**RICKEY IVIE (S.B.N: 76864) Public Entity** rivie@imwlaw.com DAVIDA M. FRIEMAN (S.B.N: 232096) **Exempt from Filing Fee** 1 dfrieman@imwlaw.com
IVIE, McNEILL & WYATT 2 444 S. Flower Street, 18th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017-2919 (213) 489-0028; Fax (213) 489-0552 3 4 Attorneys for Defendants, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, et al. 5 6 JS-6 7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 12 RICARDO LARA, ANA LARA, CASE NO.: CV12-08469 DDP(SHx) 13 NOTICE OF CASE RELATED TO Plaintiffs, Alex Rosas, et al. v. Leroy Baca, CV 12-00428 DDP (SHx) 14 15 VS. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; LEE **JUDGMENT** 16 BĂCĂ ÎN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS SHERIFF OF LOS ANGELES 17 Pretrial Conf.: February 5, 2015 COUNTY; LEE BACA IN HIS INDIVIDÚAL CAPACITY February 10, 2015 **Trial Date:** 18 DEFENDANT DOE DEPUTY
"LOPEZ" AND DOE DEFENDANTS 19 2-30, Inclusive, 20 Defendants. 2.1 22 23 This case came on regularly for trial on February 10, 2015 to February 19, 24 2015 in Courtroom 3 of this Court, the Honorable Dean D. Pregerson presiding; 25 the Plaintiffs appearing by Attorneys Hermez Moreno and Brian Bush from 26 Boucher L.L.P. and Michael Alder, from Alderlaw P.C. and Defendants appearing 28 - 1 -[Proposed] Judgment

by Attorneys Rickey Ivie and Davida M. Frieman from **IVIE**, **MCNEILL & WYATT**.

A jury of 9 persons was regularly impaneled and placed under oath. Witnesses were placed under oath and testified. After hearing the evidence and arguments of counsel, the jury was duly instructed by the Court and the case was submitted to the jury with directions to return a verdict. The jury deliberated and thereafter returned into court with its verdict consisting of the issues submitted to the jury and the answers given thereto by the jury, which said verdict was in words and figures as follows, to wit:

We the Jury answer the questions submitted to us as follows:

## COUNTY DEFENDANT (MUNICIPAL LIABILITY CLAIM)

**QUESTION NO. 1**: Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that one or more Los Angeles County Sheriffs' Department custodial officers violated Plaintiff Ricardo Lara's Eighth Amendment Rights against cruel and unusual punishment by directing another inmate to force Plaintiff to perform exercises known as "fichas" or "burpees"?

YES \_\_\_\_ NO <u>X</u>\_

Answer Question No. 2 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 1. If you answered "NO" to Question No. 1, skip to Question No. 4

**QUESTION NO. 2**: Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the Los Angeles County Sheriffs' Department custodial officers violated Plaintiff Ricardo Lara's Eighth Amendment Rights against cruel and

- <u>Z</u> —	
[Proposed] Judgment	
[110poscu] Juugment	

1	unusual punishment pursuant to a longstanding practice or custom of Defendant
2	County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department?
3	
4	YES NO
5	
6	Answer Question No. 3 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 2.
7	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 2, skip to Question No. 4
8	
9	<b>QUESTION NO. 3</b> : Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
10	evidence that the longstanding practice or custom of Defendant County of Los
11	Angeles' Sheriff's Department was a moving force behind the injuries to Plaintiff?
12	
13	YES NO
14	
15	DEPUTY DEFENDANT (EIGHTH AMENDMENT EXCESSIVE
16	FORCE/CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT CLAIM)
17	
18	<b>QUESTION NO. 4</b> : Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
19	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil directed another inmate to force
20	Plaintiff to perform exercises known as "fichas" or "burpees"?
21	
22	YES NO <u>X</u>
23	
24	Answer Question No. 5 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 4.
25	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 4, skip to Question No. 7
26	
27	
28	- 3 –
	[Proposed] Judgment

1	QUESTION NO. 5: Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
2	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil's conduct violated Plaintiff Ricardo
3	Lara's Eighth Amendment Right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment?
4	
5	YES NO
6	Answer Question No. 6 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 5.
7	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 5, skip to Question No. 7
8	
9	QUESTION NO. 6: Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
10	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil's conduct was a moving force that
11	caused the injuries to Plaintiff Ricardo Lara?
12	
13	YES NO
14	
15	DEPUTY DEFENDANT (NEGLIGENCE)
16	
17	QUESTION NO. 7: Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
18	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil was negligent by allowing another
19	inmate to force Plaintiff to perform exercises known as "fichas" or "burpees"?
20	
21	YES NO <u>X</u>
22	
23	Answer Question No. 8 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 7.
24	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 7, skip to Question No. 9
25	
26	QUESTION NO. 8: Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
27	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil's negligence in relation to the act of
28	- 4 –
	[Proposed] Judgment

1	allowing another inmate to force Plaintiff to perform exercises known as Tichas
2	or "burpees" was a substantial factor in causing injury to Plaintiff Ricardo Lara?
3	
4	YES NO
5	
б	
7	DEPUTY DEFENDANT (INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL
8	<u>DISTRESS</u> )
9	Answer Question No. 9 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 4.
0	
1	QUESTION NO. 9: Was Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil's conduct in
2	directing another inmate to force Plaintiff to perform exercises known as "fichas'
3	or "burpees" outrageous conduct?
4	
5	YES NO
5	
7	Answer Question No. 10 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 9.
3	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 9, skip to Question No. 13
9	
)	QUESTION NO. 10: Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
L	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil intended to cause Plaintiff Ricardo
2	Lara emotional distress?
3	
4	YES NO
5	
6	Answer Question No. 11 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 10
7	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 10 skip to Question No. 13
8	- 5 –
	[Proposed] Judgment

1	
2	
3	QUESTION NO. 11: Did Plaintiff Ricardo Lara suffer severe emotional
4	distress?
5	
6	YES NO
7	
8	Answer Question No. 12 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 11.
9	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 11, skip to Question No. 13
LO	
L1	QUESTION NO. 12: Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
L2	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil's conduct was a substantial factor in
L3	causing Plaintiff Ricardo Lara's severe emotional distress?
L <b>4</b>	
L5	YES NO
L6	
L7	DEPUTY DEFENDANT (INTERFERENCE WITH MARITAL RELATIONS)
L8	Answer Question No. 13 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 4.
.9	
20	<b>QUESTION NO. 13</b> : Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
21	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil violated Plaintiff Ana Lara's
22	Fourteenth Amendment Right to be free from government interference in her
23	marriage with Ricardo Lara by directing another inmate to force Plaintiff to
24	perform exercises known as "fichas" or "burpees"?
25	
26	YES NO
27	
28	- 6 –
	[Proposed] Judgment

1	Answer Question No. 14 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 13.
2	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 13, Skip to Question No. 16
3	
4	QUESTION NO. 14: Did Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil's conduct shock
5	the conscience?
6	
7	YES NO
8	
9	Answer Question No. 15 only if you answered "YES" to Question No. 14.
10	If you answered "NO" to Question No. 14, skip to Question No. 15
11	
12	<b>QUESTION NO. 15</b> : Did the Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the
13	evidence that Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil's conduct was a moving force that
14	caused the injuries to Plaintiff Ana Lara?
15	
16	YES NO
17	
18	DAMAGES
19	Only answer the following questions if you answered "YES" as to any
20	Defendant on any or all of the following questions: 3, 6, 8, 12, 15. Otherwise,
21	please answer no further questions and have the foreperson sign and date this
22	form.
23	
24	QUESTION NO. 16: What is the amount of damages, if any, that Plaintiff
25	Ricardo Lara Incurred as a result of Defendant(s)' conduct?
26	Deet New Frances
27	Past Non-Economic
28	- 7 –
	[Proposed] Judgment

1	Future Non-Economic
2	
3	Only answer Question No. 17 if you answered "YES" to Question No. 15.
4	Otherwise, please skip to question 18.
5	
6	QUESTION NO. 17: What is the amount of damages, if any, that Plaintiff
7	Ana Lara Incurred as a result of Defendant(s)' conduct?
8	
9	Past Loss of Consortium
LO	Future Loss of Consortium
L1	
L2	<u>PUNITIVE</u>
L3	Only answer the following questions if you answered "YES" as to any
L <b>4</b>	Defendant on any or all of the following questions: 3, 6, 8, 12, 15. Otherwise,
L5	please answer no further questions and have the foreperson sign and date this
L6	form.
L7	
L8	QUESTION NO. 18: Did you find that the conduct of any of the following
L9	defendant(s) was malicious, oppressive, or in reckless disregard of Plaintiff's civil
20	rights?
21	
22	Defendant Nicholas Lopez-Gil
23	
24	It appearing by reason of said verdict that:
25	Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DEPUTY NICHOLAS LOPEZ-
26	GIL, are entitled to judgment against Plaintiffs RICARDO LARA and ANA
27	LARA.
28	- 8 –
	[Proposed] Judgment

Now, therefore, it is **ORDERED**, **ADJUDGED**, **AND DECREED** that said Plaintiffs RICARDO LARA and ANA LARA shall recover nothing by reason of the Complaint from Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and NICHOLAS LOPEZ-GIL. Each party shall bear its own costs.

> Honorable Dean D. Pregerson United States District Judge

Dated: July 22, 2015

[Proposed] Judgment

-9-