# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE AT KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE

Thomas Neely,		:	
P	laintiff,		
VS.		: Case No. 3:05-cv-304	
Fox of Oak Ridge,		: Jury Trial-Day 1	
Γ	Defendant.	:	
Transcript of proceedings before the Honorable H. Bruce Guyton,			
U. S. Magistrate Judge, on June 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2006.			
Appearances:	On behalf o	f the Plaintiff:	
	Robert J. English, Esq. Michael C. Inman, Esq. Knoxville, Tennessee		
On behalf of the Defendant:			
	Jennifer N	oodfin, Esq. A. Caywood, Esq. e, Tennessee	
Court Reporter:	800 Market	ocuba, RMR Street, Suite 132 Tennessee 37902 24-4590	

accident- and we don't dispute that he was working for us at the
time, so if you do find he did something wrong, that's attributable
to us. If you find he didn't do anything wrong, we don't have
anything that we did wrong separately. Our role here today is as his
employer defending actions that were made- or allegations against
us that our employee did something wrong.

So if you get past that hurdle and you found that they have met
their burden of proof, that despite the fact that this was a rainslickened road and Mr. Curd was acting reasonably, then you have
to find that Mr. Neely sustained damages that are directly a result
of what happened in that accident that occurred out there in Clinton
on that date.

We have been sued in this case for two and a half million
dollars. That is the number that was listed in the lawsuit which Mr.
Neely feels that he is entitled to. And his attorney has told you
today about the course of treatment that he has underwent and the
things that he has done since this accident occurred.

What I want to do is fill in a few more details about what
you'll hear, hear from Mr. Neely, as he testifies in accordance with
what he has told me before. I have taken his deposition. He has
sworn to me under oath that certain things occurred, and I suspect
he'll testify in accordance with those things today.

We already know what the doctors have said, because we've
 preserved their testimony by deposition and by videotape or CD ROM, I guess they call it now. And you will see those doctors

1

2

3

5

testify on this video screen as if they were here today.

Mr. English alluded to it a little bit before, Mr. Neely was referred to these doctors by his lawyers. They chose specific doctors for him to go to. There was one doctor that Mr. Neely saw 4 before Dr. Koenig that he didn't like, so then they found somebody else and sent him to Dr. Koenig. Then they sent him to the pain 6 specialist. These were all referrals that were made through the 7 lawyer's office. 8

Mr. Neely told his doctors, at the scene of the accident, that he 9 lost consciousness. He told me, in his deposition, that he did not 10 lose consciousness. The doctor reviewed an emergency room 11 record which showed he did not lose consciousness. 12

Mr. Neely is going to tell you he can't work, but he told me, 13 when I took his deposition, that he has applied for certain jobs and 14 he just has not checked back or heard back from those jobs that he 15 has applied for. 16

The symptoms that he is going to tell you about, when you 17 hear the doctors testify about these symptoms, are not confirmed by 18 the tests that Mr. English alluded to. He mentioned these MRI 19 examinations which were given to Mr. Neely on the various 20 occasions, they show these disc bulges. The doctors have said that 21 they can't really tell for sure if those things were caused by the 22 accident because they may be degenerative changes that exist in 23 people as they get older. 24

25

The doctor did say, in his opinion, that if these symptoms Mr.

11

Neely was talking about were true, based on a history given by Mr. 1 Neely, the doctor would attribute those things to the accident. So 2 you can see what we have to do here. We have to first believe what 3 Mr. Neely is saying before we can believe what the doctors are 4 saying about these symptoms. 5

Because there is no test that shows why Mr. Neely says he has 6 pain down his arms or down his legs. Mr. Neely told me he has pain 7 all the way down his arms, into his hands, into his fingers. He told 8 me he has pain down his legs, into his feet, into his toes. He told 9 me his eyes hurt, he told me his head hurts, he told me he has 10 memory problems.

You will listen to what these doctors say, and there is never a 12 report to the doctors that there are any memory problems. Mr. 13 Neely told me he told his doctors these things, but the doctors don't 14 confirm that, either. 15

Mr. Neely had a previous worker's comp. case when he was 16 working at Scott County Hospital, where he injured his knee. Some 17 of the tests that the doctors gave him, even according to the 18 doctors, confirmed that there was a symptom Mr. Neely was 19 reporting that was out of context with the test that he was being 20 given. You'll hear Dr. Koenig talk about that. He calls it a 21 Waddell test, and he will explain what that means as well. 22

Mr. Neely had a bruise on his back in October, 2004, that he 23 says happened at the accident and his doctor says was not there 24 until after the accident, with no explanation for it. He and his wife 25

3

4

5

6

7

had a child in November of 2005, after this accident. He takes care
 of that child now to some extent.

His wife and he sell things at a flea market on the weekends. He drives to pick these things up wherever they're located and takes them to the flea market in his community, Strunk, Kentucky, where he and his wife live. He drove to Virginia one time to pick these things up.

8 These are all points that you're going to hear, and they're 9 going to impact your ability to decide how much weight all of this 10 evidence is to be given. All we're asking is that you take all of 11 these things into account in deciding whether or not Mr. Neely has 12 met his burden of proving these things by a preponderance of the 13 evidence.

He's asking for a lot of money, he's asking for a lot of
different damages. For example, he's asking for this award for lost
earning capacity. He doesn't think he's going to work again as a
result of this. You have to not only weigh that, but you have to
weigh the other things that you will hear about that as well.

Why doesn't he have a job now? Is it just because he didn't
hear back from the places he applied for? Is it because he's taking
care of a child? Is it because that he and his wife are getting
income from this flea market and from rental properties that they
have? That's for you to decide.

But those are the things that really destroy any weight of the
evidence that he will put on regarding his claim for lost earning

91

3

5

capacity. That one's easy for me. In my opinion, he has no claim for 1 lost earning capacity because of those other factors that I've said. 2

Other damages that he's going to be claiming require him to meet that same burden, and if he can't meet that burden, you all 4 took an oath today saying you'd decide this case fairly and impartially. While it may be difficult to award this man limited 6 damages, that's what you will have to do if you believe the 7 evidence does not meet the standards. 8

Our system works real well when the jurors listen to the 9 evidence and listen to the instructions that the Court gives, and I 10 suspect you're going to do that today. 11

I want to thank you all for taking the time to be here and 12 listening to what we have to say about it and letting us present the 13 case and letting me present the case on behalf of Fox of Oak Ridge 14 so that you can truly understand what's going on here. We'll try to 15 present this as clearly and concisely as possible so you can get to 16 the point where you can help us decide these issues. Thank you. 17

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel. Members 18 of the jury, we're at the point now where we can begin taking 19 evidence in this case. Before we start taking evidence from any 20 witnesses, we're going to take a lunch break. 21

But I am going to tell you that there have been stipulations of 22 evidence or fact that have been made by the parties as part of the 23 preparation for this case. There are three stipulations of fact the 24 parties have agreed upon, and so I'm going to read these to you 25