IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NORTHERN DIVISION

THOMAS NEELY,)	
) No. 3:05-CV-30	Э4
Plaintiff,)	
) Knoxville, TN	
VS.) June 21, 2006	
) 9:30 a.m.	
FOX OF OAK RIDGE,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL (CONTINUED)
BEFORE THE HONORABLE H. BRUCE GUYTON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: Robert J. English, Esq.
Michael C. Inman, Esq.
Robert J. English & Associates
706 S. Gay Street
Knoxville, TN 37902

For the Defendant: Clint J. Woodfin, Esq.
Spicer, Flynn & Rudstrom, PLLC
800 S. Gay Street, Suite 1400
Knoxville, TN 37929

DANA HOLLOWAY, LCR #11, CCR #455
MILLER & MILLER COURT REPORTERS
Knoxville, Tennessee 37943
Phone (865) 675-1471 / Fax (865) 675-6398
E-mail: jmccon3590@aol.com

And if they are, then my intention would be to ask the

25

foreperson if they answered "No" to No. 2, then why did they go on and answer No. 3?

And based on that information, if that clears up the ambiguity -- perhaps it will. And if it doesn't, then the Court is going to let the jury go and proceed on.

MR. WOODFIN: Your Honor, obviously, you can do whatever you see fit in this situation, but I don't necessarily view the ambiguity, I guess, the way the Court does.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. WOODFIN: If they had been asked injuries and damages and came up with that figure, I don't think we have a question. But I'm thinking it's very consistent for them to rule that the injuries were not caused based on the proof that was presented, yet awarded amounts for medical expenses that were proven in this case, which is very close to the figure that they arrived at.

If the Court sees a problem with the verdict,

I'm a little bit concerned about questioning the jury

further about why they came up with that number.

I guess we have to look it from the perspective of the answer to the second question should just prevent my client from being awarded

1 damages at all.

So if anybody has a problem here, it probably should be me. But I'm not asking the Court for any relief. I am asking the Court to allow this verdict to stand, poll the jury on unanimity, and see if they all agree with that number and the reason they arrived at that.

And then if motions post trial are filed by either side, for whatever reason, we can take those up at that time. But I think the appropriate thing to do would be to poll the jury and see if they're unanimous in their decision.

If their decision is wrong, or some party feels like they have been wronged by their decision, I guess post trial motions would be appropriate.

I'm not prepared, and don't want to be prepared to argue any post trial motions today. I will say that no motion was made after the close of plaintiff's proof, so I'm not sure they are entitled to ask for a judgment notwithstanding the verdict of this case on the damages issue, which is what we're dealing with here.

So I think on behalf of my client, I would just request the Court consider asking the jury their opinion about whether or not this was unanimous.

If they say that they were, let the verdict stand, and let us file motions to clear it up if it needs to be cleared up.

THE COURT: Well, of course, either party can file a motion in the nature of a mistrial even after the verdict has been returned if the verdict is a flawed one.

Is there anything else you want to add, Mr. English?

MR. ENGLISH: Yes, Your Honor. It's obviously an inconsistent verdict for them to find Fox negligent and say that Fox did not cause the injuries, and then to award damages, you just can't do that.

If they had said "Yes" to Question No. 2 and given us thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000), we would be stuck with it.

But to say "No," they're not liable for any damages and to give thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000), that's a very inconsistent verdict. And it just can't stand, Your Honor.

I think I agree with Clint on that. I think it would be very prejudicial to my client to bring the same jury in here that has just held up their hand and sworn that this was their verdict unanimously and ask them again about it and try to break it down. I think

we need another jury to try this case. 1 THE COURT: All right. Well, I appreciate 2 those comments. It's difficult to know exactly what to do. But we're going to ask one question and we're going to see if we get some clarification, and then we'll go from there. 6 Bring the jury in. (Jury in at 5:30.) 8 9 DEPUTY CLERK: This Court is again in session. Please be seated. 10 11 THE COURT: I'm sorry to keep you-all longer. 12 But before the Court can accept the verdict form, the Court will need to make another inquiry with regard 13 to -- and the Court understands your response to 14 15 Question No. 1, being, "Yes." 16 Question No. 2: Was the Defendant Fox of Oak Ridge, Inc.'s negligence a legal cause of injuries to 17 18 the Plaintiff, Tom Neely? Your answer is "No." 19 20 And is that the unanimous verdict of everyone 21 on the jury? Please raise your right hand if it is. 22 All right then. All right hands were raised. 23 I must ask you, Madam Foreperson, given that 24 answer to Question No. 2, why did the jury proceed to 25 answer Question No. 3?