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(The following proceedings were held in
open court in the presence of the jury:)
THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. Welcome back, everybody.

Mr. Galvin, you may proceed.
MR. GALVIN: Thank you, your Honor.
There are several points $I$ want to make. And this is the opportunity that we get to lay out for you, ladies and gentlemen, what the evidence will show, what the claims are and what the evidence will show.

First I want to respond to some issues that were raised this morning, and let me do that by first pointing out to you this here. This here is a simple timeline that goes from 2002 to 2012.

Some of the documents you were shown and some of the issues that you were told about regarding the brake override system all arose in the 2009 to 2012 time frame related to a recall that was up there for about 12 or 13 minutes.

This vehicle was not part of that recall. The 2001 to 2006 Camry was not part of the recall. It was not involved in
the floor mat issues. That document -- and it's undisputed that this document was not part of the recall.

This vehicle as a 2002 to 2006 Camry was first designed in 1998, first came out in 2001. And from that point forward to 2002 went through iterative changes, but it was a different generation. This is the time period.

There's another point that needs to be made. And the facts are going to be in this case that this is not a stuck pedal case. It's not a stuck pedal case. It's a stuck -alleged stuck foot case. And I'll get into more of that in a few moments.

With respect to the brake override system, we will get into in more detail about the brake override system and what Toyota had and what Toyota didn't have, but the idea that the brake is the boss, $B-O-S-S$, is just simply wrong. Using this 3-D model that Mr. Mardirossian showed you, the boss in the car is the driver. The driver is the one who controls the vehicle; the driver is the one who makes decisions about what the vehicle does.

In this case there was 13 seconds where Mrs. Uno was the boss, and she stepped on the gas 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, $6,5,4,3,2,1$, and she impacted the first pole. She was the boss, not the brake.

The brake override system only works in specified certain circumstances and doesn't work otherwise. It does not work if the gas pedal is not jammed down and not moving. It doesn't move if you don't press the brake. It doesn't work if you're pumping the brake or moving the brake pedal back and
forth. You've got to put your foot on the brake, you have to apply the brake, and you have to keep your foot there.

This is a functionality that has a limited scope of circumstances when it works, and none of those circumstances occurred in this crash.

You were shown some advertising about the vehicle. The 2006 Toyota Camry is a safe vehicle, and it was a safe vehicle, and it was a good vehicle.

For 2006 it had a five star rating, a NHTSA five star rating. It was number one in the J.D. Power; it was best rating in J.D. Power Associates' Initial Quality award for the midsized car segment. It got the Automotive Loyalty award from R.L. Polk for the 2006 midsized car.

So for those agencies that took the vehicles, evaluated them and looked at them, this vehicle did well. Our advertising was correct. It's safe. Whether it's sexy or not is in the eye of the beholder.

There are a number of key issues that $I$ think we need to discuss, and the first is what are we doing here.

This is a case that -- the case here, the claim that brought us here, ladies and gentlemen, is that somehow when Mrs. Uno's vehicle was struck by the Bello vehicle, that somehow her foot got stuck behind the brake pedal and it was partially on the gas pedal.

And then for over a half a mile and 35 or so seconds, it was like that and she was trying to allegedly step on the brake, and she couldn't stop the vehicle.

Plaintiffs' own experts who will come here and testify
said that if the foot wasn't stuck in the first place, there is no case. The whole case requires you to first believe the evidence that there would be a stuck foot in this circumstance.

In this case plaintiffs just can't say what could have happened. They have to prove it. They have to prove more likely than not under the instructions that the Court will give you that the foot was stuck and then everything else that follows. That's their burden.

If they can't prove the foot was stuck under their own witnesses' testimony, there is no case. Because their case relies on a stuck foot.

So the first key point is can the foot get stuck. Can Mrs. Uno's size six, double $X$ wide foot get stuck the way the plaintiffs say? And the answer to that is, no, it cannot. The evidence will be it cannot.

There is plenty of room in that foot well for feet. The geometry and the spacing between the pedals is just fine. It's not going to cause the foot to get stuck. There is nothing down there to stick the foot.

There is nothing to stick the foot. There is nothing to get it stuck. And I'll show you what the evidence will be there.

And with respect to the injuries on the foot that you saw, it was difficult to see them all, but the right foot of Mrs. Uno was severely injured. She had massive injuries as you would expect if you go sideways into a tree at 54 miles per hour.

But the reason her foot was damaged and injured the way it was, because it is over and on the gas pedal when the vehicle went, driver's side leading, into the pepper tree.

The driver's side of the vehicle where the driver sits was crushed so much that it was pushed into the passenger's side. And her foot was grabbed by the crush and crushed in there. Her left foot was not. And we'll show you why.

So let me first show you this. What this is, this is a photograph, a blown-up photograph, of a model who has the same sized foot as Mrs. Uno had.

And so what she has -- what we did is we put her in an exemplar vehicle like you saw before, a similar vehicle, '06 Camry, and we put mirrors down there so you could see all around; you could see all around, you could see under the pedals and so forth.

We said put your foot on the gas the way you would put your foot on the gas.

What you'll notice -- first of all, can everyone see this okay?

What you'll notice is that for this model with flip-flops on, her heel is on the floor as you would drive a vehicle. Her heel is on the floor, and her foot is on the gas pedal. And that's the normal driving position for someone the same size and weight, basically, as Mrs. Uno. This is the size six foot, double $X$, in a Camry in a normal driving position.

What I'm pointing to here, here is the foot on the gas pedal. Here's the brake pedal. If you look here where the
mirror is, you can see the bottom of the gas -- you can see the gas pedal where the flip-flop is on it and you can see part of the brake pedal but not very much of it.

So that is the normal position. You're driving along. Your foot is on the gas. That is the way your foot is going to be.

Now, the evidence is that the plaintiffs' hypothesis is that when this vehicle was hit by the Bello vehicle, that the heel stayed where it was on the ground and that the top of the foot moved over. And there's problems physics-wise with that that we'll talk about when we get to that part of the impact, but the heel stays on the ground, and the top part moves over. That's what their expert says. That is what their evidence will be.

This is a photograph of the same model putting her foot in the position that the plaintiffs say is the, quote, stuck foot position.

So what the model did was, looking at the plaintiffs' expert's photographs like what you saw, she moved her foot so the top -- her toes were behind the brake pedal and her heel was over on the gas to duplicate the hypothesized, imagined position that the plaintiffs' experts have said that Mrs. Uno's foot was in as she was driving her half a mile, 35 seconds or so.

So this is the, quote, unquote, stuck foot position. What you need to know here is that the mirror is down here. In order for this person with the size six foot to get their foot into that stuck foot position, they needed to raise
their foot off the ground and hold the foot in that position pulling their toes against the back of the brake.

If you want, you can flex your ankle and you can either press on the gas pedal or not press on the gas pedal.

In this, quote, stuck foot position that the plaintiffs propose, the foot's not stuck. Because there's nothing holding it there other than the purpose of holding your leg up in the air.

So what you need to do, if your foot is down here with your heel on the floor, you have to lift your foot up, rotate it like this. Your right side rear end comes off the seat. Your hip moves, and you have to hold it there. Because there is nothing on the brake pedal or gas pedal that is holding it. You have to hold it this way.

There is nothing that's holding the foot there. The models that you see are keeping their leg levitated in that position.

The evidence, according to the plaintiffs, is that this is a brake pedal from an '06 Camry. The evidence is that when the foot gets behind the brake pedal here, the thongy thing on the flip-flop somehow catches on this rubber edge that comes over the pad of the brake pedal.

The brake pedal is steel. This is a rubber pad that fits on the steel plate that you press against. It fits on sort of like a Tupperware top on a food container. It has a lip, and you kind of put it on, pressure it on.

The plaintiffs' theory is that the foot is caught somehow on here due to this, due to this lip edge.

You'll hear that the plaintiffs' experts can't really describe what it is that catches it. They just say, well, this little edge that flips over caught the foot. But the problem with that and the evidence will show that it doesn't catch the foot. It doesn't catch it.

They're not claiming that the flip-flop did this on her foot. They're not claiming that anything like this happened. They're claiming that the foot and the flip-flop got behind the brake and the rubber lip that goes over the steel catches it.

It doesn't happen. It didn't happen. That's what the evidence will show.

With respect to the gas pedal, there's nothing on the gas pedal that is going to hold the foot in that position, nothing. The gas pedal moves up and down. The weight of a foot like Mrs. Uno's would press on the gas pedal.

So if your foot is here and you press on the gas pedal, it's going to fall to the ground. That's gravity. It's been around for a long time.

The only way you can create a, quote, unquote, stuck foot position that the plaintiffs hypothesize is that if you hold your foot in that position.

To show you an example of the amount of room in that area for someone with a foot the same size and shape as Ms. Uno, we have a video to demonstrate, and you'll see more of that in this trial.

Bill, can you show that? And don't forget, it's no audio.

So let me show what you're going to see. What you're going to see is same model in the same vehicle, and the point is to move the foot around, show you can get in between the brake and the gas, move it around the pedals, pull it out, and then to put it in this, quote, stuck foot position, press on the brake and show you what happens.

So, Bill, can you please?
(Video played.)
MR. GALVIN: Can you play it back and stop when it goes into the stuck foot position?

What you just saw is that there is plenty of room down there. There is plenty of room. There is nothing that is going to catch on the back of -- nothing on the brake that will catch the foot. The gas pedal moves. There is nothing that is holding the foot there.

What you'll also see, that in order to put it into the position -- stop it, Bill -- they have to lift the foot up. The person has to purposely -- I'm sorry, Mr. Brisco.

Bill, rerun it, please.
MR. BERRY: This monitor is off.
MR. GALVIN: It's on. Are you running it?
Okay. Stop it.
The point I want to direct your attention to and what the evidence will show is that in order to get the foot into this levitated, held-up, allegedly stuck position, this person who has the same size foot as Mrs. Uno has to lift her foot up.

It doesn't go up there by itself. The evidence will
show there is no forces in this crash that will cause the foot to levitate up. There is no forces in this crash that is going to cause the foot to be held there for a mile distance in 35 seconds.

And there is no reason why an alert driver couldn't control this vehicle and move their foot around down here.

If $I$ said a mile, correction, it's a half a mile.
So the plaintiffs did testing, and you're going to see that. That is going to be in the evidence.

And the plaintiffs' own testing shows that this is not a stuck pedal case. Plaintiffs' testing shows that -- and this is Mr. Hannemann. Plaintiffs' testing shows this vehicle could have been stopped in this accident scenario, and it's going to show that the brake pedal and the gas pedal don't stick the foot. It's not a stuck foot case.

What we've got here is we've got some snippets, some runs from Mr. Hannemann's test. So let me show you -- first of all, this is a test to show you -- he prepared this and provided it to us in discovery, in deposition, to show us the scenario that he believes occurred that he says the foot stuck, the pedals are stuck, and that when you pump the brake, you can't get your foot out.

What you're going to see is you can remove your foot; that he's manipulating the test because he's pressing on the gas to make it look like the vehicle is going faster and that there is not a relationship between pumping on the brake and on the gas.

So let's watch this first.
(Video played.)
MR. GALVIN: Simply stated, if your foot is in that position, you can get your foot out. You simply take your foot out. It's not hard.

Now, he obviously has bigger feet than Mrs. Uno, and he obviously doesn't have to levitate it off the ground and hold it there, but the point is it shows you can remove your foot from that position.

Next one, Bill.
What you're going to see -- what you're going to see, it went too fast. What you're going to see here is the plaintiffs' expert is going to tell you she was stepping on the brake and there was no evidence to that effect. And because she was stepping on the brake, she couldn't get her foot from this stuck position.

What this will show you is that that's not true. Even their own testing shows the foot, while you're pumping the brake, comes out on their own testing. All right.
(Video played.)
MR. GALVIN: You'll notice that the gas pedal moves because the foot is moving. The gas pedal is not stuck. This is in slow motion.

See, the foot comes out. He sticks it back in, tries to press on the brake again. The gas pedal comes down, his foot comes out, and he pushes it back down in there. It's not a stuck pedal.

Pause it.
This next one here, the evidence will be when you hear
these experts, they'll say, well, when the foot is in this, quote, stuck position, when you press on the brake, that makes the gas go faster because the foot is connected to the brake and therefore hitting the gas and so it's pushing the gas down.

And here's this information from the test that proves this point. That is what this witness is going to say to you, ladies and gentlemen.

What this will show you is if you put your foot in that position, you can cause the gas pedal to be pressed just by rotating your angle or you can cause the gas pedal not to be pressed by not rotating your ankle.

You can dictate whether you're on the gas or not. It just depends how you move your ankle.

And the evidence will be in this case, even from plaintiffs' expert, that Mrs. Uno had a normal ankle.

So what this will show you is that in his test he purposely pressed the gas down to make it look like in a stuck position the gas is going faster. But, in fact, what the evidence is is that he did it on purpose.

What you want to look for is what his foot does on the gas pedal before he steps on the brake.
(Video played.)
MR. GALVIN: What you saw is that he stepped on the gas first.

