

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

VERDICT FORM

1								
2	Part A. LIABILITY							
3	False 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	Unruh Act							
8								
9	2. 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	Section 1981							
14	3. Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24,							
15	2007, Wal-Mart violated Section 1981 and denied Van equal accommodation under the law?							
16								
17	Yes No							
18	Negligent Hiring, Training, Supervision or Retention							
19	4. Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 2007							
20	Wal-Mart committed the tort of negligent hiring, training, supervision or retention?							
21								
22	Yes No							
23	Intentional Infliction 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	against her?							
27	Yes No							
28								
	2 2							
	Case No. 5:08-cv-05296-PSG AMENDED VERDICT FORM							

	Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress					
		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 dis				
	Yes	No				
	Negligent Misrepresen	gent Misrepresentation				
		las Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 007, Wal-Mart committed the tort of negligent misrepresentation?				
	Yes	No				
	Negligence Claim					
	8. Has Van proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that on November 24, 2007, Wal-Mart was negligent in its conduct toward Van?					
	Yes	No				
•	wer to Question 8 is "Yes," is "No," proceed directly to	then please proceed to Question 9. If your answer to Part B.				
	9. Was Wal-Mart's negl	igence a substantial factor in causing harm to Van?				
	Yes	No				
•	wer to Question 9 is "Yes," is "No," proceed directly to	then please proceed to Question 10. If your answer to Part B.				
	10. Was Rainier neglige	ent?				
	Yes	No				
If your answ	your answer to Question 10 is "Yes," then please proceed to Question 11. If your answer to estion 10 is "No," proceed directly to Part B.					
-	11. Was Rainier's negligence a substantial factor in causing Van's harm?					
-						
-	Yes	No				

1	12. What percentage of responsibility for Van's harm do you assign to:								
		Wal-Mart:	%						
2		Rainier:	%						
3		TOTAL:	<u>100</u> %						
4	Please proceed to Part B.								
5	<u>Part B.</u>	DAMAGES							
6 7	If you answered "Y	es" to any or all of Qu	uestions 1, 2, 3,	4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9, p	lease answer the				
8	following questions. Otherwise, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the foreperson sign and date this form.								
9	13. What is the total amount of damages, if any, suffered by Van in each category								
10	described below? Do not award duplicate damages for the same harm suffered from multiple claims.								
11		Compensatory Dan	nages:	\$					
12		Punitive Damages	:	\$					
13		TOTAL:		\$					
14	Dated:								
15						-			
16	PRESIDING JUROR								
17	After this verdict form has been signed and dated, notify the court that you are ready to present your verdict in the courtroom.								
18									
19									
20	SO ORDERED.								
21	Dated: January 12, 2015								
22			P		And /				
23			PAU	UL S. GREWAL ed States Magistra	fene	-			
24			Оші	ed States Magistra	ne suuge				
25									
26									
27									
28									
	Case No. 5:08-cv-0 AMENDED VERD		4						