Dockets.Justia.com

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

1		<u>VERDICT FORM</u>						
2	<u>Part A.</u>	LIABILITY						
3	Fals	se Imprisonment						
4	1. Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24,							
5	2007, Wal-Mart committed the tort of false imprisonment?							
6		Yes	No					
7	IInu	wh Aot						
8	Unr	ruh Act						
9	 Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 2007, Wal-Mart violated the Unruh Act and denied Van full and equal 							
10	accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges and service of Wal-Mart's business based on her race, ancestry or national origin?							
11			, ,					
12		Yes	No					
13	Sect	tion 1981						
14	3. H	as Van proven, by	y a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24,					
15	2		olated Section 1981 and denied Van equal accommodation					
16	u.	nder the law:						
17		Yes	No					
18	Neg	ligent Hiring, Tr	raining, Supervision or Retention					
19	 4 H	as Van proven by	y a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 2007					
20	V	Val-Mart committe	ed the tort of negligent hiring, training, supervision or					
21	re	etention?						
22		Yes	No					
23	Inte	entional Infliction	n of Emotional Distress					
24								
25	5. Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 2007, Wal-Mart committed the tort of intentional infliction of emotional distress							
26	a;	gainst her?						
27		Yes	No					
28			2.00					

1	Negligent infliction of Emotional Distress								
2	6. Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 2007, Wal-Mart committed the tort of negligent infliction of emotional distress?								
3	2007, Wai-Wait Commi	tied the tort of negligent infliction of emotional distress:							
4	Yes	No							
5	Negligent Misrepresenta	tion							
6									
7	7. Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 2007, Wal-Mart committed the tort of negligent misrepresentation?								
8	Yes	No							
9		110							
10	Negligence Claim								
11	8. Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 2007, Wal-Mart was negligent in its conduct toward Van?								
12	2007, wai-wai was ne	grigent in its conduct toward vair:							
13	Yes	No							
14	If your answer to Question 8 is "Yes," then please proceed to Question 9. If your answer to								
15	Question 8 is "No," proceed directly to Pa								
16	9. Was Wal-Mart's negligence a substantial factor in causing harm to Van?								
17	Yes	No							
18									
19	Question 9 is "No," proceed directly to Pa	en please proceed to Question 10. If your answer to art B.							
20	10. Was Rainier negligent?								
21									
22	Yes	No							
23	If your answer to Question 10 is "Yes," then please proceed to Question 11. If your answer to								
24	Question 10 is "No," proceed directly to Part B.								
25	11. Was Rainier's negligence a substantial factor in causing Van's harm?								
26	Yes	No							
27									
28	If your answer to Question 11 is "Yes," the Question 11 is "No," proceed directly to be	nen please proceed to Question 12. If your answer to Part B.							

28

1	12. What percentage of responsibility for Van's harm do you assign to:								
2		Wal-Mart:		_%					
3		Rainier:		_%					
		TOTAL:	_100	_%					
4	Please proceed to Part B.								
5	Part B.	DAMAGES							
6	If you answered "Y	es" to any or all of (Ouestions	123456	7 8 or 9 please answer the				
7 8	If you answered "Yes" to any or all of Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9, please answer the following questions. Otherwise, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the foreperson sign and date this form.								
			4 - £ 1						
9	13. What is the total amount of damages, if any, suffered by Van in each category described below? Do not award duplicate damages for the same harm suffered								
10	fr	om multiple claims.							
11		Compensatory D	amages:	\$					
12		Punitive Damage	es :	\$					
13		TOTAL:		\$					
14	14. Did Van use reasonable efforts to mitigate her damages?								
15									
16		Yes		No					
17					ion 15. If your answer to Questi	on			
18	14 is "Yes," stop here, answer no further questions, and have the foreperson sign and								
19	15. How much of Van's damages could have been mitigated by Van's reasonable efforts?								
20		\$							
21									
22	Dated:								
23									
24				PRESIDIN	G JUROR				
25			ed and date	ed, notify the	court that you are ready to pre	sent			
26	your verdict in the	courtroom.							
27									

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 9, 2015

PAUL S. GREWAL United States Magistrate Judge

Case No. 5:08-cv-05296-PSG VERDICT FORM