Run it again, please.
He steps on the brake, holds the gas down, and then he pumps. Of course the vehicle is going to go fast. He stepped
on the gas.
The pedal is not stuck, ladies and gentlemen. It's moving. It's moving with his foot just the way it's designed. What you're going to see here is another example where he pushes the gas pedal down to get it going, puts it under the brake, and then pumps the brake, suggesting that the reason the vehicle is going faster is because he's pumping on the brake, but, in fact, he already has the vehicle going.

So the question is is the foot stuck? No, the foot is not stuck. There is plenty of room there. There is nothing to stick it, nothing to catch it. These pedals move, and they move the way they're designed to move, and plaintiffs' own testing shows that.

Now, with respect to the injuries to the foot, let me talk about those a little bit.

There was significant crush in this car, and we'll get to the accident reconstruction in a minute.

But what's important to point out is that this vehicle hit the pepper tree at 54 miles an hour, driver's side leading. That is a very serious, significant side impact for any vehicle. As a result of that, there was significant damage to the vehicle.

What this exhibit is here, it's an overhead shot of Mrs. Uno's vehicle.

This is her car. This is the print from the tree. This is where she hit the tree.

The damage to the vehicle pushed the whole side of the vehicle in. So basically parts of it were over on the
passenger side. The driver's side turns into the passenger side.

And when it did that, it pushed all the components -the seat, the pedals, the steering wheel -- with it.

So what this is -- and I'll show you a more simplified version on the screen in a second.

But, first of all, what this is is down here is an outline of an undamaged 2006 Camry right here showing the driver's seat, the console, the parking brake handle, the pedals, the brake and accelerator pedal, the foot well area.

So that's for a reference point. This is undamaged, no accident vehicle outline. It's in gray so that when you look at this one here, you see how you compare the damaged one to the non-damaged one.

This red one up here, the red line up here is an outline of Mrs. Uno's damaged vehicle. The experts go and measure it with all kind of fancy stuff. So they're able to very accurately identify what the damage is, how much damage there is.

And what this is here, ladies and gentlemen, is the as-damaged outline of the vehicle identifying various components that were moved in the crush.

So there is the console box, you know, the top, the little armrest cover that is on the console. There is the seat belt buckle that is on the right-hand side of the seat, the seat belt buckle.

Here's the parking brake handle that is right here. The steering wheel is right here, this yellow thing. Then we
have the brake right here, the accelerator pedal right here, and the pad that is beside the accelerator pad on the tunnel. So these are the pedals.

So this is after the crash is over, after the vehicle is up against the tree, where everything is. It shows how it all moved, how it all was crushed in there.

To get an idea of how that compares to an undamaged vehicle, you then take the gray outline of the undamaged vehicle and put it on top of this outline of the damaged vehicle to get an idea how did all this stuff move.

Here's the undamaged parts. Here's the damaged parts.
You can see that this steering wheel went from here to here, here to here, here to here.

The console cover, you know, where you put your arm, went from here to here, here to here.

And the pedals went from here, purplish pink colors here, pedals from here to here, from here to here, from here over to here.

The evidence will be when the pedals moved that way, the whole floor pan was crushing that way.

You have to understand that Mrs. Uno was sitting in this seat and her right foot was down on the gas pedal -- on the gas pedal. When the crush came in, it grabbed her foot and pulled it or pushed it over towards the passenger side.

Her upper body, because of the way the laws of physics work, is wanting to go out the door. Because she's hitting the tree. The car is hitting the tree at her door, and so she's going to want to go that way, and the crush of the floor
pan has taken her foot that way.
So that's why she got the injury she got. She got that injury when the vehicle crashed into the tree.

She's here with her right foot at the accelerator pedal. Her left foot is back here. The crush comes in. The brake pedal is moving from here to here. The gas pedal is moving from here to here. Her foot is caught by this whole structure that is moving in this massive crush.

Her torso is coming this way so the legs are going this way. She's going this way.

And her left foot is back here, and it's pushed with the crush in behind her right foot here. Her left foot had no injuries to it. Her left foot was essentially protected. It rode the wave of crush behind her right foot. Her right foot was in the area of the pedals.

That's how Mrs. Uno got those severe injuries to her right foot.

The evidence is going to show that there was no stuck foot, ladies and gentlemen. There was no stuck foot in this case. There was no stuck foot to be under the brake, to be pressed on by the left foot that then pressed on the gas pedal. It didn't happen.

Now, the second key point that I want to discuss is the evidence -- you're going to look at the evidence of her overall behavior over the course of this accident path to determine what happened. Because that's part of what your job is.

You're going to see evidence of her overall behavior
starting from before the Bello crash, through the Bello crash, over to the other side of the street where she turned right and went the wrong way, hit two poles, went across the median, went on to the next median, hit a small tree, ultimately hit the big tree.

When we -- when you look at that -- and you have to look at it. When you look at a crash case like this, you look at the environment, you look at the vehicle, and you look at the driver. You look at all three of those things.

So let's first look at what's happening at 23 rd Street at the Bello accident.

This is a blowup of the 23rd Street intersection where the Bello accident occurred out on Euclid. And what the evidence is going to be -- can you guys see?

There's a lot that we don't know from this point up. Because there are no witnesses. She was home alone when she left on this trip.

We don't know whether when she did the drive you saw this morning that she hit every curb on the way down or not. There is no witnesses about what happened during that drive.

What we know relative to what you're here to decide, ladies and gentlemen, is that at this point she was struck by the Bello vehicle. At this point we know that at this point we have a vehicle that is on a road that has a 45-mile-per-hour speed limit and she's going down the road and Mrs. Bello comes out and impacts the left side of the Uno vehicle.

We know when that impact occurs that Mrs. Uno is going

28 to 31 miles per hour. We know that by engineering reconstruction of this accident. And those speeds are really not in dispute. There's really no dispute about that.

So the plaintiffs' stuck foot theory requires, as a foundational point, that her foot be on the gas, that her foot is starting on the gas. There's no evidence that her foot is on the gas at this point one way or the other.

What we know is we have a 45-mile-per-hour speed limit and she's going 28 to 31 when she gets hit.

We know there is some angle to where she is here to here.

She's struck, and the vehicle rotates around about 160 degrees to this location, and it makes tire marks on the road when it does that.

We know that it does it at about 98 degrees a second. So it's a pretty fast spin.

The experts -- all the experts agree that Mrs. Uno's vehicle was stopped after this impact after it stopped rotating. It stopped; then it started going again.

With respect to Mrs. Bello, the evidence this morning -- you were told there was evidence that Mrs. Bello looked up and didn't see it. Mrs. Bello, after her accident -- after this accident, was attending to her daughter and then at some point looked up and this Uno vehicle was gone.

She doesn't know and doesn't remember how long she was attending to her daughter. So in terms of this, quote, quick Mrs. Uno took off, there is no evidence of that. You have to
decide what the evidence is. But as of now, there is no witness that labels a time of how long a time Mrs. Uno was stopped here.

What we know is this vehicle came to a stop and eventually got over here.

So Mrs. Uno drove away from this end position. The first thing -- she left the scene of this accident. The question is why.

She left the scene of the accident, and even
plaintiffs' own experts -- Mr. Hannemann, who you talked about, says that it's his opinion that she drove away from the accident and she went on $23 r d$ Street. She went up and made one right turn, made another right turn, and then started driving south in the northbound lane.

He said he did calculations to determine what her speed was. And what he said was that when she drove away, she got to a point that was 230 feet beyond this intersection on the straightaway here, and from here to here, she got her vehicle up to 36 miles per hour, 36 miles per hour right there.

The evidence is not going to be that she accelerated away from here.

And his opinion is that he will tell you that she did not step on the brake in any of this area. There is no braking by Mrs. Uno in any of this area.

That's plaintiffs' own expert. His evidence will be that the vehicle came to a stop, she started going, she drove, and she got on the straightaway going the wrong way down the street.

Why? There is no acceleration. From here to here, getting to 36 miles an hour is not acceleration.

When she made this turn -- you're also going to hear from the witnesses, the Wunsches, and when they saw the vehicle, Mr. Wunsch says it was going fast. They have different speeds. I'll let them speak for themselves. It was 50, 60, but they couldn't say for sure.

But they say when they saw the vehicle, the speed it was going, she couldn't have made the turn that way.

Plaintiffs' own experts has it at 36 miles an hour, 230 feet down the road.

This vehicle could have been stopped if someone wanted to stop it. If it was stopped here, you could have turned the key off and gotten out. That's what the evidence would be because there is nothing wrong with the vehicle.

The evidence would also be that there were not other cars in this intersection. There is no evidence in this case, ladies and gentlemen, that there were other cars in this intersection, anything coming this way, going that way, other than Mrs. Bello who pulled over up here.

So there is no evidence that Mrs. Uno turned this way to avoid kids on bikes like you were told.

This is at 23rd Street. The evidence will be that this is where the vehicle was hit by Bello, stopped, and then Mrs. Uno drove away.

Even plaintiffs say there is no braking in here.
Plaintiffs have another expert who will say that, well, I saw a tire mark, and I think that may be evidence that she
was accelerating away.
This here, these red marks you see on this diagram are the tire marks that were caused by the Uno vehicle when it was rotating around, coming to its point of rest after it was hit by the Bello vehicle, these red marks right here.

These things circled in orange are just pieces of the cars that were involved that came off.

This purple mark right here is the tire mark that the plaintiffs' expert Mr. Hille says, well, I think that might be evidence that she accelerated away.

The evidence is, ladies and gentlemen, that it isn't and it can't be. Because this mark is nowhere near where the vehicle ended up after it was hit and rotated around. The vehicle is not anywhere near this mark. This mark is the wrong size and the wrong location and the wrong dimension.

On top of that, plaintiffs' other expert says the vehicle drove away and got up to 36 miles per hour.

The 36 miles per hour is not the rapid acceleration, it's not the car taking off on you, but it's technically speaking acceleration because you're stepping on the accelerator. She was purposely driving away from the scene of the accident.

That is at the scene. So now I want to focus you on what happened as the vehicle went down the road, what the evidence will be.

No. It stops here. A half mile is a long way on a diagram.

THE COURT: Can all the jurors see?

JUROR RODRIGUEZ: It's kind of hard to see the far end. MR. GALVIN: You know what I'll do? I'll move it down and then move it.

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Why don't I just come over here and you don't have to worry about blocking me.

MR. GALVIN: That's fine.
You guys tell me when to stop.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Stop.
MR. GALVIN: Okay. So we left off at the intersection of 23rd. Okay?

This is -- just so we have orientation, do you see this little car right here? It's right here. So it's the front of it just sticking out there. So it's just basically a
continuation. It's a different skill level.
So from this point, the 230 -foot mark on a straightaway going the wrong way down North Euclid, up until this point right here is a long way. And in this distance there were witnesses that drove by Mrs. Uno.

She started driving down the road. She was always in this lane right here, the number one lane, and there were people that drove by her.

Some people didn't look back so they didn't see whether she had brake lights. Some people looked and said they didn't see brake lights, but they didn't remember one way or the other. Some people said they didn't see brake lights. They would have remembered maybe if they did, but they weren't sure, but there's a mixed bag.

Witnesses see different things, remember different
things.
From this point forward all the way down to here, to this point here, there's nothing on the road. All we have is what the witnesses say as she was driving by them.

What we have is witnesses that describe a vehicle that is going faster and faster over time, faster and faster over time.

They don't describe a vehicle that's got screeching brakes. They don't describe a vehicle that's slowing down. They describe a vehicle that is speeding up.

And when you go -- say in this area -- and I'm just being general. I'm not giving the specifics, but about in this area, there was another car in this number one lane. And Mrs. Uno was driving directly at that car, and that car moved over.

Where that happened was about 13 seconds from where the vehicle first hit the first utility pole which is down here. In that time frame, if you stepped on the gas, you could get to that telephone pole and be 80 to 90 miles per hour.

Up until that point, people had been moving out of her way or she was driving by them. And that driver, Marjan Whyte, was there, but she was directly in the same lane. She moved over. Mrs. Uno went past her, and she kept going.

Then what happened is as Mrs. Uno kept driving down here is where -- can you guys see it down there?

Let me explain it. Then I'll move it.
Right here is where we see the first evidence on the roadway of something going on with this vehicle and this
driver.
The vehicle goes off the road to the right. Right here the road gets a little narrower, and the vehicle comes down here, goes off the road. Then it hits the first pole right here.

Where it goes off the road is about roughly four seconds from the final impact with the tree. Where it hit the telephone pole is roughly 3.2 seconds from hitting the big tree.

After the first pole, it comes down. It hits the second pole.

The first pole did significant damage to the right front, the right-front suspension, blew out the tire.

She kept driving. She hits pole number 2. She hits the first pole at 80 to 90 miles per hour. She hits the second pole at 73 to 82 miles per hour.

And the second pole, she hits it further back on the car. That causes the rear end of the car to ricochet out into the road like that.

So now the vehicle is now even more out of control and the rear end is swinging out to the left and the front is swinging around to the right.

