

FFB 0 1 2010

By

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - CENTRAL DISTRICT

ADETOKUNBO SHOYOYE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Defendant

Case No. BC388511

JUDGMENT ON SPECIAL VERDICT

This action came on regularly for trial on January 25, 2010 in Department 62 of the above-entitled Court, the Honorable Michael L. Stern, Judge of the Superior Court, presiding. Attorney Gary S. Casselman appeared for plaintiff Adetokunbo Shoyoye. Attorney Thomas C. Hurrell appeared for defendant County of Los Angeles.

A jury of twelve persons was regularly impaneled and sworn and agreed to try the cause. Witnesses were sworn and testified. After hearing the evidence and arguments of counsel, the jury was duly instructed by the Court and the cause was submitted to the jury with directions to return a special verdict. The jury deliberated and thereafter returned to court with its special verdict on the issues submitted and the answers given thereto by the jury, which verdict was in words and figures as follows:

1 "TITLE OF COURT AND CAUSE"

2 We, the jury in the above-entitled action, find the following special verdict on the
3 questions submitted to us as follows:

4 **Question No. 1:**

5 Did the County of Los Angeles hold Adetokunbo Shoyoye in custody?

6 Answer: Yes X No _____

7 If your answer to Question 1 is "yes," then please proceed to the next question. If
8 you answered "no," please proceed to question 4.

9 **Question No. 2:**

10 Was there an unnecessary delay in releasing plaintiff Adetokunbo Shoyoye?

11 Answer: Yes X No _____

12 If your answer to Question 2 is "yes," then please proceed to the next question. If
13 you answered "no," please proceed to question 4.

14 **Question No. 3:**

15 Was the County of Los Angeles' conduct a substantial factor in causing harm to
16 plaintiff Adetokunbo Shoyoye?

17 Answer: Yes X No _____

18 Please proceed to the next question.

19 **Question No. 4:**

20 Did the employee(s) of the County of Los Angeles intentionally act or fail to act
21 with plaintiff Adetokunbo Shoyoye's right to be free from the unreasonable seizure by
22 actual or implied use of threats, intimidation or coercion?

23 Answer: Yes X No _____

24 If your answer to Question No. 4 is "yes," please proceed to the next question. If
25 you answered "no," please proceed to Question No. 6.

1 **Question No. 5:**

2 Was the County of Los Angeles' employee(s)' conduct in violating plaintiff
3 Adetokunbo Shoyoye's right to be free from unreasonable seizures a substantial factor
4 in causing harm to plaintiff Adetokunbo Shoyoye?

5 Answer: Yes X No _____

6 Please proceed to the next question if you answered "yes" to this question. If
7 you answered "no" to both questions 3 and 5, the foreperson should sign and return the
8 verdict form.

9 **Question No. 6:**

10 What do you find to be the total amount of damages, if any, suffered by plaintiff
11 Adetokunbo Shoyoye as a result of the County of Los Angeles' conduct?

12 A. Economic Loss:

- 13 1. Past lost earnings: \$ 3,700.00
14 2. Future lost earnings: \$ 7,000.00
15 3. Property loss: \$ 12,000.00

16
17 B. Non-economic loss:

- 18 1. Past non-economic loss, including
19 physical pain and mental suffering: \$ 80,000.00
20 2. Future non-economic loss, including
21 physical pain and mental suffering: \$ 100,000.00

22
23 Dated: 1-29-10 /S/ Rachel Marks

24
25 It appearing by reason of said special verdict that plaintiff Adetokunbo Shoyoye is
26 entitled judgment against defendant County of Los Angeles.
27
28

1 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that
2 plaintiff, Adetokunbo Shoyoye, have and recover from defendant County of Los Angeles
3 the sum of \$202,700.00, plus interest at the legal rate of 10% per annum from the date
4 of this judgment, and costs of suit pursuant to a timely filed memorandum of costs.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: February 1, 2010

MICHAEL L. STERN

Michael L. Stern
Judge of the Superior Court