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THE COURT: I want to thank you all again for giving me a course on Friday about The Contribution Act and willful and wanton and intentional and all of those things.

What I did over the weekend was read back through The Contribution Act, read back through the I PI, a better edition than the book that I had, which is contemporary. And I read through a number of cases that were frankly mentioned in the I PI.

And as Mr. Rogers had pointed out one of the prime cases is the Ziarko, Z-i-a-r-k-o, versus Sue Line Railroad 161, I L App., 2671994 case; The Gerill, G-e-r-i-I-I, Corporation versus J.P.L. Hargrave Builders 128, I L 2nd 179, 1989 case; Henry versus St. J ohn Hospital 138 -- I 'm bragging about the cases I read -- 138 IL App. 553, a 1990 case. The Boston Material Service Corporation, 125 IL. App. 3rd 1053, a 1984 case; the J oe and Dan I nternational Corporation versus U.S. Fidelity, 178 I L App. 3rd 741, which is a 1988 case, Macnning versus Barton, it's a 1994 case, 264 I L App. 3rd, 952. The Burke versus Rothchild Liquor Mart, 1992 case, 148 I L app 2nd 429. And The People versus Brochman, B-r-o-c-h-m-a-n, case 148 I L 2nd 260, which is a 1992
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case.
And what I confirmed basically what the lawyers told me on Friday -- and again, I appreciate the lengthy discourse on it, which I needed or I wouldn't have made you stay that late.

According to Ziarko, it's
well-established that willful and wanton acts may be found where the tortious conduct was intentional.

The Contribution Act is basically an equitable doctrine. Actually, the restatement second of torts characterizes conduct as either negligent, reckless or intentional.

IPI 14.01, reads "When I use the expression 'willful and wanton conduct' I mean a course of action which shows actual or deliberate intentional of harm or if not intentional shows an utter indifference or conscious disregard for the person's own safety and the safety of others."

Okay. So after reading through all of this, I see that the defendants are entitled to bring this contribution act.

It was J ackson's intentional action. It wasn't the person seeking contribution, which is different from the Ziarko situation.
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## I realize that I llinois courts are

 kind of split over when both people have committed intentional torts or when the contribution seeker has committed intentional torts act, so that's not the case here, so they're allowed to bring their contribution act claim. What else do I need to say about that?I need to make sure it confirms to what is required in the IPI. Okay. And I need to make sure that I read it separately from the other jury instructions. I'm not going to take a break or anything, but I ' $m$ going to pause, but we need to explain maybe what's going on in a sentence or something just so it differentiates between -- I can imagine a lot of our jurors will gleaned over listening to all these jury instructions.

I which I could copy J udge Donnelly and read it like a Shakespearian sonnet or something, but I don't have the Chutzpah to try to do that this morning.

MR. ESPOSITO: Or the time.
THE COURT: Or the time it would have been fun.
I have a couple other issues to deal
with.

| 1 | MR. ROGERS: I understand you're ruling and I |  | one or more defendants. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | don't want to argue the issue. | 2 | So I just wanted to memorialize that |
| 3 | THE COURT: Thank you so much for letting me | 3 | and the motion seeks a ruling at some point that, |
| 4 | borrow this. | 4 | again, any result they obtain on the contribution |
| 5 | MR. ROGERS: Absolutely. | 5 | claim does not apply or affect our ability to recover |
| 6 | THE COURT: I requested to buy us one. | 6 | any verdict we should attain from Allied-Barton. |
| 7 | MR. ROGERS: This is a two-and-a-half page | 7 | MR. ESPOSITO: Your Honor, I did so the |
| 8 | short memorandum and Motion to Strike the | 8 | research too over the weekend. And here's our memo. |
| 9 | Contribution Claim. It more or less memorializes | 9 | And it says a couple things. Of |
| 10 | what we were arguing on Friday. | 10 | course, you now ruled that the contribution claim is |
| 11 | THE COURT: Okay. | 11 | viable, which means, J oseph J ackson is on the verdict |
| 12 | MR. ROGERS: It cites two things which were not | 12 | form. |
| 13 | referenced by the Court now, which I think go into | 13 | The question -- |
| 14 | not whether you're going to allow the contribution | 14 | MR. ROGERS: I think she said on the |
| 15 | claim, which I understand your ruling, but how you | 15 | counterclaim verdict form. |
| 16 | apply it. | 16 | MR. ESPOSITO: Yeah, the counterclaim verdict |
| 17 | First off, it cites the contribution | 17 | form, exactly. |
| 18 | statute at Section 4, which is a section that the | 18 | The questions, I think we were left |
| 19 | defendants had not cited to you and a section the | 19 | with when we left on Friday evening were what are we |
| 20 | Court did not reference. | 20 | doing about Chambers and Brown. And this memo sets |
| 21 | I quoted it in my motion, and what it | 21 | out, I think pretty clearly, with Supreme Court case |
| 22 | says is rights -- it's entitled "Rights of Plaintiff | 22 | law, with Appellate Court case law, that a master and |
| 23 | Unaffected." | 23 | servant are deemed to be one. They're unified. |
| 24 | And it reads: | 24 | They're considered consolidated and unified. |
|  | Page 6 |  | Page 8 |
| 1 | "A plaintiff's right to | 1 | And that, therefore, comes down and |
| 2 | recover the full amount of his judgment | 2 | applies. Remember the 600-17 instruction that we |
| 3 | from any one or more defendants subject | 3 | tendered. That is fully supported by the law. |
| 4 | to liability and tort for the same | 4 | Everything -- if Brown and Chambers |
| 5 | injury to person or property or for | 5 | are found to be negligent, Allied-Barton has to eat |
| 6 | wrongful death is not affected by the | 6 | that negligence, so the Court has recognized that we |
| 7 | provisions of this act." | 7 | are a unified one. |
| 8 | It's my expectation at some point | 8 | That supports, number one, the 600-17 |
| 9 | after judgment -- should we be fortunate enough to | 9 | instruction that we tendered and I have given you |
| 10 | get a judgment -- that they would attempt to apply | 10 | alternates because you asked for alternates, but that |
| 11 | any apportionment to that judgment. | 11 | supports to that point. |
| 12 | And Section 4 Of the Contribution Act | 12 | Larry is correct that The Contribution |
| 13 | says that the plaintiff's judgment against the | 13 | Act does not prevent him from collecting his full |
| 14 | defendant toward tort fees is not affected; meaning, | 14 | judgment. |
| 15 | that the contribution recovery merely says where that | 15 | THE COURT: Right. |
| 16 | defendant can go seek contribution for what they owe. | 16 | MR. ESPOSI TO: If we are going to be found |
| 17 | Again, it doesn't apply to they would | 17 | viable, we are not going to be able to say "You can't |
| 18 | claim -- go to the contribution to the Estate of | 18 | collect it from us" except -- except Section 2-1117, |
| 19 | J oseph J ackson. | 19 | which is applicable -- which is applicable, which |
| 20 | I also cite Unzicker v. Kraft Food | 20 | post-dated The Contribution Act. And which says "in |
| 21 | I ngredients court case at 203 I L 2nd 64. | 21 | fairness to a minimally responsible person" and this |
| 22 | In essence, it reiterates in that case | 22 | is the case that Larry cited. |
| 23 | that nothing in The Contribution Act affects a | 23 | "In fairness to a minimally |
| 24 | plaintiff's right to recover full damages from any | 24 | responsible person." And the legislature defined |
|  | Page 7 |  | Page 9 |
|  |  |  | 3 (Pages 6 to 9) |
| SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY <br> (312) 782-4705 |  |  |  |

minimally responsible is under $\mathbf{2 5}$ percent.
In fairness to that person, if their proportionate share of liability is under $\mathbf{2 5}$ percent, then their liability is several only. And we will owe the full amount of a several judgment against us, which is our proportionate share. That's how the law operates.

The laws recognized even as to Section
2-1117 that when there is agency, when there is a concert of action, those parties in those relationships are deemed as one party for purposes of 2-1117. Fault cannot legally be a portion between them, ergo is one.

So it all comes back to the
proposition that we were talking about on Friday night, and that is on that verdict form, the contribution form will show two people to whom fault must be allocated: AlliedBarton, which must be responsible for all the negligence that would be established as to itself, Chambers and Brown. That's the one party. The other party is J oseph J ackson.
And that, that determination will then affect Section 2-1117.

MR. ROGERS: Brief reply. I don't believe
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MR. ROGERS: He's attempting to apply a different statute utilizing The Contribution Act.

I don't want to the waste the Court's
time because again.
THE COURT: I can consider that.
MR. ROGERS: After the verdict.
MR. ESPOSITO: We wanted to give you the law because we wanted to show you what we believe is going to be the result after the verdict.

MR. ROGERS: So I did want to say to the Court again that if you use an example of why it's illogical: Contribution actions as we, as you have read over the weekend and knew, can be pursued independent of --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ROGERS: -- of an existing action.
So to believe that logic would say
that the plaintiff can have a trial, obtain a verdict against the defendant, and some six months or a year later when some contribution result is obtained, they're successful on a contribution claim, they can come back to plaintiffs' claim and apply that for purposes of apportionment. And that's not the law. That's illogical.
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But what the contribution claim is doing is saying for whatever degree of liability we as the defendant have to the plaintiff, you share in that and you owe us $X$ percentage as determined to be the cases.

The other thing I would point out is the defendant cherry-picks who they want to sue in contribution, which alters, manipulates and changes the percentages. As an example, by not including Brown, by not including Sidney Chambers, and just in a hypothetical the MB Realty defendants, their percentage of the responsibility -- although, they're not liable because of the settlement -- there's no determination as to what percentage, if any, they contributed to the incident, so the percentages because simply by virtue of who they pursue in contribution are skewed and altered. And that's discussed in the case law.

So the Court again will have a chance to delve into that issue potentially after the verdict. I think we agree it's not something that has to be decided now.

MR. MOTZ: We don't actually agree on that, your Honor. This is black letter law. And Counsel's
cases that they cite also stand exactly for what we are saying. 211-17 says if we are less than 25 percent, we only pay severely for our share.

Counsel is misplaced in talking about cherry-picking. The NACA and MB Real estate defendants settled extinguishing any right that we have to go after them.

But under the law, we are entitled to the setoff of their settlement. That's the remedy that we get under the law.

This has to be decided because judgment is going to enter probably very shortly after, if not minutes after, the verdict is returned. This is black letter law 211-17.

Counsel is not reading everything in concert. The judgment after 211-17 applies is what he's entitled to.

So if we get a 10 percent fault
allocation, we are only severely responsible for 10 percent of the total judgment. That's the way the law reads. That's the effect of having a third-party defendant in this matter.

And I believe we need an answer to this right now. And I know Mr. Esposito has a couple
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Now, Larry makes the other point: Why haven't we sued -- why haven't we included NACA. Well, plaintiff settled with NACA. And once there was a settlement made in good faith -- you entered the good faith finding -- we can cannot by operational law bring a counterclaim against NACA.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ESPOSI TO: Now, why haven't we brought a contribution claim against Brown and Chambers? The which law I cited in the memo makes that very clear; we cannot file a contribution claim against our servant. That is the I llinois law.

So who are we left with? We are left with J oseph J ackson precisely the guy who they sued in contribution. And Allied name goes on the form, J oe J ackson's name goes on the form. That's it.

MR. ROGERS: I disagree. He just gave me his brief, your Honor. They're agreeing that a judgement gets entered -- I'm sorry -- that a verdict will be rendered based upon your ruling that the counterclaim will be considered and then I think we just have to decide about their --

THE COURT: Well, when I see the percentage -I don't know. None of us knows what the jury is
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of points he wants to make.
MR. ESPOSI TO: Your Honor, it is not our position that we opine a defendant can go to trial, decide to bring in the loop and decide later to bring contribution actions and allocate fault in a way that's pleasing to him and now go back to the plaintiff and say "Hey, Mr. Plaintiff, I don't owe you all that money, you know, that the jury told you that I owed you."

A defendant, like a plaintiff, has to make certain decisions. If a defendant feels that he is minimally responsible for the total fault in the case, then defendant better be filing a contribution claim, and so this jury can resolve all these issues together.

Now -- so -- and that's what we have done here. We filed a contribution claim and allowed the jury to resolve all of these things together.

Now, Larry says that we are
cherry-picking. But I have to remind the Court that J oseph J ackson was a party defendant --

THE COURT: Oh, I know. I remember all this.
MR. ESPOSI TO: -- until the start of trial and then all of a sudden he's out of the case.
going to do in this case.
MR. ROGERS: Right.
THE COURT: But from everything that I read Mr. Esposito is correct.

Counsel, believe me, I spent the weekend reading this stuff.

Another thing I see in this is it wasn't brought timely. I disagree with you on that. In a lot of the cases that I read, it was brought during the trial of the action that was considered timely, so since I see that here.

I'm trying to phrase this right. I'm agreeing with defense on this issue of the percentage. We will see what happens in terms of what the jury verdict is.

MR. ROGERS: On the position of applying the percentage to the verdict?

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. ROGERS: We have not even brief --
THE COURT: You want to brief that. I will give you a chance to brief it then. Okay.

MR. ROGERS: He just handed me a brief apparently argue --

THE COURT: We have got time. I'm letting you
know kind of what my reading is, but I will read a brief and you've changed my mind before.

MR. ESPOSI TO: Your Honor, we tendered you an alternate verdict form. And what the verdict form does -- I have given it to Larry. I gave it to him on Saturday.

What the verdict form does is over our objection, it conforms the verdict form to how the plaintiffs have set it up in terms of the elements of damage and of the itemization in terms of the form all that kind of stuff.

But if you remember, plaintiffs' form do not have a contribution determination on the verdict form. Our form has added that.

THE COURT: And that's what I'm going with.
MR. ESPOSI TO: Has added that.
So plaintiffs will have their
itemizations in the order the they want it. We will have the contribution information as we believe it should be. I understand the Court has now ruled.

THE COURT: Yes.
There was an issue on Friday about whether plaintiffs were planning to play the portion of the $\mathbf{9 1 1}$ tape. Is that a mute issue? You were
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MR. MOTZ: I think it's also the motion
consistent with your ruling our motion in limine, I want to say 55 , but I could be wrong on the number. THE COURT: Let me listen to Mr. Rogers on that.

MR. MOTZ: Sure.
MR. ROGERS: What we largely wanted to play is
the absence of gunfire during the time period that the door was pulled off to show that Mr. --

THE COURT: Brown.
MR. ROGERS: -- Brown was not fired upon.
So it's largely absence of gunfire.
And I would think that out of anything that would be less prejudicial and less, you know, alarming to the jury. So it was mainly for purposes of that.

So our plan was to play what a gunshot
sounds like on a recording and then to play about 45 seconds after the doors come off to show that there are none.

So, again, it would be largely
silence, but for the mumblings of Ms. Murphy -- not
mumblings --
THE COURT: I know.
MR. ROGERS: But for her statements on the
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going to check.
MR. ROGERS: I did. And we do want to play a portion of the 911 tape.

THE COURT: Counsel, I 'm not going to allow it.
I can't do it.
MR. MOTZ: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: And the reason is even though it was admitted into evidence --

MR. ROGERS: Can I tell you what I wanted to play?

THE COURT: Counsel, I already -- you can tell me, Counsel, but I 'm not wavering -- is not only did I allow the five minutes that I allowed, then I allowed something to be replayed, so I already extended it. And as much as defense -- because it's something that was admitted into evidence and can't be replayed because of the prejudicial effect and the affect on the jury hearing that.

