LEE ANN MANLEY,

San Francisco County Superior County

OCT 2 9 1998

ALAN CARLSON, Clerk

Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT NO. 304

Case No. 987-295

Plaintiff,	SPECIAL VERD	ICT	
VS.			
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, AND DOES 1-50,			
Defendants.			
We, the jury in the above-entitled	I case, find the follow	ring special verdict on	he
questions presented to us:			
Question No. 1: Was there a dan	gerous condition at th	ne crosswalk at Mason	and
Ellis Streets on June 17, 1996?			
	Yes	No	
Answer (check one):			
10		41.i 4i.4	
If your answer to question no. 1 v	was no, sign and re	turn inis veraict.	

If your answer to question no. 1 was "yes," then answer question no. 2.

PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

1	Question No. 2: Was the plaintiff's injury caused by the dangerous condition a	nd			
2	n a way that was reasonably foreseeable?				
3	Yes No				
4	Answer (check one):				
5					
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: Did defendant City and County of San Francisco have actual of	r			
9	constructive notice of the dangerous condition a sufficient time prior to plaintiff's accident on				
10	une 17, 1996 within which measures could have been taken to protect against the dangerous				
11	ondition?				
12	Yes No				
13	Answer (check one):				
14	If your answer to question no. 3 was "no," sign and return this verdict.				
15	If your answer to question no. 3 was "yes," then answer question no. 4.				
16	Question No. 4: Was the plaintiff contributorily negligent on June 17, 1996?				
17	Yes No				
18	Answer (check one):				
19					
20	If your answer to question no. 4 was "no," proceed to Question No. 6. If your answer to question no. 4 was "yes," then answer Question No. 5.				
21					
22	Question No. 5: Was the contributory negligence of plaintiff a cause of her inju	ry			
23	r damages?				
24	Yes No				
	answer (check one):				
25					
26	Proceed to Question No. 6.				
27					

28

1	Question No. 6: Without taking into consideration the reduction of damages due			
2	to the negligence of plaintiff, if any, what do you find to be the total amount of damages, if any,			
3	suffered by plaintiff as a result of tripping in the crosswalk at Mason and Ellis Streets on June 17			
4	1996?			
5	Proceed to Question No. 7.			
6	Question No. 7: Assuming that 100 percent represents the total cause of the			
7	plaintiff's injury, what percentage of this 100 percent is due to the fault of defendant and what			
8	percentage is due to the negligence of plaintiff?			
9	Defendant's fault%			
10	Plaintiff's negligence%			
11	Total 100%			
12	The state of the s			
13	Dated: October 28, 1998			
14	Jary Horeperson			
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				