When it does that, the tires are making marks on the road, and then the vehicle continues straight, goes across the median into the other median at 21 st street, hits a small pepper tree, and then impacts with the big pepper tree. And that's the final impact.

At the second pole, she's going 73 to 82 , as $I$ said.

When she comes off of the pole and hits the curb here, she's going about 72 to 80 miles per hour.

The vehicle is continuing. It gets to the curb here at 21st Street, and it's going about 70 miles per hour.

When it hits the small tree, it's going about 64 to 68 miles per hour.

Then it hits the big tree at 54.
We know it hit the tree at 54 because we mathematically did a reconstruction of this. And we also ran a test of a Camry into a tree similar to this, a man-made tree similar to this, to compare the damage. That was the purpose of that test.

Is it okay?
Okay. From 23rd Street all the way up to here, nothing on the road. Just people where she's driving by.

Here is the first evidence of the vehicle in this crash, in the events of the crash, where the right side was off the road.

She goes off the road, impacts pole number 1 does damage to the right front of the vehicle. The vehicle keeps going.

In this damage, as I said, she blows up a tire; the suspension is totally decimated. She keeps going. She keeps going.

She hits pole number 2. She goes from 89 miles an hour -- 80 to 90 is the first pole -- to 73 to 82 at the second pole.

The second pole causes the rear end of the vehicle --
the impact causes the rear end of the vehicle to ricochet out onto the road which causes the vehicle not to be tracking, but now it's going partially sideways down the road.

So from the outside, if anybody is looking at it and you're down here, it will look like the vehicle is turning right.

The vehicle then continues down, and it is rotating. And it continues down, goes into the median, hits a small pepper tree, and then hits a large pepper tree.

There is no evidence of braking in this area on the road. The tracks, the marks on the road are what are called yaw marks from the vehicle rotating and the tire laying down marks as it's going along the road.

The vehicle is not going straight and rolling. It's -the rear end is out, and the front end is over, and it's making those marks.

These marks are not from pulling up the parking brake. They are from the vehicle rotating on the road and going to its final impact with the tree.

So what we see in this accident is the vehicle going progressively faster and faster, going off the road down here, impacting a pole, and the accident has already started.

So this blue mylar starts at pole number 1. This is where the accident is happening. This is the accident.

When this pole impact occurs, the accident has happened. This is the rollout.

Anything that happens in here is not going to dictate what happens here, generally speaking.

The evidence will be from the witnesses about that. It's too late. When you're in this blue zone, it's too late. The vehicle is going too fast. The vehicle is out of control. There's no control of the vehicle at this point. It's impacting the pole, yawing around, coming down here.

This is the area. Pole number 1 is the area where generally Ms. Peeples was. It's also the general area where Mr. Ensberger was.

Ms. Peeples said she saw the brake light go on, go off, go on, go off. Mr. Ensberger said he didn't see the brake lights. He followed the vehicle; he watched it all the way down. He's adamant that he didn't see brake lights at all.

In fact, in his deposition, if anyone said they saw brake lights, it couldn't be true. Because he watched the vehicle, specifically watched the vehicle, and he didn't see it.

That's an issue that you, ladies and gentlemen, will have to decide. But as you factor that in, the evidence is going to be that what is described by Ms. Peeples as brake on, brake off, brake on, brake off wouldn't have made any effect in this area. This accident has already happened. The vehicle is already out of control. It's on its way to impact with the big pepper tree. If you're in the blue, you're in trouble.

This is where those two witnesses were. They weren't all up in here.

Ms. Peeples was driving past her at pole number 1 and had rocks and stuff thrown up on her car. The other guy was
trying to pull out of a driveway -- but ultimately, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to be the ones to decide what happened. That's why we need to focus on this accident, the facts of this accident.

The witness is Mr. Epperson, not Ensberger. Ensberger was further down.

So those are the facts of what happened in this accident. We have someone who is impacted up at 23rd Street, leaves the scene of the accident, makes two right turns, progressively goes faster and faster the wrong way down the road, so why is that?

We know it's not a stuck foot. We know there is no evidence that it could be a stuck foot. That's not possible. There has to be some explanation for this odd, unusual behavior.

So the evidence will be, ladies and gentlemen, that this is a case of simple driver's error, driver's error.

This is a case of pedal misapplication. Pedal misapplication is not some new phenomena that has just been developed. It's been around for a long time. It was studied in 1986, 1988, 1989, '99, 2004, and then again in 2012.

It's not a fabrication. It actually happens.
Pedal misapplication is when someone, for whatever reason, intends to step on one pedal and steps on the opposite pedal. There are situations where pedal misapplication happens.

The situation, the factors of relevance here are distracted drivers and unexpected events, both of which we
have here.
We have a driver that's obviously distracted going the wrong way down the road, and we have a driver that encounters an unexpected event going down the road the wrong way and also having a car coming right at them in their own lane of travel.

There are driver characteristics, ladies and gentlemen, that are known to be associated with pedal misapplication. Among them are cognitive impairments, someone who has a problem in their head. Among them are shorter-statured people.

We have the situational factor here when we look at this accident, and we have the driver characteristics.

The trial is the last sort of event in an investigation like this. So before that there is investigation. We look at the facts. And we've been doing that for three and a half years.

So looking at this accident scenario, trying to understand what happened, knowing that we have events going on here that don't make sense, we looked at Mrs. Uno. It's natural. It's part of the process. It's part of the investigative approach, the environment, the vehicle, the driver.

And when this accident happened, in fact, when the police officers spoke to the family, he spoke to Jeffrey Uno, and Jeffrey Uno volunteered to this officer that his mother had a blood sugar of 83 about a month before this accident and had confusion.

You're going to hear that. You'll hear it on the
stand.
But I want to be complete. He also said to the driver -- to the officer, but it didn't affect her driving.

So we looked at Mrs. Uno's health, and she had diabetes for quite some time. We looked at her medical records. She had diabetes. She had non-alcoholic cirrhosis that was related to the diabetes. She had hepatic encephalopathy as well.

And we looked at what was going on with her blood sugars knowing that there are symptoms that are associated with hypoglycemia of confusion and forgetfulness.

Seeing, within her own medical records, reports of confusion and forgetfulness, seeing in her records that her diabetes was not in control, she was not in control, knowing that before this accident her medication had been changed -and you heard that this morning. She was now on insulin -looking at that, looking at what her son said to the officer, we went and talked to her doctor.

What her doctor told us in the deposition, she looked at the records of blood sugar, and she said Mrs. Uno was out of control; that had she known of the swings in the blood sugar, she would have had her come in and would have changed her medication. She was on insulin that was causing her to be hypoglycemic.

And the instructions to Mrs. Uno, according to the doctor, were keep track of this, call me to let me know what's going on. And there were no records of any call from Mrs. Uno or the Unos to the doctor reporting that her blood sugar was
not in control which was a function of this new medication. So we also talked to the doctor about, well, what is the -- what is normal for Mrs. Uno? Because we are all different. And what the doctor said was, it needed to be between 110 and 150.

Mrs. Uno's doctor herself said in sworn testimony that the normal blood sugar that Mrs. Uno should have should be between 110 and 150.

And what I'm showing you here is, for the month before the accident, the blood sugar levels taken by Mrs. Uno -orange is p.m. Blue is a.m -- and this blue band right here is the band that Mrs. Uno's doctor wanted her blood sugar to be.

You'll notice that for that month there was literally almost no day where the a.m. and p.m. reading was within the band of normal as described by Mrs. Uno's doctor.

So there will be witnesses. There will be doctors that will come here and explain to you that the conditions and symptoms of hypoglycemia that we all know about, in their opinion, were present on the day of this accident because we know habitually she had a problem being within this band during this time period.

We know that there are reported instances of her having confusion and forgetfulness, and we know that on the day of the accident, that morning when she took it, her blood sugar, it was 83.

We know that Jeffrey, her son, told the police officer that at 83 she had confusion. So that's what we know.

The doctors are going to testify that in their opinion this is a factor that accounts for and explains cognitive impairment.

When we look at the reconstruction of this accident and understand that this vehicle was being driven the wrong way down the road after making two turns, that the more likely explanation for what was happening was Mrs. Uno was suffering from hypoglycemia.

You'll hear evidence about what she ate on that day or what she didn't eat and then what people say she ate at another time she ate. That will be, ladies and gentlemen, for you to work out. Those are facts that you will have to work with.

This accident was not caused by the vehicle; it was caused by the driver. It was a pedal misapplication event that occurred when Mrs. Uno was confronted with Mrs. Whyte's vehicle right in front of her.

She became hypersensitive to what was going on, hit the gas, took off, and hit the pole at 80 to 90 miles per hour. She was never on the brake. She was never on the brake, and her foot wasn't stuck.

So let me talk about the brake.
The brakes in this vehicle are safe brakes. There is nothing odd or unusual about these brakes. They work. They are in millions of Toyota vehicles and have been in them for decades, and they work. They're not some newfangled design. You step on the brake in this vehicle, and the vehicle responds. You will know it responds because it starts slowing
down.
There is no claim in this case by the plaintiffs' experts that the brakes are defective. There is no claim that the brakes are defective. There is no claim that there was ever any problem with these brakes.

This vehicle had 10,000 miles on it, and there was no reported problem with the brakes.

There is no indication that whenever they drove and they stepped on the brakes, the vehicle didn't stop. The brakes in this vehicle worked.

And in this vehicle -- and you will see testing that proves this -- even at this point if you start driving around the intersection at 23rd and you stepped on the brakes, this vehicle would have stopped. This vehicle would have stopped if you were driving down the straightaway at 70 miles per hour and you stepped on the brakes. This vehicle would have stopped.

The only evidence of braking that the plaintiffs point to are the yaw marks that are left at the end of the accident scene where the rear end of the vehicle ricochets around and lays down those marks, and that's not braking. And you will see evidence why that is not evidence from braking.

The other evidence the plaintiffs rely upon is the description given by Ms. Peeples. And there, ladies and gentlemen, you'll have to decide what Ms. Peeples means and whether it means she was on the brake or not.

And let me explain to you, a brake light can go on without pressing the brakes for reasons -- and let me explain
it because $I$ think they got a little muddled up this morning.
This is the brake switch right here, this little thing here. So the brake is in the vehicle upright. This is the brake switch.

When you put your foot on the brake, it moves the plunger so it turns the brake on. The brake lights can flash and go on if you step on the brake, if you touch the pedal or if the vehicle goes over a curb or it gets jostled.

So Marjan -- Ms. Peeples could have seen brake lights as this vehicle was going over the curb, but the fact of the matter is where she claims she saw brake lights was in the blue zone. They wouldn't have made any difference here.

Now, I want to talk about BOS. BOS is not $B-O-S-S$, the boss. $B-O-S-S$ is the person who is functioning the vehicle. BOS is a function or technology that Toyota started developing for its vehicles in 2008.

In 2001 Toyota had -- let me step back.
BOS is a computer program, logic, that is put on the engine computer that reads when you step -- when a pedal is down and when you step on the brake, it has different logic of when it turns on and when it turns off.

In 2001 Bosch, who makes car computers, had it on its car computers, and Toyota had Bosch computers on some of its vehicles outside the United States. In fact, they were diesel vehicles. They were like 89 -horsepower, you know, 1.0, 1.4-liter engines. In those vehicles there was BOS.

Later, in 2005, in those vehicles with that specific engine -- later in 2005 there were some other vehicles that
were developed where the engines were developed by other companies that were sold by Toyota in Toyota vehicles that had BOS .

In 2005 there were some vehicles with smaller engines like I just described that had a computer from Siemens that had BOS on it, and they were diesel, I believe.

Then also in 2005 there were some other vehicles with a Bosch computer that had BOS on it.

Toyota did not include BOS on the Camry as standard equipment until 2011. In 2007 Toyota was not putting BOS on its Camry.

I think this morning it was indicated that the evidence will show in 2007 Toyota was putting BOS on Camrys. That's not the case.

In 2010 Toyota put BOS on 2007 Camrys as part of what was going on in that 2009, 2010 time frame, not on this vehicle because this vehicle wasn't involved in that stuff.

BOS is not a substitute for a brake system. BOS is a functionality that has very limited circumstances under which it works.

If the gas pedal is pushed down and trapped by the floor mat, for example, and not moving and if someone steps on the brake, the BOS logic, the Toyota BOS logic that plaintiffs' talked about in his deposition, would close the throttle and the vehicle would eventually, over time, slow down. It's not instantaneous. It takes time. The computer has to read, okay. The gas pedal is down. The brake pedal is pushed. I have to close the throttle.

That has to be the state it stays. The gas pedal has to stay in that position, and the brake has to stay on.

BOS is not a remedy or a cure for pedal misapplication, period. It's not.

And BOS will not work -- and you will hear more details on this, but BOS does not work if the gas pedal is moving.

So if the gas pedal is down and it's moving like you saw with Mr. Hannemann's testing, if the gas pedal is moving and your foot is on the brake and the brake is moving, BOS is not going to turn on. Because the computer is reading that as someone wants to go or stop and it can't decide what to do so it's not going to activate.

So there are limited circumstances under which BOS works.

The fact that a vehicle doesn't have BOS doesn't make it defective. The evidence will be that when you have a 2006 vehicle and it doesn't have what a 2010 vehicle has or a 2011, that just makes that vehicle old.

The evidence will also be in this case in order for BOS, B-O-S, to activate, you have to step on the brake. You have to step on the brake and stay on the brake, and that didn't happen here.

There is no witness that can give you, ladies and gentlemen, testimony that said I saw the Uno vehicle with the brake lights on and staying on going down the road.

If that's the situation, ladies and gentlemen, if these brakes were used in this vehicle, this vehicle would have stopped. It would have stopped.

The testing that was done by both plaintiffs' experts and defense, Toyota experts, shows that the brakes in this vehicle, even if you pump the brakes and evacuated the vacuum, would stop the vehicle.

The evidence will be if you started doing braking down in the blue zone, it's too late because the accident has already happened.

This is a situation where instead of stepping on the brake which could have stopped this vehicle, the evidence will show that Mrs. Uno stepped on the gas.

This is an accident. This is an accident due to driver error, not a defect in the vehicle.

You'll also hear from Mrs. Peeples that what she claims she saw with respect to the brake lights she specifically says it wasn't like it was pumping.

So when you hear testimony about pumping from experts, think of what the witnesses say that were at the scene. The one person who said she saw brake lights, says it wasn't like they were pumping. So that must mean it was just going over the curb.

There are a lot of facts in this case, ladies and gentlemen. You're all the judge of the facts.

This case is about this accident, what happened in this accident.

And thank you for your attention.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
At this point we're going to take our afternoon break. We're going to take a break until 10 to 3:00, 2:50.

You are reminded not to discuss this matter amongst yourselves or with any other person. You are not to form or express an opinion on the matter until it is submitted to you for decision.

Thank you very much.
(The following proceedings were held outside the jury's presence:)

THE COURT: All right. Anything for the record?
MR. AKARAGIAN: Not from us.
THE COURT: All right. See you at 2:50.
(Recess.)
(The following proceedings were held in
open court in the presence of the jury:)
THE COURT: All right. Welcome back, everybody.
Mr. Duffy, are you ready to proceed?
MR. DUFFY: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. You may.
MR. DUFFY: Thank you.
Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. You're on the home stretch. Okay? So we're almost there for the afternoon.

But the opening statement is an opportunity for us to talk to you about what we believe the evidence is going to show because, as I said to you earlier, a trial is a series of snippets. It's disjointed somewhat because witnesses have to be accommodated.

And so there's a lot of information that comes out. It's not like what we normally watch on the TV show or in a movie where we see it from beginning to end. It's very
disjointed. Things come in, they come out. They come in, they come out.

So it gives us an opportunity, then, to talk to you about what we feel the evidence is going to show in a flowing manner as opposed to actually how you're going to see it.

At the end, as her Honor has indicated, then we get to do a summation as to what the evidence did show.

So with that, what we're going to talk to you about now is what the evidence shows. But it's important to understand in this particular case we are not dealing -- there isn't a great dispute about the fact that Mrs. Uno was coming down Euclid. There is no dispute that she was driving southbound on Euclid. There is no dispute that she had the right of way as she was coming down Euclid Avenue.

And there is no dispute that there was an accident, and there is no dispute that Mrs. Bello hit Mrs. Uno and she spun around. There is no dispute on that.

But there is a very serious dispute about what occurred in that impact, and that's what I'm going to be talking to you about over this next few minutes.

First off, what we have here is this happened back in August of 2009, and it was late afternoon. And we all know that here in Southern California it can get very hot in the late afternoon, and in this particular day, it was rather hot. It was 99 degrees.

And Mrs. Bello and her daughter were out in the car, and they decided to stop at a Carl's Jr. They got an ice cream soda, and now they were on their way home.

So as they get to go home in this particular case, it's -- their house -- Mrs. Bello's home that she had lived there for many, many years was approximately two blocks from where the accident occurred.

So this intersection of $23 r d$ and Euclid is an intersection that Mrs. Bello has gone through many times and where the Carl's Jr. was located down on Foothill Boulevard.

She is progressing in the northbound lanes -- you heard a lot about the northbound lanes -- coming up, makes a left turn onto $23 r d$-- and you've seen the median. You've seen the pictures -- and comes to that intersection where the accident did occur.

What happens there is that Mrs. Bello comes up -- and you've seen the diagrams and everything, lots of trees in that particular area. And she said that she comes up to the intersection and she's looking to the right to see -- there is a tree there that she's trying to get clear of.

Now, she then proceeds into the intersection and makes contact with Mrs. Uno's vehicle.

Now, here's the thing. Mrs. Bello believed she had come to a stop and that the next thing that she remembers is she heard a loud noise and that was in the crash.

So she hears the loud noise, and her daughter that was seated in the passenger seat began crying. She was shaken up by this. So Mrs. Bello was attending to her, trying to calm her down.

Now, what happened here is when this occurs, she's in the middle of the intersection. So you've seen this already.

So we'll use it again.
Here is Mrs. Bello's vehicle. I'll move this out of the way.

Can everybody see that? Okay.
So we have Mrs. Bello coming through here, and then she believes she had stopped.

She enters the intersection, and she hears a loud noise. The crash occurs. Her daughter, Lynette, is now startled, is shaken by that and begins crying.

What happens, once she realizes what had happened with this noise, she realizes -- she looks around. She is in the intersection.

So what she does at that point is her car had come to a stop in the intersection and it had also turned off.

So what she had to do was just turn the car on and it was fine. The car -- she was able to turn it on. But she turns the car on, and she moves the car across the intersection because she realizes that, all right. She is in the middle of the intersection. She better get over there and deal with Lynette at that point.

So she moves it into the intersection and -- I think we're going to see.

You can see the car. This is where Mrs. Bello had moved the car to after the accident happened.

Now, you can see on either photograph it's on the other side of the intersection because you can see the police car, you can see the ambulance there, and you can see where Mrs. Uno -- Mrs. Bello had parked the car.

So what she did was she moved the car across the intersection. She drove it and drove it over to the side.

You can see the front of the car. That's where the car had impacted the side of Mrs. Uno's vehicle.

Now, once she gets over there, she, again, is trying to calm Lynette down. And Lynette is still crying, is shaken up.

Then neighbors, the neighbors start coming out.
Now, remember Mrs. Bello lives in this neighborhood. And one of the neighbors that does come out is a Ms. Borba, Jenile -- she goes by Jennifer -- Borba. And she sees Mrs. Bello. She sees Lynette. She knows the both of them because they share an alleyway in the back and they come in and out of that alleyway to get into their homes.

So she comes over and wants to, at least, find out what's going on, does she need any help.

Mrs. Bello says, yeah. I would like you to -- I would like to get Lynette checked out. Would you go in the ambulance with her and go to the hospital while I deal with the police officers here?

So what happens here is eventually, then, Lynette is taken to the hospital, and they go and pick her up later that evening, and she was fine. And Mrs. Bello was okay.

And there's going to be witnesses that are going to come in and say that they got -- they went up there, they saw the vehicle, they saw Mrs. Bello outside the vehicle, they checked to see if she was okay, and, you know, she said she was fine, but she wanted to, you know, make sure that Lynette was fine.

So that is, in a nutshell, what took place from a testimonial standpoint.

Now, in this case we have information that many times we don't have. In a lot of automobile accidents, we don't have specific, precise information, but in this one we do.

We're fortunate we have what they call an EDR, an equipment data recorder. The best way to describe this is the black box. We've all heard about the black box with airplanes.

Sometimes they find the black box with an airplane, sometimes they don't, but everybody wants the black box because the black box is going to give us information to tell us what occurred. It's not a video, but it's data that is recorded.

And Mr. Mardirossian had shown you the document that when it's pulled out of the vehicle, out of Mrs. Bello's vehicle, you have the information as to what was transpiring in the seconds, the brief seconds, before the accident occurred.

This is all very, very important. Because it's going to give us accurate information. And you're going to hear all the experts tell you that they believe that this black box recording is -- has provided us with very valuable and accurate information.

So the black box recording, then, tells us -- gives us an indication of what was happening in Mrs. Bello's vehicle.

Now, we don't have that information for Mrs. Uno's vehicle as far as here is concerned. We do have it down the
road. And you've already heard the others talk about that, so I'm not going to go any further on that.

But we do have the black box information that we retrieved from Mrs. Bello's vehicle. So what did that tell us?

Well, as you saw this morning -- and you're going to see this in evidence, but essentially what happened was Mrs. Bello made the turn onto 23rd Street going west. She was coming northbound on Euclid, going west, makes the turn, and then when she's going ten miles an hour, and she goes down to about four miles an hour, and then at the impact she's about ten miles an hour.

So we know exactly what the vehicle was doing at that point, and this is going to become very important. And the reason it's going to be important is to try to reconstruct what happened in this accident.

Reconstruction -- the experts are going to reconstruct the accident for you and talk about exactly what occurred.

In reconstructing it, what you need for reconstruction is -- having the EDR ratings is very valuable but also having physical evidence to be able to put it all together so that in reality we can tell from the EDR readings and from the physical evidence on the street exactly what happened.

In fact, the police officers, when they initially investigated this, everybody was scratching their head. They couldn't figure out what happened. Were these two related? They just didn't know what was going on.

But with the EDR readings and with the physical
evidence -- and you've heard Mr. Galvin talk about these marks on the street. They're called yaw marks. All right? It's a fancy term. It's a specific term for skid marks that are generated through a rotational pattern. The experts will tell you about that.

But it does tell us exactly -- it tells us what happened to the vehicles.

So just in simple, we have Mrs. Bello moving and hits the side of Mrs. Uno's vehicle, and Mrs. Uno's vehicle is going about 28 to 31 miles per hour. We calculate that out by all of this physical evidence. And we know that Mrs. Bello's vehicle was going approximately 10 miles an hour.

So now you put those together so you can tell what occurred.

So they hit on the side of the vehicle. Because the vehicle is going 28 to 31 , it's going to keep moving down the street, but it's going to spin out from what they call a lateral delta-v.

Now, we're all going to learn about what that means, a lateral delta-v. It's a change in velocity. And the experts are going to tell you that in this collision, in this accident, what we have is a low speed impact lateral delta-v.

They're going to tell you that this vehicle, the Bello vehicle, hits the Uno vehicle and then it begins turning like this. And over a two- to two-and-a-half-second time frame, the vehicle goes around and the back end comes to this point, which is basically about 160 degrees turn. But it's what they call a four-mile delta-v.

And they're also going to tell you that the longitudinal delta-v is about half of that, about two miles.

Okay. So now we know. We know what the EDR reading tells us. It tells us 10 miles an hour.

We know we have the yaw marks on the street. So now we have an indication of what could end up occurring during this entire transaction in about two, two and a half seconds.

So what that is going to tell us is that we have -- now we have the directional forces that I just talked about, but we also are going to learn from reconstructing this through mathematics, physics, things like that, plus all of the initial information that we have.

So we now are going to know also what are the rotational forces that would have taken place on the vehicle. And the experts are going to tell you that on -- in this kind of a collision where you have the contact with the side of the vehicle such that the vehicle is passing by but makes the contact, it's going to spin it out. It's like hitting something and then the back end swerves out.

What you're going to hear from the experts is with a four-mile delta-v, you're talking about essentially what would be the impact in bumper cars.

We all have been through amusement parks and gone into bumper cars. It spins around; the back end spins around. Because this vehicle is moving in a westward direction and this vehicle is moving in a southerly direction.

So if you're coming towards somebody in a bumper car and they're moving across, you're going to hit them and you're
going to spin them.
So they're going to talk about that tells us not just what we have from a side -- from the lateral delta-v, but the rotation is also going to be important.

So what we're going to be talking about, then, is the rotational force. And what the experts are going to tell you is that in this particular accident with the rotational forces being as they were where the car is going to be moving because it's going in a southerly direction, the net effect on the occupant, the person in the car, is going to be about nine-tenths of $a \mathrm{G}$.

And they're going to talk about that, and why is that going to be important? Because that's going to be giving us information as to could this foot have become trapped, would Mrs. -- what would Mrs. Uno's body movement be?

One thing we do know is that she did have a seat belt on. That seat belt has the lap and the shoulder which will keep her in the seat so that she's not going to be, you know, hitting things on the inside from the delta -- lateral delta-v. Her body is going to move somewhat here. She might make some contact on the side, the experts will say, with her shoulder.

But there is also the rotation that we just talked about. The rotation is also going to be taking her body back in the other direction.

So you've got two different forces. One she starts out this way because of the contact with Mrs. Bello's vehicle. The other is as the vehicle is now beginning to make that
rotation.
And you'll hear testimony about what is that like? That rotation is like being in a chair, in an office chair, and the rotation brings you this way.

So that tells us what is transpiring on the body. That's going to be important because we need to have some information as to what was happening in the collision as to Mrs. Uno's body.

And also it's going to tell you, as far as with the shoulder strap, with the lap belt, that her body -- there would be some movement, but it's not going to be significant.

What the experts are going to talk to you about is you've heard already about this foot being moved into that direction and then being on the gas, underneath the brake pedal in what we call a dorsiflex situation.

So, again, all of this is based on physics. And the experts can tell us all of this stuff based on physics, based on math, and they will go through all of this with you.

But there's another thing that we've done in this particular case in order to not just -- the experts can tell you all of these things, but now we want to also see if we can do some kind of test in order to determine and see does this make sense, does all of this make sense.

So what you're going to hear is Dr. Nicholas Carpenter is going to be coming in and testifying. He is a biomechanic Ph.D.

Now, biomechanics is what's happening with the body. When forces are put on the body, how does the body react?

This is all through forces and how the body's structure works.
So in order to test this, to see -- okay. We have the delta-v, the equivalent of bumper cars, the rotational force is like spinning in a chair. But what actually happened in the vehicle for Mrs. Uno? Because obviously that's all based upon physics.

So what he did was he did what they call a rigid barrier test. A rigid barrier test is a test that is done by biomechanical experts in order to test, well, how does -- how do the forces really generate?

And so what they do is they try to -- as close as possible based upon physics, to determine the impact and what kind of -- what would result from that. And we do know from the physics of this that we have the lateral delta-v of four, the longitudinal of about two.

So we have information. So now let's do a test.
So what Dr. Carpenter is going to talk to you about is he ended up getting a Camry, a 2006 Camry, a similar Camry to what we're talking about here, to Mrs. Uno's vehicle. Then through wiring it up and getting everything into play, he devised a way of using a -- what do you call it? I'm just drawing a blank.

He ended up using a loader that -- to generate the same forces.

Actually, what he will testify to is the forces he used were actually a little bit higher than the forces that were in this to see what would happen. And he sat in the car.

I know it's pretty hot in here, right? I agree.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. DUFFY: He used a forklift to simulate the forces that were generated.

Now, what he's going to do, he says he got in the vehicle and they generated the same type of forces, a little bit higher than what was in the collision, to see what it was and wired up -- and he even had a bicycle helmet on with wires on it so he could figure what would happen with the head, what would happen with the body, and, of course, what would happen with the foot.

And he will tell you that he did that because he can come in and tell you what was going on and present you with the readings that were obtained, sort of like the EDR readings, where we can at least -- we have something there in concrete as to what was happening.

Now, Dr. Carpenter is not the same size as Mrs. Uno because Mrs. Uno was about five feet, four-eleven, five feet, and Dr. Carpenter is almost six feet. So he is a little bit farther back in the seat and everything, but he will explain that. But it's more to find out what these rotational forces were going to be in the accident.

What he's going to tell you is that in this particular accident those forces that he was sitting there and he -- of course, he knows it's coming and everything. But he just tries to be, you know, in a neutral position. And his body did move to the left.

Now, for him, his head with the bicycle helmet on contacted the roll bar in the vehicle, but he'll tell you that
wouldn't have been possible for Mrs. Uno because she is just too short. She would have been up closer because her feet had to be closer to the pedals to be able to work the car.

But he's also going to tell you that during this time -- and he'll give you all of the numbers as to what was happening -- that his foot, his foot, moved a little bit to the left but in these rotational forces, because of the spin factor, came back to the neutral position.

And so we're going to be presenting this to you because, as Mr. Galvin said, there's a real dispute as to whether or not the foot in this particular case could have been trapped underneath the brake pedal such that Mrs. Uno then ended up taking off from that point forward.

So all of this is going to be presented to you so that you can evaluate exactly what happened in that particular collision on that particular day.

One of the things we don't know is Mrs. Bello never saw Mrs. Uno leave. So we know she left, but we just don't know the timing of that. But we do know that the forces are such that the foot would not have moved that far, even Dr. Carpenter's foot which is much bigger.

He also used the surrogate. Everybody has surrogates in this case. So you've got that. So everybody has surrogates. Everybody is using their foot in their surrogate and showing you what's going on.

But the surrogate, again, what he will talk about and also Dr. Black will talk about is just the fact that with Mrs. Uno's foot being a size six, rather small, in order to
get into that position underneath the brake pedal -- it's not like, you know, Shaquille O'Neil's foot -- you get right underneath that brake pedal pretty easily, maybe half of it would be under that.

But he can have it on the floor as we normally drive. Because everybody, when you drive, you drive with your heel on the floor. Why? Because if you lift up your leg and try to drive with your heel up in the air pressing on the accelerator, your quad muscle is tight. Your hip flexors are tightened. You're going to get very tired very fast.

So that's not the natural thing. You put it on the floor, and that's how you do it.

In that position the surrogate's -- you'll see photos that show that the surrogate's foot is not going to get under the position of the brake pedal. The toes will get in there, but in order to get into that position, it's not even just lifting the foot off the floor, but it's also twisting it and turning it into this direction and holding it there for approximately 35 seconds.

And so these are the things that are going to be talked about and also the human factors' element, what do people do.

You're going to have Ph.D.s in human factors talking to you about -- people get studied. We all get studied, maybe not individually but as a group. We get studied to see what do people normally do in different situations.

And they're going to be talking about how different scenarios, you're going to react different ways.

They'll talk about startle effect. They'll talk about
hypervigilance, and we'll get into all of that. I'm not going to deal with it right now.

But all of these things are going to be important because the other thing that they're going to tell you is the foot being caught in that position and then the brake being applied, the brake is going to put pressure on the top of the foot, especially because in this situation we have a flip-flop, which means that there is nothing between the foot and the back side of the metal brake.

The metal brake is going to go right onto the skin, and then as you press down, the surrogates -- they found the surrogates said, yeah, I feel it.

The human factors people are going to tell you -- you probably don't need human factors people to tell you this, is that when you feel that metal cutting into your foot, you're going to pull it out. That's going to be the reaction that you're going to get.

So all of these things are going to be important in trying to determine what did happen in this particular situation, and as Mr. Galvin had talked about, that what really happened when Mrs. Uno left that scene and began, through a series of right turns, right turns and then going down, this is the classic case of pedal misapplication.

Being confronted with a scenario you're not expecting and then reacting to it, and then once that takes place, then everything starts snowballing. So the human factors people will be talking to you about that.

So what we have here is a situation where the impact
occurred. No dispute, Mrs. Bello struck. We know that from the EDR reading.

We know that the vehicle came over here and came to a stop. Why do we know that? By the yaw marks. We know by the yaw marks on the street that the vehicle had to have come to a stop.

Now, unfortunately we don't have any witness to this other than, of course, Mrs. Bello, but we don't have any witness here because all the people that came out after the accident, they heard that loud noise just like Mrs. Bello talks about of having the loud noise occur.

And, again, human nature -- and we don't need a Ph.D. in human factors to tell us what happens when you have a loud noise and a bang outside -- what does everybody do? They come outside. What happened? And the only thing we have then is just the witnesses after the fact that come out and tell us.

They'll tell you that they saw Mrs. Bello in the position where the car is and she was standing outside the car. The police officers will tell you that too. They talked to her and everything else.

And she didn't know. She remembers a loud noise. She doesn't -- she didn't know where the car went, didn't know anything more.

But it's the EDR readings and it's the physical evidence that tells us the entire story of what occurred in this particular collision.

And I think at the end you'll see that the impact -and this impact, this low delta-v with a rotational force of
nine-tenths of a G -- that's not a very strong G force -where at that point Mrs. Uno came to a stop and then for some other reason -- and Mr. Galvin talked to you about hypoglycemia, and you will see here a lot about that and talk about that, but from that point, once everything stopped, for some reason then she went and made these series of turns. It was down the road when the pedal misapplication occurred.

So you'll be able to see all of this evidence, and it's all there in black and white on the EDR readings and the physics of it. And that will be what you'll ultimately make your determination as to what you believe the facts were and was this foot actually trapped in this position for 35 seconds going down the road until the point where unfortunately Mrs. Uno did crash into the tree.

That is a tragedy, and nobody is questioning that. It's definitely a tragedy for Mr. Uno and for Jeffrey Uno. But the pedal misapplication is the logical explanation for this.

So thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Duffy.
Mr. Mardirossian?
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Yes, your Honor. We are prepared to call our next witness. We're going to be asking the court that we play the deposition of Mr. Carr.

Can we -- while we set up for that, can we also bring out the demonstrative model that $I$ used in the opening?

Because our first witness, Mr. Wunsch, will be able to lay some foundation for that and he can position himself.

Can we approach also, your Honor?
THE COURT: Certainly.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Just on the topic of playing the video.
(The following proceedings were held at sidebar:)
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Yes. Your Honor, Mr. Galvin made some statements in his opening about how it would be impossible to have your foot stuck underneath the gas -underneath the brake pedal with it still also on the gas pedal.

We know that Lee Carr has said that is possible and the scenarios, and we want to be able to now play Lee Carr's clip also.

MR. GALVIN: If you want to know what the testimony was you have to ask him.

MR. AKARAGIAN: What are you talking about?
THE COURT: You need to -- before you speak, you need to say your name again.

MR. BERRY: This is Mark Berry. Sorry.
I don't understand.
THE COURT: I just want clarification as to what
Mr. Mardirossian was asking for.
We have an agreed clip. Are you talking about playing something else?

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Correct.
MR. BERRY: Well, no. We object. Until we have seen it, see what you propose to play and have a chance to look at it and counter designate, that's not fair. Not just,
surprise, a piece of testimony and saying you want to play it now.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
We need to know in advance. A day in advance, say who you're going to use and who you're going to call. You need to talk to them today about Carr and what portion you want to read and then do it on Tuesday.

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: I understand, your Honor. The only reason it came up now is because we heard -- because we hadn't planned on playing it until we heard somebody say it couldn't happen. We heard it.

If the Court wants us to do it on Tuesday, we will do it on Tuesday.

MR. GALVIN: Of course when I said it couldn't happen in this case.

THE COURT: And this is Mr. --
MR. GALVIN: Galvin. Sorry.
It couldn't happen in this case.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Go ahead. Armen, I think, wants to say something.

MR. AKARAGIAN: We would like to play what we have for Mr. Carr today.

The issue has become -- because of the Court's rulings on some of the designations we had, the Court had us table an objection to the foot getting stuck in the way Mr. Carr said, I've seen that happen. There has been mention made that it's impossible, that it can't happen.

If that happens, then we may have to face a situation
where -- we're not saying that we will have to play it right now, but what we're saying is we don't want to waive an opportunity to play that based on comments made by counsel at this point.

THE COURT: I understand you're not waiving anything. And $I$ understand that whatever it is you do want to play, you'll show them so that they can make whatever objections are counter designated.
(Proceedings at sidebar concluded.)
THE COURT: While they're bringing that out, let me ask the jurors, are you getting cooler? Is it better?

MR. AKARAGIAN: Dim the lights?
THE COURT: Why are we dimming the lights?
MR. AKARAGIAN: I'm asking is that what we do or not when we play the video.

THE COURT: Mr. Mardirossian, are you prepared now to call your first witness?

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Yes, we are.
Before we call a live witness, we will play a segment from a video deposition of one of the defense experts in this case, Mr. Lee Carr, who was designated by Toyota as their expert in automotive technology and dynamics.

THE COURT: I didn't understand that we were going to play a video.

So now that we are, let's see what it looks like and we'll decide if we need to dim the lights.

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: By the way, just so I introduce people, that is Derrick Brandberry who is operating our
equipment in the past and, of course, Armen Akaragian to my left.

THE COURT: Can everybody see that okay? We don't need to dim the lights?
(The following video deposition played:)
Q. Would you please give us your full name?
A. Lee Carr, C-A-R-R.
Q. And you've been hired as an expert witness on behalf of the Toyota defendants in this case, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You agree that the motor vehicle designer must consider brake pedal application so that vehicle capacities will be compatible with the likely demands of the driver to achieve a reasonable degree of safety?
A. Yes.
Q. Well, let's get more specific on this topic of the stuck pedal.

As far as a stuck pedal goes, you agree that stuck pedals in automobiles have been a phenomenon that have been occurring for at least 20 years, correct?
A. As far as I know, that's happened ever since we've had motor vehicles, more than a hundred years.
Q. So you do agree that because that phenomenon has been known for motor vehicles for -- as you said, since we've had motor vehicles for more than a hundred years, a manufacturer has to first see a pedal getting stuck as an event that can occur in a motor vehicle, correct?

```
    A. To some level, yes.
```

Q. You do agree that also for manufacturers -- a stuck pedal has been a phenomenon that's been known in motor vehicles for at least a hundred years should undertake whatever counter measures it can to try to prevent a pedal from getting stuck, correct?
A. Sure, yes.
Q. First from a design and development standpoint, have you yourself seen any testing performed by Toyota where they tested a 2002 to 2006 Camry prior to its release to the general public to determine how the vehicle would perform when the accelerator pedal and the brake pedal are depressed at the same time?
A. $\quad$ No.
Q. Have you seen any testing performed by Toyota during the design and development of the 2002 to 2006 Camry to determine how the Camry would perform in the event the vacuum system, the brake system, was deplete and the accelerator pedal was pressed at the same time?
A. No.
Q. And what did NHTSA find as part of the testing of the Camry in how long it would take the Camry to stop, if it would, under circumstances of certain brake forces with vacuum assist depleted?
A. The brake force -- they show a variety. The answer is different.
Q. Let's starts with the lowest and work our way up.
A. All right. They would show with 225 pounds of
pedal force, it would stop from 65 miles an hour at about 190 feet.

