secrets. The Defend Trade Secrets Act ("DTSA"), signed by President Barack Obama on May 11, 2016, applies to any misappropriation of trade secrets that occurs on or after the signing date. Until now, companies victimized by... [Read More](#)

---

## Related Practices

**Non-Competes  
and Protection  
Against Unfair  
Competition**



©2016 Jackson Lewis P.C. All rights reserved. Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. No client-lawyer relationship has been established by the posting or viewing of information on this website.

\*Honolulu, Hawai'i is through an affiliation with Jackson Lewis P.C., a Law Corporation