

IMAGED

APR 12 2004

1 DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669  
City Attorney  
2 JOANNE HOEPER, State Bar #114961  
Chief Trial Attorney  
3 PETER J. KEITH, State Bar #206482  
Deputy City Attorney  
4 Fox Plaza  
1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor  
5 San Francisco, California 94102-5408  
Telephone: (415) 554-3908  
6 Facsimile: (415) 554-3837

**FILED**  
San Francisco County Superior Court

APR 12 2004

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk  
BY: *[Signature]*  
Deputy Clerk

7 Attorneys for Defendants  
8 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and  
9 OFFICER J. SANTOS

10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
11 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
12 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

13 EDWARD LEE NAHIGIAN,  
14 Plaintiff,  
15 vs.  
16 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
17 FRANCISCO, POLICE OFFICER  
18 SANTOS, and Does 1 to 20,  
19 Defendants.

Case No. 322-913

**[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT**

Date Action Filed: July 16, 2001  
Trial Date: **March 8, 2004**



20  
21 This cause came on regularly for trial on March 8, 2004 in the above-captioned court, and  
22 was assigned for trial to the courtroom of the Honorable Thomas J. Mellon, Jr., Judge of the  
23 Superior Court. Plaintiff Edward Lee Nahigian was represented by Cardoza Law Offices,  
24 Michael Cardoza, Esq. and Barbara Zanger Zuniga, Esq. Defendants City & County of San  
25 Francisco and Officer Joaquin Santos were represented by the San Francisco City Attorney's  
26 Office, Deputy City Attorney Brian K. Gearinger and Deputy City Attorney Peter J. Keith. A  
27 jury of twelve (12) persons was regularly impaneled and sworn to try said action. Witnesses on  
28 the part of plaintiff and defendants were sworn and examined. After hearing the evidence, the

JUDGMENT

1 arguments of counsel, and instructions of the Court, the Jury retired to consider their verdict and  
2 subsequently returned into Court, and being called all answered to their names, and duly  
3 rendered their special verdict in writing, which was accepted by the Court and ordered entered in  
4 the Minutes, in words and figures as follows, to-wit:

5 We, the Jury in the above entitled action, find the following special verdict on the  
6 following questions submitted to us:

7 Question No. 1: Did the arrest by Mr. Santos harm Mr. Nahigian? Answer: No.


8 Question No. 5: Was Mr. Santos's conduct outrageous? Answer: No.

9 WHEREFORE, the Court orders the following Judgment:

10 Judgment is hereby entered in favor of defendants Officer Joaquin Santos and the City &  
11 County of San Francisco; and against plaintiff Edward Lee Nahigian. Defendants are awarded <sup>prevailing parties and are</sup>  
12 statutory costs and disbursements <sup>as may subsequently be found, entitled</sup> according to proof.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED:

14 Dated: April 12, 2004

15   
16 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28