It showed with 225 -- yeah. I'm sorry.
With wide open throttle and 225 pounds of torque force, they found with no vacuum assist that it would take about 210 pounds -- 210 feet to stop.

And then with 112 pounds of brake pedal force, wide open throttle, and no vacuum, they found that the vehicle would decelerate from 65 down to about 18 miles an hour.

Then it would continue on with a speed of between 13 and 18 miles an hour indefinitely until they ceased the test at a thousand feet.

At a pedal force of 50 pounds, they found that the vehicle -- and without vacuum assist they found the vehicle accelerated, which is what we saw on the earlier chart. And then they show with 15 pounds of brake force, wide open throttle, the vehicle accelerated.
Q. There are some situations with the Toyota Camry, the 2006 Toyota Camry, including the two that we talked about, where if a driver applies 50 pounds or less of brake force, the driver actually cannot slow the vehicle if the vacuum assist is depleted, correct?
A. Correct. If you only apply that amount of force, it won't stop.
Q. Or slow down?
A. It wouldn't even slow down.
Q. It would actually accelerate?
A. Yes.
(Video deposition completed.)
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: That is all of our playback.
At this point we would like to call Mr. Wunsch, Edward Wunsch, to the stand.

THE CLERK: You can stand behind the court reporter there.

Raise your right hand.
EDWARD WUNSCH,
having been called as a witness and sworn, testified as follows.

THE WITNESS: I do.
THE CLERK: Sir, please take the witness stand.
Can you please state and spell your first and last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Edward Wunsch, $\mathrm{W}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Mardirossian, you can proceed.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Thank you, your Honor.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MARDIROSSIAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Wunsch.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Mr. Wunsch, where do you reside?
A. In Mount Baldy, California.
Q. And how long have you lived in that general
area?
A. Since November of 1987.
Q. And can you tell us basically where Mount Baldy is in relationship to Euclid Avenue or Highway 83?
A. About 11 and a half miles.
Q. And what direction, 11 and a half miles --
A. North.
Q. North?
A. North.
Q. And tell us a little bit about the general area that you live in. Is it up on top the mountain, basically?
A. We're approximately halfway up the hill. We are at 3800 feet. The top is 10,064 .
Q. Very well.

Who do you live with?
A. My wife, Judith.
Q. Let me ask you a couple of background questions, if $I$ might.

It's even more embarrassing when I ask female witnesses. How old are you, sir?
A. $\quad 75$.
Q. And what type of work did you do in the last job you had?
A. Food salesman, salesman in the food industry, primarily.
Q. And how long did you perform that duty?
A. My first job was with the National Biscuit Company in 1960. And I have had various positions with various companies since then, but $I$ was retired in '09.
Q. We're going to be talking about Euclid Avenue or

Highway 83.
Are you familiar with that area, sir?
A. Quite.
Q. Tell us how it is that you're familiar with it.
A. Going up and down the hill, the gym I go to is about four blocks west of Euclid and Foothill.

If I'm going down to anyplace south and east of Mountain Avenue, I go down Euclid.
Q. So would it be fair to say you're quite familiar with Euclid Avenue?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And that would be from where it begins, I guess somewhere near 24 th, all the way down at least to Foothill and beyond?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. We have a three-dimensional model here that we've been using for our openings. It's exhibit 5302-9.

I'm going to ask, with the Court's permission, to ask you just to step down for a moment and take a look at this model and ask you if it shows generally what you know of Euclid.

Take a moment. Take your time.
A. Very accurate reproduction as far as I can tell.
Q. Hang on before you go anywhere. Thank you for that.

Hang on. Let me just ask you a couple questions.
What would you call this area here in the middle?
A. I would call it a median strip.
Q. And is there a special name for this area, first of all?
A. Yeah. I think they call it the Bridle Trail, the Bridle Path, something like that.
Q. Have you walked or jogged in that area?
A. I have.
Q. Looking back here where this says 23rd Street --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- and depicted, and so north would be in what direction, sir?
A. This direction.
Q. And so to get to where you live up the mountain, how long of a drive is that?
A. From there to our house, maybe nine and a half, ten miles.
Q. All right. Now, while you're there, if I'm down here at 21st, what's on this side of Euclid, which would be the east side? What's here?
A. Houses.
Q. Are these small houses? Large houses?
A. Large.
Q. Large houses?
A. Yeah.
Q. Would it also be true that on the other side --
A. The same.
Q. -- that these are large, fairly expensive
houses?
A. Quite, yes.
Q. Okay. As you travel up and down Euclid, do you use any particular lane, or it just depends?
A. It depends. I try and always stay to the right, if possible.
Q. Right meaning the curb lane?
A. The curb lane, yes. Correct.
Q. Let me ask you, on the day of this accident, back in August of 2009 , August 28 th, were you on Euclid?
A. Yes.
Q. What type of car were you in?
A. My Ford $E-150$ pickup truck.
Q. Were you alone?
A. $\quad$ No.
Q. Who was with you?
A. My wife, Judith.
Q. Anyone else?
A. No.
Q. Were you the driver?
A. $\quad$ I was.
Q. How long had you owned that vehicle,
approximately?
A. Since 2006 .
Q. Where were you coming from?
A. We came from the shopping center called the Campus Center at approximately the 210 Freeway and Campus.
Q. I'm sorry.
A. We turned. We left there on 19th Street and
turned right onto Euclid.
Q. And turned right, meaning heading northbound?
A. Correct.
Q. And where were you going?
A. Home.
Q. And was this approximately 4:00 p.m. in the afternoon?
A. It sounds about right, yeah.
Q. In terms of the lane of travel that you took after you made that right turn onto Euclid northbound, what lane were you in?
A. The lane closest to the curb.
Q. Were you listening to any music at the time?

First of all, do you remember if you had the radio on?
A. If I have it on, it's usually on KFI. I don't remember if it was on or not.
Q. Can you describe that day whether it was warm, not warm?
A. Yeah. As I recall, it was a warm, clear day.
Q. Anything unusual about that day that comes to mind?
A. Other than the incident?
Q. All right. Let's talk about the incident.

What's the first thing that alerted you --
THE REPORTER: I'm sorry.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: I was going to have him mark his positions. That's why I asked him to be here. I could ask him to go back to the stand and ask him to go back down.

THE COURT: I think the only issue -- I figured you were going to keep him there as long as you needed him to be referring to the model, which is fine with me.

You just need to keep your voice up. I think the court reporter is having difficulty taking it down.

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: I apologize.
Q. If I sound like I'm yelling at you, I'm not yelling at you.
A. I understand.
Q. So $I$ was asking you about where you were going, and $I$ think you told me you were going home?
A. Yes.
Q. And in terms of what it is that you saw that was unusual, tell us what you saw.
A. I saw a vehicle appear to make a turn at a higher rate of speed that $I$ would consider possible. I felt that there was -- a driver was drunk or out of control, and that car then proceeded at us in the lane closest to the median strip at a very high rate of speed.

As soon as $I$ saw it, $I$ told my wife, call 911.
Q. Now, you talked about you saw a vehicle making a turn?
A. I saw the concluding portion of a turn. I didn't see the whole turn.

What caught my eye was the car was approximately a half to two-thirds of the way around to complete the turn coming at us in the wrong lane of traffic.
Q. Can you give us an estimation of what speed that
vehicle was going as it was going through the turn?
MR. GALVIN: Foundation.

THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Okay. Were you able to see and appreciate how fast that vehicle was coming around the turn?
A. I've been driving for over 50 years. I knew it was too fast.

To estimate the miles per hour, I have no idea. But it was too fast for it to be a normal turn. It was way too fast.
Q. Now, you say you've been driving for 50 years?
A. More than that.
Q. When you make a turn around -- let's say a right turn, how fast do you normally make them with just normal traffic?

MR. GALVIN: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: On a street like that, I would estimate 5 to 15 miles an hour. 15 is probably at the high end.
Q. BY MR. MARDIROSSIAN: If you were to compare the speed of that vehicle going around that turn with what you go at 5 to 15 miles an hour, can you give us a comparison?
A. It would seem like at least two to three times faster than it should have been.
Q. Now, looking at this model and looking at the intersection of $23 r d$ and Euclid, do you see what I'm talking about, that general area?

```
A. Yes.
```

Q. The vehicle that you saw make that turn and start heading towards you, can you describe that vehicle, the color, type, shape?
A. I knew it was gray. I couldn't tell for sure. I thought it might be a Toyota.

And I noticed the left side had damage to it. That's all I can recall. I didn't observe the driver, and the whole thing happened so fast. That's about all I can give you in the way of testimony.
Q. Just in terms of positioning -- and I've taken the liberty of putting your name on this little flag.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And what I'm going to do is ask you, first of all, this being 22 nd Street and this being 21 st and that being $23 r d$--
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- can you give us a general location of where you were in your truck when you first saw this vehicle rounding the turn?
A. Somewhere along in here.
Q. All right. So let me just see.

When you say "somewhere along" --
A. North of 22 nd Street.
Q. North of 22 nd Street?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And by way of driveways, I'm counting one, two, so from the second driveway to the fourth driveway, sir?
A. Yes. Approximately, yes.
Q. All right. Now, knowing that this is not a precise area, would this be the general center of that area?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if I place this here in the second lane, would that be the center but not necessarily the identical location?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, at this point is where you're driving.

Mrs. Wunsch is next to you.
Do you know if she saw what you saw by -- by that I mean, do you know if she was looking at the car?
A. I don't believe she was.

I believe when I saw it, I said call 911. She may have been looking in that direction; she may not have been. Don't know.
Q. Very well.

At some point does the Toyota pass you or the vehicle coming at you?
A. Yes.
Q. So when you first see it, it's where this flag is.

When it passes you, how fast was that vehicle going by you, if you could give us an approximation?
A. I would call it around 60 miles an hour.
Q. And approximately where were you as that vehicle passed you?
A. Somewhere in this area.
Q. All right.
A. I don't know exactly where, but somewhere in there.
Q. All right. Somewhere between the fifth driveway to the eighth driveway?
A. I would say that's approximately correct, yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Mardirossian, it's the fifth driveway to the eighth driveway north of?

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: North of 22 nd Street.
Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Q. BY MR. MARDIROSSIAN: I'll take the liberty of taking the other flag that we have with a J for Judith -that's your wife's name?
A. Yes.
Q. We're just going to make that an $\mathrm{E}-2$ for identification.

So this would be just about the area where you were, not identical, not exact, but the general area where you were when the Toyota passed you by?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you described what you described as damage, heavy damage, to the driver's side of the vehicle; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You made a call to 911; is that right?
A. I called -- I told my wife, call 911. She picked up the cell phone and held it while $I$ was driving, and I did the talking on it.

I didn't hold the phone; she did.
Q. What did you tell 911?
A. Well, I -- I was panicked. I said something like -- it may not be in this order -- there was a vehicle coming at us at a high rate of speed. It seems like it was out of control, and it was going southbound in the northbound lanes of Euclid Avenue where the easternmost lanes are, two lanes north and the western are the southbound lanes.

This car was coming at us southbound in the northbound lanes.
Q. Did you say anything about damage on the driver's side of the vehicle?
A. Yeah. As the car is going past me, I observed that there was some kind of damage to the left side of it, and I believe it seemed like a lot at the time, but it went by real fast.
Q. So this is what you told the 911 operator; is that correct?
A. As best $I$ can recall.
Q. Very well.

Mr. Wunsch, I think we're done with this general area so $I$ can maybe ask you to take the stand again, sir.
A. Sure.
Q. Thank you, sir.

In terms of the vehicle approaching you and passing you by, can you tell us if there was anything you heard coming from that vehicle?
A. It --
Q. It's a yes or no answer.
A. I seemed like I remember the sound of the car being louder than it should for traveling on that street, like the sound of an engine racing.
Q. All right. You say "the sound of an engine racing," meaning what?
A. There may have been other sounds related to it that I'm not aware of, but it sounded like a car's engine over-revved.
Q. Now, did it look to you like the vehicle was going at a steady pace, or was it going faster and faster?
A. It was accelerating from the time I first saw it.

I didn't turn around after it passed me, but as it passed me, I think it was around -- I would guess it to be around 60 miles an hour.
Q. So when you say from the time you first saw it, you mean from the time you first saw it rounding that turn at 23rd heading southbound in northbound lanes to the time it passed you, it was speeding up the whole time?

