

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

EMMANUEL BRACY,	)	Case No. CV 13-9350 JC
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	<b>JUDGMENT</b>
DETECTIVE RICHARD GUZMAN;	)	
DETECTIVE RANDY RICO;	)	
DETECTIVE DONALD WALTHERS;	)	
and DETECTIVE CARL WORRELL,	)	
Defendants.	)	

This action came on regularly for trial on November 16, 2016, in Courtroom 21 of the United States District Court, Central District of California, Western Division-Los Angeles, the Honorable Jacqueline Chooljian, Magistrate Judge Presiding. Plaintiff EMMANUEL BRACY was not present, but was represented by attorneys Brian T. Dunn and Megan R. Gyongyos. Defendants RICHARD GUZMAN, RANDY RICO and CARL WORRELL were present and were represented by Assistant City Attorney Cory M. Brente and Deputy City Attorney Kelly N. Kades. Defendant DONALD WALTHERS was also present and was represented by attorneys Peter James Ferguson and Allen Christiansen.

1 The trial was not bifurcated, and the issue of liability and damages (except  
2 the claim for punitive damages against Defendants, which Plaintiff dismissed  
3 during the trial) went to the jury. A jury of 8 persons was regularly impaneled and  
4 sworn on November 16, 2016. Witnesses were sworn and testified and exhibits  
5 admitted. On December 1, 2016, following the presentation of evidence and  
6 argument during a jury trial which concluded on December 1, 2016, the jury in the  
7 above-entitled action, UNANIMOUSLY found as follows:

8  
9 We the jury, in the above-entitled action, unanimously find as follows:

10 QUESTION NO. 1:

11 Has Plaintiff Emmanuel Bracy proved by a preponderance of the evidence  
12 that any of the following Defendants violated his Federal Constitutional right  
13 under the Fourth Amendment by subjecting him to excessive force?

14	RICHARD GUZMAN	Yes _____	No <u> x </u>
15	RANDY RICO	Yes _____	No <u> x </u>
16	DONALD WALTHERS	Yes _____	No <u> x </u>
17	CARL WORRELL	Yes _____	No <u> x </u>

18 If your answer to Question No. 1 is “no” for all four Defendants, then please  
19 sign, date and return this verdict form. If your answer to Question No. 1 is “yes”  
20 for any of the Defendants, then please proceed to Question No. 2.

21 QUESTION NO. 2:

22 As to any Defendant for whom you answered “yes” to Question No. 1, has  
23 Plaintiff Emmanuel Bracy proved by a preponderance of the evidence that such  
24 Defendant(s)’ use of excessive force was a cause of injury to him?

25	RICHARD GUZMAN	Yes _____	No _____
26	RANDY RICO	Yes _____	No _____
27	DONALD WALTHERS	Yes _____	No _____
28	CARL WORRELL	Yes _____	No _____

1 If your answer to Question No. 2 is “no” for all Defendants for whom you  
2 answered “yes” to Question No. 1, then please sign, date and return this verdict  
3 form. If your answer to Question No. 2 is “yes” for any of the Defendants, then  
4 please proceed to Question No. 3.

5 QUESTION NO. 3:

6 What is the total amount of damages, if any, proven by Plaintiff Emmanuel  
7 Bracy?

8 \$ \_\_\_\_\_

9  
10 Dated: December 1, 2016

\_\_\_\_\_ /s/

11 Presiding Juror

12  
13 Based on the special verdict, and Plaintiff's prior dismissal of punitive  
14 damages during the trial, Defendants RICHARD GUZMAN, RANDY RICO,  
15 DONALD WALTHERS and CARL WORRELL are entitled to judgment against  
16 Plaintiff EMMANUEL BRACY.

17 Now, therefore, it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that  
18 Plaintiff EMMANUEL BRACY, have and recover nothing by reason of his claim  
19 as set forth in his Complaint against Defendants RICHARD GUZMAN, RANDY  
20 RICO, DONALD WALTHERS and CARL WORRELL and that Defendants shall  
21 recover their costs in accordance with Local Rule 54.

22 JUDGMENT IS HEREBY ENTERED IN FAVOR OF ALL  
23 DEFENDANTS ON PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM AS SET FORTH IN HIS  
24 COMPLAINT.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 DATED: December 19, 2016

\_\_\_\_\_ /s/

27 Honorable Jacqueline Chooljian  
28 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE