

JS-6

1 SEKI, NISHIMURA & WATASE, LLP
 J. EDWIN RATHBUN, JR., SBN 221804
 2 ANDREW C. PONGRACZ, SBN 258554
 605 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 900
 3 Los Angeles, California 90015
 Phone: 213.481.2869; FAX: 213.481.2871
 4 E-mail: erathbun@snw-law.com

5 Attorneys for Defendants, Deputy Jaquez,
 Sergeant Moses, Sergeant Berry, Deputy Ruiz,
 6 Deputy Suarez, Deputy Romero,
 Sergeant Renfrow, Deputy Cueva

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 9

10 DURRELL ANTHONY PUCKETT,)	Case No.: CV 07-7853-RJB
)	
11)	JUDGMENT ON SPECIAL VERDICT
12 Plaintiff,)	AFTER JURY TRIAL
)	
13 v.)	
)	
14)	Trial: March 14, 2011
)	
15 DEPUTY JAQUEZ, et al.,)	
)	
16)	
17 Defendants.)	
)	
18)	

19

20 This action came on regularly for trial on March
 21 14, 2011 in Department 1 of the above-entitled United
 22 States District Court, Central District of California,
 23 the Honorable Robert J. Bryan Presiding; Plaintiff
 24 DURRELL ANTHONY PUCKETT appearing by attorney William
 25 Domnarski; Defendants DEPUTY JAQUEZ, DEPUTY ROMERO,
 26 DEPUTY RUIZ, DEPUTY CUEVA, DEPUTY SUAREZ, SERGEANT

1 BERRY, SERGEANT MOSES, and SERGEANT RENFROW appearing
2 by attorneys J. Edwin Rathbun, Jr. and Andrew C.
3 Pongracz.

4 A jury of 8 persons was regularly impaneled and
5 sworn. Witnesses were sworn and testified. After
6 hearing the evidence, the jury was duly instructed by
7 the Court. After arguments of counsel, the cause was
8 submitted to the jury with directions to return a
9 verdict on special issues. The jury deliberated and
10 thereafter returned into Court with its verdict
11 consisting of the issues submitted to the jury, and the
12 answers given thereto by the jury, which said in words
13 and figures as follows, to-wit:

14 **JUDGMENT ON SPECIAL VERDICT**

15 "TITLE OF THE COURT AND CAUSE"

16 "The jury unanimously answers the following
17 questions: [Check either 'yes' or 'no' for each
18 question you are directed to answer.]

19 (1) Has plaintiff Durrell Anthony Puckett proved by
20 a preponderance of the evidence that the following
21 defendants have violated his constitutional rights as
22 described to you under 42 U.S.C. § 1983?

23 Deputy Henry Jaquez Yes _____ No X

24 Deputy Adrian Ruiz Yes _____ No X

25 Sergeant Melinda Berry Yes _____ No X

26 Sergeant Steve Moses Yes _____ No X

27 Deputy Carlos Cueva Yes _____ No X

28

1 Deputy Mark Romero Yes _____ No X

2 Deputy Pablo Suarez Yes _____ No X

3 Sergeant Mark Renfrow Yes _____ No X

4 (2) Has plaintiff Durrell Anthony Puckett proved by
5 a preponderance of the evidence that as a result of the
6 actions of the following defendants, he, Durrell
7 Anthony Puckett, suffered damages?

8 Deputy Henry Jaquez Yes _____ No X

9 Deputy Adrian Ruiz Yes _____ No X

10 Sergeant Melinda Berry Yes _____ No X

11 Sergeant Steve Moses Yes _____ No X

12 Deputy Carlos Cueva Yes _____ No X

13 Deputy Mark Romero Yes _____ No X

14 Deputy Pablo Suarez Yes _____ No X

15 Sergeant Mark Renfrow Yes _____ No X

16 * * *

17 Dated this 17th of March, 2011.

18

19 _____ /s/

20 Jury Foreperson

21 By reason of said special verdict, Defendants
22 DEPUTY JAQUEZ, DEPUTY ROMERO, DEPUTY RUIZ, DEPUTY
23 CUEVA, DEPUTY SUAREZ, SERGEANT BERRY, SERGEANT MOSES,
24 and SERGEANT RENFROW are entitled to judgment against
25 Plaintiff DURRELL ANTHONY PUCKETT.

26 ///


27 ///

28

1 Now, therefore, it is **ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED**
2 that Plaintiff DURRELL ANTHONY PUCKETT have and recover
3 nothing by reason of each and all of the claims set
4 forth in his Second Amended Complaint against
5 Defendants DEPUTY JAQUEZ, DEPUTY ROMERO, DEPUTY RUIZ,
6 DEPUTY CUEVA, DEPUTY SUAREZ, SERGEANT BERRY, SERGEANT
7 MOSES, and SERGEANT RENFROW, and that Defendants DEPUTY
8 JAQUEZ, DEPUTY ROMERO, DEPUTY RUIZ, DEPUTY CUEVA,
9 DEPUTY SUAREZ, SERGEANT BERRY, SERGEANT MOSES, and
10 SERGEANT RENFROW shall recover costs in accordance with
11 Local Rule 54.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: March 28, 2011



Robert J. Bryan
United States District Judge