MR. GALVIN: Objection. Leading.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. GALVIN: Move to strike.
THE COURT: The answer is stricken.
Q. BY MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Mr. Wunsch, did you see if the vehicle that was approaching you was speeding?
A. Oh, beyond a shadow of a doubt.
Q. Did you notice if it was picking up speed?
A. It appeared to be -- it couldn't have made -the laws of physics would have prevented it from going around the corner at the speed it was going when it passed me.

So I would say, yes, it accelerated from the time it made the corner until it passed me.
Q. After it passed you, did you look to see the rear of the light -- the rear of the light -- the rear of the car to see if the brake lights were on?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you turn around at all to see the rear of the car?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you look at your rearview mirror to see the rear of the car?
A. I could have, but I didn't. I was just glad the car went past us without hitting us.
Q. Tell us what emotions were going through you as this event unfolded.
A. I was very worried. I was almost paralyzed. I think the reaction was, oh, my god, call 911.

And we slowed a little bit, and I go -- like we made it. We didn't get hit.
Q. Did the police officers that investigated this accident contact you?
A. Yes.
Q. Did they interview you?
A. Yes.
Q. And was your deposition taken with some of the lawyers here for -- that are here in this room for Toyota and for Bello?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you since learned who the occupant or the driver of that Toyota Camry was?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you since learned that it was somebody that your wife knew?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell us about that.

MR. GALVIN: Objection. Relevance.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: If they're not going to get into it, I don't need to get into it at all.

THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Did you tell me just a moment ago that you did not get to see what gender or what age the driver of that vehicle was that passed you?
A. I did tell you. I couldn't tell who was driving or what was driving. It was too fast.
Q. Were you in lane number two, meaning the curb lane?
A. Yes.
Q. The outside lane?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you there that entire time, from the time you saw the Toyota Camry heading southbound until the time it passed you?
A. Yes.
Q. Where was the Toyota Camry in terms of lane? What lane was it in from the time you first saw it heading southbound on Euclid until it passed you?
A. The lane closest to the median the entire time.
Q. So that I understand what you're telling us, just so that we have the record straight, going northbound, that would be the number one lane, the fast lane?
A. Correct.
Q. And as you're describing it, it would be the lane closest to the center median, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And by the way, is the center median made of like dirt and gravel?
A. Yeah. Yes, more gravel -- light gravel, not -yes, gravel. Gravel and ground.
Q. After the 911 call, did you also see a Lexus at the $23 r d$ and Euclid intersection?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell us what you saw.
A. As we were driving up, we saw this car parked on the northwest corner of 23 rd and Euclid, and it looked like it had been in an accident.

And there was people -- there was one lady sitting down and another one standing up. And it looked like they may have needed help.
Q. Did you speak to any of those individuals?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ask them if they needed help?
A. I did. And I -- I'm a little vague on this. I
thought they said they had already called 911, but it had been a while. So then $I$ believe $I$ made another 911 call.
Q. And then did you leave the area?
A. After a while, yeah. We might have been there 10 or 15 minutes. I'm not sure.
Q. Were you there long enough for emergency
personnel to show up?
MR. GALVIN: Objection. Speculation.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I don't remember, counselor.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Okay.
MR. GALVIN: Withdrawn.
Q. BY MR. MARDIROSSIAN: And once you left the area, did you head home?
A. Yes.

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Thank you, your Honor. I have
nothing further.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Galvin?
THE WITNESS: Oh.
THE COURT: I think Mr. Galvin may have some questions for you.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. GALVIN:
Q. How are you?
A. Well. Thanks. How about yourself?
Q. Good. Thanks.

We've never met, right?
A. Right.
Q. I represent Toyota. I've had the benefit of being able to read your deposition so some of my questions already take into account things you've said. Okay?

So you were coming from Home Depot, right?
A. I believe so. It was definitely that shopping center. It probably was Home Depot. If I said that earlier, that's what it was.
Q. Yeah, Home Depot.

Pretty much I know -- pretty much I know what you're going to say before you say it. This is just to get everything before the jury. Okay?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. You were going north in the number two lane, the right-hand lane on Euclid, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you were going 35, 40 miles per hour, the speed limit?
A. Correct.
Q. Or below the speed limit, correct?
A. Somewhere in that neighborhood.
Q. And when you first saw the Camry, you were about a block away from it?
A. Yeah. It's a long block, but I would say that's about right.
Q. Now, is this flag -- what does this flag right here represent?
A. Is that the first one?
Q. Yeah, that's the first flag.
A. That's where $I$ first observed the Toyota.
Q. Okay. When you say you first observed the Toyota, it could mean this is where the Toyota was or this is where you were?
A. No. No. That's where I was.
Q. So this is -- when you said in your depo when you first saw it you were a block away, is this flag right here your guesstimate of where you were?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So was your $F-150$ here, or is there some range?

And if you don't know, you don't know.
A. Thank you. That's it. I know it was north of 22 nd and south of $23 r d$.
Q. Somewhere in here?
A. Yes. Thank you.
Q. And there was no particular noise you heard coming from the car other than it sounded like it was going fast?
A. As I recall, it sounded -- you know how an over-revved engine sounds, like if you have a conventional shift car or an automatic transmission and you've left it in low range too long? That was the sound that I recall.
Q. Or let me ask it this way.

You don't think there was any sound of the car other than it was going -- the sound of it going much -- at a -- let me do better than that.
"I don't think it was anything other than the sound of a car going at a much higher rate of speed than $I$ would have expected"?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Right?
A. But that would include an over-revved engine.
Q. And other than that, you didn't hear anything else from it?
A. Correct.
Q. And you didn't hear any horn?
A. Correct.
Q. You couldn't see the driver?
A. I could not. Right.
Q. Now, is that because you didn't look?
A. Counselor, it happened so fast, I don't know.

All $I$ know is $I$ had this gray missile coming at me and we survived it. I don't think I was focusing on who was driving it or anything like that.
Q. Fair enough. It's not like you were supposed to -- I wasn't intending to convey you were supposed to have seen it.

So let me take it back and do it this way.
You were in the number two lane, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you see this vehicle coming in your
direction, right?
A. Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Is that yes?
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I know better than that, too.
THE COURT: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
Q. BY MR. GALVIN: And if I understand what you said at your deposition, you had an adrenaline rush. You were afraid. You thought you were going to be in an accident?
A. Yes.
Q. So you pulled over, didn't you?
A. I'm a bit vague about that one, counselor. I believe when my wife handed me the phone, I either slowed to a -- or came to a stop or $I$ slowed very -- slowed down a lot.

But I can't give you exact specifications on that instant.
Q. Okay. Let me put it to you this way.

You didn't keep going at the 35 to 40 that you had been going at before you saw the vehicle and before you started to call 911, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So when you actually pulled over and went to a dead stop or you pulled over and were sort of crawling, you don't remember, but it's something like that, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And where -- relative to this flag, if you can tell us -- maybe you can't -- would it have been that area that you sort of pulled over -- you did what we just
talked about, you pulled over and crawled or stopped or a combo?
A. One to three driveways from where that flag is that's closest to me.
Q. Okay. So one -- so it would be here, here, or here?
A. Somewhere.
Q. Do you want to come down so you can see what I'm doing?
A. Yeah.
Q. So here is where you were when you first see it?
A. Uh-huh, right.
Q. And then you did a 911, so you slowed down and pulled over to a crawl like we just talked about?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. So identify in here -- because you'll be gone when we need to use this --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- where that area would have been and where you did that.
A. I can't give you a specific driveway, counselor. I'm sorry.
Q. Okay. Is it up here? Is it down here? Just give it a range.
A. Somewhere between here and here.
Q. Okay. So one, two, three, four.

So basically between these two flags?
A. That would be my -- that is the way $I$ recall it.

Yes.
Q. Okay. And this is the flag where she passed you?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So did you start slowing down and pulling over, doing whatever it is you did, from this point?

Do you know what $I$ mean?
A. Yeah. At this point $I$ said to my wife, call 911.

She picked up the cell phone, dialed it, and held it up to me to talk into.

THE COURT: The record should reflect that this point was the first flag.

MR. GALVIN: Correct.
Q. BY MR. GALVIN: And so were you in that state of -- a pulled over, slowing state when the car passed you?
A. We hadn't come to a complete stop.
Q. Right. But whatever that state was where you were, you know, pulled over, slowing down?
A. Yes.
Q. You were in that state, that driving state, when the car passed you?
A. As best I recall, yes.
Q. So if it was back here that you got into that slowing, pulled over type state and the car passed you here?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Then somewhere from here to here, you were in that state slowed down when the car passed you?
A. As best $I$ can recall it, yeah.

My wife may be able to help you better on that point.
Q. Okay. And the here that I'm pointing to for the record is the flag that you put here as the point where the Camry went past you?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So from that flag, the-Camry-passed-me flag backwards to the when-I-first-see-the-Camry flag, that's basically the distance that you were slowing down, pulling over?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. That's all I have for this moment. Yes.

From the time you saw the Camry to the time it passed you, it was going in a straight line in the number one lane, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And from the time it passed you going back behind you, did you look at it at all?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. You know that it hit a phone pole, though, right?
A. So we heard, yes, tragically.
Q. And when it went by you, beside you, did you look at the vehicle?
A. It all happened so fast. I noticed left-side damage, and $I$ noticed a high rate of speed and something like an over-revved engine.

That's about the best that $I$ can give you, counselor. Q. And when you saw the vehicle on the straightaway coming down Euclid, you concluded in your mind that it could not have made the turn at the speed it was on the straightaway because that was too fast, right?
A. I don't think the laws of physics would allow a car to negotiate a 90 -degree turn at what $I$ consider to be 60 miles an hour.
Q. I'll get there.

But just more simple than that, in terms of we're not doing reconstruction, when the vehicle went past you, when you saw it, your mindset was, based on what we know from what you told us before, whatever speed it was going here couldn't have been the speed it took the turn up here because that would have been too fast?
A. Are you saying -- where the vehicle passed me?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, correct.
Q. And prior to where the vehicle passed you, as I understand your testimony, you had seen the vehicle from somewhere close to this intersection when you were back here, right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Yeah. And at some point you concluded that the vehicle was going faster and faster, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was after it was on the straightaway, when you had the clear shot and you could judge that, right.
A. Yes.
Q. And in terms of this sequence, if you're here when you first see it and you could see it up here, knowing Euclid as you know it, is that a pretty long distance?
A. Do you want me to estimate the feet?
Q. No.

I'm going to object to my own question. It calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. GALVIN: Now, as I recall what you told us before, you thought you saw it making the turn.

Are you -- did you actually see it make the turn, or is it something that is vague to you?
A. When I looked up, I saw what I thought was a completion of a turn at a much higher rate and in an erratic fashion than would normally be done. That triggered in my mind something bad is wrong.

Then when the car came at us accelerating, I was quite certain.
Q. And for all the time when you saw the Camry, it was in the number one lane, right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Even when it made the turn, it turned into the number one lane, correct?
A. Well, it turned from the southernmost portion of that cross street, 23rd, into the number one lane of northbound Euclid.
Q. Correct. So it was in -- you say the southernmost area of --
A. Of 23rd Street as it's going -- as you're going east.
Q. Right. Into the number one lane on Euclid?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And from that point it always stayed in the number one lane past you?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Bear with me. I'm trying to cut through.

I want to try to clarify something. You've used 60 here, and I don't want to pick nits, but let me just see if you recognize this.
"I saw a vehicle coming at us at a very high rate of speed, which $I$ can't say it was 60 , but $I$ think it was pretty close to that. It was definitely way faster than any vehicle should be going even if they were going the right way on the one way street, and they were coming at us the wrong way on that street."

Do you remember saying that?
A. Words to that effect, yes.
Q. So you can't say it's 60, but it was going faster than it should have been?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Now, from the point where you first saw the Camry way up here on 23 rd --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. This is where you were when you first saw the

Camry, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Way up here in the intersection of 23rd?
A. Yes.
Q. You only saw the Camry? You never saw any other cars at that intersection, correct?
A. I did not.
Q. Can you identify for us, Mr. Wunsch, where you were when you first saw the silver Lexus?

And if you need to come down, help yourself.
A. Thank you.

It was after we got closer to 23rd. If you want me to
guess --
Q. We don't want you to guess, but we want you to make an estimate.
A. My estimate would be one to four driveways, something like that.
Q. Okay. So in this --
A. In this area.
Q. Somewhere in this area?
A. Yeah.
Q. So 23rd, driveway, driveway, driveway, driveway?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And you were in the number two lane.

Were you still doing that crawl?
A. I believe we picked up some speed, and then when we got up here, we noticed over here the car that we saw wasn't here. It was here.
Q. Okay.
A. And it looked like it had been in an accident.

There was a young lady sitting on the ground alongside a tree and another lady standing over her.
Q. Now, that was the only vehicle you saw at that intersection is the silver Lexus, right?
A. That's the only one I recall.
Q. And as you sit here today and as you sat at your depo, that was the only one you saw at that intersection?
A. Correct.
Q. So in this model we see all these cars here. They weren't here, were they?
A. If they were, I didn't see them.
Q. Can you put to us where the Camry was? I just put it here, but why don't you do it?
A. Are you talking about the Lexus?
Q. The Lexus. Here. Use this one.
A. That's where $I$ recall it being.
Q. And --

THE COURT: And, Mr. Galvin, can you identify what it is that was just placed in that spot?

MR. GALVIN: Sure. There is a little silver car here.
Can I ask the witness to say what he did?
Q. Say what you did.
A. When we got up here, we observed the car which it seemed like it had been in an accident and the young lady sitting down alongside the tree and another adult lady standing there.

They looked like they had been experiencing some kind of trauma.
Q. Was the older lady taking care of the younger lady, or could you tell?
A. It seemed like it, yes.
Q. Comforting them -- her?
A. Yes. It seemed.
Q. You didn't see any other vehicles at this intersection?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. So if we want to depict what you saw on this model, these four vehicles -- the five vehicles, three silver and the two red, should not be here, right?
A. They may have been here. I was focusing on what I thought to be a car in the accident.

If there were cars there or not, I don't know.
Q. You didn't see any?
A. I didn't see them. If they were there, I don't remember.
Q. We're just going on what you saw.
A. Okay.
Q. You didn't see them. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. If some other witnesses saw them, that's their job to tell us. Okay?

In terms of what we see looking at this thing, you come up and the only vehicle you saw was the silver Lexus?
A. That's my recollection.
Q. Okay. With the two females out on the sidewalk? MR. MARDIROSSIAN: Asked and answered, your Honor. THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. GALVIN: And did you know who those people were?
A. No.
Q. Okay. What did you do next?
A. We pulled over and -- you know, I can't even remember where we parked. I'm guessing we probably pulled in front over here, but I wouldn't swear to that. And we stopped to inquire if they needed any help.

The lady sitting down I thought might have been injured. She had some other problems which probably are totally irrelevant.

And I believe we inquired if they had called for an emergency. As I recall, they said they had, but it had been a while.

So as I recall, I made another 911 call.
Q. And do you have an estimate of how fast you went from Euclid up over to here to the -- when you parked?
A. I --
Q. You never thought you were going to be asked all these questions, did you?
A. If you've experienced this, you'll know what I'm talking about. In a moment of semi-panic, it seems like time drags on and on. It seemed like a minute or two, but it was probably 15 seconds.
Q. Does that mean you don't really know?
A. Correct.
Q. So when you're gone and we're arguing to the jury what you said, you don't know how long it was?
A. It was less than three minutes and more than 30 seconds. How's that?
Q. That's fine.

You didn't hear any screeching or skidding tire sounds, right?
A. I did not. I generally drive with my windows up, however.
Q. Okay. But even if that's how you were driving that day, you didn't hear any of that stuff?
A. That's correct.
Q. You don't think she had her headlights on, but you don't know?
A. Correct.
Q. She being the Camry?
A. Correct.
Q. You didn't see or hear the tree impact?
A. Correct.

MR. GALVIN: I think I'm done. Just let me consult.
I have nothing further. Thank you.
THE COURT: Mr. Duffy?
MR. DUFFY: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. DUFFY:
Q. Mr. Wunsch, good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. We've never met, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. In fact, at your deposition, it was only Mr. Mardirossian and -- there were only two attorneys there at your deposition.

Do you remember that?
A. There was a court reporter, the gentleman over here --
Q. Mr. Jimerson?
A. The gentleman at the far right.

THE COURT: The record should reflect that's
Mr. Jimerson.
THE WITNESS: Thank you. Nice guy.
There was another gentleman there, but $I$ don't know who he was or his affiliation.
Q. BY MR. DUFFY: He was there as the video person, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So we've never met?
A. Correct.
Q. So you indicated when you got up to 23rd, did you then, you know, make the left and go across and then go in front of the silver Lexus that you're talking about?
A. That's where we turned, and I believe we parked in front of the Lexus.
Q. Okay. And when you made the turn onto 23rd, you didn't have to pass any cars or anything like that, correct?
A. If we did, I don't remember it.
Q. Okay. But if there were cars there, you would have had to wait, so your memory at this point is you just don't remember any cars?
A. I think it's wide enough for two cars there. I'm not sure. I think that lane might accommodate two vehicles going east and two vehicles going west but maybe not.
Q. But you don't remember --
A. That is correct.
Q. $\quad-\quad$ seeing.

Okay. So when you pulled -- you got out of your truck, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then that's when you came back over and you saw the -- one of the -- I think you described her as a granddaughter of the other person.

Where did you come up with that?
A. I probably just speculate on it.

It looked like the older lady was taking care of the younger lady, and it looked like the younger lady might have been in a state of shock or something similar.
Q. Describe for me what you saw with the younger lady.
A. She was sitting down, and she said she had need of a restroom.
Q. Okay. And the -- as far as -- describe her. What was she wearing, anything like that?
A. I don't recall, counselor.
Q. Now, the younger one was already on the grass at the time when you pulled up, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the older woman, was she walking around?
A. That's what $I$ recall.
Q. Okay. She didn't appear to be injured, did she?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. The younger woman, did you -- you were there for about, what, 10 to 15 minutes?
A. Sounds about right.
Q. Okay. During that time when you were there, the ambulance had not arrived, correct?
A. That's what $I$ recall.
Q. Okay. Well, while you were there, did you ever see the young lady that you talked about -- did you ever see her get up and move around or do anything?
A. I believe she did.
Q. And tell us what you saw in that regard.
A. I'm not sure I understand your question.
Q. Well, what did you see when you said that you saw her get up and move around?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Describe for us what you saw.
A. I thought she was -- I thought her movements might indicate either shock or perhaps some degree of mental retardation or something like that.
Q. Now, when you -- okay. But the mental retardation issue, that wasn't something that you thought was
coming from the accident, right?
A. You're right. I was not thinking that.
Q. You're just describing her condition?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What $I$ want to find out is what about -when you saw her walking around, did she appear to be limping? Did she appear -- tell me what you saw in that regard.
A. I don't recall that part.
Q. Okay. Did you see any blood or anything like that?
A. I did not.
Q. The same thing with the older woman?
A. Correct.
Q. But she did seem to be shaken up?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you have any conversation with the young lady that you just described?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. And so what did you -- were you the first one there at the scene when -- in other words, were there any other people besides the older lady and the younger lady? Was there anybody else there?
A. I believe a homeowner came out and I -- you know, I believe the young lady said she needed to use the restroom and could she go inside, and he said no.

That's the part I got out of it.
Q. As far as your recollection, then, is that just that you were the first one to arrive at the scene?
A. I don't know that, counselor.
Q. That's why I'm asking.

Did you see anybody else out there? You told us about the man who came out of the house.
A. Yes.
Q. He came out after you got there?
A. Yes.
Q. Before you got there -- I mean, as you arrived there, did you see anybody else out there?
A. I recall the older lady and the younger lady.

If there was anyone else there, I don't remember them.
Q. Okay. And we're almost done.

The other thing is that when you -- when you pulled around in front, you said that you saw the vehicle that was -and you put it down here past the intersection.

What made you think that that vehicle had been involved in the accident?
A. There may have been some damage to it that I didn't see, but something didn't look right to see this young lady sitting down alongside the tree and this older lady that seemed like she was agitated or something.

And, you know, it's too much of a coincidence that this car comes past us at a high rate of speed, apparently out of control, and maybe that was a collision or something. I --
Q. So it wasn't that you saw any damage on the back of the car or anything like that; it was just that you just thought that this might have been connected in some way?
A. That's the way I recall it.
Q. Okay. And from the time that -- when you first saw the vehicle up until the time when you got over here, that was that time frame of 30 seconds to three minutes that we're talking about?
A. Correct.

MR. DUFFY: Thank you. No further questions.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: No further questions, your Honor.
Thank you, Mr. Wunsch.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mardirossian.
Mr. Wunsch, you may step down.
MR. MARDIROSSIAN: He was wondering whether his wife was going to be taking the stand. I said I don't think so.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Wunsch. You are excused.
All right. We are going to call it a day.
Now, as you will recall, we're going to be in session typically Monday through Thursday so you don't come back tomorrow. We're off tomorrow.

Then this next week, as I mentioned to you during jury selection, we're off on Monday.

So Monday, August 12th, we are not going to be in session, but you do need to return on Tuesday, August 13th. We'll start at 9:00 a.m.

I thank you all for being here so promptly this morning. And I ask you, please, to come back promptly at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, August 13th.

You are reminded not to discuss this matter among yourselves or with any other person, not to form or express an
opinion on the matter until it's sent to you for deliberation.
You can leave your notebooks in your chairs.
Thank you so much. Have a great weekend. See you next Tuesday.

Mr. Hernandez, could you hang back for just one moment.
(The following proceedings were held
outside the presence of the jury:)
THE COURT: The record should reflect that we are outside the presence of the jury but Mr. Hernandez is still with us.

Mr. Hernandez, yesterday we spoke very briefly about the possibility of my calling your employer. Did you want me to do that?

JUROR HERNANDEZ: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Did you bring the information with you?

JUROR HERNANDEZ: I have the number of the agency. THE COURT: Okay. Is there a particular person I
should speak with at the agency?
JUROR HERNANDEZ: I don't know. Just whoever is there.
THE COURT: And the agency, is that your employer?
JUROR HERNANDEZ: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And do you have the full name and telephone number written there of the agency?

JUROR HERNANDEZ: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. If you could give that, then, to Ms. Jones on your way out.

JUROR HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you so much. We'll see you on Tuesday morning.

MR. GALVIN: Thank you, your Honor.
(Juror exits courtroom.)
THE COURT: Okay. The record can reflect that Mr. Hernandez has exited the courtroom.

Mr. Akaragian, did you have something you wanted to raise?

MR. AKARAGIAN: Just something. I know the Court has a 4:30.

The Lee Carr CD, what's the Court's preference? I know Mr. Salyer is transcribing the videos. I could mark it as an exhibit also and however the Court wants to do it, or we can just go with the transcript. That was the only thing I was going to ask.

THE COURT: Why don't you talk amongst yourselves and decide how you want to do that. You can address that on Tuesday morning.

Let me just address one other thing.
Mr. Akaragian, you asked for some guidance in connection with your brief that you're going to give me on Tuesday.

When I look at Commercial Code 2313, what I was referring to was comment or note number 5 that talks about paragraph $1(B)$ that makes specific some of the principles set forth above when the description of the goods is given by the seller.

And, in particular, it ends with the line, "Of course
all descriptions by merchants must read against the applicable trade usages with the general rules as to merchantability resolving any doubts."

So that is what $I$ was referring to in terms of giving some context as to what safety means, and it being a general trade usage in connection with that issue. So that is what $I$ was referring to.

MR. AKARAGIAN: Thank you, your Honor. That's a big help.

THE COURT: The only other thing I want to address before you leave is the issue of -- two things.

Exhibits, I'm assuming whatever you're going to use on Monday you're going to bring hard copies for the Court so that we've got a set of whatever it is that we can mark and so that we can keep the record clear.

Mr. Mardirossian, did you intend to admit the one exhibit that you did refer to, exhibit 5302-9?

MR. MARDIROSSIAN: I would like to, yes, your Honor.
MR. GALVIN: I think we have to get some foundation for the scale and stuff. I don't mind if we continue to use it the way we have been.

THE COURT: All right. Then $I$ will expect you to address it later when you wish to.

The final issue is when you're going to be using a deposition or reading from a deposition of somebody, I'm going to need to get involved in that discussion.

I want you to make sure that you have copies of the deposition so that $I$ can read along.

MR. BERRY: Our intention is to lodge the originals for anyone where we have the originals.

MR. GALVIN: We didn't have them for the Wunsches.
MR. AKARAGIAN: We had them right here just in case.
MR. GALVIN: I'm not making fun. I'm just saying I didn't have it.

THE COURT: I don't particularly care to have a lodged copy of every single deposition that you all have done in this case. I'll have enough boxes of documents to look at.

But I want to make sure that we got handy copies of the depositions of the witnesses where there is a chance that you might read from it.

And thank you. I appreciate the fact that you had it here.

All right. Thank you all very much. See you --
MR. DUFFY: One thing, your Honor, I would like to address on the record.

THE COURT: Mr. Duffy.
MR. DUFFY: There was a motion in limine about financial condition, and Mr. Mardirossian started asking the witness about all of these big expensive houses that are lined up on this area here, implying that Mrs. Bello lives in one of these big fancy houses because she lives two blocks from here.

That I felt was improper in light of the motion in limine. I just wanted to bring it to the attention of the Court. I don't think it should happen again.

THE COURT: All right. If that's an objection, it's overruled.

I don't think that that -- while you may be sensitive to that, I don't think that was -- certainly not what $I$ got from the testimony. But $I$ hear you, and I will be sensitive to the issue.

MR. DUFFY: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. I'll take my 4:30 conference call.

Thank you all, and we'll see you next Tuesday at 8:30.
(At 5:10 p.m. the proceedings were adjourned until Tuesday, August 13, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.)

