

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, NORTHERN DIVISION

SUE-ZANNE MANN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
)	2:07cv751-MHT
)	(WO)
JAMES A. DARDEN and)	
CAMILLE V. EMMANUEL,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

JUDGMENT

On the 28th day of July, 2009, after this cause had been presented to a jury, a verdict was returned as follows:

I. First Incident of Tasing

(1) Do you find that defendant James A. Darden is entitled to discretionary function immunity?

Yes X
No

If you find that Darden is protected by discretionary function immunity, you need not go any further as to this incident. If you find that he is not protected by

discretionary function immunity, then you should continue to the next question.

XXX

II. Second Incident of Tasing

(3) Do you find that defendant James A. Darden is entitled to discretionary function immunity?

Yes X

No

If you find that Darden is protected by discretionary function immunity, you need not go any further as to this incident. If you find that he is not protected by discretionary function immunity, then you should continue to the next question.

XXX

SO SAY WE ALL.

/s/ Merrit E. Ash
Foreperson

DATED: 7/28/09

It is therefore the ORDER, JUDGMENT, and DECREE of the court that judgment is entered in favor of defendant James A. Darden and against plaintiff Sue-Zanne Mann, with plaintiff Mann taking nothing by her complaint.

It is further ORDERED that costs are taxed against plaintiff Mann, for which execution may issue.

The clerk of the court is DIRECTED to enter this document on the civil docket as a final judgment pursuant to Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

DONE, this the 29th day of July, 2009.

/s/ Myron H. Thompson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE