

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 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES LORAN QUINN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FRESNO COUNTY SHERIFF, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:10-cv-01617 LJO BAM

JUDGMENT ON THE SPECIAL VERDICT

_____ /
This case came on for trial on August 7, 2012 in Courtroom 4 of the United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Fresno Division. The Honorable Lawrence J. O'Neill presided. David M. Hollingsworth appeared on behalf of Plaintiff James L. Quinn, and James J. Arendt and Roy Santos appeared on behalf of Defendants David Alanis and the County of Fresno.

A jury of eight (8) persons was regularly impaneled and sworn. The parties then made opening statements, witnesses were sworn and testified, and exhibits were admitted into evidence. On August 9, 2012, the Court instructed the jury, the parties presented closing arguments, and the jury retired to deliberate. On August 10, 2012, the jury unanimously returned a Special Verdict in favor of Plaintiff James L. Quinn and against Defendants David Alanis and the County of Fresno for violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, false imprisonment, violations of California Civil Code section 52.1, and negligence. Pursuant to the Special Verdict, Plaintiff was awarded the following damages:

1. Violation of § 1983: \$21,000 in economic damages
2. False Imprisonment: \$4,000 in non-economic damages

1 3. Violation of Section 52.1: \$400,000 in non-economic damages

2 4. Negligence: \$0

3 (Doc. 167.)

4 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Plaintiff James L.
5 Quinn shall recover and have judgment against David Alanis in the amount of four hundred and twenty-
6 five thousand dollars (\$425,000.00) with interest thereon to accrue at the legal rate from the date of
7 judgment is final until the date of satisfaction of the judgment. Plaintiff's counsel may also file a motion
8 with this Court seeking reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred as a result of the litigation.

9 NOTE: The judgment has been changed in effect by a post trial motion and ruling.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 **Dated: March 11, 2013**

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28