Again, just tell me what you want to tell me.

MR. ROGERS: Are you saying the basis of your
ruling that we cannot play a portion of the 911 tape is the prejudicial effect?

THE COURT: Basically, yes.
record. So, again, I don't think that's prejudicial.
THE COURT: Wasn't that the section that
you -- what was the section that I allowed five minutes.

MR. MOTZ: They played it twice.
THE COURT: I thought that was it.
MR. MOTZ: That was it. And they played that section twice.

MR. ROGERS: Well, excuse me, Counsel. She's asked me a question.

It's our position that your Honor allow us to play for impeachment purposes the absence of any gunfire during that time period.

And we cannot for the first time --
well, we needed to present that in evidence in our case in chief.

So in order to argue the case, we
would like to present the evidence from our case in chief in front of the trial to the jury, so that's why we think it would be proper to allow us to play that in closing again. It's about a minute total maybe less than a minute to show that there were no shots fired around that timeframe.

MR. MOTZ: They played it twice, your Honor.

We object.
THE COURT: Counsel, I'm not going to let you play it.

MR. MOTZ: Thank you.
THE COURT: I'm sorry.
Do we have anything else.
MR. ESPOSITO: I think we --
MR. ROGERS: I think we should look
specifically at the instruction that he proposed to make sure that we --

MR. MOTZ: We haven't addressed the $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ instructions.

MR. ESPOSITO: There were a few instructions we didn't get to yet.

MR. ROGERS: Well, the verdict form is the most important one. So let's look at the verdict form.

MR. ESPOSITO: Okay.
THE COURT: Somebody needs to let your office know that they can't play the 911 tape.

MR. ROGERS: Kitty can send that e-mail.
THE COURT: Okay. Off the record.
(Whereupon, there was an
off-the-record discussion.)
THE COURT: Let me ask you this: In this case
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when The Contribution Act starts, wouldn't it make sense to put a caption above it called "The Contribution Act."

MR. MOTZ: That's not the way the IPI reads.
THE COURT: It's not the way it reads.
MR. ESPOSITO: If you look at IPI 614.
THE COURT: Okay. I have to look at it.
MR. ESPOSITO: It's one --
THE COURT: It's one without any kind of delineation?

MR. ESPOSITO: Right.
THE COURT: Okay. I will stick with the IPI, Guys.

MR. ROGERS: You wanted all the signature lines on one page?

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. ROGERS: We will modify this to make it fit.

THE COURT: And stapled to one verdict form so we don't have a floating verdict form.

MR. ROGERS: Yeah, and do you want "Verdict Form A " continued at the top? You asked me to do that.

THE COURT: Yeah, I do.

MR. ROGERS: You do. Okay.
THE COURT: Mr. Kotin, has anybody had a chance to look at this?

MR. ROGERS: That's ours, right?
MR. ESPOSITO: Just to confirm here because my
notes are sketchy on this. These top three names on the top, that's how you wanted them to show, right?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ESPOSITO: Okay.
MR. ROGERS: This is Plaintiff's I nstruction
No. 40. It's actually the Court's I nstruction
No. 40; meaning, we are drafting something that conforms to the Court's instructions, and it lists the we have reviewed it collectively.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROGERS: And Counsel agrees with the language. We need to get the signature lines on the same page, so there will be some space adjustments.

MR. ESPOSI TO: And just for the record that
with the understanding that we objected to some of those line items, and that's the --

MR. ROGERS: The Court's instruction.
MR. ESPOSITO: Right.
MR. ROGERS: Over your objections and over our
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objections.
MR. ESPOSITO: Right.
THE COURT: Come on in. Okay.
Now, that we have taken care of the
verdict form, we have given you the 617 instruction and we did alternates on that because you had requested them. Okay. They're coming up. Okay. Grab some chairs.

If you go back to our I nstruction 44.
.44A, 44B, the 44 was what we were talking about on Friday.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ESPOSI TO: This is on our packet, your
Honor.
THE COURT: I just don't have the numbers on the bottom.

MR. ESPOSI TO: You want to use mine.
THE COURT: You want to switch?
MR. ESPOSITO: Actually, that is your set.
Those are defense instructions.
THE COURT: Okay. I thought I already -- I didn't rule on this.

MR. ROGERS: I thought you denied it.
THE COURT: I thought I granted it in terms of

The Contribution claim.
MR. ROGERS: Just so the record is clear this instruction says "if you find for the plaintiffs and against the defendants in returning your verdict as to the contribution claim of AlliedBarton and Robert Brown, you will consider AlliedBarton, Robert Brown and Sidney Chambers as one party."

So we object to that because it
contradicts the other instructions that say they're separate parties to be treated separately and independently. We think this is confusing, even as drafted and should be denied.

MR. ESPOSITO: Your Honor, I think the instruction on the separateness dealt with the plaintiffs.

What you're looking -- 44 is what I tendered. 44A, which is immediately behind it, is an alternate that you requested. 44B is also an alternate that you requested. You didn't request it specifically, but you said "Give me some alternates."

THE COURT: I know, I said that. For purposes of Contribution Act, 44 is correct. That's what I have.

MR. ESPOSITO: Okay. Then we'll stay with 44.
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Other areas of the instructions say
"that you are to treat and consider these claims and defenses separate."

THE COURT: Counsel, I know. This is what we talked about Friday.

What I was saying for 44 was that it has to be read in conjunction with The Contribution Act -- I mean, with contribution claim.

MR. ROGERS: They are not.
THE COURT: It's different --
MR. ROGERS: I thought you said on Friday -THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROGERS: -- that they would reference The Contribution Act in the instruction, which he does do in 44A.

THE COURT: Let me see.
MR. ROGERS: So he qualifies that instruction to only apply to the contribution claim in 44A.

THE COURT: You know what, maybe that's the better way to do it.

MR. ESPOSI TO: Okay. Understanding, of course, that we are not waiving anything under 2-1117. But if this helps them answer the verdict form -- if this helps them to deal with the verdict form, then I
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think it can be given as modified.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. ESPOSITO: It is under the contribution
series. You know, I recognize that.
THE COURT: I know. I know and you guys probably know this, these things are in no special order. There are no page numbers.

So when I get them back, they're all out of order, so I wouldn't want something floating that applies to the plaintiff claims. I think it's fair and makes sense to add to the contribution claim on there.

MR. ESPOSI TO: That was my sense of what you were saying on Friday that you were a little concerned about that aspect of it. I thought that's what --

THE COURT: You're right.
MR. ESPOSI TO: -- you were driving at.
MR. ROGERS: So are you granting to 44A over
our objection? We object to 44 and 44A, are you --
THE COURT: I 'm granting 44A over your objection.

MR. ROGERS: Okay. And your Honor, this
reiterates the point I was making about putting
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"contribution claim" at the top of the contribution portion to delineate that from the other claim. So then we renew that on Verdict Form A just at the top you put "contribution claim."

MR. ESPOSI TO: I don't think it's necessary. The IPI doesn't call for it. I think the instruction makes it clear that we are dealing with the contribution claim here -- the verdict form, I should say.

THE COURT: This says: "As to the contribution claims brought by AlliedBarton."

MR. ESPOSITO: Yeah, that's correct.
THE COURT: No, I 'm going to keep that the way it is.

MR. ESPOSITO: So we have a few more instructions that you've got them there.

At the end of the instructions, we
tendered some $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ instructions.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ESPOSITO: I think there is four of them, that relate to Mr. J ackson's conduct. And as you know, 60.01 allows the --

THE COURT: The statute.
MR. ESPOSI TO: -- us to cite statutes as
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evidence.
MR. ROGERS: So the $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ instructions, your
Honor, cover issues in areas that were not the
subject matter of the case, not introduced in the
case. These are criminal statutes. Criminal
statutes that should not be introduced before this
jury. They're meant to do nothing but confuse the
jury. As an example, Allied-Barton's I nstruction No. 47 --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROGERS: -- talks about kidnapping.
When has this jury ever heard about
kidnapping?
THE COURT: They have heard "hostage" as you pointed out over and over and over again. So they have heard "hostage" so...

MR. ROGERS: This doesn't say "hostage." This says "kidnapping." So it would lead them to speculate that this Court is instructing them that in some way, shape or form a kidnapping is at issue. So this should be denied. It's conclusive.

You did not want us to reference the
violations of post orders and master security officer policies and procedures when there was clear evidence
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they were violated. You struck that from our issues instructions.

They're now seeking to introduce 60.01 instructions that there has been absolutely no testimony on whatsoever. And not only that, they want to introduce them has Court's instructions referencing them as having the force of law in the State of I llinois.

So this is highly prejudicial to the plaintiffs. It is not supported by the evidence in the case. And it would be error, we would suggest reversible error, to instruct the jury on the $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ instruction criminal statutes in the State of Illinois. They also are incomplete as presented.

THE COURT: Let me say something, the reason I didn't allow the post orders and rules and regs in the jury instructions is because violation of those is not violation of statutes. It's different.

I know there is some outlier cases
with the specific facts of that case, so that was the basis of my ruling on that issue.

MR. ROGERS: We didn't submit them as $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ as if those policies, procedures or post orders were statutes.
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## THE COURT: That's true.

MR. ROGERS: We presented them as components of our 20.01 instruction, which is our claim, our claim that AlliedBarton violated its own policies and procedures, which under the case law is proper and can be considered in determining negligence.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me hear from Mr. Motz. MR. MOTZ: Your Honor, first the 20.01 issue, the issues instructions, were correctly ruled on with Counsel's claim.

With regard to $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ instructions,
Counsel -- I think the Court will remember every single witness from Tenton, Hauri, Kennedy, Brown, J enkins, McGoey, they all referenced the various criminal acts that Mr. J ackson --

THE COURT: Just a second I have to respond to this. It has to deal with jurors coming in.

MR. MOTZ: Okay. I'm looking through the testimony. I believe this is -- it was either Kennedy or Hauri on the 28th talked about kidnapping in regard to the overall state of mind with regard to Brown.

MR. ROGERS: Can he read the language just so --

MR. MOTZ: And specifically I believe 12/ 01 was McGoey:
"Q. Can we agree that
Mr. J ackson was a trespasser on
the post orders of AlliedBarton?
"A. I guess in the classic sense, yes.
Once he made his criminal demand, that
would be one the lesser included crimes.
"Q. And what would be the other
crimes?
"A. Well, kidnapping. Whatever
statues apply in the State of I llinois,
when you threaten somebody with a
firearm and threaten them with death."
This kidnapping has been repeatedly
brought up in this trial.
The other -- with regard to the other
60.01s, it's -- I know the various, including Hauri
and Kennedy admitted that he committed murder; hence,
why our 60.01 is out there.
All of the evidence supports the
giving of these $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ instructions.
REPORTER: Your Honor.
MR. MOTZ: All of the evidence in this case
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supports giving a 60.01 instructions, which are not -- it's to educate the jury what the criminal law is to show evidence of Mr. J ackson's negligence.

All four of these are proper. They are complete with regard to the evidence in this case. They're clear distinct statement of the law. They should be given.

THE COURT: Let me read them.
MR. ROGERS: Before you read through them, I would suggest you read also the discussion about 60.01 instruction.

And what it says, your Honor, is, it talks about legislation that affects the standard of care. Okay. The issue the jury is deciding.

This jury is not deciding any criminal issues. This jury -- you don't even see any reference whatsoever to the use of criminal statutes in the I Ilinois Civil J ury I nstructions, the I PI J ury I nstructions For Civil Cases. It talks about the use of ordinances and statutes for purposes of determining the standard of care. These have no application whatsoever.

They draw undue influence from J oseph J ackson and his criminal actions when the jury is not
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deciding about his criminal actions. Wholly improper.

MR. MOTZ: We would --
MR. ROGERS: They also know that they're abbreviated agree. They don't cite the whole statute.

MR. MOTZ: Your Honor -- I'm sorry. Are you finished.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.
MR. MOTZ: With regard to the $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$
instruction, this is commonplace. If it was a traffic accident case --

THE COURT: Are you sure this is appropriate to put in a jury trial?

MR. MOTZ: Oh, absolutely.
MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is not.
THE COURT: One of the things that is going through my mind is it's a lesser standard in a civil case --

REPORTER: Your Honor, I 'm not sure.
MR. MOTZ: Your Honor, I believe I was actually speaking at this point.

THE COURT: I 'm inclined to let it in. Don't let me get reversed on this. I'm saying it's a
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lesser standard in a civil case.
MR. ROGERS: Right.
So these are criminal statutes that have a higher standard, which you're introducing allowing them to reference in a civil case and the jury is not deciding them at all. They have no opportunity --

MR. MOTZ: Your Honor --
MR. ROGERS: -- to even decide whether there was kidnapping in this case.

THE COURT: Let me think about this one.
MR. ROGERS: Can you read this, Judge.
THE COURT: I have a problem with the murder one, kidnapping one less so.

MR. ESPOSI TO: If I may say one thing, your Honor, if I could say one thing to add to this conversation?

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. ESPOSITO: We are not asking the jury to resolve questions of murder or kidnapping or use of a weapon, and those types of things.

What we are saying here by this
instruction is the State of Illinois by law has deemed certain things to be very serious in nature,

| 1 | the very types of things that are involved in these | 1 | MR. ROGERS: -- to what extent, if any, J oe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | instructions. | 2 | J ackson was negligent. So they want you to consider |
| 3 | And the jury needs to know that in | 3 | the violation of a criminal statute that's incomplete |
| 4 | order to when they're ultimately allocating fault to | 4 | and deciding whether it was negligent. It's |
| 5 | be able to weigh the conduct of J ackson, weigh the | 5 | improper. |
| 6 | conduct of AlliedBarton. | 6 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 7 | The conduct is at two different | 7 | MR. MOTZ: I know Mr. Esposito wants to say |
| 8 | levels, and that's something that the jury is allow | 8 | something, so I 'll be brief. |
| 9 | to take into consideration when it determines what | 9 | There is no dispute in this case for |
| 10 | the ultimate degrees of fault are of each of the two | 10 | these four instructions that J oe J ackson did violate |
| 11 | people on the verdict form. | 11 | these statutes. There is no question about that. |
| 12 | MR. ROGERS: So, your Honor, the | 12 | Their own experts admit murder. The |
| 13 | instruction -- just to read a portion of the | 13 | evidence is in the case of kidnapping. These are |
| 14 | introduction for 60.01, it says: | 14 | all -- this is what the evidence shows in the case. |
| 15 | "I nstructions concerning | 15 | This goes to whether or not J oe |
| 16 | violations of the statute ordinance | 16 | J ackson was willful and wanton. That is the question |
| 17 | or administrative regulation should not | 17 | the jury is deciding. These statutes color and aid |
| 18 | be given unless the evidence is adequate | 18 | the jury in determining that question. |
| 19 | to support a finding that that violation | 19 | If that's what the law states, 60.01 |
| 20 | actually occurred." Okay. | 20 | is proper when the evidence supports the giving of |
| 21 | There 60.01, in its basic form -- | 21 | these statutes. And there is no dispute in this |
| 22 | THE COURT: I 'm hearing you Counsel. | 22 | case. All Counsels referenced this during opening |
| 23 | MR. MOTZ: What are you reading? | 23 | statement. And by "Counsel" I mean plaintiff Counsel |
| 24 | MR. ROGERS: I'm reading 47. | 24 | said "murder." And there is no doubt that these are |
|  | Page 38 |  | Page 40 |
| 1 | There was in force in the State of | 1 | all enforced. |
| 2 | Illinois at the time of the occurrence in question a | 2 | If Counsel's concern about the |
| 3 | certain statute that provided that A, a person | 3 | brevity. You know, we can show you the whole |
| 4 | commits the offense of aggravated kidnapping when he | 4 | statute. It's specifically when you basically pick |
| 5 | or she commits kidnapping and colon dot, dot, dot, | 5 | them. When you do this. And it's clear the way |
| 6 | they delete, don't reference 1 through 5, okay. So | 6 | these have been presented, it's what is concordant |
| 7 | it's incomplete. | 7 | with the facts that have been presented. |
| 8 | MR. MOTZ: We can show you the rest of the | 8 | Over to you. |
| 9 | statute. | 9 | MR. ESPOSITO: Sure. What I was going to say, |
| 10 | THE COURT: How much is there? | 10 | your Honor. |
| 11 | MR. ROGERS: Then lists No. 6, "commits the | 11 | MR. ROGERS: What is this double teaming? |
| 12 | offense of kidnapping while armed with a firearm." | 12 | THE COURT: I have had double teaming |
| 13 | And then they bottom, your Honor, | 13 | throughout this trial on every side except Mr. Kotin. |
| 14 | that's important. Read -- the $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ statute says if | 14 | MR. ESPOSITO: All I was going to say, your |
| 15 | you decide that J oe J ackson violated the statute. | 15 | Honor, iis under the statutes, if you look at the |
| 16 | Counsel just said the jury is not | 16 | statutes, pick any particular one of those, they |
| 17 | being asked to decide if they violated it. | 17 | provide various ways in which a defendant could be |
| 18 | The instruction says they are to | 18 | found to have violated the statute. |
| 19 | consider whether it was violated. | 19 | There were some that weren't cited in |
| 20 | If you decide that J oe J ackson | 20 | there because they're totally irrelevant to this |
| 21 | violated the statute on the occasion in question, | 21 | case. We picked the areas where we believe there was |
| 22 | then you may consider that fact together with all | 22 | relevance of the criminal violation, the nature of |
| 23 | other facts -- | 23 | the criminal violation to what we're dealing with in |
| 24 | THE COURT: Okay. | 24 | the case. That's why there's those gaps. |
|  | Page 39 |  | Page 41 |
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| 1 | I believe the notes on use of $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 1}$ | 1 | given. Plaintiffs' 27 is the one that I believe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | also indicate you don't have to do the whole statute; | 2 | should be given. |
| 3 | in fact, you can even paraphrase the statute. What | 3 | MR. ESPOSI TO: We give out the $\mathbf{6 0 0}$ series, |
| 4 | we did here was quoted the relevant portions of the | 4 | Larry. |
| 5 | statute. So I think that is okay. | 5 | I thought the Court ruled when you |
| 6 | You know, the other point is simply, | 6 | retire to the jury room, you know, that instruction? |
| 7 | we are not asking any juror to find -- to make a | 7 | I think you gave our instruction on that. |
| 8 | criminal reasonable doubt determination. | 8 | MR. ROGERS: But that instruction -- |
| 9 | But I think you can look at the | 9 | MR. ESPOSI TO: And you told me to remove the |
| 10 | evidence, the videos and hear all the testimony and | 10 | boxes and I removed the boxes. |
| 11 | everything you heard, I think you can say as a | 11 | THE COURT: I remember that. But what is the |
| 12 | threshold matter -- I think we can all say threshold | 12 | issue? What do we still have? |
| 13 | matter -- if J oe J ackson was at 26th and Cal. and | 13 | MR. ROGERS: I don't think you definitively |
| 14 | was put on trial, he would lose on all of those. | 14 | determined which instruction on deliberation needs to |
| 15 | THE COURT: Okay. Let me go back. | 15 | be given, which is we submitted B45.01 plaintiffs' |
| 16 | I 'm not going to allow them in. And | 16 | I nstruction No. 27. |
| 17 | the reason is -- the reason is, not just that they're | 17 | And I think you have to look at the |
| 18 | not complete, but I don't want the jury to get hung | 18 | two instructions and make a definitive instruction. |
| 19 | up on deciding is this first-degree murder is this. | 19 | MR. ESPOSI TO: Now, we submitted -- I think you |
| 20 | MR. MOTZ: But -- | 20 | have mine, J udge? |
| 21 | THE COURT: That's what -- you know what, I | 21 | THE COURT: 45.01, "when you retire to the jury |
| 22 | don't want it to be a distraction, Counsel. | 22 | room." |
| 23 | MR. MOTZ: It's not a distraction and this is | 23 | MR. ESPOSITO: If you go to my 613. |
| 24 | absolutely -- | 24 | THE COURT: Okay. |
|  | Page 42 |  | Page 44 |
| 1 | THE COURT: I think that it is. | 1 | MR. ESPOSI TO: And as we were saying on Friday, |
| 2 | MR. MOTZ: It's not. | 2 | which we believe is still true today because we are |
| 3 | And the example that I used earlier, | 3 | dealing with a contribution action also that the |
| 4 | it is commonplace in negligence cases where there is | 4 | cases involve for purposes of the verdict form in the |
| 5 | a violation -- for instance, an automobile accident, | 5 | contribution series. |
| 6 | I can't tell you how many cases I have seen when the | 6 | THE COURT: All right. I know you said you |
| 7 | plaintiff's tender a 60.01 instruction under the | 7 | would take the boxes out. I thought that was kind of |
| 8 | Illinois Motor Vehicle Code to say you violated the | 8 | interesting. But anyway let's leave it like that. |
| 9 | statute, you know, in cases where there is a D -- | 9 | MR. ROGERS: So this instruction that they |
| 10 | THE COURT: Counsel, that's true. | 10 | submitted is improper. |
| 11 | MR. MOTZ: And that's why these should be | 11 | As an example, it says -- |
| 12 | given. There is no question about it. It's still | 12 | THE COURT: You know what, I think the |
| 13 | the same criminal standard. | 13 | Plaintiffs' 45.01 -- Counsel. |
| 14 | THE COURT: Counsel, I 'm not going to give it. | 14 | REPORTER: Your Honor. |
| 15 | MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, your ruling is that | 15 | MR. ROGERS: I thought I heard you say you're |
| 16 | AlliedBarton instructions 47, 48, 49, and 50 are | 16 | going to give Plaintiffs' about 45.01, which is |
| 17 | denied? | 17 | Plaintiffs' 27. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Those are the statutes? | 18 | MR. ESPOSITO: Over our objection, your Honor. |
| 19 | MR. ROGERS: Yes. | 19 | And then you're denying our 613? |
| 20 | THE COURT: Okay. Yes. | 20 | THE COURT: Those are the statutes? |
| 21 | MR. ROGERS: Paul, I just want to clarify -- | 21 | MR. ESPOSITO: No, 613. |
| 22 | I 'm kidding. I 'm kidding. | 22 | THE COURT: Yes. I 'm sorry, guys. Yes, I am |
| 23 | Your Honor, B45.01, I wanted to make | 23 | denying it. |
| 24 | sure the Court has that instruction and it's been | 24 | MR. MOTZ: What are they giving? |
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| 1 | MR. ESPOSI TO: This is the one "when you retire | 1 | (Whereupon, the following |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | to the jury room," you know, that instruction. | 2 | proceedings were had in open |
| 3 | MR. MOTZ: Oh, okay. You had the verdict form | 3 | court, in the presence and |
| 4 | up. I got confused and scared. | 4 | hearing of the jury.) |
| 5 | MR. ESPOSI TO: No. | 5 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 6 | THE COURT: When are you guys going to sit down | 6 | Good morning, members of the jury. |
| 7 | and decide what order this is all going to come in. | 7 | I know you heard all of the evidence |
| 8 | MR. ESPOSI TO: Here is what I would propose, | 8 | in this case, but trial is not quite over. I think I |
| 9 | your Honor -- | 9 | told at the beginning, I don't expect you to remember |
| 10 | MR. ROGERS: Did you submit a verdict form that | 10 | everything I told you days ago, but at this time the |
| 11 | was? | 11 | lawyers have an opportunity to make their final |
| 12 | REPORTER: Your Honor. | 12 | arguments to you. Those are called closing |
| 13 | MR. ESPOSI TO: Here's what I would suggest, | 13 | arguments. Okay. |
| 14 | your Honor, that Larry has an argument to give. I | 14 | The lawyers are not giving you |
| 15 | would like to sit down with Kitty, if I can and she | 15 | testimony, but what they say is not evidence; |
| 16 | and I can conform and fill out the verdict forms with | 16 | however, they're going to refer to evidence that you |
| 17 | the clean instructions so that -- | 17 | have heard during the course of this trial. |
| 18 | MR. ROGERS: You and I should work out the | 18 | Okay. You all sat there and taken |
| 19 | order. | 19 | notes and paid attention and you will recognize the |
| 20 | MR. ESPOSI TO: The Court can work out the | 20 | evidence in this case. |
| 21 | order. | 21 | And with that, we are ready to start. |
| 22 | THE COURT: I don't want to work out the order. | 22 | Plaintiffs go first, and then the Defense. |
| 23 | I will approve something or settle a dispute. | 23 | Mr. Power? |
| 24 | MR. ROGERS: Okay. | 24 |  |
|  | Page 46 |  | Page 48 |
| 1 | MR. ESPOSITO: I just want to make sure you had | 1 | CLOSI NG ARGUMENT |
| 2 | a consolidated packet of your instructions and our | 2 | BY |
| 3 | instructions. | 3 | MR. POWER: |
| 4 | MR. ROGERS: Okay. She wants us to do the | 4 | May it please the Court, Counsel, Counsel, |
| 5 | order. | 5 | Plaintiffs. |
| 6 | MR. MOTZ: I think something needs to be done | 6 | Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, this |
| 7 | here because Paul is leaving at lunch because he has | 7 | is an opportunity where we get to address you and sum |
| 8 | to catch a flight. | 8 | up what we believe the evidence has shown. |
| 9 | THE COURT: I know. | 9 | You should base any verdict based on |
| 10 | MR. ROGERS: You and I can do it. She just | 10 | the evidence from the witness stand, as well as the |
| 11 | wants us to do the order. | 11 | instructions on law the Court will give you at the |
| 12 | THE COURT: We'll have some time -- | 12 | end of the case. |
| 13 | MR. MOTZ: I was thinking that he and Kitty can | 13 | Now, first of all, I want to thank you |
| 14 | make the first glance and then you and I can sit | 14 | for your service in this case. It's not easy to give |
| 15 | down. | 15 | up your life for three weeks or so and come in here |
| 16 | MR. ROGERS: Kitty cannot do the order of jury | 16 | and listen to this civil dispute issue. |
| 17 | instructions. She's my assistant. | 17 | As you can see, this is isn't a |
| 18 | THE COURT: You know, I will approve it. I | 18 | criminal case. It's a civil case to resolve the |
| 19 | don't want to run out of time with all the stuff. | 19 | differences. |
| 20 | MR. ROGERS: There should be a break right at | 20 | A little history in respect to the |
| 21 | lunch or something. | 21 | right of trial by jury. |
| 22 |  | 22 | It started in England after the Magna |
| 23 |  | 23 | Carta came over to the States before we became the |
| 24 |  | 24 | United States and we had colonies. Each of the |
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## Mr. J ackson was right.

And Mr. Chambers, who had seen him a number of times before, was very suspicious, very suspicious. And he actually, if you remember the video, he sees him walking towards the mid-rise. And if we put the clip of the mid-rise and high-rise, he watches him walk -- he comes up, there is no one over on the high-rise that takes you right to 38.

Mr. Chambers approaches, comes around. Now he's supposed to be a highly suspicious, that's what he said. Mr. J ackson is right there. Now, he watches him walk towards the mid-rise; no attempt to delay; no attempt to talk to him to deescalate. There is code numbers, Code 10, that we heard from Mr. Jenkins, there is a Code 4. Mr. Brown is not aware of any code numbers. They have no distress code. And he double-swipes him right through, with all these people here.

Now, if you were concerned about the people on the 3rd floor, wouldn't you have gone to the right and say, the way to 38, the upper floors, is to the right where nobody is. And then you could decide to do something else.

I nstead, he did nothing. He even said
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learned. He was interested in learning. That's one of the reasons why there is criteria in terms of minimum standards because, number one, you want to make sure someone can read; number two, you want to make sure that they can read their lessons, they can understand their lessons, they can pass their tests; they can do their job, so you set up minimum qualifications. Those were not met, pursuant to the contract. Mr. Brown did not have a high school degree diploma or GED. That was a minimum standard by contract.

And then worse is, that he didn't even read Lesson 7. Lesson 7. Workplace Violence. He told you "I didn't read it." I didn't know anything about Paula (sic) J ones.

There was also a lesson he was tested
on dealing with an aggressive visitor. That's another lesson he was tested on. He flunked. October 6, 2006. Did they remediate him at all? Did they do any other testing to make sure he knew what he was doing? No.

Because we looked at those records, and those records reflect that as of July 6, 2006, he had had no testing; he had no training sessions. He
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he put on the most convincing act to try to convince Mr. Chambers that there wasn't a problem.

I think it's pretty pathetic myself.
You're supposed to be a security guard and that's what you do? That's your security guard?

Little do any of us know, what training people have when they fix our cars, when they fix our elevators, when they guard our buildings, we don't know that. We presume, because maybe they have a good name, they have a good reputation, that they know what they're doing.

In this case, you're a tenant in the building, you didn't pay -- you didn't pay to have a greeter.

Counsel said in opening statement, these guards were greeters. You didn't hear that much anymore, did you?

Greeters with handcuffs? They acted like -- he acted like a greeter, that's for sure. He acted like a greeter. He didn't know what he was doing.

Now, I don't mean to deprecate one's lack of education. Thomas Edison never finished high school. All right. But Thomas Edison read. He
had nothing, nothing.
And who they said was the account manager, the account manager, Mr. Chambers, was not the account manager. He was actually the shift supervisor, who they told us was account manager, but he wasn't promoted until J anuary.

And that could, maybe not, explain the void why there was no training, why there was no testing well beyond the quarterly.

We look at Contract No. 1 and 2, there was a difference between the contracts. And you see when you get into Contract 2, which was applicable at the time, it adds:
"To insure the safety of all persons on the property."

That was added to Contract 2.
Now, on Contract 1, it did provide for 1020, it did provide for "two officers will monitor access to the elevator tower banks from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday."

Now, this apparently was taken out of Contract 2, but we do know there was a section -we'll come back to that in a moment --

But in Contract 1, Corporate Level

Expectations, which is 2C2 still provided that they expected that the security company look out for the safety and protection of life.

So that was a corporate expectation in
Contract 1, as well as Contract 2. But Contract 2, in addition, picked up a duty, so they had a duty that they assumed to protect people.

And if we go to the bottom of 2 , the first page, they were "To provide a competent and well-trained on-site supervisor for performance of the contract duties at all times when said contract duties were being performed and to maintain a continuing employee training program, to insure maximum efficiently and performance of the contract duties and to insure the safety of all persons on the property."

