

HONORABLE TANA LIN

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
IN SEATTLE

PAUL BERNAL,)	
Plaintiff,)	NO. 2:22-cv-00533-TL
vs.)	
)	PLAINTIFF’S SUPPLEMENTAL
THE BOEING COMPANY,)	BRIEFING ON EMOTIONAL
Defendant.)	DISTRESS DAMAGES
)	

Plaintiff, Paul Bernal, provides this memorandum in response to the Court’s request for supplemental briefing on his claim for emotional distress damages.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this matter, Bernal seeks an award for the emotional distress he has experienced as a result of the retaliatory events established by the trial testimony and evidence. Bernal has referred to his emotional distress as “garden variety,” and both he and his wife, Jamie Harker, provided this Court with testimony describing what he has experienced.¹

As set out below, Bernal’s and Ms. Harker’s testimony is not only sufficient to establish that he experienced significant emotional distress, but it is also sufficient to warrant and support a substantial award of damages.

¹ Regarding Bernal’s use of the term “garden variety” to describe his emotional distress damages, see Declaration of Margaret Boyle in Support of in Support of Plaintiff’s Supplemental Briefing on Emotional Distress Damages.

II. AUTHORITY AND ARGUMENT

Garden variety emotional distress.

1
2
3 “Garden variety” emotional distress is usually defined as “ordinary or commonplace
4 emotional distress, that which is simple or usual.” Rollins v. Traylor Bros., Inc., C14-1414-JCC,
5 2017 WL 1756576, at *6 (W.D. Wash. 2017). Since this definition provides little contours for the
6 damages that will fall within it, garden variety emotional distress may be best defined by
7 contrasting it with what it isn’t: “emotional distress that is not garden variety may be complex,
8 such as that resulting in a specific psychiatric disorder.” Id. Additionally, and perhaps the most
9 definitive distinction between what is and what isn’t garden variety emotional distress is the
10 manner of proof: a plaintiff who relies upon an expert or a treatment provider to establish distress
11 symptoms or conditions no longer pleads “garden variety” emotional distress. Id.

12
13 As a result, a plaintiff who characterizes his emotional distress damages as “garden
14 variety” effectively states that proof of his emotional distress damages will be limited to the
15 testimony of himself and other nonexpert witnesses.²

16
17 Regarding what emotional distress fits within the definition of “garden variety,” courts
18 have found plaintiffs to claim such emotional distress when asserting “humiliation, loss of
19 enjoyment of life, pain and suffering, personal indignity, embarrassment, fear, sadness, anger,
20 anxiety, and anguish,” Rollins, 2017 WL 1756576, at *6, as well as, “depression, anger,
21 irritability, sleep loss, discouragement, withdrawal, relived experience, and low self esteem.”
22 Sims v. Lakeside, 2007 WL 5417731, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 15, 2007).

23
24 ² As Bernal did in this matter.

1 As the above references to “anxiety” and “depression” make clear, a plaintiff’s proof may
2 include “layman allegations bearing similarity to a ‘specific psychiatric disorder,’” without
3 rendering the claim “complex” – or, something more than garden variety. Id., citing, Sims, 2007
4 WL 5417731, at *1.

5 In both the Ninth Circuit and Washington State, proof of emotional distress may be
6 established and supported by the subjective testimony of the plaintiff, and also combined with
7 observations by others (including relatives), and appropriate inferences from the circumstances.
8 Passantino v. Johnson and Johnson, 212 F.3d 493, 513-14 (9th Cir. 2000)(citing to both Ninth
9 Circuit and Washington State opinions). In this matter, the Court heard sufficient testimony to
10 establish and support a finding that Bernal experienced significant garden variety emotional
11 distress.
12

13 Bernal provided his own testimony and Ms. Harker’s to establish that since August 2,
14 2018, he has and continues to experience many of the symptoms discussed in Rollins and Sims,
15 including humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety, depression, sleep issues, withdrawal from family
16 and friends, and self-esteem issues – as well as stress from feeling like a leper at work and that his
17 once very promising career is permanently stalled. Additionally, Bernal also described
18 experiencing gastric issues and an eye twitch that he relates to stress resulting from the events of
19 this case. Though Bernal has neither asserted or provided evidence of a professional or expert
20 diagnosis of depression, anxiety, gastrointestinal malady, or optic defect, this Court can credit to
21 the extent it views appropriate Bernal’s and Ms. Harker’s “layman allegations” that Bernal has
22 exhibited such symptoms and that they are related to the events of this case. Indeed, this
23
24
25

1 testimony is similar to the layperson testimony anticipated or provided by the plaintiff in Rollins,
2 2017 WL 1756576, at *6-7 (anxiety), the plaintiff in Sims, 2007 WL 5417731, at *1 (depression),
3 and the plaintiff in Passantino, 212 F.3d at 513 (rashes, stomach problems, and anxiety stemming
4 from belief that career would no longer advance).

