```
MR. SIMMONS: No, Your Honor.
 1
                   MS. ROBINSON: No, Your Honor.
 2
                   THE COURT: Thank you. All right, you'll
 3
    now hear closing arguments. Mr. Miller goes first.
 4
                   MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
            I'm going to approach and grab the board, if I
 6
 7
     may, Your Honor?
                   THE COURT: Go ahead.
 8
                   MR. MILLER: In a short time you folks
 9
     are going to go back in the jury room, and you're going
10
     to have two jobs in there.
11
            First is to come to an opinion as to the value
12
13
     of the case.
            The second is to convince your colleagues as to
14
     why that value is correct.
15
            I'm going to give you some guidance as to how
16
     the Plaintiff sees those issues.
17
            Normally what I do in a case is I'll get up on
18
     the board like this. I'll draw a line between
19
20
     Plaintiff and Defendant. I'll prepare the evidence:
     What did Plaintiff's evidence show? What did
21
    Defendant's evidence show? Draw into comparative as to
22
     how we see the case.
23
            Here the line goes straight down to Plaintiff,
24
     all of the evidence in the Plaintiff. You heard the
25
```

1 opening statements, and it set apart, you know, in 2 terms of what appeared to be the differences in the parties. You're going to hear all these things about 3 all this, you know, why Plaintiffs everything they're 4 saying is absolutely incorrect. And then what did you 5 6 really hear? 7 You heard from Dr. and Mr. Simmons 8 said, listen to Dr. listen to what he has to 9 say. What did Dr. say? 10 said this woman was very badly hurt in the accident. He said she has a permanent neck 11 12 injury. He said carpal tunnel -- get back to that in a 13 second -- is related to this accident. 14 We heard from Ms. and we heard that this injury has changed her life. We heard Dr. 15 16 say that the injury is permanent, and she's not going 17 to get any better and expects to get worse. 18 The Defendant has not offered any testimony. They didn't bring a doctor here to say Dr. 🛑 19 20 full of it. Show you surveillance video of Ms. running the hundred yard dash. They brought you 21 22 absolutely nothing. 23 What did they bring you? They brought you a lot of, well, who was your primary care doctor? 24 printed form at was your 25

old primary care doctor instead of your new primary care doctor. They said they were going to make a big issue about her concussion, prove she didn't have a concussion in the accident. Did the Defendant's show that? Not a stitch in evidence.

They also separately wanted, and they wanted to pick apart of the details of the record. Did you say this little thing one time, later say it differently this way? Did you say not often versus sometimes or the little pickings to the record? This didn't show up in the record, as if a doctor writes down every single thing you say, as if things aren't said at doctors.

I want to show you the jury instructions that the Court read, two of them, because they read them so fast it's hard to follow, which is susceptibility of injury. The effect that an injury might have upon a particular person depends upon the susceptibility to injury of the Plaintiff. In other words, the fact that the injury would have been less serious if inflicted upon another person should not affect the amount of damages to which the Plaintiff may be entitled.

There's no evidence -- they brought you a lot of talk about prior medical records. What did somebody say about, this woman had a neck injury before the accident, that she complained to a single doctor and

said my neck hurts. Where was that evidence? Where was the evidence she told somebody that? All we have is them basically saying this woman is not being truthful about that. There's absolutely no evidence at all.

And what this instruction says is that you don't change the amount of damages because someone was susceptible to injury. You're right, the gun was loaded, if it was you or I this injury may not have happened. Clearly it was a serious wreck, but maybe you or I would have come out better. Some more serious accidents some people do well. Some less serious accidents people don't do so well.

The before picture was a woman who was not in pain and a woman who has been in pain ever since.

The second instruction the Court read is aggravation of preexisting condition. A person who has had a particular condition before the accident may be awarded damages for the aggravation or worsening of that condition. And that takes us back to her carpal tunned syndrome. The Defendant made a good point. We don't see medical records for three months. It's got to resinate a little bit, because we have the earlier -- she had complaints earlier than that, but three months is a long time, and you may very well find that

that carpal tunnel syndrome was totally unrelated to the accident. You may find that. Dr. didn't say that. No medical doctor said that. But you may find that that was the focus of their cross. It wasn't the focus of Dr. and Ms. carpal tunnel this, carpal tunnel that. They didn't really focus on it. Why we're here was this woman's permanent neck injury.

These instructions -- I'll give you another way to look at it too. I hope I'm not beating this horse down. If you're rear-ended in a car, and you have a carton of eggs in the back of your car -- the Defendant cannot deny responsibility by saying they could have been golf balls when they were eggs.

Ms. Robinson got up here today and said this case is about money. The case is about money, there's no question about it. The only justice you have to award in this system is financial compensation. The question is, how much?

As a lawyer I try to think of different ways to sort of communicate this idea to the jury. The judge's instructions were relatively vague, they don't give you a formula. You have to find out what the injuries are worth. What I'm going to do is give you Plaintiff's view, some kind of a lens and road map of Plaintiff's

```
view of the damages. I'll say it now, I'm going to say
 1
 2
     it again before I finish up, you can disregard it, you
     can cut it in half, you can double it. You can do
 3
     whatever you want with it. I'm not suggesting by any
 4
 5
     stretch of the imagination that I have the appropriate
 6
     formula, but you've got to come up with something,
 7
     that's your job. I'm going to give you my thoughts on
 8
     the way to do it.
 9
            The way I like to frame it sometimes to juries
10
     is to say, what if this job, this suffering, would be a
     job in the newspaper in the help-wanted ads?
11
12
     Employment is a little down these days. So how much
13
     would what Ms. is going through be worth? And
14
     I guess the first ad in the want ads would be crash
15
     dummy, the accident itself, what happened in the
16
     accident. But would you be able to get somebody to
17
     accept that concussion as Dr. . described and Ms.
        described, that big huge bulk in her neck.
18
                                                         The
19
     fear of wondering where your daughter is. Glass
     shattering everywhere. Losing your glasses. Air bags
20
     explode in your face. What's that worth? I'm going to
21
     throw out a number, $10,000. That might be
22
     ridiculously low or high. Take it for what it is.
23
         Let's try --
24
25
                   THE COURT: Counsel, Bruce has a marker
```

here you can use.

MR. MILLER: Super.

Pain and suffering over the last three and a half years. This accident occurred on February 9th, 2005. What has she been through since that crash? The ER, pain, tests, all these things she's been through; what's that worth? Call it three years -- it's been three and a half years -- I'm saying \$3,000 a year, \$9,000.

Okay, now we have this, what this case is about -- oh, before I get to that, the carpal tunnel syndrome. Clearly she had a preexisting carpal tunnel problem and clearly unambiguously Dr. is saying I'm telling you that carpal tunnel syndrome is related to the accident. For the last three years and next 32.4 -- which is how long she expects to live -- what's that worth? I'm going to assume, because I want to be conservative, that most of this carpal tunnel problem she's going to continue to have problems with this preex.sting problem, the accident kind of set it off a little bit, but largely we're still dealing with mostly the preexisting problem. I'll put that down as carpal tunnel, and I'll call it \$10,000 for the last three years and next 30 some years.

But this case is not about these three numbers

there. This case, like I said before, can't beat this point down enough. You guys are going to forget Ms.

me too, and it's a memory to us. This is her one chance, her only chance, just from you folks to adequately compensate her. And what's that worth? That's a tough call. That's why they paid you guys a lot of money to be here today.

The number I came up with is this, 75 cents an hour for the rest of her life. Told you that in opening, 75 cents an hour. What does that mean? 75 cents times 24 hours in a day, 18 dollars a day, over 365 days, over 32.4 years. That math, you can check me on it if you guys brought calculators, is \$212,868, that totals up, I believe, to like 241, \$241.868.

The one complaint you might have with that is 24 hours a day. Her testimony was she's not able to sleep very well. She struggles sleeping. You might want to cut that back, you know, what she sleeps. I'm not giving credit for sleep time. You might want to say it's too high, I want to cut it in half. You also might want to say Mr. Miller is being too conservative. I don't want to suggest a limitation one way or the other. I'm trying to give you something to go on to try to figure out how to deal with the rest of that

```
woman's life and what that compensation ought to be.
 1
     And I think because we've got a trial here, Defense is
 2
 3
     going to disagree with that number. What I'm hoping
     they're going to do is give you a number and
 4
 5
     explanation as to why it should be what it is, I'd be
     curicus to hear that. That's what I have.
 6
 7
             I have the advantage over the Defendant here.
 8
     have the opportunity to speak to you one more time.
 9
     I'm going to give them the opportunity to answer what I
     just said here, then I have one more chance to give you
10
     my final thoughts.
11
12
            Thank you very much.
13
                    THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Miller.
14
            Mr. Simmons.
15
                   MR. SIMMONS:
                                  Thank you, Your Honor.
16
            May it please the Court, madam forelady, ladies
     and gentlemen of the jury. If you don't mind I'll turn
17
18
     this, Your Honor.
19
                   THE COURT: Fine.
20
                   MR. SIMMONS: I'll be very short and very
     brief with you. You've heard enough. You've listened
21
22
     to the evidence, but let me just go over some of the
     evidence with you so that we'll know exactly what we're
23
24
     saying, because I have a copy of what the doctor told
```

you when you saw the video deposition.

25

But before we start, I'll comment about the figures that they've put on the board. I don't ever try and tell jurors how to decide the case and decide what figures. That's why we have you. That's why we're in this courtroom. You now know today why we're here. Only question is, how much, if any. And please note that I say, if any, because the Court -- and if I'm wrong, the judge will, Judge Cavanaugh, you'll hear him right now -- you do not have to award any money in this case if you do not believe that Plaintiff was injured because your award can be zero. You are the ones to decide what amount, if any, you're to put on that verdict sheet. So use your common sense, your reasonableness.

You heard the evidence and there's a few comments I'd like to make regarding the evidence that may help you in making your decision. We know there was an automobile accident. We know there was a fairly severe accident. Because you have a severe accident doesn't mean you're hurt any more than when you have a minor accident that you're not hurt.

We have air bags that went off. Now what's the purpose of air bags? You all know. I don't quite understand how you could strike anything directly in front of you with an air bag blowing up, but we have

the testimony that it happened.

We do know that there was previous condition this lady had. She had migraine headaches and had them for years. We know she had carpal tunnel syndrome, we found that out. We had it in both hands, and she had surgery on one of them in 2002. We do know that she had, from the tests, bulging disc in her neck before this accident, and after the accident they were the same. You heard the doctor say, we looked at the MRI's and they're identical. Now obviously to me that means that they haven't been aggravated or injured.

The one thing we don't know, why did she have an MRI in 2002 of her neck if she wasn't having trouble? People have had MRI's. You all probably know what they are, putting them in a machine. Not really a pleasant thing you want to go through. They tell you they're going to play music. I could never hear the music. I heard thump, thump, thump. Sat there and said how soon can I get out of here? But this was one done in 2002. Why? Does that mean she had complaints? That's for you to decide. That's why we have you people.

Now, we do know this, that after the accident she went to \_\_\_\_\_\_. They didn't even take an X-ray. Now, if you had a head injury, did they miss it? Did they miss this bump, that hospital, you know,

I don't understand. Wouldn't the ambulance driver have picked up on it? He was there at the scene, wouldn't he have said something? Instead she didn't get in the ambulance, she went later on.

We then have the family doctor. She doesn't go

and goes to them. Why wouldn't you call your family doctor or somebody who has treated you? Doesn't that make sense to do that first?

Instead she goes there and gets seven physical therapy treatments, that's all. She gets some injections and you heard her testify, that's all the treatment that I got.

She had other tests done, and you also heard the other tests say they were normal -- not, now not that the bulging discs were normal, the EKG's and all of the rest of them, all normal. Now, that's what we have in this case basically, completely in the whole matter.

Now, the Judge has told you further that -- and I'll read you a couple things that the doctor said that may help refresh your memory -- the Judge said you people are to decide this case on the evidence presented in this case, as well as your own experiences.