Now, Exhibit A to that in 2-013 talks
about standards of conduct:
"Accordingly, it is agreed that
said service provider employee shall
meet high standards of appearance and
demeanor and shall at all times treat
customers and employees, visitors and
vendors with the utmost courtesy and
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respect."
Then if we get to $\mathbf{B}$ under "Operational Duties and Responsibilities" of Contract 2, they talk about:
"Responding to all alarm conditions and any other indications of suspicious activities, monitor access due and enforce all access control procedures including identification of personnel and control and entry and exits to the property and vital areas in accordance of owner's expectations.
"Use reasonable effort to deter persons observed attempting to gain unauthorized access to the property."
"Use reasonable efforts."
"Respond to suspicious incidents whether discovered by owner or tenants and take reports on items that are installed or damaged to the building.

When necessary and deemed appropriate, follow incidents to their conclusion."

Did Mr. Chambers following this through to conclusion?
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When he watched a gentleman, Mr. J ackson, that had no ID -- they're supposed to have their ID on their person. He had no ID. You saw him get turned away. You saw him loitering around the building since late morning, early afternoon and never questioned him at all.

And then, to watch him walk away with
Mr. Brown without doing a thing.
Did he follow incidents to their conclusion? Of course not. All he had to do was take a couple more seconds. And if he didn't want to follow and go towards them and ask them about that suspicious package -- that we will go over in a moment -- he didn't want to ask him about that. He could have gone on lockdown, right? He could have done that. He could have called for lockdown. He could have called 911. There are all kinds of things he could have done. Gone over the PA system. He did nothing. Mr. Chambers did nothing. He walked away.

And somehow, the fact that they claim that they fired him, well, we didn't hire him. We didn't fire him. He's their agent. They're responsible for his conduct. I don't know what the implication here is, but they are responsible for his
negligence, for not doing anything that entire day, nothing. They're responsible for Mr. Brown's negligence for not doing anything that entire day.

In addition, H says:
"Respond to and provide assistance
to security-related situations in conformance with common sense and good judgment and in keeping with the owner's policies and procedures."

Now, if we go to 2014 mandatory training, mandatory. This is mandatory. This is their contract.
"Service provider shall provide 24 hours of supervised on-the-job training, as well as 16 hours of pre-employment classroom training.
"The cost shall be born by service provider and shall be included in the stated billing agreement. Owner/ manager reserves the rights of all training and interviewing all candidates.
"Additional training: Service providers shall provide quarterly training -- quarterly training -- to all
training -- quarterly training -- to all

| 1 | building security personnel. | 1 | told you in opening, he wasn't here or he wasn't |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | "Costs shall be born by service | 2 | there earlier in the day. |
| 3 | provider and should be included in | 3 | And then they show video showing when |
| 4 | stated billing rate. | 4 | he entered later at around just before 3:00 or so and |
| 5 | "Additional training sessions | 5 | then we showed video around noon, which corroborated |
| 6 | shall be a minimum of 4 hours per guard, | 6 | what Mr. Chambers said. |
| 7 | per quarter; training topics shall be | 7 | We are corroborating, by |
| 8 | pre-approved by owner and cover | 8 | circumstantial evidence, that there is a gentleman |
| 9 | materials; such areas include | 9 | that appears to look just like Mr. J ackson from their |
| 10 | as life safety, terrorism, CPR, handcuffs. | 10 | cameras with a hat on, with an envelope. So that |
| 11 | "All training should be completed | 11 | corroborates circumstantially what Mr. Chambers had |
| 12 | before the end of the quarter." | 12 | to say under oath. He's there in person. Whatever |
| 13 | But we know that didn't happen in | 13 | they did to him, they did to him. Whether it's fair |
| 14 | Mr. Brown's case. He hadn't had any training since | 14 | or not fair. That's not on us. My clients didn't |
| 15 | J uly 6th. The testing that they did, he flunked, | 15 | even know who Mr. Chambers was. He only worked there |
| 16 | which included workplace safety. | 16 | two years. |
| 17 | "Required training will test | 17 | So I can see why they want to move |
| 18 | guards' knowledge of company and building | 18 | away from Mr. Chambers because he didn't follow any |
| 19 | procedures, technical systems, report | 19 | of the orders. He didn't follow any of the policies. |
| 20 | writing, policy, procedure, life safety | 20 | He didn't follow any of the procedures. It makes |
| 21 | and post orders. | 21 | sense. But they hired him. They later fired him. |
| 22 | "Training should also include | 22 | It's not on us. He admitted to these things under |
| 23 | telephone protocol, how to answer | 23 | oath. They certainly were not in his interest to say |
| 24 | and take an accurate message and | 24 | that, you know, that actually own up to some things. |
|  | Page 62 |  | Page 64 |
| 1 | face-to-face encounter training. | 1 | He made mistakes. He was negligent. That can |
| 2 | "How to speak courteously face to | 2 | happened. |
| 3 | face procedures. Encounter training. | 3 | In this case there were profound |
| 4 | Scenario training. | 4 | consequences to his negligence. There were profound |
| 5 | That's what Mr. Hauri was talking | 5 | consequences to Allied-Barton's negligence in not |
| 6 | about. | 6 | training people to hire people that weren't |
| 7 | They should do scenario training, act | 7 | qualified, in hiring people that didn't read lessons |
| 8 | out when someone approaches you saying they have a | 8 | and not making sure they read their lessons, to have |
| 9 | weapon, what do you do? They did none of that, ever. | 9 | no remediation after they flunked their test. |
| 10 | The contract required it. | 10 | Life and death is at stake here in |
| 11 | And then if we go to 2-016, where the | 11 | these buildings. And they did nothing to ensure that |
| 12 | contract required possess a high school diploma, GED | 12 | Mr. Brown knew what he was supposed to do, even as he |
| 13 | or equivalent, well, they say that it wasn't required | 13 | got up here after numerous sessions of preparation, |
| 14 | in Contract 2 to have two guards there -- but in | 14 | he thought that he was supposed to only stand 2 to 3 |
| 15 | Contract 1, when they talked about in terms of | 15 | feet away from an aggressive person. |
| 16 | standby people, in Contract 1, they talked about six | 16 | No, it's 6 feet. And I think I showed |
| 17 | people, and in Contract 2, they had eight people. | 17 | you on numerous instances in their own lessons, 6 |
| 18 | The duties were enhanced between the contracts. | 18 | feet, 6 feet, 6 feet. It makes sense because you |
| 19 | Now, the Court is going to instruct | 19 | want to have reaction time. You want to keep some |
| 20 | you on the law. For example, circumstantial | 20 | distance. You want to remain in control. And that's |
| 21 | evidence. | 21 | what Mr. Hauri said. He never wanted -- if someone |
| 22 | What is circumstantial evidence? | 22 | says, you know, "I have a gun. Come in the alley |
| 23 | Well, we know, for example, Mr. Chambers said he saw | 23 | with me. I'm going to rob you. I won't harm you," |
| 24 | Mr. J ackson earlier in the day. And then Counsel | 24 | well, you don't go in the alley. |
|  | Page 63 |  | Page 65 |
|  |  |  | 17 (Pages 62 to 65) |
| SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY <br> (312) 782-4705 |  |  |  |

Even Mr. J enkins admitted there is fight or flight. Saying just what Mr. Hauri said, but he said he didn't know the level of Mr. Brown's training that whether he would know about fight or flight or not, but you can't give in control.

Now, someone has a gun to your head,
they have a gun to your head. At that moment there is not much you can do when you have a gun to your head. But you have to start thinking, what am I going to do because it's likely the consequences are not going to be good no matter what.

But if you don't have a gun in your head and you saw the restraint policy, the restraint applied in this case, and applied in this case for what reason? Because there wasn't a weapon that was shown. Down on the 3rd Floor, there wasn't a weapon that was shown. And the weapon was not shown, I believe, until he got up to the top -- until he got up to the office because when he talked to the Chicago Police, he said nothing about that. He said nothing about that to the police.

The first thing you tell a police
officer is that, you know, obviously, "He stuck a gun
on me on the 3rd Floor, showed me a gun on the 3rd
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Floor. He forced me into the elevator by showing me a gun." That would be the first thing to say, especially when you have three people that were killed. And that was not said at all to the Chicago Police at all.

Now, in terms of instructions, I talked about circumstantial evidence, but, you know, you're going to hear a jury instruction regarding life expectancy. Michael McKenna had 23.1 years to live; that would be the average life expectancy of a 58-year-old.

Now, when you think about that time, that would take you back to the beginning of President Clinton's first term in office. How much time has passed? That was the time that he should have had with his young son and his wife and his older kids.

All that time gone because of their failure to properly train and hire people that didn't know what they were doing; that didn't do anything. That's the bottom line.

When you think about it, Chambers did nothing the whole day. Brown hadn't seen him earlier, but from the time he first said to Brown
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"I 've got a gun," he did nothing. He did nothing. He did nothing to deter. They did nothing to delay. They did nothing to deescalate. And that's throughout all their lessons, it talks about deescalating.

If you get in the elevator, you may be in trouble, if someone really does have a gun. He didn't know he actually had a gun until he got in the elevator, at least if you take his word at it, but you're going to go upstairs and you know you're not the target.

And Detective Tenton talked about that. He was -- he had a target. And that target became lawyers, but he wasn't targeting people on the 3rd Floor. And Mr. Hauri said at the end of the day he was likely would walk away from it. Because if you get in a fight on the 3rd Floor, you're never going to get up to 38. You're going to probably get arrested.

And what did he do when Ms. Rosario turned him away? He walked away because you've got to do something on 3. You have to prevent him from getting up to 38.

And what happened? He went completely
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bonkers on 38. On the elevator, he told Mr. Brown he owed him $\$ 1,000$. And then all of a sudden when he went crazy, the escalation occurred, it was $\mathbf{\$ 3 0}$, $\$ 50$ million. He went into complete psychosis at that time. And that is textbook. That's what they tell you in their own books. It's textbook. You deescalate. If you go up there, it's going to escalate, who knows what's going on to happen? And we know what happened.

Now, in their own books, and you've seen that already, in nine out of ten times, if they handled it correctly and appropriately and correctly from the beginning, this doesn't happen. Nine out of ten times in their own materials that's what they teach.

So if Brown and/ or Chambers did what they were taught to do, this would never have occurred.

If Brown had known Code 10, the signal Code 10, he said he would have done it. If he had just given Code 10. Chambers said that's what they used. And actually Mr. Jenkins said that's what they used Code 10, over the radio, as well as face-to-face, Code 10. Code 10.

Did Chambers have to, if he didn't
want to use the restraint policy, which he could have he could have pulled him right over $\mathbf{2 5}$ feet away to the control room and called for lockdown.

We heard lockdown on the 911 tapes.
And the lockdown -- it's right in there in their policies -- Chambers admitted, Chambers could have called for lockdown. Brown didn't even know in the post orders, workplace violence, Code 10. He didn't even know Code 10. I mean, what kind of training is this with our life and health is at stake?

And Mr. McGoey said as far as he's
concerned if someone comes up to a security officer and says "I 've got a gun and a bomb, take me to the top floor," you do it. That's what he said. You may recall him saying that.

You take -- can you imagine a security system like that? You take them to the top floor? He's badmouthing codes.

Dr. Kennedy devoted his life to
distress codes. He says when they started it, it was lost to antiquity. He talked about the I ndian codes from the Cherokees from World War I and World War II. The I ndians with smoke signals, all codes.
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All they needed is a simple code. All they need is to train Mr. Brown on Code 10. Nothing. Absolute negligence on all their parts. And that's why we are here.

Now, you are the judges of the
credibility of witnesses, whether they're to be believed or not believed, that's for you to decide.

When they hire a witness come in all the way, for example, from California and testifies at a deposition and trial testimony for a plaintiff and all the other 70-some depositions and trial testimonies for the defense, you judge the credibility of that witness because they're here to give an opinion, and that's why they were hired.

Now, you want to look at 5-548. This was the incident report. Remember, Mr. Brown said in his deposition that he did -- filled out an incident report and then later he tried to deny it. And then he owned up to it because it was under oath and we played it, where he said he didn't fill out an incident report. And this is from their own MSO investigative reporting, when an incident happens a security officer must create an incident report to be complete with all the correct and accurate facts.
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He's never seen that incident report that he did a day or two after the occurrence, nor have we.

So there is a jury instruction that if a party to this case has failed to offer evidence with those powers to produce --

MR. PATTON: I will object to this.
THE COURT: Counsel.
MR. POWER: I thought it was given.
THE COURT: No.
MR. PATTON: Move to strike.
THE COURT: I will strike those last comments.
Counsel, will start again.
MR. POWER: He testified under oath that he filled out an incident report. And he never produced it. Never looked at it again. We never saw it. He was supposed to do an incident report and he didn't do it, so we do know he gave a police report.

We do know he gave a statement to the police on the day of the occurrence where it says:
"Offender attempted to go to the
38th Floor. Was sent away because he had no ID. Returned and showed him the note. Told him he a gun. Took him to
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38th floor. Entered office. Asked for McKenna. Locked door with chain. McKenna in a meeting. Walked out in the hallway. And offender asked where McKenna was and then put gun to her head. Woman got McKenna out of the room. Offender said he owed money. Offender shot McKenna. Officer ran down the hallway and shot again. Security guards came and knocked down door. Ran with Security to stairwell to the 37th floor, and took elevators down."

Nowhere in here does he talk about a gun being pulled on him in an elevator.

Now, typically if someone's going to talk about why they submitted, you would say when they showed a gun, pulled a gun. He says, he pulled a gun out in the office. Earlier he said he told him he had a gun. And I think that's consistent with the evidence in this case. Be that as it may, he didn't see a gun at the earliest until he got into the elevator.

