

JS-6

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRUCE WHITE, AN INDIVIDUAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER FETCH, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 16-5493-GW(ASx)

JUDGMENT

Judge: The Honorable George H. Wu
Trial Date: May 22, 2018

This matter came on regularly for trial on May 22, 2018, in Courtroom 9D of the above-entitled court before the Honorable George H. Wu, Judge Presiding.

Ephraim O. Obi appeared for plaintiff Bruce White. Deputy Attorney General Paul C. Epstein of the Office of the California Attorney General appeared for defendants State of California, acting by and through the California Highway Patrol, Matthew Fetch and Cory Villars.

A jury was empaneled and sworn on May 22, 2018. Witnesses were sworn

1 and examined and documentary evidence was received. Following instruction and
2 closing arguments, the jury began its deliberations on May 24, 2018. On May 25,
3 2018, the jury returned the following verdict:

4
5 **I. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 -Violation of Constitutional Rights**

6 A. Did Defendants Cory Villars or Matthew Fetch arrest Plaintiff Bruce
7 White **without** having probable cause to believe Plaintiff had: (1) resisted arrest
8 under California Penal Code § 148(a)(1), (2) kidnapped a person in violation of
9 Penal Code §§ 207/208, or (3) committed a lewd act on a child age 15 in violation
10 of Penal Code §288(c)(1).
11

12 Yes No

13
14 B. Did either Cory Villars or Matthew Fetch use excessive force in
15 detaining or arresting Plaintiff Bruce White?
16

17 Yes No

18 **II. State Claims**

19 A. Did either Cory Villars or Matthew Fetch commit an act of violence on
20 Plaintiff Bruce White where a substantial motivating factor for the officer's conduct
21 was his perception of Plaintiff's race?
22

23 Yes No
24
25
26
27
28

1 B. Did either Cory Villars or Matthew Fetch engage in act(s) of
2 “outrageous conduct” intending to cause Plaintiff emotional distress which did
3 cause Plaintiff to suffer severe emotional distress?
4

5 Yes No

6 If the jury’s answer to any of the above questions is “Yes,” there will be
7 additional follow-up questions from the Court.
8

9 Dated: May 25, 2018

/s/ Presiding Juror

10
11
12 WHEREFORE, BY REASON OF THE AFORESAID, IT IS HEREBY
13 ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that plaintiff Bruce White shall take
14 nothing by reason of his Second Amended Complaint on file herein, that defendants
15 State of California, acting by and through the California Highway Patrol, Matthew
16 Fetch and Cory Villars shall have judgment against Plaintiff, that the Second
17 Amended Complaint shall be and hereby is dismissed with prejudice, and that
18 defendants shall be entitled to statutory costs of suit pursuant to a timely filed Bill
19 of Costs pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1) and Local Rule 54-2, et seq.
20
21
22

23
24 Dated: June 11, 2018



25 GEORGE H. WU, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28