1								
2	O							
3								
4	JS - 6							
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
6	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - EASTERN DIVISION							
7	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - EASTERN DIVISION							
8	RICHARD SPURLING, ) Case No. EDCV 07-01071 SGL (Opx) [Assigned to Hon. Stephen Larson]							
9	Plaintiff,							
10	VS. Judgment on Special Verdict							
11	BRINKS, INCORPORATED, a ) Delaware corporation, )							
12	Defendant							
13	)´							
14	This action came on regularly for trial on February 17, 2009, in the United							
15	States District Court, Central District of California - Eastern Division, Hon. Stephen							
16								
17	Kopple, and Joseph Socher of Eisenberg & Associates and the defendant appearing by							
18	attorneys, James Kellett and Jonathan Moskowitz of Crowell & Moring.							
19								
20 21	, ,							
22	the members of the jury, with directions to return a verdict on special issues. The jury							
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								

Richard Spurling v. Brinks Inc et al

Doc. 117

## RETALIATION FOR REFUSAL TO ENGAGE IN RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

3	1.	Was Plaintiff, Richard Spurling, asked to terminate Sabrina Gadsden on account
4		of her race?
5		X Yes No
6		If your answer to question 1 is "yes," then answer question 2. If you answered
7		"no," continue with question 5.
8	2.	Did Plaintiff, Richard Spurling, refuse to terminate Sabrina Gadsden on account
9		of her race?
10		X YesNo
11		If your answer to question 2 is "yes," then answer question 3. If you answered
12		"no," continue with question 5.
13	3.	Was Richard Spurling's refusal to terminate Sabrina Gadsden on account of her
14		race a motivating factor in Defendant Brinks' decision to terminate him?
15		X YesNo
16		If your answer to question 3 is "yes," then answer question 4. If you answered
17		"no," continue with question 5.
18	4.	Was Brinks' termination of Richard Spurling a substantial factor in causing
19		harm to Richard Spurling?
20		X Yes No
21		Continue with Question 5.
22		
23		RACE DISCRIMINATION
24	5.	Was Richard Spurling's race a motivating factor in Brinks' decision to
25		terminate Richard Spurling?
26		YesX_No
27		If your answer to question 5 is "yes," then answer question 6. If you answered
28		"no," then answer question 7.

1	6.	6. Was Brinks' termination of Richard Spurling a substantial factor in causing								
2		harm to plaintiff?								
3	YesNo									
4		Ansv	wer Question 7.							
5	7.	7. If you answered "yes" to either question 4 or question 6 then answer question 8.								
6		If you answered "no" to both question 4 and question 6, stop here, answer no								
7	further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.									
8	8.	8. What are Richard Spurling's damages?								
9		a.	Past economic loss, inclu	ıding lost earnings:		\$120,073.00				
10		b.	Past non-economic loss,	including emotiona	al distress:	\$ 25,000.00				
11		c.	Future economic loss, in	cluding lost earning	gs:	\$ 63,000.00				
12										
13					TOTAL:	\$ 208,073.00				
14										
15	Doto	d.	March 5, 2009	Signade	/s/					
16	Date	u	Watch 5, 2009	Signed.	/s/ Pres	iding Juror				
17		It an	magring by reason of said y	vardict that Plaintiff	f Dichard Sr	vurling is antitled				
18	It appearing by reason of said verdict that Plaintiff, Richard Spurling, is entitled									
19	to judgment against Brink's Incorporated.									
20	NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that									
21	plaintiff, Richard Spurling have and recover from said defendant, Brink's									
22	Incorporated the sum of \$208,073, together with costs to be determined by the Clerk									
23	of Court with interest thereon at the rate of seven tenths of one percent (0.7%) per annum from the date of the entry of this judgment until paid.									
24	amu	111 11 UI	in the date of the entry of the							
25										
				3776	arsor					
26	DAT	ED:	March 20, 2009		ephen Larson					