So in respect to the bag inspections.
If we go to 5-193, carrying a concealed weapon. These are things that they see every day. Crimes

| 1 | they see every day; carrying concealed weapons. | 1 | don't get passed; you got a greeter there, and you |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | These are things that are supposed to be on the | 2 | have lower rent. It's cheaper. |
| 3 | lookout for. | 3 | But when you get in a building, as |
| 4 | If you go to 5-196. If you talk about | 4 | their own expert said, is equivalent to Sears Tower |
| 5 | one of the most important things is the planning, at | 5 | or a first-class building, you're paying higher |
| 6 | the bottom: | 6 | rents. There is a certain expectation and they |
| 7 | "Most importantly, do you know | 7 | didn't meet it. |
| 8 | what to do when someone tries to | 8 | Now, we look at Post Order Exhibit |
| 9 | violate your work site? Access | 9 | No. 6 at the top, we talked about what they said |
| 10 | control procedures? You need to know." | 10 | regarding preparation, being prepared, right at the |
| 11 | What did Brown know? He knew nothing. | 11 | top. "The key to managing a crisis is preparation." |
| 12 | He didn't deter. He didn't delay. He didn't try to | 12 | How were they prepared? They had no |
| 13 | deescalate. He didn't know the codes. He was not | 13 | distress code. Code 10, Mr. Brown didn't know about |
| 14 | prepared. He had absolutely no preparation and | 14 | it. Mr. Brown just was going to take him upstairs |
| 15 | that's why we're here. | 15 | and hoped that Mr. J ackson would just forcibly get |
| 16 | If we go to 5-917: | 16 | his money back. |
| 17 | "Watch for suspicious and | 17 | Well, I have been taught, you know, |
| 18 | unknown people." What are you supposed to | 18 | hope for the best, plan for the worst. |
| 19 | do? "Ma'am, can I help you with something? This is | 19 | How are you hoping someone is going to |
| 20 | private property. Can I ask you what you're looking | 20 | forcibly, and if he had a gun -- we didn't know if he |
| 21 | for?" You're supposed to question them. Chambers | 21 | had a gun at that time -- but if had a gun, forcibly |
| 22 | did none of that. | 22 | get his money back and everything would be |
| 23 | 5-198, "Loitering: | 23 | hunky-dory. That's absurd. It's absolutely absurd. |
| 24 | People who are standing around | 24 | It's contrary to the whole training of a security |
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| 1 | not appearing to be conducting any | 1 | officer. The whole training of a security officer is |
| 2 | legitimate business." | 2 | to be prepared, to deter, delay, deescalate. He did |
| 3 | That's Mr. J ackson throughout that | 3 | nothing. |
| 4 | whole day. | 4 | Here where it says: Nearly in every |
| 5 | 5-199, "What to look for: Lopsided or | 5 | crisis situation, the frontline member, the |
| 6 | uneven envelopes." | 6 | receptionist, she did her job. She turned him away, |
| 7 | That takes us to that point in time | 7 | which is proof that he wasn't going to try to barge |
| 8 | with Mr. Brown. I thought it was like this when | 8 | through there. He was going to trying to get there, |
| 9 | Mr. Chambers approached them. I thought he had his | 9 | but she turned him away; she did her job. |
| 10 | hand in the bag like this, which may seem obvious, | 10 | And then it was Mr. Brown. In nine |
| 11 | but he said, No, it was like this. And he said it | 11 | out of ten cases, a person's initial response will |
| 12 | was bulky like this, and he was within 1 foot of me | 12 | determine the success or failure with dealing with a |
| 13 | hugging me, hugging me. | 13 | crisis. Each member of the team must carefully |
| 14 | And Chambers said, it was suspicious | 14 | understand his or her role. |
| 15 | that he was 1 foot away from him. He's supposed to | 15 | That role should never be, I 'm just |
| 16 | be 6 foot. But this -- and they're supposed to be | 16 | going to bring him up to a floor and have at it |
| 17 | checking for lopsided or uneven envelopes. | 17 | because he lost his best opportunity. He not only |
| 18 | And what did he do? He walked away. | 18 | had Ms. Rosario's eyes. He had the security officer |
| 19 | He didn't call 911. Didn't call for lockdown. Brown | 19 | in the control booth, $\mathbf{2 5}$ to 50 feet away, who could |
| 20 | didn't know about Code 10. What kind of building is | 20 | call 911, who could assist, get the Metra police up |
| 21 | this? What kind of security system is this? What | 21 | there, who could get the Chicago police there. He |
| 22 | were they paying for? | 22 | had Mr. Chambers and himself. And he had a camera |
| 23 | People do get in buildings where there | 23 | right there. |
| 24 | is very little security; you can walk right in, you | 24 | Once you take him off to the elevator, |
|  | Page 75 |  | Page 77 |

there is no cameras the rest of the way. You're at his mercy. You lost complete, complete control.

And why he would ever take him to the mid-rise, where all those people were, it doesn't take you to 38, rather than the high-rise, I 'Il never know; except that he wasn't protecting people on the 3rd Floor by taking a person that claimed he had a gun.

Now in 6013, it talks about in their post orders that Mr. Brown is required to know Code 10. He didn't know it.

And 6038, it talked about every person
had to have identification for access beyond the 3rd
Floor. And, A:
"To politely, but firmly explain
it's company policy not to allow anyone into the facility without proper identification."

6039: "Continually watch for unusual events, loitering.

6, question suspicious persons:
Example, people who seem lost. Ask one
of the following questions: 'May I help
you?' 'Are you lost?' 'Do you have
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did know about the system. Chambers knew about the
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system, the PA system. Go to that system. Call for a lockdown. Do something. But they have two big guys. Chambers 6'4', 270, Brown is 6 foot 2, 305 and he's never going to have that around again. He's never going to have that unless he takes him up in the elevator.

But the Use of Restraints Policy, a felony crime had been committed; they can see that; witness by a security officer applies. All Chambers had to do, if Brown had called Code 10, is call the police. They call 911. Call the control room. Call the police while Brown is handcuffing him. Someone should be restraining him. He has not displayed any type of weapon. He hadn't displayed a weapon at that time.

At least two security officers were present. They were. And a security officer has verified the above. He would have. All he had to say was "Code 10, claims he has a gun."

Brown moves to retrain him; Chambers calls control; get Metra Police, get Chicago police. That's all they had to do.

Now, the lessons that he failed included emergency situations dealing with aggressive
people, workplace violence, that was the test he did on October 6, 2006. And he failed, failed that test and they did nothing to remediate him.

Now, negligence is the failure to do something that a reasonably careful person would do under a similar circumstance.

It's for you to decide whether or not the -- Brown was negligent in not reading his lessons, not knowing what to do not knowing, not knowing the codes, not following the post orders, all those things. Of course, it was.

Mr. Chambers was negligent in not questioning J ackson from the beginning, not talking to him about "Why are you here? What are you doing here? It's private property."

Now, at the end, at the end of all
this to say "What is this package you have here, sir?" "What are you doing? You were declined entry? Who are you coming here to see?" Not questioning him.

If Chambers was trained, then all of them go into the control room. Lock it down. Call the police. Do something. Don't walk away. Don't walk away and let Brown abandon his post. There is
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combination led to the injury and deaths, it meets the burden of proximate cause.

That means the last cause, it doesn't have to be the last cause like the shooting, if that negligence was an earlier cause, which in combination led to the injuries and death, that means proximate cause has been established.

And we know it has been established because nine out of ten times had they done their job, this would not have occurred; the shooting would not have occurred.

So if they had done -- if earlier on, they had done their job, people would not be dead. Mr. J ackson would likely be in jail or would have left and hopefully had gotten some help for whatever was going on with him. That would have been the preference, but that is what proximate cause is.

Now, in terms of the charges of negligence, each of the plaintiffs have charges of negligence, and they are $A$ through $S$, and I 'm not going to repeat each and every one of these charges of negligence.

And all you have to do is find one, one or more, to be found, based on the evidence, that
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no one on the 3rd Floor now. No one. Who is mining the store? No one.

Now, it was the defendants' duty to be free from negligence.

Now, when we talk about causation, they like to say "Oh, he was a hostage. He was a hostage. He was a hostage." This could have been handled early on by Chambers; it could have been more appropriately handled by Brown based on the evidence that you heard in this case. But it's -- in terms of proximate cause, the plaintiff has a burden of proof more probably true than not that the defendant, one or more of the defendants were negligent, and that negligence was a proximate cause of the injuries and deaths in this case.

So what does that mean, proximate cause? It means that that is a cause that in the natural order of ordinary events produces the scenes of plaintiffs' injuries, right. What does that mean? It may not be the only cause nor the last or nearest cause, if it is sufficient or if it combines in another cause resulting in the injury. Meaning, that the last cause is the shooting, but if there was a cause that was not the last or the nearest, but in
the defendants were negligent, and then you go to damages.

So it says in "terms of charges," the plaintiffs charge that the defendants, Mr. Brown, Mr. Chambers, AlliedBarton -- they are the agents and employees, so any actions by Brown or Chambers are actions attributable to AlliedBarton; they're responsible for them.

So of all the allegations: Failing to insure the safety of all persons on the property, including Michael McKenna, Allen Hoover, Paul Goodson and Ruth Leib. Violation of the security contract. Failure to provide adequate security personnel, so you will see on and on and on.

If the plaintiff proves just one of those, the verdict should be for the plaintiff, so you will have those to look over inside.

I think there is no question that the defendants were negligent for numerous reasons based on the evidence in this case. And you can look at your notes and rely on your memories, and I think there is no question the verdict should be for the plaintiff and against the defendants.

Now the burden of proof, it's more
probably true than not. It's not what's called 2 beyond a reasonable doubt. It's the preponderance; 3 meaning, they say if a the blind lady of justice 4 carrying the scales of justice, if a feather were to 5 come down on the one scale and tip it ever so 6 slightly, plaintiff has met the burden of proof. $7 \quad$ It's more probably true than not. That's the burden of proof, that the defendants were negligent, their negligence proximately caused the injuries or deaths in this case.

Now, can we get to -- when we get to damages in this case, we talk about the loss of life, the loss of normal life. By loss of normal life, I mean a temporary or permanent diminished ability to enjoy life, this includes a person's inability to pursue pleasurable aspects of life.

Now, there is also other damages, which I won't get into it. In respect to the loss of society, conscious pain and suffering, emotional distress. You heard the testimony in this case.

Now, regarding the emotional distress, now, you heard Detective Tenton testify, he said that Michael was initially, obviously, when you get hit in the head, you're probably stunned, that maybe you're
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not making motion much like if you get a concussion at a football game; you get stunned and knocked out momentarily, but he's shot in the head, so maybe he didn't make any sound until Detective Tenton got up there. I don't know that.

But Ruth Leib left right away and Detective Tenton testified as to the screams, the moans for 35, 40 minutes. And one allows to recover for that. And they allow a recovery for that because they don't want a defendant to negligently cause someone to suffer in the manner in which he suffered and then just walk away from it. And that's our law. That's our law.

Now, if you don't believe Detective Tenton, what he testified to here, then you should not have an award for loss of normal life and pain and suffering and emotional distress experienced by Michael McKenna. It all rests on whether or not on Detective Tenton and the medical people. Lay people are not allowed to testify as to the conclusion of conscious pain and suffering.

So that's why when the medical examiner said initially in her deposition, "Based on the autopsy alone, I cannot say that there was pain
and suffering." But she said the nature of the wound into the area of the brain that it was, the temporal lobe, that would not preclude pain and suffering. That is an area of the brain that deals with auditory processing and vision and not to consciousness.

So you heard Detective Tenton testify, and he even, as I brought out with the medical examiner, he even told the lawyers not to mention it to the family because when you hear someone died, screaming and moaning, for 35, 40 minutes, it's not a way anyone would imagine to want to die. But the law allows for compensation for that pain and suffering and that emotional distress for someone who should have lived 23.1 years until J onah was 25, but to die in this manner, these are the last 35, 40 minutes of his life.

And the Court has taken judicial
notice that the definition of "screaming" to give a long loud piercing cry or cries expressing excitement or emotion or pain.

Well, in respect to incapacitation, if you're incapacitated, you can't do what you normally do, what you're being asked to do or much of anything. To incapacitate someone is to cause him or
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her to not be able to function normally. There is no question that Michael was incapacitated.

And then to "moan," to make a long low sound expressing physical or mental suffering. That's what "moan" means.

So there is no question what the definition is and why you're screaming and why you're moaning. The issue is in this case is Detective Tenton to be believed under oath, and I believe he is.

And I know that -- I told them I'm not going to go there, that Dr. Raphael said "Oh, my children scream," I don't think the screaming by Michael McKenna were screams of pleasure. They were screams of pain and suffering of distress, knowing the likely outcome in respect to his death.

Now, in this case, it would be great if you, the jury, can say "We the jury, find for the plaintiff and Michael McKenna is now coming back to life. We restore Michael McKenna to you." That's not going to happen, obviously.

If we go back to the Old Testament, "We the jury find for the plaintiff now inflict on the defendants what was inflicted on Michael

McKenna." Well, that's not our system of justice here.

Our system of justice is making the family whole for taking away, taking away Michael McKenna, by not making sure he was one of the nine out of ten who lived. They didn't.

So if you believe Officer Tenton, I
believe that the pain and suffering, and I recommend, it's for you to decide, should be conscious pain and suffering 3 to $\$ 5$ million. These are my recommendations.

For emotional distress experienced 2
to $\$ 4$ million. And the loss of a normal life experienced, 2 to $\$ 4$ million.

There is also the benefits, the goods, the services, that's $\mathbf{\$ 6 0 9}, \mathbf{5 2 7 . 0 0}$. That's what Dr. Linke testified to.

Now, now, in respect to wrongful death cases in Michael McKenna's death, the community has suffered, everyone has suffered, friends, neighbors, but the law does not allow recovery for those people. The law limits the recovery in a case like this to the -- in Michael's case to lineal descendents, which include the adult children, as well as Suzanne and
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life, he was devoting himself to his wife and to his new son and he was still devoted to his older children, and he loved them very much.

And if I could just show you one clip about how J onah should have had Michael until he was 25 and he lost him at 2. He was devoted to his wife. He was devoted to J onah. He was devoted to his older children. I would suggest for loss of society between $\mathbf{2 8}$ and $\$ 30$ million to the family to be divided amongst the five pursuant to whatever the Court determines. The Court will determine how it would be split up.

But I would suggest that because this is a person who was concerned about others, even to the point, as Ruth described, when he came out -now, if you can imagine, if you have a security guard accompanying a guy with a gun, and the security guard, according to him, is saying this fellow with the gun is a friend of Michael McKenna's before, obviously, he pulled a gun, but saying that, then he pulls a gun.

Can you imagine your feeling, how you
feel when you're leaving the office, and this security guard is misrepresenting a fact; not only
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Jonah. We have Matthew, Warren and Amber and we have Suzanne and J onah. So there is five people.

You will on the loss of society
component, you will be instructed on loss of society, but the loss of society component is for five people. And then the Judge decides how it's to be allocated amongst the five, pursuant to our laws.

But the law, when a person leaves children and a wife, the law recognizes there is some substantial loss, some substantial pecuniary loss and that if some substantial pecuniary loss is recognized and it limits it to the few that can recover.

And Michael McKenna, the type of
person he was, even the lady on the 911 tapes, which
I would like to play the 911 tapes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Counsel, I made a ruling on that.
MR. POWER: I understand.
So on the 911 tapes even the lady,
Mrs. Murphy, talked about we have to save this man, what a wonderful people he was. You heard what Ruth had to say about Michael, all the charitable bike rides he did for various causes. Michael worked to live. He didn't live to work.

He wasn't a -- at this time in his
feel betrayed, you've got the security guard on the side with the fellow with the gun, so you come out there -- now, this is a guy that said -- Ruth had a gun to her head -- "Why does this have to happen on my watch?" This is a guy who is only worried about himself. He's only worried about himself.

Now, he comes out here and he's trying, according to Ruth, say "Listen, I 'm by myself," because J ackson is saying "Who else is with you?" "I 'm by myself. Those lawyers do not work with me." He knows he's likely a goner, and he was, but he was trying to protect all those other lawyers in that suite. That's the type of guy Michael McKenna was.

And what was the type of guy security officer AlliedBarton hired, the guy who is saying "Why does this have to happen on my watch?" Look at the contrast.

Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate
your time here today, and thank you for your attention.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. Everybody okay? You need a washroom break. Okay. Let's take five minutes.

```
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Mr. Rogers.
MR. ROGERS: Thank you, your Honor. CLOSI NG ARGUMENT
BY
MR. ROGERS:
May it please the Court, Mrs. McKenna, Ms. Leib Mr. Goodson, Counsel, Counsel.
Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is it acceptable to you that a security company contracts to provide the protection of life and the security of individuals, is paid to provide that service, fails to follow its own policies, fails to follow its own procedures, fails to follow its own post orders and as a result of that, three innocent individuals at work are killed and one is shot and seriously injured? That's the question you have to decide here today.
It's an awesome responsibility on your part, but trust me when I tell you that it is very, very important to both sides, both the plaintiffs and the defendants in the case.
Before I get into what I believe the facts has shown in the case and the evidence has
```
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like it or hate it, but to abide by the system, follow the Court's instruction and decide the case based on the evidence.

And as lawyers, we have the privilege of representing individuals who can't stand in front of you and talk about their case.

Trust me, if Mrs. Hoover or Mrs.
McKenna or Ms. Leib or the Goodsons could talk to you directly and say this is how this impacted me and affected me, they would love to do that, but they trust in their lawyers and they trust in the system and they trust in the Court to instruct you to make an unbiased decision, based upon the evidence.

