Dockets.Justia.com

District Court	District of California
Inited States I	For the Northern Dis

FREDERICK JACKSON: 1.

1.	I KEDE	ARICK JACKSON.			
	A.	With respect to	the tasing, has plain	tiff Frederick Jackson prove	en
that a	ny of th	e following offic	ers used excessive fo	orce against him in violation	of
the F	ourth Ar	mendment?			
			Yes	No	
	Office	er Lombardi			
	Office	er Smith			
	Office	er Dumpa			
	B.	With respect to	the alleged slammin	ng against the vehicle, has	
plain	tiff Fred	erick Jackson pro	oven that any of the f	following officers used	
exces	ssive for	ce against him in	violation of the Four	rth Amendment?	
exces	ssive for	ce against him in	violation of the Four Yes	rth Amendment?	
exces		ce against him in er Hatcher			
exces	Office	_	Yes		
exces	Office	er Hatcher	Yes		
exces	Office	er Hatcher er Smith	Yes		•n
	Office Office C.	er Hatcher er Smith With respect to	Yes his arrest, has plaint	No	
that a	Office Office C.	er Hatcher er Smith With respect to	Yes his arrest, has plaint	No tiff Frederick Jackson prove	
that a	Office Office C.	er Hatcher er Smith With respect to e following offic	Yes his arrest, has plaint	No tiff Frederick Jackson prove	
that a	Office Office C. any of the	er Hatcher er Smith With respect to e following offic	Yes his arrest, has plaint ers arrested him with	No diff Frederick Jackson prove nout probable cause in viola	
that a	Office Office C. any of the Fourth	er Hatcher er Smith With respect to e following office Amendment?	Yes his arrest, has plaint ers arrested him with	No diff Frederick Jackson prove nout probable cause in viola	
that a	Office Office C. any of the Pourth Office Office	er Hatcher er Smith With respect to e following office Amendment?	Yes his arrest, has plaint ers arrested him with	No diff Frederick Jackson prove nout probable cause in viola	

-	With respect to the tasing, has plaintiff Frederick Jackson proven			
any of the following offi	icers tased him in reta	liation for using speech		
tected by the First Amend	dment?			
	Yes	No		
Officer Lombardi				
Officer Smith				
Officer Dumpa				
E. With respect t	to the alleged slammir	ng against the vehicle, has		
intiff Frederick Jackson p	roven that any of the	following officers slammed h		
inst a vehicle in retaliatio	on for using speech pro	otected by the First		
nendment?				
	Yes	No		
Officer Hatcher				
Officer Smith				
F. With respect t	to his arrest, has plain	tiff Frederick Jackson proven		
t any of the following offi	icers arrested him in re	etaliation for using speech		
	dment?			
tected by the First Amend				
tected by the First Amend	Yes	No		
tected by the First Amend Officer Lombardi	Yes	No		
·	Yes	No		
Officer Lombardi	Yes	No		
Officer Smith	Yes	No		

by you into the three categories shown, i.e., the three categories must add up to

1	the total (if any). (If no damages have been proven but you nonetheless have
2	found a constitutional violation, you may award nominal damages up to one
3	dollar.)
4	
5	Tasing \$
6	
7	Slamming
8	
9	Arrest \$
10	
11	Total \$
12	
13	2. ASHLEY JACKSON:
14	A. Has plaintiff Ashley Jackson proven that Officer Lombardi used
15	excessive force against her on March 30, 2008, in violation of the Fourth
16	Amendment?
17	
18	Yes No
19	
20	B. If so, state the amount of any damages proven (or indicate up to
21	one dollar in nominal damages):
22	
23	\$
24	
25	3. BRIANA JACKSON:
26	A. Has plaintiff Briana Jackson proven her claim of negligent
27	infliction of emotional distress as to any of the following defendants?
28	Yes No

1	Officer Lombardi
2	Officer Smith
3	Officer Dumpa
4	
5	B. If so, state the amount of any damages proven:
6	
7	\$
8	
9	4. If you have answered "yes" to any of Questions 1 and 2, state whether plaintiffs
10	have proven by clear and convincing evidence that punitive damages should be awarded against
11	any officer you find violated any Fourth Amendment rights:
12	
13	Yes No
14	Officer Lombardi
15	Officer Smith
16	Officer Dumpa
17	Officer Hatcher
18	
19	If you answer "yes" as to this question, then there will be a short supplemental
20	proceeding immediately after your verdict. The purpose of the short supplemental proceeding
21	would be to allow you to fix the amount of any punitive damages.
22	
23	ONCE YOU HAVE FINISHED ANSWERING THE NECESSARY QUESTIONS UNANIMOUSLY,
24	PLEASE HAVE THE FOREPERSON SIGN AND DATE THIS FORM. THEN CONTACT THE DEPUTY OR
25	MARSHAL TO INFORM HIM OR HER THAT YOU HAVE COMPLETED YOUR DELIBERATIONS.
26	
27	
28	Dated: July, 2010.
	FOREPERSON