1 risk. Remember that? Well, he also has the burden of 2 proving that by the preponderance of the evidence. 3 All right. Ms. Zois? 4 MS. ZOIS: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 Does the jury have access to the verdict sheet, 6 Your Honor? 7 THE COURT: I have it here. 8 MS. ZOIS: May I --9 THE COURT: You want a copy? MS. ZOIS: 10 Yes, please, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Give one to I'm sorry. 12 MS. ZOIS: Your Honor, madam clerk, counsel, in the opening statement this morning, one of the 13 14 first things that I went through were the facts of this 15 case and how the facts and this tragedy happened. And one 16 of the first decisions that you're going to have to make on the (unintelligible) issue itself is (approximately 17 18 five unintelligible words) of 19 (approximately five unintelligible words) vehicle was his 20 conduct on the evening of this accident negligent? 21 I'll go through it because I have to, but I 22 think that if his acts weren't negligent on the evening of 23 this accident, I'm not sure what would be. On the evening 24 of this accident on the February 27th, 2005, Mr.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

(unintelligible) got in his car and was just passing

through into D.C. (Approximately three unintelligible words). He had somewhere in between -- I'm not sure how much he had to drink, okay, quite frankly. I'm not sure you all are either because testimony is all over the map. He could've had three drinks that evening or 300. I don't know. I don't know the answer to that question, and I don't think anybody does because of the different versions that he's provided.

But he's admitted to drinking something that evening. He got into the car with his passenger,

, after they were leaving the club, and drove home. It was interesting that he (approximately four unintelligible words) said, oh, yes, I was speeding. Yep, I was speeding. He was speeding. We know that he was speeding.

Detective (phonetic) came in and said that he was going 47 in (appropriate two unintelligible words) and that he hit the curb, lost control of his car, crossed over double yellow lines, headed into oncoming traffic and struck another vehicle. If this isn't negligence, just based on the speeding alone, I'm not sure what is. Negligence is defined as doing something an ordinary person using reasonable care would not do.

Ordinary people, under the circumstances, don't do 47 in a 30. Reasonable people under the circumstances don't hit

10 .

curbs. Reasonable people under the circumstances don't lose control of their vehicles. Reasonable people under the circumstances don't cross double yellow lines and drive head-on in the opposite direction of traffic.

So like I said before, I think that the first question that you all are going to have to decide in this case is an easy one. Was negligent on the evening of this accident? And even by his own testimony, coupled with that of Detective I think that that is an easy conclusion to come to that his acts on this evening rose to the level of negligence.

The second issue that you will have to decide in this case before you get to the issue of damages is the issue of the legal term (approximately ten unintelligible words). And the defense has the burden of proof on that issue. And that's (approximately five unintelligible words). Allstate Insurance Company has denied this claim. They have denied that was negligent.

They have hung their hat on the assumption of the (approximately five unintelligible words).

and are covered under a policy of insurance with Allstate on the evening of this accident, and the argument is that assumed the risk of his injuries by getting into the car that evening with his driver,

25

-	what the delense needs to prove to you is that
2	understood that risk, comprehended that risk. And
3	when I say that risk, I mean getting into a car and
4	understood that risk, appreciated that risk, and
5	voluntarily accepted that risk. Have they done that?
6	Have they proven that to you? Because of all the evidence
7	that's come in on this issue, I'll tell you what they've
8	proved to me. What they've proven to me is that
9	told at the end of this evening before he
10	got into that car I can drive. I can drive. asked
11	him the question, want me to drive? said
12	no, I can drive. I got it. That's been said to him.
13	What that proves to me is that accepted
14	that could drive that night. He asked him, he
15	convinced he could drive that night. Who's in a
16	better position to know whether or not
17	could drive? or ?
18	Clearly, is in a better position to
19	determine whether or not he can drive that vehicle home
20	that night.
21	Not just that, he takes all of this one step
22	further on this issue. He doesn't just tell I got
23	it, I'm driving home, I'm okay to drive, I'm okay to

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

drive. He came in here and told you ladies and gentlemen

of the jury that when he got in the car that night, when

21

22

23

24

25

he left the Platinum Club that night, when he started up 1 2 his car in that parking lot, I could make it home. thought I could drive that car home that night. I didn't 3 feel like I wasn't going to be able to make it that night. 5 I was confident I could drive. That's what he told you. 6 He's confident he can drive home. He's convinced that he could drive home, but Allstate Insurance 7 8 Company wants you to believe that the risk of these injuries because he should have known better. 9 Don't forget, they have the burden of proof on that issue. 10 So when you get to the assumption of risk 11 12 question, please remember that all we know about what went 13 through head that evening is that his buddy, who 14 drove him there, told him he could get him home. He told him he could get him home. And, also, what we know today 15 16 here is that the Defendant himself, ., who 17 got behind the wheel of this car, to this day also 18 believes that he could make it home that evening. 19 Now, keep in mind that the reason this accident

happened is because he's doing 47 in a 30. He's speeding. You could throw out the issue of alcohol in its entirety and you still get there. He's still negligent because he's speeding. And as far as the assumption of risk, he told us in the end -- asked him were you speeding home? Oh, yeah, I was speeding home. I was

speeding home. They said it takes 20 to 25 -- I wrote this down. It takes 20 to 25 minutes to get from his house to the Platinum Club. They left the Platinum Club at 2:30. The accident was -- he conceded at least after three o'clock. That's a half an hour. He had no problems navigating his way out of D.C. He had no problems on 295, had no problems on 495. It's after he gets into his comfort zone of being a couple miles away from his house and he's taking the residential roads that he drives everyday, and he goes 47 in a 30 (approximately three unintelligible words).

Now, the issue of damages in this case is -this is one of the hardest closing arguments I have ever
had to do.

: Objection.

MS. ZOIS: On the issue of --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. ZOIS: Okay. On the issue of damages, this is a case that involves one of the most unnatural experiences that a parent could ever have to endure and go through. It involves having to bury someone that you gave birth to. It involves having to think about how this accident happened (unintelligible). It has to do with having to relive in your own mind what happened in the last couple seconds of their lives and they were taken

from you as a result of somebody else's negligence. That is one of the most horrific tragedies I think that any person (approximately three unintelligible words).

There's two different issues regarding the damages in this case. The first issue is what damages should be awarded to the estate of . And the damages that should be awarded to the estate of

include up to \$5,000 in reasonable expenses for burial and funeral expenses. The parties have stipulated as to what the funeral expenses were, which were over \$9,000, but the appropriate award for funeral expenses in this case are \$5,000 because that's what the Maryland law allows funeral expenses to be.

The other portion of the damages to be considered for the estate of are the last seconds of his life, what's called pre-impact fright.

It's what he went through from the time this accident went into motion, up until the time of his death. And we know that knew the accident was coming.

testified that he -- they hit the curb and before
the accident happened yelled out. I mean he was
awake. He was alert. He knew something was not going
well, and he yelled out in the car. From the time
hits that curb, up until the time of

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

death, that time period is compensable under

1. . . .

the law for damages.

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

I'm not sure how to even begin to (approximately three unintelligible words) calculate the appropriate amount to give to -- award for that portion of (unintelligible). I can't even begin to understand what might go through someone's mind in the last couple seconds of their lives, traveling at the opposite direction in oncoming traffic and seeing a tour bus headed towards your side of the window, knowing that impact is going to take place. What do you think about in those last couple of What -- how is that the most afraid anyone could seconds? possibly ever be in in anyone's lifetime? What do you really think about? Family. You have to. Mom, sister, pregnant sister, the nephew you might not ever see. you want to make a phone call to apologize to somebody. Maybe there was a girl he had a crush on in high school he wanted to call and say, hey, did I ever tell you I'm in love with you? The people that -- what goes through your head in those last couple of seconds? I don't know. are those last couple of seconds worth? I don't know. don't know.

As far as conscious pain and suffering goes, as far as the accident happening, what next? According to the driver, he asked are you okay, according to the statement and according to what he testified to today, are

you okay? According to his written statement that he gave a couple hours after the accident, in that statement it says said I'm fine. So there's evidence that

long, but there is some measure of time between the time this accident happened and the time that he left, and I really, really hope that that's true because the thought of ... running and leaving the scene of this accident, leaving dead, dying friend who doesn't confirm that he's fine, that's just something that I'm not sure of (approximately three unintelligible words). Thinking that somebody would leave their dead, dying friend after this car accident without getting a verbal confirmation that I'm fine is something I — that's the version that — that's the way it happened in this case.

Again, what's that worth? How do you -- what is -- your last minutes, your last seconds in your life when you're alone, you're in a car, you're pinned in, you can't get out, your friend just left? I don't know.

As far as the claim for (unintelligible), the claim from -- there are two different areas on the verdict sheet. The first one is the estate of , which includes the area for funeral expenses, the area for pre-impact fright, and the area for conscious pain and suffering after the accident.

Ź

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

The second portion of the damages' award is for and the loss of her only child -- or only son. And, you know, the -- this is probably the first closing argument I've ever stood in front of anyone --

Objection --

MS. ZOIS: -- not given a number.

THE COURT: Stick to the --

It's -- she's going to go through the MS. ZOIS: next 26 years of her life, would've lived much longer, (approximately ten unintelligible words), without seeing his children, without seeing him in a tuxedo walking down an aisle marrying the girl of his dreams. She's going to go through 26 anniversaries of the day of his death. She's going to go through 26 February 28th's, 2005s. She's going to go through 26 birthdays for every year in July. She's going to go through 26 Christmases. She's going to go through 26 Thanksgivings, and she's going to go through 26 Mothers Day's without her only son there.

She's, I think, an amazing mother. She's an amazing woman who -- I mean as you know (approximately four unintelligible words) what she's testified to, she dedicates her life to serving other people. She teaches GED classes at to help kids graduate from high school. She is devoted to the arts, which helps

1	disabled residents of (approximately three unintelligible
2	words). She is a minister of her church. She's a very
3	spiritual woman. She is a forgiving woman. She has
4	forgiven for taking her older child. She
5	forgave him to the extent that she went to his
6,	(unintelligible) and asked that the judge show mercy on
7	him and she has forgiven.
8	She has dealt through death in such
9	in the such a way that she inspires
10	: Objection.
11	MS. ZOIS: by the way that she's dealt with
12	his death.
13	THE COURT: Just a second. I already told the
14	jury well, you know what they say in their close
15	when I told you the attorneys and what they're telling you
16	in their closing arguments and their opening is not
17	evidence. The only evidence you consider, testimony from
18	the witness stand and the exhibits.
19	: Your Honor, that wasn't the
20	(unintelligible) of my objection. May we approach?
21	THE COURT: Sure.
22	(Bench conference is inaudible and therefore
23	unable to be transcribed.)
24	MS. ZOIS: The way has coped with
25	the loss of her son is an inspiration. She, I think, is

an extremely strong woman, who, like she said, she understands he's deceased. She understands he's gone and he has -- feels like a part of her has been ripped out and it has, but she has not let go of the connection (approximately three unintelligible words), even though he's deceased, she -- he's still a part of her and she still goes on because she has to for her only daughter and her only nephew. And she has done things that have helped her recover from this loss by setting up a scholarship fund at the in his name. She -- the way she has dealt with that is inspirational and it's (unintelligible).

As far as her damages, her loss, and as far as what is an appropriate amount to award for damages for the pain and the suffering that she has gone through, the pain and suffering that she will continue to go through from the minute that police officer came to her door and said (approximately five unintelligible words), I need you to come down and identify his body. From that moment forward, what are the damages worth to suffer through that? And it's a number that you would all have to collectively come up with because there's nothing for —there's no guidelines for this. A death of a sister isn't like this, and a death of a child isn't like that, and any traumatic suffering isn't like this. I mean there's no

1	law or timetable or calculation that I can provide to you
2	to assist you in coming up with this daunting task of
3	adequately and fairly compensating a mother for the loss
4	of ner son. Is it five million or ten? Is it one? I
5	don't know. But your job as jurors are to talk about what
6	adequate compensation is for her for the loss that she
7	suffered.
8	I'll have another opportunity to talk to you
9	again after defense counsel gives his closing argument,
10	but this is a difficult case. (Approximately fifteen
11	unintelligible words).
12	(WHEREUPON, further proceedings were held, but
13	not herein transcribed per request of ordering party.)
14	MS. ZOIS: I'm sorry wasn't in the
1,5	courtroom during that closing argument because that's the
16	first time I've ever heard Allstate Insurance take the
17	position that is negligent.
18	: Objection, move to strike.
19	THE COURT: Sustained. Disregard that last
20	remark.
21	MS. ZOIS: The assumption of the risk, counsel
22	was excitable and discussing what knew
23	(approximately two unintelligible words) this accident and
24	one of the problems you all have as jurors and as fact