So let me try -- and I won't go over all of

these, because you probably remember them better than I do -- this is Dr. \_\_\_\_\_\_. And he was asked, were you ever provided any records for the carpal tunnel? He said, no, I just noted, you know, that she had carpal tunnel release. It really didn't work very well. And I locked to the neurostudies which were ordered, and I also looked at her medications, some of which can contribute to ongoing carpal tunnel problems like hyperthyroidism is the documented cause.

Now, the doctor knew when he checked her records that the previous carpal tunnel didn't work and that she had existing problems with it. Then he asked, who sent her for the MRI in 2002? And doctor said, do you know who sent her for the MRI? No. Do you have any idea why the MRI was done? No. Based upon the report, please correct me if I'm wrong, there was no significant changes from the preaccident MRI and the accident, correct? Right.

Now, we know that there were no changes made. We know that there is preexisting arthritis and preexisting disc disease. Some of you may have arthritis, you know, it continues on. It never goes away and never gets better, and there isn't much you can do for it except hot moisture and try to work it out. Once it's there, it's not going to

improve.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

She also has a degenerative disc disease. Same thing is going to happen with that. We know that's going to progressively get worse as you get older and move forward. But what the interesting thing, I don't remember seeing this in the report, and that's why I asked the doctor before, and I'm no spring chicken, I've seen a lot of these medical reports, and I said, I see, Doctor, you made a comment in your report of August 5th, 2005 -- actually it was February 9th, 2005, the accident was, in your impression you said, in my opinion her subjective complaints exceed her clinical and objective findings. I said, what does that mean? He says, that means even though she has had a lot of complaints, her physical examination, neurological examination, other than for some limitation of the neck was not that remarkable. And the MRI of the neck itself wouldn't account for the complaints that she manifests. It didn't mean she didn't hurt, but I just couldn't really balance the severity of what she was complaining against what I would have expected to see. That was her doctor's opinion. Now, ladies and gentlemen, when you go back in

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when you go back in the jury room and you look at your jury sheets, you have one question to answer, there are no medical

expenses, don't even consider those. Don't guess, because you're not allowed to. The Judge told you about guesswork. I know that really puts a problem for you, gee, how do I know what figure to put on here, if any? That's your decision. That's what your experience comes from in this world. And look at it, decide from the facts in the case what amount, if any, you should put in that figure for her. It's spelled out for you. I think you have it for pain and suffering, et cetera.

2.3

Thank you all very much. I appreciate your attention.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Simmons.

Ms. Robinson.

MS. ROBINSON: I'm actually going to be even briefer, ladies and gentlemen, Your Honor, because what I was about to say was just covered with some minor points and that is, counsel just said before that we made a big deal about the carpal tunnel. Well, we did make a big deal about the carpal tunnel, because we knew she had suffered from it before. Her own doctor admitted when you listened to his testimony, he never actually got the records from her prior surgery. He didn't know what, if any, pain she was experiencing before this accident occurred. And when we asked her

and she was on the stand, she originally said it was fine, she wasn't having any problems. But actually when we asked her at her deposition last year was she having problems, she actually admitted at the deposition before she was here on this trial under oath she did have trouble with her carpal tunnel before the accident ever happened.

So your job, as you've been told several times now, is to judge the credibility of the witnesses. You can choose to believe any of them or none of them, put any weight that you want on anything. That's your job. That's part of what you use to assess what, if any, damages to give.

In addition to what was just argued by Mr.

