## ORIGINAL

San Francisco County Superior Court LOUISE H. RENNE, State Bar #36508 City Attorney MAY 2 2000 PATRICK J. MAHONEY, State Bar #42464 2 Chief Trial Attorney ALAN CARLSON, Clerk BRIAN GEARINGER, State Bar #146125 3 Deputy City Attorney Fox Plaza 1390 Market Street, 6th Floor San Francisco, California 94102-5408 5 Telephone: (415) 554-3800 6 Facsimile: (415) 554-3738 7 8 Attorneys for Defendant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - UNLIMITED JURISDICTION 11 12 Case No. 998-682 CATHERINE DRAPER AS GUARDIAN AD LITEM FOR MINOR EBONY AL [<del>PROPOSE</del>D] JUDGMENT ON 13 GRAY. SPECIAL VERDICT 14 Plaintiff, Date Action Filed: October 21, 1998 April 10, 2000 Trial Date: 15 vs. 16 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND DOE ONE 17 THROUGH DOE FIFTY, 18 Defendants. 19 This action came on regularly for trial on April 10, 2000 in Department 305 of the 20 Superior Court for the City and County of San Francisco, the Honorable Paul H. Alvarado, 21 presiding. Deputy City Attorney Brian Gearinger appeared on behalf of defendant City and 22 County of San Francisco. James O'Donnell, Esq. of O'Donnell & Smith appeared on behalf of 23 plaintiff Catherine Draper as guardian ad litem for minor Ebony Gray. 24 A jury of twelve persons was regularly impaneled and sworn. Witnesses were sworn and 25 testified. Evidence was admitted. After hearing the evidence and arguments of counsel, this 26 Court instructed the jury and the cause was submitted to the jury with directions to return a 27 verdict on special issues. The first issue was as follows: "Was defendant negligent in failing to 28

JUDGMENT ON SPECIAL VERDICT

SAN FRANCISCO SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO. 998-682.

N AUTOGEARINGEMENT GRAVERIAL Volument of

prevent the assault on the plaintiff by a fellow passenger on February 16, 1998?" By a vote of 10-2, the jury answered the first question as follows: "Yes."

The second issue was as follows: "If you find that defendant was negligent, was such negligence a cause of injury to the plaintiff?" By a vote of 10-2, the jury answered the second question as follows: "No."

This Court then polled the jury and confirmed the above votes. A copy of the Special Verdict is attached as Exhibit A.

### IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows:

- 1. That defendant City and County of San Francisco have judgment in its favor and that plaintiff Catherine Draper as guardian ad litem for minor Ebony Gray take nothing from defendant City and County of San Francisco as a result of this judgment; and
- 2. That defendant City and County of San Francisco shall recover its costs from plaintiff Catherine Draper as guardian ad litem for minor Ebony Gray, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1032, 1033.5 and 1141.21(a), as shall be submitted in defendant City and County of San Francisco's Memorandum of Costs.

Dated: April /, 2000

The Honorable Paul H. Alvarado
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

JUDGMENT ON SPECIAL VERDICT SAN FRANCISCO SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO. 998-682.

# SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA NINTY OF SAN FRANCISCO – UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

'	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - CHEMITED TOTAL		
)     -	DEPARTMENT NO. 305		
1	CATHERINE DRAPER AS GUARDIAN	Case No. 998-682	
2	AD LITEM FOR MINOR EBONY		
3	Plaintiff,	SPECIAL VERDICT	
4	vs.		
.5	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN		
6    7	FRANCISCO AND DOE ONE THROUGH DOE FIFTY,		
18	Defendants.		
19			
20		C. L. C. Hawing appoint wordigt on the	
21	We, the jury in the above-entitled case, find the following special verdict on the		
22	questions presented to us:	•	
23	Question No. 1: Was defendant n	egligent in failing to prevent the assault on the	
24	plaintiff by a fellow passenger on February 16, 1998?		
25		Yes No	
26	Answer (check one):	<del></del>	
27	If a second to question no. 1.1	was "no " sign and return this verdict.	
28	If your answer to question no. 1 was "no," sign and return this verdict.		
	Special Verdict, SC NO. 998-682		

If your answer to question no. 1 was "yes," then answer question no. 2. . 1 Question No. 2: If you find that defendant was negligent, was such negligence a 2 cause of injury to the plaintiff? 3 Yes 4 5 Answer (check one): 6 If your answer to question no. 2 was "no," sign and return this verdict. 7 If your answer to question no. 2 was "yes," then answer question no. 3. 8 Question No. 3: Without taking into consideration the reduction of damages due 9 to the negligence of the plaintiff, if any, what do you find to be the total amount of damages, if 10 any, suffered by the plaintiff as a result of the assault by a fellow passenger on February 16, 11 1998? 12 **Economic Damages** 13 \$\_\_\_\_\_ Non-economic Damages 14 \$ \_\_\_. Total 15 If your answer to question no. 3 was "zero," sign and return this verdict. 16 If your answer to question no. 3 was anything other than "zero", then answer 17 question no. 4. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Special Verdict, SC NO. 998-682

Question No. 4: Assuming that 100 percent represents the total cause of the plaintiff's injury, what percentage of this 100 percent is due to the fault of defendant and what percentage is due to the negligence of plaintiff, or wrongful conduct of the fellow passenger who assaulted the plaintiff? % The negligence of defendant The negligence of the plaintiff The wrongful conduct of the fellow passenger who assaulted the plaintiff 100% Total Dated: April 13, 2000 Special Verdict, SC NO. 998-682

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

I, MARIA M. CARMODY, declare as follows:.

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action. I am employed at the City Attorney's Office of San Francisco, Fox Plaza Building, 1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

On April 24, 2000, I served the attached:

### [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT ON SPECIAL VERDICT

on the interested parties in said action, by placing a true copy thereof in sealed envelope(s) addressed as follows:

JAMES J. O'DONNELL, ESQ. O'Donnell & Smith 1776 Ygnacio Valley Rd., Suite 200 Walnut Creek, CA 94598

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

and served the named document in the manner indicated below:

* *	l	
12	processes to be placed and sealed in envelope(s) addressed to the addressee(s), at the	BY MAIL: I caused true and correct copies of the above documents, by following ordinary business practices, to be placed and sealed in envelope(s) addressed to the addressee(s), at the City Attorney's Office
13		of San Francisco, Fox Plaza Building, 1390 Market Street, City and County of San Francisco, California, 94102, for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service, and in the ordinary course of
14		business, correspondence placed for collection on a particular day is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day.
15		BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I caused true and correct copies of the above documents to be placed
16		and sealed in envelope(s) addressed to the addressee(s) and I caused such envelope(s) to be delivered by hand on the office(s) of the addressee(s).

BY EXPRESS SERVICES OVERNITE: I caused true and correct copies of the above documents to be placed and sealed in envelope(s) addressed to the addressee(s) and I caused such envelope(s) to be delivered to EXPRESS SERVICES OVERNITE for overnight courier service to the office(s) of the addressee(s).

BY FACSIMILE: 1 caused a copy(ies) of such document(s) to be transmitted via facsimile machine.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed April 24, 2000, at San Francisco, California.

Maria M. Carmody

JUDGMENT ON SPECIAL VERDICT SAN FRANCISCO SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO. 998-682. N. LIT GEARINGEMUNT GRAY/TRIAL/JUDGMENT TRI