So as lawyers, we want to make sure we don't miss anything. We want to make sure you understand the importance of the issues that we think are important. We want to put it in front of you, so that it's as clear as can be.

So I apologize on behalf of myself, I apologize on behalf of the lawyers representing the plaintiffs and even the defendants if some of it has gotten repetitious for you, but we know that when we stand and talk to you, we are not talking for ourselves; we are talking for the people who are
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sitting here. We want to make sure that their voices are heard and their claims are presented and all of the issues and all of the evidence is being considered.

In opening statement, the Court instructed you is not evidence. It's what an attorney expects the evidence will show over the course of a trial.

And a trial, I like to say is like a puzzle, because rarely does one person hold every piece of a puzzle; meaning, the facts of what happened in the incident, the training, and expectations of the security officers and then the testimony. All of those pieces of evidence come together from different witnesses and different pieces of evidence, and you are responsible for pulling those all together and answering the questions that will be presented to you at the end of the case by the Court.

Mr. Power touched upon a lot of that, but I wanted to present to you as succinctly as I can what I think a couple of things you should focus on within the body of information we provided you.

Let me start with where the case

| 1 | started with and how AlliedBarton got there. How did | 1 | AlliedBarton provided security for |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | AlliedBarton get to the $\mathbf{5 0 0}$ West Madison and become | 2 | that entire property. |
| 3 | the entity responsible for securing and protecting | 3 | And on that 3rd floor, that tenant |
| 4 | the lives and safety of individuals? And that | 4 | space above, they were responsible for access |
| 5 | started with a contract. It started with their | 5 | control, access control. That was managed, as you |
| 6 | agreement to do that -- not the plaintiffs telling | 6 | heard from the evidence, through a series of steps. |
| 7 | them to do that. Their acceptance of the | 7 | One involving a concierge or visitor center, where |
| 8 | responsibility and duty to protect life and the | 8 | you either -- where you were entered in the system; |
| 9 | safety of individuals in that building. | 9 | meaning, a tenant had authorized you to come up or |
| 10 | You heard testimony from Mr. J enkins, | 10 | you had your own ID badge that you could swipe |
| 11 | the director of security, that they were the subject | 11 | through. |
| 12 | matter expert brought in to provide that security. | 12 | And the security officers were |
| 13 | I would like to point to Exhibit 2 | 13 | responsible, AlliedBarton was responsible for |
| 14 | about the corporate expectations, what was expected | 14 | managing that area, making sure that only authorized |
| 15 | from AlliedBarton: | 15 | individuals made it up above the 3rd Floor, above the |
| 16 | "The service provider shall | 16 | 3rd Floor where Mr. McKenna, Mr. Hoover, Ms. Leib and |
| 17 | provide security personnel and | 17 | Mr. Goodson were all going about their regular day |
| 18 | services to operate, supervise and | 18 | working. |
| 19 | assist in the administration of the | 19 | Let's talk about the post orders, the |
| 20 | premises security program as determined | 20 | property-specific post orders. Let's go to the first |
| 21 | by the owner for the safety and | 21 | page of Exhibit 6 please. |
| 22 | protection of life." | 22 | Mr. Power showed you this, but I think |
| 23 | It's not an obligation or | 23 | it's important. |
| 24 | responsibility that the McKennas or Hoovers or Leibs | 24 | "Hire us, we can protect life, the |
|  | Page 98 |  | Page 100 |
| 1 | or the Goodsons placed on AlliedBarton. It's what | 1 | safety of individuals. We have trained |
| 2 | they agreed to do. As the subject matter security | 2 | individuals. We even have specific post |
| 3 | experts, they agreed, contracted to provide security | 3 | orders for your property that we will |
| 4 | for the safety and protection of life. | 4 | develop to carry out our obligation |
| 5 | You heard a lot of evidence about how | 5 | because we know that the key to |
| 6 | they do that. You heard about security officer | 6 | managing a crisis is preparation, |
| 7 | handbooks. I'm showing you Plaintiffs' No. 19 for | 7 | preparation. |
| 8 | identification. The information provided to their | 8 | "Difficult situations requiring a |
| 9 | security officers to explain to them how to begin to | 9 | quick confident response are a normal |
| 10 | prepare themselves to do their job. You heard what | 10 | occurrence in asset management." |
| 11 | they call the master security officer lesson book. | 11 | It's not our words, ladies and |
| 12 | That's the lesson book AlliedBarton prepared, as the | 12 | gentlemen. These are their words. |
| 13 | subject matter experts, to convince this building | 13 | "Difficult situation." No question |
| 14 | that they could do what they contracted to do, | 14 | about it. Robert Brown was in a difficult situation, |
| 15 | protect, provide security for the safety and | 15 | but that is exactly why AlliedBarton was hired to be |
| 16 | protection of life. This is how good we are. This | 16 | prepared and have security officers to have an access |
| 17 | is what we do. The contract. | 17 | control system that was prepared for difficult |
| 18 | Then you heard about the post orders. | 18 | situations, requiring a quick and confident response. |
| 19 | The post orders are supposed to be property-specific | 19 | "Proper handling can avert or |
| 20 | about providing security. And you heard about this | 20 | minimize a situation and prevent it from |
| 21 | building. They were very proud to tell you about | 21 | escalating into a crisis." |
| 22 | 100,000 plus people that come through the building | 22 | Let's talk about that a little bit. |
| 23 | and that there are food courts and security up on the | 23 | Let's just be fair and reasonable about what this |
| 24 | 3rd Floor for the private tenant spaces. | 24 | evidence has shown about how this escalated to a |
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crisis.
You heard all types of lawyer talk
about people getting shot on the 3rd Floor, and I was protecting individuals on the 3rd Floor. But let's think about the evidence and what it has shown about the 3rd Floor and J ackson's actions.

And we make no excuses for J ackson.
Okay. He was the exact type of person Allied was hired to keep away and protect the individuals from.

But what did J ackson, when he presented up to the concierge desk -- strike that.

When he first came up the escalator, he first went to a security officer, and he was directed to the concierge desk. The concierge did their job, they checked the system to see if he was in the system. He was not in the system and/ or did not produce an ID to be cleared and they did not authorize him to go up the stairs.

You saw the video, I won't show you again. He fumbled through his wallet a couple of times. Then what did he do? He walked back to the security officer, Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown was engaged in what appears to be, from the video, a casual conversation with
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"A. Yes.
"Q. And you remember that, don't you?
"A yes.
"Q. Okay. And you remember at the time you saw the man standing next to Officer Brown in his hands in his pockets; is that correct?
"A. Yes.
"Q. Okay. The report says, 'I walked around to the front and asked the gentleman if there is a problem.
"So you spoke directly to the; man that was talking to Mr. Brown; is that correct?
"A. Yes, I did.
"Q. And when you spoke to the man, you walked to the front of the man; is that correct?
"A. I was in between the two of them, the security officer and the man.
"Q. Okay. But you were facing --
"A. I facing them.
"Q. -- the man. Were you also
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maybe a tenant, who knows who it was. He doesn't
know. And J ackson just stood there around in the back. He didn't pull out a gun. He didn't rush him. He didn't try to sneak past him, and then he went down the escalator.

A couple of seconds later, he came back up the escalator. And I think the evidence showed that he went down and immediately turned around and came back up. He went right back up to Mr. Brown.

And when he went up to Mr. Brown this time, he approached him on the side. And Mr. Chambers, Mr. Chambers, his supervisor, saw him and he went over there and he confronted them. And he said to them, "I s there a problem?" Why did he do that? He did that. He told you in his admissions.

Let me turn to the admissions beginning with the first one.
"Page 61, it goes on to say on
the way back to the control room at approximately $14: 45$, I saw the same
man standing unusually close to
Officer Brown with his hands in his
pockets. Do you see that?
facing Mr. Brown?
"A. Yes.
"Q. Okay. So you were facing both of them and you asked the gentleman, not Mr. -- not Officer Brown, you asked the gentleman if there is a problem; is that correct?
"A. Yes.
"Q. And did the gentleman say anything to you?
"A. No, he didn't.
"Q. Okay. Officer Brown answered you for him answering no.
"A. Right.
"Q. I s that right?
"A. That's correct.
"Q. And that's what you remember?
"A. Yes.
"Q. Now, this gentleman that you asked, was there a problem, you had seen him earlier that day; is that correct?
"A. Yes.
"Q. Where did you first see him that day?

| 1 | "A. Downstairs in the retail area. | 1 | They can argue the admissions, but you can't get up |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | "Q. Okay. And that would be on | 2 | there and start playing videotape that has been |
| 3 | ground level? | 3 | admitted in this case as trial testimony. You can't |
| 4 | "A. Or (sic) ground level, yes." | 4 | get up and read a transcript and start reading the |
| 5 | Security officer Chambers, and I don't | 5 | pages to the jury. That's inappropriate. |
| 6 | know, hopefully you recall the testimony, he said | 6 | MR. ROGERS: These were admissions. These were |
| 7 | because he had seen him down in the 1st Floor retail | 7 | admissions. We can read admissions. |
| 8 | area, not once but twice in the area of the elevators | 8 | THE COURT: This is something -- there is |
| 9 | looking lost, when he saw him on 3, he was suspicious | 9 | nothing different than what the jury has already seen |
| 10 | of him. | 10 | during the course of the trial? |
| 11 | Suspicion is exactly what these master | 11 | MR. ROGERS: No. |
| 12 | security officer policies and procedures and the post | 12 | THE COURT: Your point is they saw it during |
| 13 | orders tell them to look for, these suspicious | 13 | the course of the trial and it's trial testimony? |
| 14 | people. And he went over to them and he directed a | 14 | MR. POWER: It's still an admission. You can |
| 15 | question to them, "Is there a problem?" And Brown | 15 | read admissions. |
| 16 | answered. | 16 | THE COURT: See, and you were complaining about |
| 17 | And the testimony he provided was, he | 17 | double-teaming earlier. |
| 18 | was suspicious because he had seen him multiple times | 18 | I will allow it in if you stuck right |
| 19 | and most people go from $A$ to $B$ in that building. You | 19 | to the admissions and things that have already been |
| 20 | come there, do your business and you leave, and this | 20 | heard by the jury. |
| 21 | man is loitering for hours. Secondly, he had been | 21 | MR. PATTON: Judge, just for the record, we |
| 22 | denied access by the concierge, yet he then had | 22 | object to this and renew our motion before barring |
| 23 | approached Brown. | 23 | these admissions to be played to the jury. |
| 24 | Third, he was standing usually close | 24 | THE COURT: Counsel. |
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| 1 | to Brown; and fourth, Brown he directed a question | 1 | MR. PATTON: I will have further motions when |
| 2 | 'Is there a problem' to Mr. J ackson and Brown | 2 | we are done with this. |
| 3 | answered quickly. He was suspicious of him by his | 3 | (Whereupon, the following |
| 4 | own admission. | 4 | proceedings were had in open |
| 5 | AlliedBarton acts through the actions | 5 | court, in the presence and |
| 6 | of its employees, Brown and Chambers. | 6 | hearing of the jury.) |
| 7 | What did he do? He was suspicious. | 7 | THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Rogers. |
| 8 | Did he do what you would expect a reasonably careful | 8 | MR. ROGERS: Can I have a ruling, your Honor? |
| 9 | security officer to do under those circumstances? | 9 | THE COURT: The objection is overruled. |
| 10 | And I 'm talking about Chambers. And I ask you to | 10 | MR. ROGERS: He was suspicious of Mr. J ackson. |
| 11 | play the clip. | 11 | He was suspicious of how close he was standing to |
| 12 | MR. PATTON: Your Honor, I have an objection. | 12 | Mr. Brown. He knew he had been denied access. He |
| 13 | I would like a sidebar. | 13 | had seen him down on the lower floor a couple of |
| 14 | THE COURT: Okay. | 14 | different times looking lost. And Brown answered a |
| 15 | (Whereupon, the following | 15 | question that was directed at J ackson. |
| 16 | proceedings were heard | 16 | And what did Chambers do? And did he |
| 17 | in chambers, outside of | 17 | do what you would expect a reasonably careful |
| 18 | the presence and hearing | 18 | security officer charged with protecting life, |
| 19 | of the jury.) | 19 | charged with the safety of individuals to do? Let's |
| 20 | MR. PATTON: Judge, this is absolutely | 20 | see what he did. |
| 21 | inappropriate to play trial testimony. You can't | 21 | Can you go back to the clip. |
| 22 | take a transcript and start cherry-picking the trial | 22 | MR. PATTON: I will renew my objection. |
| 23 | testimony in front of this jury. | 23 | THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, that will be |
| 24 | They can talk about the admissions. | 24 | overruled. |
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| 1 | MR. ROGERS: Here we see J ackson approaching | 1 | with a crisis. There can be multiple ways, but if we |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Brown and we see Chambers coming into the scene | 2 | go back to the video, this is not the way. |
| 3 | walking toward them because he's suspicious of them. | 3 | I want you to pay close attention to |
| 4 | He walks around them. He stands in | 4 | what Mr. Chambers does after he watches them walking |
| 5 | front of them. He directs a question, as he told | 5 | toward the turnstile. He watches. They're going |
| 6 | you, not me, because of his suspicions. | 6 | toward the turnstiles. |
| 7 | He's standing there next to Brown. | 7 | Playing it, I think it starts around |
| 8 | And Brown and J ackson begin to walk toward the | 8 | minute 7. Advance it a little bit, if you could. |
| 9 | turnstiles and what does he do? Stop it right there. | 9 | What does he do? He walks away. He |
| 10 | He watches. He watches a man he admittedly was | 10 | walks away and goes down the turnstiles. |
| 11 | suspicious of, a man he knew had been denied entry, a | 11 | That's what the security supervisor |
| 12 | man he had seen around the building for hours when | 12 | did despite his suspicions of the man, despite |
| 3 | most people go from A to B, and he watched them walk | 13 | Mr. Brown telling you that he's standing next to me |
| 14 | toward the turnstiles and up to the 38th floor. | 14 | like this. I don't know whether it's like this, like |
| 15 | Is that what this contract required | 15 | this, but I know that if somebody has their hand in |
| 16 | AlliedBarton to do? Is that what this security | 16 | an envelope and you're a security officer, you would |
| 17 | handbook expected security officer to do? Is that, | 17 | reasonably expect you to inquire, question and do |
| 18 | when you see suspicious individuals, what you're | 18 | something other than walk away because situations |
| 19 | supposed to do? | 19 | escalate to crises if you don't respond |
| 20 | This is Chambers, ladies and | 20 | appropriately. |
| 21 | gentlemen, the supervisor. All they wanted to talk | 21 | Can you pull up 5-196, the bottom |
| 22 | to you about is him being a hero and Brown being a | 22 | portion. |
| 23 | hero. This is video, video evidence showing you what | 23 | So what you have to decide largely is |
| 24 | he did and did not do. | 24 | if it's okay to contract to do something, put on a |
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| 1 | And we know, because Brown told you | 1 | dog and pony show about how good you are at it and |
| 2 | and we know what happened, that it escalated. And it | 2 | how good your guys are, but then when the situation |
| 3 | gets right back to their post orders. | 3 | arises neither you nor your security officers know |
| 4 | Let's go back to Exhibit 6 on the | 4 | what to do. |
| 5 | first page. That paragraph right there. | 5 | What do I mean by that? Duress codes. |
| 6 | "In nearly every crisis situation, | 6 | You heard testimony that in hospitals when a nurse or |
| 7 | a front-line member of the staff, | 7 | a doctor has a difficult patient or someone, they |
| 8 | security guard, will be the first person | 8 | will say "Can you page Dr. Strong." That's a key to |
| 9 | to come in contact with the crisis." | 9 | get the security officer. You know, in your own |
| 10 | That's true. It's true. It's not my | 10 | homes -- strike that. |
| 11 | statement. It's not Mr. Power's statement. It's not | 11 | Personal security system at homes, |
| 12 | Mr. Kotin's statement. It's Allied-Barton's | 12 | your alarm goes off, they call you. If you don't |
| 13 | statement. It's their post orders for the building |  | give the right code back, then they send the |
| 4 | at 500 West Madison Street. | 14 | authorities. |
| 15 | Now, in nine out of ten cases, that | 15 | Duress codes have been around forever. |
| 16 | person's initial response will determine the | 16 | How can you be this top-notch worldwide security |
| 17 | building's success or failure in dealing with the | 17 | company that supposed to know what to do and your guy |
| 18 | crisis; thus, it is very important that each member | 18 | is suspicious standing in front of another security |
| 19 | of the team carefully understand his or her role. | 19 | officer and they don't know what to do? There is no |
| 20 | Know what to do. Respond. | 20 | duress code. |
| 21 | So you heard about duress codes. You | 21 | They say now it's a hands-off policy |
| 22 | heard about restraint systems. You heard about 6 | 22 | even though they carry handcuffs. They can recall |
| 23 | feet away. Why did you hear about all of those | 23 | the elevators right there at the concierge desk. You |
| 24 | things? Because there may not be any one way to deal |  | heard Mr. Jenkins say it. All you have to do is |
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right there at the concierge desk recall the
2 elevators to 1. You can recall the 31st elevator.
3 J ackson told them where he was going. Recall the 4 elevators.
$5 \quad$ Get on the PA system. Get on the PA $6 \quad$ system and say "We have an intruder that's going 7 through the building, lock your doors until we can 8 identify the problem." But to walk away is not the 9 exercise of ordinary care when you've contracted to 10 protect life and the safety of individuals in a 1 building. 2 Mr. Jackson, as I think you know
thought he had an ingenious idea. He went to a patent lawyer, Mr. McKenna. Mr. McKenna did everything right. He researched it and found out that, in fact, the idea had already been patented. And for some strange reason, Mr. J ackson didn't get it. He thought it was stolen, and he held this grudge for years, apparently, against Mr. McKenna.