Simmons about that she did have a prior MRI with no
explanation as to why, and that the doctor who you
heard testify did review it in conjunction with what he
sent her for and found no changes along with the fact
that he didn't have any records about whether or not
she had been having carpal tunnel problems before this
accident, just her testimony, I asked him about
history, what goes into a history? Yeah, you actually
have to examine the patient and also rely on what the
patient tells you. If they don't tell you whether or
not they're having problems or they're not a good

historian or they don't tell you about any other 1 treatment or accidents like the one she had in 2004, 2 whatever you're basing your opinion on doesn't have all 3 of the information. Keep that in mind when you assess 4 5 what weight to give the doctor in his opinion about 6 whether or not there's any permanent injury in this case from this accident, not whether or not she has 7 permanent injury or a condition that existed 8 preexisted, exists to this date, but what comes from 9 this accident. 10 When you do that, in light of what the jury 11 12 sheet says, you can award whatever your common sense 13 says, and that includes nothing. Thank you for your time and patience. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Miller. 16 17 MR. MILLER: I didn't want to -- I don't 18 want you to award \$241,000 in this case, I want you to 19 award ten-million dollars, but the problem is I've got 20 to be reasonable, and I can't offend your sensibilities 21 by giving a number that's completely outlandish. 22 They, both Ms. counsel and 23

counsel, said if any, the uncontroverted, unquestioned evidence besides inuendo in opening statements, the woman suffered a concussion in the accident. An air

24

25

bag exploded in her face, and they spent a good bit of time saying, if any. That's their position, this woman should get nothing. So, I guess, we actually did get the number, we got the nothing, what they expect you to award.

If you think she's a big liar, I wouldn't give her anything either. This witness is not lying to you today.

As these closings, I was getting mad about certain points -- I've kind of lost some of my steam -- I want to go over some of the things. EKG was normal, so she didn't have a heart condition. That showed us a great deal. Nobody ever complained of heart condition.

She didn't go to her family doctor. That was a big issue.

The carpal tunnel syndrome that you heard mostly about, again, when I warned you about that was their case. He said we never had their prior records. Ms. Robinson is a good lawyer. Would you have had the prior records? He said, I don't care what the prior records would say, I know she had surgery, I know she had problems from it, and I'm telling you this exacerbated the injury.

Again, I have been up front with you guys. I appreciate that none of that matters. What should

really concern you guys is three months before, even in the medical records, but to make thing up, Dr.

One thing they did reference an MRI in 2002.

Why did she have an MRI before? They know she had an MRI in 2002. It could have been a neck injury, yet you've got into evidence at all from anybody that she's had any prior neck injury? A little innuendo. Maybe it could be. You've been given no evidence at all.

There wasn't these great changes in the MRI. Dr.

looked you straight in the eye as he could through a video camera, said, look this woman had preexisting problems that were not symptomatic. You saw the jury instructions, that's what matters. What her before and after conditions, is she in pain today?

The air bags deployed and, therefore, there couldn't be an injury in the case or a bruise on her face? Dr. noted that, a bump on her head. He said there was no X-ray in the hospital. That's just simply not true.

What do you think? She's still in pain right now.

she in pain after that accident?

That's it. I mean, in the end this is this witness, Ms. One chance for compensation in this accident. I've given you a number that I believe

```
1
     is reasonable compensation for these injuries, and the
 2
     Plaintiff requests that you award her that amount or
 3
     some other amount that you believe is reasonable.
 4
     I do appreciate you coming here today. We need
     you guys to make the system work. I'm very grateful
 5
 6
     for it.
                   THE COURT: That concludes the case.
 7
 8
            Ms. now you're in charge. Remember when
 9
     you go back there, folks, Ms. ____ is to have the only
10
     copy of the verdict sheet. The rest of you may take
11
     the notebooks and pencils with you at this time.
                , alternate juror in Maryland is only
12
13
     allowed to serve until the jury begins deliberations.
     So your job is finished now, you're free to go.
14
15
     Okay. All right, thank you.
            Go ahead back with and start your
16
17
     deliberations.
             (Whereupon, the jury left at 4:20 p.m.)
18
19
                   THE COURT: Okay, thank you. We'll let
    you know when we get a verdict.
20
            Counsel, also the jury sheets are being
21
     collected at the end of each trial now. I think it
22
     started as a result of lot of this witness intimidation
23
24
     coming out of the City starting in the County too so
     we're collecting all of the sheets, including mine.
25
```

1	(Whereupon, the jury deliberated, and there was
2	a change in Court Reporters.)
3	a change in court Reporters.
4 5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	