5 **Damages.**

6 Guidance on the appropriate damage award in this matter can be found in Washington
7 State, Western District of Washington, and Ninth Circuit cases involving similar emotional
8 distress testimony.

9
10 In Goldstine v. FedEx Freight Inc., 2021 WL 952354 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 15, 2007), the
11 plaintiff was terminated just as he learned of a cancer diagnosis. He testified to the emotional
12 distress he experienced as a result of facing a cancer diagnosis without insurance, his fear of not
13 being able to afford the necessary surgery, and the shame he felt having to rely upon friends and
14 family to help with medical bills. The plaintiff also testified that for a period of three months he
15 was “hopeless and confused and began to withdraw.” Id., at *8. Plaintiff’s testimony was
16 supplemented by the testimony of a friend who described plaintiff as “hurt and outraged” and
17 “victimized.” Id.

18
19 The jury awarded the plaintiff \$1,750,000 for those damages. The trial court denied the
20 defendant’s motion for a remittitur, finding that “the jury heard sufficient evidence of [plaintiff’s]
21 emotional distress caused by [defendant’s] discriminatory acts that would make remittitur
22 improper. It cannot be said that the award ‘is grossly excessive or monstrous, clearly not
23
24
25

1 supported by the evidence, or based only on speculation or guesswork.” Id., citing In re Exxon
2 Valdez, 270 F.3d 1215, 1247-48 (9th Cir. 2001).

3 Similarly, in the above cited Ninth Circuit case, Passantino v. Johnson and Johnson, the
4 plaintiff testified that as a result of the defendant’s discrimination she

5 “constantly worried, cried, and felt trapped and upset. She felt she was forced to spend
6 less time with her family because she feared she would lose her job, given that her
7 performance rating had been declining. She suffered stomach problems, rashes, and
8 headaches which required medical attention. In addition, she sought counseling from her
9 pastor. Most important, her advancement within the company was brought to a halt.”

10 Passantino, 212 F.3d at 503. The plaintiff’s testimony was corroborated by testimony from her
11 husband and sister. Id., at 513. The jury in that case awarded the plaintiff \$1,000,000. Id., at
12 504.

13 On appeal, the defendant argued that the trial court erred when upholding the jury’s award
14 because, when properly considered, the plaintiff’s evidence did not support it. The Ninth Circuit
15 rejected that argument holding “Washington law contains no severity requirement as a
16 precondition to awarding compensatory damages; thus, [plaintiff’s] testimony corroborated by
17 that of her husband and sister is adequate to support the jury’s verdict.” Id., at 513.

18 In a recent Washington State case, Elias v. City of Seattle, 2 Wn. App.2d 1039
19 (2018)(unpublished)(attached), two plaintiffs each sued the defendant for a retaliatory transfer
20 they asserted followed their protected conduct. One plaintiff testified that her transfer was “hard
21 to take” and caused her emotional distress due to the loss of overtime and employment
22 opportunities, and exposed her to rumors regarding the basis for the transfer. She also testified
23 that when transferred she had no assigned job duties for five months, during which time she
24
25

1 worked double shifts to make up for the lost overtime, causing her to not see her son and feel
2 “crabby, tired.” *Id.*, at *4. The jury awarded her \$1,500,000 million in emotional distress
3 damages.

4 The other plaintiff also testified regarding the emotional distress he experienced,
5 describing that his work as a police officer was a “calling” and that his transfer was “gut-
6 wrenching” because it caused him to leave coworkers he considered family. The jury awarded
7 this plaintiff \$750,000. *Id.*

8 On appeal, the defendant challenged the awards arguing that they were unsupported by
9 sufficient evidence and a shock to the conscience. The court rejected both arguments.

10 On the sufficiency argument, the court noted that “once a plaintiff proves discrimination, [he] ‘is
11 only required to offer proof of actual anguish or emotional distress in order to have those damages
12 included in recoverable costs pursuant to RCW 49.60.’” *Id.*, citing Bunch v. King County
13 Department of Youth Services, 155 Wn.2d 165, 180, 116 P.3d 381 (2005).³ The claimed distress
14 does not need to be “severe,” and the testimony in support of it can be “limited.” Elias, at *4,
15 citing Bunch, at 180.