But again, he didn't bum-rush the 3rd
Floor and security when he was turned away from the concierge, he turned and went away.

When he was responded to, as the
policies tell you to respond, he didn't get
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the thing that you were charged to protect against is ludicrous.

What were you hired to do? To the extent you entertain any percentage of responsibility for J oseph J ackson, listen to AlliedBarton, put up the first page of the post orders.

They told you nine out of ten times, if they responded correctly, they did what the policy said, the crisis would be averted. 90 percent of the time. They did not do it here. They bear $\mathbf{9 0}$ percent of the responsibility. Should you entertain at all J oseph J ackson and his intentional conduct and attempt to compare it to their negligence.

J oseph J ackson paid the price he should pay. He was held accountable for his vicious criminal acts. AlliedBarton is trying to avoid theirs by pointing to his, the very acts they were hired to protect and guard against. You're smart people. You have heard the evidence.

You will receive an instruction from the Court on proximate cause. J oseph J ackson was the criminal cause. He pulled the trigger that harmed these individuals -- killed these individuals and harmed Ms. Leib.
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But what the law recognizes, and Mr. Power touched upon it, is that multiple things can lead to cause injury and harm. And you will be deciding proximate cause. This is not a criminal case. It's not a criminal case.

MR. PATTON: I object to the argument. It's not the law of proximate cause.

THE COURT: I 'm going to sustain the objection.
Mr. Rogers, you want to rephrase it.
MR. ROGERS: I will, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROGERS: You will receive an instruction about proximate cause. I believe the Court will instruct you "When I use the expression 'proximate cause' I mean a cause that a natural or ordinary cause of events produce the decedents' and plaintiffs' injuries. It need not be the only cause nor the last or nearest cause it is sufficient if it combines with another cause resulting in the injury.

It's the little kid that gets bit by the vicious dog in front of the house because the owner left the gate open. The dog did the biting, but the owner is responsible for securing it, protecting individuals from the vicious dog.

Proximate cause. It need not be the last nor the nearest, it can work in combination with other events. That's the law that I believe the Court will instruct you, and that you all have agreed to follow in deciding the case.

Scenario training, I think we went over it face-to-face. Encounter training was mentioned as described within the contract.

Is it reasonable to expect a security company who commits to protect against -- the protection of life and safety of individuals to do some scenario training with their security officers about what you do if someone comes in and tells you to take them upstairs? Knowing what to do, isn't that what they say they will do as AlliedBarton?

We heard nothing about any scenario training whatsoever that was provided to Mr. Brown, Mr. Chambers or anyone else. Nothing.

Have a duress code. Utilize the Code 10, whatever you have. Do something. I ncoming packages. I ncoming packages, let me point to that and I will move off the topic. "I ncoming and outgoing package instruction."

If you could move to the rest of that
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been an honor and pleasure to represent Ms. Louise Hoover and to represent her family; her son, Allen, and her daughter, Annette. They are good people. They are fine people.

To have someone who works within your profession and trusts you with something as sensitive as this is an awesome responsibility, and I don't take it lightly.

And over the last several years, she has waited for her day in court, like the McKennas, like the Goodsons. And her husband, Allen Hoover, was a heck of a guy. He was a lawyer's lawyer. He reinvented himself at 68 years old -- $\mathbf{6 6}$ years old. I 'm sorry.

And decided he didn't like golf. He didn't want to get out on the links. He loved what he did. And he was going to work and reinvent himself and be that much more engaged.

You heard from his secretary. And trust me, secretaries don't always like the guys they work with, but you heard from Mrs. Murphy, and she testified through the reading of her deposition that he wasn't slowing down, he was working harder, working harder.

Page 120
and go to the next page and highlight Paragraph 8.
Mr. J ackson had refused to cooperate about what is in that bag, the one with his hand in it. And he's suspicious of it.
"Do not attempt to physically
retrain the individual unless lives are endangered."

Brown told you, he was impeached multiple times. He thought J ackson wanted to forcibly go upstairs with a gun and get money. Shouldn't he reasonably know lives are in danger? I think he even admitted that fact. That's exactly when you're authorized to restrain.

Wouldn't we expect a reasonably careful security officer in the exercise of ordinary care who committed to protection of life and liberty (sic) -- and safety to do something.

Your Honor, if I may, I would like to excuse Mrs. Hoover.

MRS. HOOVER: What do you want me to do.
MR. ROGERS: I'm going to talk about your husband.

MRS. HOOVER: Oh, I 'm sorry.
MR. ROGERS: Let me first tell you that it's

When his kids were young, he would bring Annette down with him to work. When the kids got older, he spent his time with Louise at their cabin on the weekends, enjoying his wife and pursuing his passion, the study of law and practice of law.

They paraded someone in here to tell you that Allen Hoover would be done practicing at 71-years-old. The man who told you that was 71-years-old and told you he had two more years to go himself. Allen Hoover, I would suggest to you, was not done at 71.

You heard from Dr. Linke, a professor emeritus from the University of I llinois, he testified to you about Allen Hoover's family's lost income as a result of his death. He told you he projected seven years, that he would work to age 73. And he estimated the lost earnings to Louise Hoover, as a result of her husband's death, $\$ 3,562,593.00$. That's not accounting for benefits and services associated with it. That's just earnings. That's not accounting for increases in his rate or hourly rate.

When you heard the economist who testified in front of you tell you his rate went up
in the last year. And in 2018, he's going to increase his rate even further.

This is just Allen Hoover's salary.
That's what seven years of income, that's what that loss looks like for this family. And that's aside from the noneconomic losses; meaning, we suggest are the most significant losses people sustain with suffering.

Starting with Allen Hoover, himself, as well as Louise, Annette and Allen, J r., Allen Hoover's estate is here representing his injury before death. His injury before death. That claim does not die with him. It is here for you to consider.

You heard testimony about how
Mr. McKenna cried in pain. You heard testimony about how he screamed and moaned. Well, no one witnessed what Allen Hoover went through. No one witnessed it. And his injury was to his neck and he was shot in his neck, he was shot in his neck, the bullet went into his spinal column and paralyzed him. He fell on his face, bruising the bridge of his nose from his glasses, and gradually over the next $\mathbf{5}$ to $\mathbf{1 0}$ minutes, from his paralysis, he lost the ability to move air,
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his ability for his heart to beat, and he slowly gradually lost consciousness and he died. That claim is before you as much as any other claim you are here to decide.

Allen Hoover is here. We are speaking for him, for his injury. For his loss of a normal life, we would ask to you award a figure between 1 and $\$ 2$ million.

For his conscious pain and suffering, we would ask you to award a figure for Allen Hoover between 2 and $\$ 3$ million.

For the emotional distress that Allen
Hoover experienced, we would ask you to award a figure between 3 and $\$ 4$ million.

For the loss of society, that's the loss of the relationship he shared with Allen, J r., and the relationship he shared with Annette, and I would suggest to you, most importantly, the love, care, affection and loss that Louise has sustained. She lost her life partner. She's in her golden years, and she feels burden to ask her son to come and fix something in the house. He has his own life. He has his own family. She feels burdened to need him to bring her downtown because she doesn't know it
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as well as her husband did and he does. She feels burdened such that she doesn't even go to the cabin they shared and went to every weekend. She hasn't gone in the last 10 years.

Allen Hoover had an estimated life
expectancy of just over 17 years. For that 17 years,
I would ask you to award between 17 and $\$ 21$ million.
Thank you for your kind attention.
I 'm sure that you will give my colleagues and the defendants the same kind attention.

When the defendants step up, have them answer questions about why it's acceptable not to do what your post orders say, what your MSO policies say and why you don't have to comply with the very contract you agreed to comply with.

Thank you for your time.
THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.
Everybody doing okay.
Mr. Kotin. Okay.
CLOSI NG ARGUMENT
BY
MR. KOTI N:
May it please this Court, Counsel, Ms. Leib, J ohn, Roger.
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Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm not going to stand here and repeat everything that you just heard. You know this case.

And I 'm of the sense that you're ready to decide this case, but I want to briefly discuss one concept about liability, and then I need to talk to you about Paul Goodson.

Let's look past the conduct of Sidney Chambers and Robert Brown on that day, December 8th.

And let's talk specifically about the negligence of AlliedBarton, the company, the national security services company.

You learned that Officer Robert Brown never graduated high school, and that was a company requirement. Maybe Officer Brown should never have been hired for the security job in the first place.

You heard that Officer Brown failed a test on an important MSO lesson related to issues directly regarding this case. Maybe somebody should have retained him on those issues.

Officer Brown didn't know Code 10.
Maybe someone should have taught him Code 10 or what if Code 10 wasn't the appropriate duress code for this situation, well, then come up with another one;
a different word, a signal, a button on your radio, a silent alarm in the guard's pockets. See, that's all AlliedBarton, Folks.

And what about scenario training, Mr. J enkins, their witness, last Thursday told you "training is paramount," he said. And that includes face-to-face training and scenario training. And our expert Ronald Hauri said the same thing.

It happens in all walks of life. In
Driver's Ed classes, they teach kids what to do when your car is sliding on ice. Firefighters learn how to evacuate people from burning buildings. New pilots learn about crash landings. And they all learn these things praying that the real situation will never happen in real life, but they're prepared to respond to it in case it does.

Now, Folks, this is a giant building. It has a train station at the bottom with $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ commuters everyday, 3,000 tenants up in the high-rise, government offices, law offices.

Is it so unfathomable that there is going to be an angry citizen or an angry client that might show up with a weapon intent on harming somebody upstairs? Of course that's not
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I 'm not going to rehash all of that.
But I kind of like what Ruth Leib told you about her coworker, Paul. She told you that Paul watered the plants and he delivered the mail, and he organized the library. She told you that he put up the Christmas tree every year. Ruth told you that Paul worked part-time just trying to live a full life. He enjoyed flower arranging. He had a real connection with Mr. McKenna because Paul had lived in J apan and both of Mr. McKenna's older sons lived in J apan. And then Ruth described Paul as a lovely, kind and compassionate man. And I think that probably says it all.

Now, I need to talk a little bit about what Paul experienced on that day before he died. And this is not a pleasant conversation. You've heard it before. I suggested to J ohn and to Roger this morning that maybe they want to step out when we talk about this, but they want to be here, and that's their right.

It started, J ackson's first encounter with Paul Goodson, as Ruth Leib told you, in the copy room, when Ruth had been shot in the foot and Mr. Hoover had been shot in the neck. And that's
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when J ackson grabbed Paul and pulled him out of the room. And Ruth told you that she was scared and Paul was scared. That's probably pretty obvious.

You heard Detective Tenton describe the next encounter between J ackson, when Paul was grabbed. And that was in the lobby of wood phillips.

And Paul was grabbed and pulled around the corner before he was shot, it's been so long, you remember I asked Detective Tenton to come down from the witness stand and demonstrate on me how Paul was dragged around the corner.

And then I asked him that silly
question "In your experience, have you seen people experiencing emotional distress in crisis like this?" And he said "Yes." And Paul Goodson was experiencing that distress.

So that ladies and gentlemen, in and of itself, that in and of itself is emotional distress, which is emotional distress which you'll see on the verdict form is line item right here that Paul Goodson is entitled to be compensated for.

But that's not all, because then when Paul was pulled around the corner and he was shot, that's also part of his claim.

Dr. Cogan, the medical examiner.
Again, it's been weeks, right? He was here and he told you that the bullet went through Paul's head on the left side and came out the right side. And he told you that Paul Goodson did not die right away. The stippling on his skin indicated it was a close-range shot, within a couple of inches.

And he explained to you that when he examined Paul's body, he was able to determine what happened before Paul died. He aspirated blood into his lungs and it caused asphyxia, suffocation. He vomited and gastric contents also went into his lungs and caused asphyxia.

Dr. Cogan told you that Paul bit his tongue before he died and that he lost a lot of blood, which indicated to him that his heart continued beating.
"Doctor, would these injuries
cause pain?" "Yes."
And then he added that the asphyxia and the suffocation would also be in his words "be very distressing."
"Based on your years of
experience, Doctor, do you have an
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> opinion as to whether Paul Goodson
might or could have actually felt
pain after the bullet entered his head?
"Yes."
Ladies and gentlemen, when Paul
Goodson was grabbed and pulled and that had to be horrifying. And then he was shot and lived for several minutes before dying. And you know that's not the way it's supposed to end, right?

He was 78 -years-old. He's not a young man. And I suppose that perhaps when a person gets to be that age, they might start thinking about when the end comes. Maybe he would have lived another 8.8 years, which is the life expectancy of Paul, according to the Federal Government. Maybe he would have lived to 103, like his mother. We don't know. But what we do know is that it was not supposed to end this way.

People talk about death, right? And they talk about good deaths. You know, the old man who dies at home peacefully in bed surrounded by his family. I cannot imagine a more opposite way of going than Paul Goodson experienced on that December 8th.

Ladies and gentlemen, for conscious
pain and suffering that Paul experienced that day and for the emotional distress he experienced before he died, I suggest to you $\mathbf{2}$ to $\$ 4$ million would be fair compensation.