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

finders in this case is that the only version of what

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

knew on the evening of their accident has come through the testimony of , who at every turn in this case (approximately two unintelligible words) street, doing whatever was necessary to try and save his butt. From the time he ran from the car at the scene of the accident, from the times filling out the statement in the police station saying how much he did or didn't drink, from the time that he's using the affidavit to show mercy upon him in his criminal sentencing proceeding and throwing himself on his I have a drinking problem, I thought I could drive that night, that's why I did so in front of a criminal judge in his sentencing proceeding, and then coming up with the other version. And Your Honor gave instructions on credibility of witnesses in this case, and he said, you can believe all, part, or none of what any witness has testified to in the case. And how you, you know, sift through the lies and what's true and what isn't true, he's admitted to swearing out statements that weren't true. So he's an admitted liar. He's lied throughout the course of this case and he's lied appropriately when it was done in an effort to behoove him in some manner, one way or another.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)
1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

little ball and throw it out the window, here's what you

have left. You have Detective

So if you take his testimony, crumble it up in a

testimony on the

10 .

stand that he was doing 47 around that 30 curve. You have the actions of on the evening of this accident and his ability to drive. He drove this road in his car at this speed (approximately four unintelligible words), and if you've ever driven into D.C. before, it's not the easiest place in the world to navigate, he got into D.C. successfully, he got out of D.C. successfully. He was able to navigate through (approximately two unintelligible words) red lights, the stop signs, the oneway streets. He got out of D.C., got onto a highway, got onto another highway, and he was on his way home when the accident happened.

He was also functioning to an ability and a level that enabled him to get out of his car, run to his friend's house in the snow in the dark, the woods. I don't think anybody that's inebriated is going to be able to do that. Not only did he do that, he did it without falling. There's no testimony at all that this gentleman on the evening of the accident was showing any outward signs of drunkenness, any outward, nobody said he was slurring. He didn't say he was slurring. Nobody said he fell down in the club. Nobody said he dropped the keys. Nobody said he fell on the dance floor, and nobody said he dropped his beer. Nobody said his eyes were red. Nobody said his face was flushed. Nobody said anything that

would give an outside observer the ability to see whether 1 or not he was intoxicated. 2

And remember, keep in mind, that functioning alcoholics, and he admitted to this. Functioning alcoholics, people that drink to this level on a regular basis, people that consume alcohol in heavy quantities on a regular basis, actually --

> Objection, Judge. May we approach? THE COURT: Yes.

(Bench conference is inaudible and therefore unable to be transcribed.)

MS. ZOIS:

Based on whether or not on this particular evening, what you find is true, whether it was three beers or 3,000 beers, the -- I don't know. I have no idea. But based on whatever it was, if it was three, if it was one, it was two, 3,000, in his body, in his head, in his mind, and under his commissions, he said I can function, I can drive (approximately two unintelligible words), and he told that.

And don't forget that the defense has the burden of proof on this (approximately five unintelligible word). They have to prove that knew (approximately three unintelligible words), appreciated (unintelligible) and voluntarily exposed himself to these risks when just

> HUNT REPORTING COMPANY Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia 410-766-HUNT (4868)1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

10

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12 13

11

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

	i ·
1	before he got in that car, his driver told him, I got it.
2	I can drive. Not only told him that, he came in here and
3	told you all that. I got it. I can drive. I can
4	function. (Approximately ten unintelligible words).
5	I'm not going to rehash the issue of damages
6	again. I'm not going to bring up the issue again. I
7	think the (approximately ten unintelligible words), but
8	what I am going to do is thank you one more time for your
9	time and attention on behalf of myself, for my client, and
10	his family.
11	(WHEREUPON, further proceedings were held, but
12	not herein transcribed per request of ordering party.)
13	(Off the record - 3:26 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	