I

1			
2	•		
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10		٨	
11	ARNOLDO SAN JOSE, and MARIA SAN)	CASE NO. CV09-1823AHM (VBKx)	
12		U.S. District Judge A. Howard Matz	
13	Plaintiffs,	KNYW XXI W XXI KY XXI	
14		FAXOROSERS	
15	CITY OF LOS ANGELES, WILLIAM BRATTON and DEREK MOUSSEAU,	JUDGMENTAFTER TRIAL	
16	Defendants.	Trial: October 27, 2010	
17	/ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	
18			
18 19	On November 5, 2010, following the pr	esentation of evidence and argument	
	On November 5, 2010, following the pr during a jury trial which commenced October	_	
19		27, 2010 and concluded November 5,	
19 20	during a jury trial which commenced October	27, 2010 and concluded November 5,	
19 20 21	during a jury trial which commenced October 2010, the jury, in the above-entitled action, UI	27, 2010 and concluded November 5,	
19 20 21 22	during a jury trial which commenced October 2010, the jury, in the above-entitled action, UI	27, 2010 and concluded November 5, NANIMOUSLY found as follows: prove that Officer Derek Mousseau used	
19 20 21 22 23	during a jury trial which commenced October 2010, the jury, in the above-entitled action, UR QUESTION NO. 1: Did Plaintiffs	27, 2010 and concluded November 5, NANIMOUSLY found as follows: prove that Officer Derek Mousseau used	
19 20 21 22 23 24	during a jury trial which commenced October 2010, the jury, in the above-entitled action, UN QUESTION NO. 1: Did Plaintiffs excessive, and therefore unreasonable, force a 3B, 3C, and 3D)	27, 2010 and concluded November 5, NANIMOUSLY found as follows: prove that Officer Derek Mousseau used	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	during a jury trial which commenced October 2010, the jury, in the above-entitled action, UN QUESTION NO. 1: Did Plaintiffs excessive, and therefore unreasonable, force a 3B, 3C, and 3D)	27, 2010 and concluded November 5, NANIMOUSLY found as follows: prove that Officer Derek Mousseau used gainst Byron San Jose? (Instructions 3A,	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	during a jury trial which commenced October 2010, the jury, in the above-entitled action, UN QUESTION NO. 1: Did Plaintiffs excessive, and therefore unreasonable, force a 3B, 3C, and 3D)	27, 2010 and concluded November 5, NANIMOUSLY found as follows: prove that Officer Derek Mousseau used gainst Byron San Jose? (Instructions 3A, Yes No _X	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 	during a jury trial which commenced October 2010, the jury, in the above-entitled action, UN QUESTION NO. 1: Did Plaintiffs excessive, and therefore unreasonable, force a 3B, 3C, and 3D) Y	27, 2010 and concluded November 5, NANIMOUSLY found as follows: prove that Officer Derek Mousseau used gainst Byron San Jose? (Instructions 3A, Yes No _X	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 	during a jury trial which commenced October 2010, the jury, in the above-entitled action, UN QUESTION NO. 1: Did Plaintiffs excessive, and therefore unreasonable, force a 3B, 3C, and 3D) Y Regardless of how you answer Question	27, 2010 and concluded November 5, NANIMOUSLY found as follows: prove that Officer Derek Mousseau used gainst Byron San Jose? (Instructions 3A, Yes No _X	

1	QUESTION 2: Did Plaintiffs prove that Officer Derek Mousseau acted	
2	negligently in how he dealt with Byron San Jose? (Instructions 4A, 4B, 4D, and 4E)	
3		
4	Yes No X	
5		
6		
7		
8	If you answered "no" to Question 2, please sign and return this form. If you	
9	answered "yes" to Question 2, please answer the following question.	
10		
11		
12		
13	QUESTION 3: Did Officer Mousseau prove that Byron San Jose acted	
14	negligently? (Instructions 4B, 4C, and 4D)	
15		
16	Yes No	
17 18		
10	If you answered "yes" to Question 3, please proceed to Question 4. If you	
20	answered "no" to Question 3, please sign and return this form.	
21		
22		
23		
24	••••	
25	• • • •	
26	••••	
27	· · · · ·	
28		
	3	

1	QUESTION 4: What percentage of responsibility for Byron S	an Jose's death do	
2	you assign to the negligent conduct, if any, of the following?		
3			
4	Officer Derek Mousseau	%	
5			
6	Byron San Jose	%	
7	Total	100%	
8 9	Total	100%	
10	Please sign and return this verdict form.		
11			
12	Dated: <u>November 4, 2010</u> By: <u>Confidential</u> Jury Foreperson		
13	Jury Foreperson		
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19 20			
20 21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	-		
	4		

1	ORDER		
2	2 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, DECREED AND ADJUDGED that		
3	judgment on the merits be entered in favor of Defendants, CITY OF LOS ANGELES,		
4	WILLIAM BRATTON, and DEREK MOUSSEAU and against Plaintiffs, ARNOLDO		
5	 SAN JOSE and MARIA SAN JOSE, and that Plaintiffs take nothing; and that Defendants CITY OF LOS ANGELES, WILLIAM BRATTON, and DEREK MOUSSEAU be entitled to recover their costs from the Plaintiffs in accordance with 		
6			
7			
8	Local Rule 54.		
· 9	A Kallers III		
10	N. (IMMANDAM)		
11 DATED: November 23, 2010			
12	HONORABLE A. HOWARD MATZ United States District Judge		
13			
14	JS-6		
15			
16	16 I reviewed the foregoing proposed judgment on behalf of my clients and submit		
17	for the Court's consideration.		
18			
19	DATED: November 10, 2010		
20			
21			
22			
 CARMEN A. TRUTANICH, City Attorney GARY G. GEUSS, Chief Asst. City Atty. CORY M. BRENTE, Supervising Assistant City Atto DENISE C. MILLS, Deputy City Attorney 			
24			
25	/S/ Denise C. Mills By		
26	DENISE C. MILLS , Deputy City Attorney		
27	Attorneys for Defendants CITY OF LOS ANGELES, WILLIAM BRATTON, and DEREK MOUSSEAU		
28			
	5		