Let me change subjects for a minute
and talk about a loss that's easier to contemplate. It's a loss that is easier to contemplate because it's a loss of these men. And you had a chance to meet the men that are involved.

The loss of society experienced by Roger and John Goodson, and even Howard Goodson, for the loss of Paul's life. Here are the Goodsons. You have seen that picture before.

And what is the loss of society?
Well, the Judge is going to read you the instruction the law, which defines loss of society. It's right here. It's a helpful description of what is meant by society. And I could go through this and I could probably try to attach a value to each word that's used as the definition, but I think, in my mind, loss of society really comes down to one word, and that's relationships. The loss of a relationship that these men had with their big brother, Paul.
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Now, you know relationships between siblings, in this case, brothers, is something that is really very special.

Most people don't know another human being as long as they know their brothers and sisters. Think about that. Our parents usually die before we do. Children don't come along until we're older. People don't usually meet their spouses until they're older.

But brothers are together from birth all the way until death, and you just hope that that comes from old age.

Roger told you about his relationship with Paul, how they grew closer in the last years of his life. When Roger retired from the Federal Government after 30-plus years, Paul flew out there to Washington where they had the retirement party.

Roger told you about those annual Goodson and Hale family reunions and how it was terrific when everybody was well and he brought the baked goods and taught Roger to love baking and then he told you how the trips became more unscheduled or more frequent when times got tough or people got sick. Roger called Paul Goodson the family
caregiver.
And it was Paul who arranged that trip just months before he was killed with J ohn and Roger and Paul to fly to California to be with Howard because he was ill.

I asked Roger what he misses most. He told you he misses seeing Paul, but what he really misses is Paul seeing his kids. You have seen this picture. That's Uncle Paul with Rogers kids and Roger's wife. I asked Roger about him. He said, I never had a friend, somebody I associate with, someone I know more than Paul. That's his loss of society.

And then you met John. And J ohn told you about their ritual on every Saturday morning of talking to each other. And he told you about the visits to Uncle Foster at the VA in Milwaukee, about visits to mother and Mary in I ndiana.

He told you how Paul loved to paint.
And how he did that painting or portrait of the church where their dad was the minister. And before Paul died, they presented that painting to the church and it still hangs there.

J ohn told you about his relationship
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with J ohn's kids. Paul's relationship with J ohn's
kid. 66004. The middle is J ohn's daughter J udy with
her son. Paul had a great relationship with her.
And J ohn told you about the visit that he and his wife had to Chicago just six days before Paul was killed. They had coffee and they had lunch and they went to see Paul's office at woods phillips. J ohn told you he cherished that visit because it was the last time he saw his brother.

And then he told you about that strange feeling he had on Friday, December 8th, that he needed to talk to his brother. And that was strange because it was a Friday and not a Saturday. He kept calling and he couldn't reach him. And then finally, at 9:00 o'clock that night, he called Paul's apartment and spoke to a Chicago police officer who broke the news. And then J ohn had to make the calls to his brothers.

He told you how he told his brother Howard, and how Howard broke down. And he told you how hard it was on Howard to cope with the loss of brother during the final nine months of Howard's life.

Now, J ohn finally told you that not a
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day goes by that he doesn't think about his brother, Paul. And he misses not seeing him, but what he really misses is knowing he's not there when he needs him. And that goes back to that caregiver, Paul Goodson. Can't you get a sense of Paul Goodson was and what he meant to this family?

So, Folks, what's the value of the loss of society. What is the value of the loss of this relationship to these men? And we need to acknowledge that these folks were not young. Paul was 78-years-old, and he may have died of old age in the next nine years or maybe not.

But those final years are that much more precious to these folks. And that's probably a hard concept to understand when we are not at that stage of life.

But someone once told me a story about it, which I think does put it in perspective. They said, imagine a little five-year-old boy with an ice cream cone. A big double scoop ice cream cone and that boy is licking away at the ice cream, and it's flying all over the place, he has ice cream on his face and on his shirt. And you say to that five-year-old boy, "Hey, little guy, that ice cream
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looks good. Can I have a lick?" And he'll say, "Sure." But then imagine when he gets down to the very bottom of that cone and there is one little bite left, one little dollop of ice cream left. And if you say to that little boy "Hey, can I have the last bite of your ice cream cone?" "No way."

Such is the final years of a person's life. Such is the final years of a brotherly relationship.

Ultimately, Folks, it's obviously up to you. But I suggest to you that fair compensation for Roger and J ohn and for Howard for those nine months for their loss of society of their brother, Paul, and even the loss of benefits and services, that's the caregiver in Paul, I suggest to you that 7 to $\mathbf{\$ 9}$ million is fair compensation.

On behalf of the Goodson family, thank you so much for your time and attention, not just this morning, but through this entire lengthy trial. The Goodsons look forward to your verdict.

THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel.
Let's break for lunch.
I 'm sorry. J ames, go ahead.
Mr. James Power.

| 1 | CLOSI NG ARGUMENT | 1 | instability caused Ruth stress, but as you heard her |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | BY | 2 | say, life happens. |
| 3 | MR. J AMES POWER: | 3 | You see prior to December 8th, Ruth |
| 4 | May it please the Court, Counsel, Ms. Leib, | 4 | was able to handle the happenings of life. She was a |
| 5 | Mr. Goodsons, Counsel. | 5 | high functioning, highly competent hard worker who |
| 6 | Some buildings offer security while | 6 | was making the best of what she could for herself and |
| 7 | others do not. Some buildings that do offer security | 7 | her children. |
| 8 | employ a single guard to sit behind a desk in the | 8 | Now, there was one aspect of Ruth's |
| 9 | lobby and wave at the familiar faces that come and | 9 | life that served for her outlet when the stress from |
| 10 | go, while others, like the building at 500 West | 10 | her personnel life started to become overwhelming, |
| 11 | Madison, employ numerous guards to staff the lobby | 11 | that aspect was the work she did with Michael |
| 12 | and whose job it is to not only prevent unauthorized | 12 | McKenna. |
| 13 | people from gaining access, but more importantly, to | 13 | As her best friend, Mike was Ruth's |
| 14 | protect the life and safety of those authorized to be | 14 | sounding board. When things at home became |
| 15 | in the building. That was the contract that | 15 | increasingly stressful, as a father himself, Mike |
| 16 | AlliedBarton entered into with the building | 16 | offered advice and guidance as Ruth attempted to |
| 17 | management at 500 West Madison. | 17 | manage the day-to-day aspects of her personal life. |
| 18 | Under that contract, the guards were | 18 | As her employer, the responsibilities |
| 19 | not greeters. They were not doormen. And they | 19 | that Mike had entrusted in Ruth gave her that sense |
| 20 | certainly were not simply friendly faces that could | 20 | of importance and confidence and trust that she |
| 21 | provide direction. They were there for the | 21 | needed. |
| 22 | protection of life. That was the contract | 22 | Also, Mike allowed Ruth to be there |
| 23 | AlliedBarton agreed and entered into, and it was that | 23 | with her children and to take the time off necessary |
| 24 | contract that required them to prevent people exactly | 24 | so she could be a part of her life. Simply put: |
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| 3 | Now, it is important that we discuss | 3 | The confusion for Ruth set in when she |
| 4 | what Ruth Leib went through on that day because it's | 4 | first entered the lobby and was informed by the |
| 5 | what she lives with everyday. | 5 | security officer with the man he was with, J oe |
| 6 | For Ruth, December 8, 2006 was a day | 6 | J ackson, was an old friend of Michael McKenna's and |
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| 20 | have the greatest home life. Her husband's | 20 | set in for Ruth. This was not a drill or a training |
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|  | Page 139 |  | Page 141 |
| $36 \text { (Pages } 138 \text { to 141) }$ <br> SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY <br> (312) 782-4705 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

response to the man who was holding the gun to her head.

As she said, she could not believe this was happening. She could not believe no one had done or was doing anything about it. She complied. She hoped Mike would be able to diffuse the situation, but Mike McKenna never had a chance.

Her best friend, confident, her rock, they held hands as they walked together from the conference room into the lobby. Within seconds Ruth watched as J ackson raised the gun that minutes earlier had been pointed to her own head, and then she watched in terror as this time he pulled the trigger.

She screamed as her best friend, her mentor, her boss fell to the floor. Unable to truly process what she had just witnessed, Ruth stumbled out of the lobby to find a place to hide. When she found a secretarial desk and began to crawl beneath, she sensed a horrible presence behind her.

Words would never adequately express
the horror that she experienced as she turned to find
the presence she felt was that of J ackson was standing over her, pointing the gun at her head.
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Nor could words express the terror she felt as she pleaded with J ackson for her life, to watched as he scanned her body with his gun deciding whether or not she should live or die or whether he should take aim. Then BAM. The pain, the searing pain she felt as the bullet tore through her foot, breaking bones before fragmenting, left as a forever reminder of the horrors that she went through that day.

Then the altered sense of reality that followed, being waved into the docket room by Paul Goodson, where he was hiding with Allen Hoover. The terror as J ackson found her once again, along with the others in their hiding place, and bearing witness to the this catastrophe. Watching Allen paralyzed from J ackson's bullet fell to the floor. No person should ever have to witness the things that Ruth witnessed on that day.

This never should have happened. J oe J ackson should have never made it up to the 38th floor. This never should have happened. If Brown was not prepared to wrestle with Mr. Jackson on the 3rd Floor, then he should not have been working in a building where AlliedBarton had agreed to protect
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life. That's on AlliedBarton.
Understandably, ladies and gentlemen, because of the things she witnessed and went through on that day, Ruth's life was forever altered as a result.

Now, what is PTSD? PTSD relates to how our mind processes and stores memory in life-threatening situations. All human beings have a natural instinct for self-preservation, so when we go through a traumatic experience in which our lives are threatened, our brain ties and creates a powerful connection between the emotions that we felt and our memories of the event.

Now, as you heard Dr. Clayton explain, the memories themselves are not complete memories, but rather stored as fragments of the whole. The fragments become what are referred to, as you heard, triggers.

The triggers could be anything from the smell of a room to the color of a person's T-shirt. These triggers are powerful, however, that the presence of one alone is enough to send that person right back to the place and cause them to experience the same fear, anxiety -- fear, anxiety
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and panic that they went through on the day of the traumatic event as if it was happening again.

Now, for Ruth these triggers can be something as seemingly benign as the elevator doors closing or passing a construction site, where the sounds of a nail gun reminds her of the shooting or someone walking down the street behind her. Every one of these normal occurrences, things me or you would encounter without a second thought, are sufficient to send Ruth into a state of panic.

In addition to the triggers, you heard Ruth experiences what are referred to as intrusive memories. These are memories of the event, which without a moment's notice come flooding back. When this occurs a person is inconsolable. They fall into a state of panic and anxiety over which they have no control.

As you heard, Dr. Clayton explain, the panic attacks caused by these memories are too powerful to be controlled even with medicine. I nstead they have to run their course.

You also heard about the restless
nights and being constantly tired, but only able to get two to three hours of sleep, how Ruth moved from
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bed to couch, hoping that the change of scenery will in some way help to quell the fear and anxiety which otherwise prevents her from getting a full night's rest.

Truly, Ruth's life is now controlled by the events on December 8, 2006. The fear and anxiety resulting from the events on that day limits her from going out and enjoying the world; how her life, what she described as full, has become small, much smaller as a result of this experience.

Now, you also heard about the tinnitus, which she experiences everyday. That's the ringing in the ears.

The ringing in her ears presents itself any time there is no noise present to drowned it out.

You heard this symptom of PTSD for Ruth serves as kind of a fear and anxiety barometer that fluctuates in severity over the course of a day, but is not and will never leave her. Indeed, it is present when she quiets herself when she goes to sleep at night and when she wakes. It is ever present.

It's a way that her mind now copes
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on that day.
Now, not to forget, there is also the inability to concentrate and the memory problems that she now suffers from. You all heard Dr. Kreiner explain prior to the shooting, Ruth was able to fully function competently at the highest levels. She had a remarkable memory. I believe Dr. Clayton described it as a hell of a memory. She could concentrate on a task and maintain focus until it was completed.

Now, a woman who has worked since she was 16 -years-old is unemployed. She can no longer function at the capacity required to perform the job she was trained to do. And one can imagine how frustrating that can be.

Now ladies and gentlemen, I could go on about all of the issues both mentally and physically that Ruth now suffers as a result of what happened on the 38th floor, but I 'm confident that you have heard all the evidence and recognize the significance of the evidence.

Simply put, in the past 11 years,
there has not been a single day that has gone by in which the memories or experiences from that day have not reared its ugly head in one form or another,
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with the trauma by attempting to protect herself. As you heard Dr. Clayton explain, it's an ever present and constant reminder of the threats of the gun shots, the trauma she experienced. It serves to keep her hypervigilant and alert, so at least in her mind, no one else can harm her.

You also heard about the depression that stems not only from the fact that she witnessed these horrible events, but that which comes from the guilty feels from leading Mike out from the conference room. That's something she lives with everyday.

The idea that she is somehow responsible for Mike's death because she retrieved him after J ackson pointed a gun within inches of her head and demanded that she get him at the explicit threat of death. The guilt she feels, asking the question, "Why did I live while the others died?"

There is no answer to that question other than the reassurance that this was not her fault.

But the pain, the unimaginable burden that she carries feeling that responsibility remains constant. She can never forget how helpless she was
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whether it is the tinnitus, the intrusive memories, the panic, the pain, the cramping that she feels in her foot, these are all conditions that she has lived with and will continue to live with everyday for the rest of her life. They will be ever present and will never leave her.

Now, you will be asked to return a verdict. And if you choose to return in favor of Ms. Leib, there will be four categories of damages. First is loss of normal life. That's loss of normal life experienced in the past and reasonably certain to be experienced in the future. This includes the loss of her best friend. The loss of the stability that her work provided, the memory loss, the living everyday with the ringing in her ears, the small world which she described as her house, the three-block-away coffee shop and the grocery store that she's now confined to. The inability to concentrate and focus, the panic attacks.

For loss of normal life, we would ask that you would return a verdict of 1 to $\$ 2$ million.

For the pain and suffering experienced in the past and reasonably certain to be experienced in the future, this includes the pain, not only from
the day of the occurrence, but the six months in which she was nonweightbearing on her foot, the $\mathbf{3 0}$ to 50 pieces of shrap metal that remain to this day and will forever remain in her foot and the cramping she testified she experiences in her foot.

For the pain and suffering, we ask
that you return a verdict between 600 and $\$ 800,000$.
Now, for the emotional distress
experienced in the past and reasonably certain to be experienced in the future, this includes the posttraumatic stress, the fear, the anxiety that comes as a result, the depression, the loss of hope,
as well as the guilt, the survivor guilt, that
question she lives with everyday "Why did I live
while the others died?"
For the emotional distress, we ask
that you return a verdict between 4 and $\$ 5$ million.
And, finally, for the lost earnings.
You heard Ms. Ruth (sic) testify that she was making
less -- when she was working for Mr. McKenna, she was making approximately $\$ 50,000$ a year for the years of tax returns that have been admitted into evidence.

The evidence shows that in 2009, she was making less than $\mathbf{\$ 2 0 , 0 0 0} 2010$ to 2013 , she made
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Thank you for your time.
THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. Okay. It's ten to 1:00. Let's that lunch break till ten to 2:00. Okay.
(Whereupon, a lunch recess was taken.)
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