


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**

LUZ RIVERA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:14-CV-08036-SVW-(JEM) ✓
Deemed related to
2:14-CV-07360-SVW(JEM)

**[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT ON
SPECIAL VERDICT AFTER JURY
TRIAL**

HON. STEPHEN V. WILSON

Courtroom: 6
Trial: Mar. 17, 2015
Action Filed: Aug. 12, 2014
Removal: Sep. 19, 2014

The court previously granted Summary Judgment in favor of Defendants on Plaintiffs' First Cause of Action for Conspiracy and Fourth Cause of Action for Municipal Liability and Bifurcated and Deferred Plaintiffs' state law causes of action pending jury trial of the remaining federal claims. The remaining federal causes of action: Second Cause of Action for Unreasonable Search and Seizure and Third Cause of Action for Violation of Due Process came on regularly for trial on March 17, 2015 in Courtroom 6 of the above-entitled United States District

1 Court, Central District of California, the Honorable Stephen V. Wilson, Judge
2 Presiding.

3 Plaintiffs, HUGO RIVERA and LUZ RIVERA appeared by attorneys
4 Gilbert Saucedo and Humberto Diaz. Defendants, DET. OMAR MIRANDA,
5 DEPUTY JASON PUGA and DEPUTY EDWARD MARTINEZ appeared by
6 attorneys Ashlee P. Clark and Janet L. Keuper.

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

15 **JUDGMENT ON SPECIAL VERDICT**

16 "TITLE OF THE COURT AND CAUSE"

17 The jury unanimously answers the following questions:

18 1. Fourth Amendment - Unreasonable Seizure

19 "Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Hugo Rivera and Luz
20 Rivera's Fourth Amendment rights to be free from an unreasonable seizure of
21 their persons?"

22 Answer: No

23 ***

24 Dated: 3/19/15

/s/

25 Jury Foreperson


26 By reason of said special jury verdict, Defendants, DEPUTY JASON PUGA
27 and DEPUTY EDWARD MARTINEZ are entitled to Judgment against Plaintiffs,
28 HUGO RIVERA and LUZ RIVERA.

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

Now, therefore, it is **ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that Plaintiffs, HUGO RIVERA and LUZ RIVERA have and recover nothing by reason of each of their federal claims set forth in their Complaint against Defendants, DEPUTY JASON PUGA, DEPUTY EDWARD MARTINEZ and DET. OMAR MIRANDA, and that Defendants DEPUTY JASON PUGA, DEPUTY EDWARD MARTINEZ and DET. OMAR MIRANDA shall recover costs in accordance with Local Rule 54. The Court, having resolved all federal claims, declines to entertain the supplemental state law claims and dismisses those claims without prejudice.

[Dkt. 37.]

Dated: 11/3/15


HON. STEPHEN V. WILSON
United States District Court Judge