16 To support its argument that the awards shocked the conscience, the defendant pointed out
17 that the plaintiffs were merely transferred and not fired, they had not sought treatment for their
18 emotional distress, and they did not claim serious symptoms of distress. The court easily rejected
19
20
21

22 ³ In Bunch, a 2005 case, the court upheld an award of \$260,000 in emotional distress damages finding it supported
23 by the plaintiff’s testimony that he was discriminated against over a six-year period, and that the discrimination left
24 him “overwhelmed,” “depressed and angry.” The court also found the award supported by evidence that the
25 plaintiff was disciplined on numerous occasions for “petty offenses that others committed with impunity,” that the
plaintiff now works for less money and benefits, and that he had to explain to his family why he was fired. *Id.*, at
180.

1 this argument: “[t]he absence of more evidence in this case is not a lack of sufficient competent
2 evidence, particularly when ‘the distress need not be severe.’” Elias, at *5, citing Bunch, at 180.
3 Since both plaintiffs’ “testimony reflect actual anguish or emotional distress...the verdict is not
4 ‘flagrantly outrageous.’” Id. As a result, the court upheld the plaintiffs’ emotional distress
5 awards of \$1,500,00 and \$750,000, respectively.


6 In this case, the testimony of Bernal and Ms. Harker regarding the emotional distress
7 Bernal has experienced is consistent with the testimony provided by the plaintiffs and their
8 witnesses in the above matters – testimony found to support the above enumerated awards.
9 Accordingly, Bernal asserts that a reasonable range for an award of emotional distress damages in
10 his case is \$750,000-\$1,750,000.
11

12 II. CONCLUSION

13 Based upon the foregoing, the testimony provided by Bernal and Ms. Harker evidences
14 and supports a finding that Bernal experienced significant garden variety emotional distress
15 damages and that he is entitled to an award consistent with range of damages set forth above.
16

17 DATED this 17th day of November, 2023.

18 BOYLE MARTIN THOENY, PLLC

19
20 

21 Margaret M. Boyle, WSBA#17089
22 Ann D. Thoeny, WSBA#17749
23 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
24 100 W. Harrison, South Tower, Ste. 300
25 Seattle, Washington 98119
(206)217-9400/margaret@boylemartin.com

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I hereby certify that on November 17, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system so that notification of such filing will be sent to the following attorneys of record for defendants:

Larry Shapero: laurence.shapero@ogletree.com

Brenda Bannon: brenda.bannon@ogletreedekins.com

SIGNED this 17th day of November, 2023, in Seattle, Washington.



MARGARET BOYLE

ATTACHMENT TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
REGARDING EMOTIONAL DISTRESS DAMAGES

UNPUBLISHED LEGAL AUTHORITY:
Elias v. City of Seattle. 2 Wn. App.2d 1039 (2018)

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

2 Wash.App.2d 1039

NOTE: UNPUBLISHED OPINION, SEE WA R GEN
GR 14.1

Court of Appeals of Washington, Division 1.

Ella ELIAS, individually, and David
Proudfoot, individually, Respondents,
Steve Strand, individually, Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE, a political
subdivision of Washington State,
Appellant.

No. 75848-9-I

FILED: February 20, 2018

Appeal from King County Superior Court,
14-2-31735-2, Honorable William L. Downing, J.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Andrea Scheele, Sarah Eve Tilstra, Joshua J. Johnson,
Seattle City Attorney's Office, Seattle, WA, for
Appellant.

Julie Anne Kays, Lincoln Charles Beauregard, Connelly
Law Offices, Tacoma, WA, Philip Albert Talmadge,
Sidney Charlotte Tribe, Talmadge/Fitzpatrick/Tribe,
Seattle, WA, for Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

Each, J.

*1 The city of Seattle (City) appeals the trial court's denial of its motion for a remittitur or, alternatively, a new trial. Three police officers sued the City. A jury awarded substantial damages to two officers but rejected the third officer's claim. The City fails to show that the damages awards are not supported by substantial evidence, shock the conscience, or were the result of passion or prejudice.

It also does not show that any alleged misconduct or error during trial prejudiced the City. We affirm.

FACTS

On June 23, 2014, Kathleen O'Toole became chief of the Seattle Police Department (SPD). She promoted then-Lieutenant Dave Proudfoot to captain and assigned him to lead the South Precinct. On July 21, Sergeant Ella Elias filed a notice of a claim stating that she intended to sue the City. This notice described hostile work environment, gender discrimination, and retaliation claims.¹

On September 15, O'Toole issued an investigatory transfer order that temporarily reassigned Elias from the South Precinct to the West Precinct. O'Toole ordered the transfer to facilitate the SPD's investigation of pending EEO complaints against Elias and Elias's claim against the City.

When Captain Proudfoot received the order, he e-mailed four members of the command staff, including O'Toole, to voice his opposition to the transfer. He stated, "[M]oving her [could] be seen as retaliation for filing an EEO-based lawsuit." The SPD permanently transferred Elias to the West Precinct on December 3, 2014. In April 2015, O'Toole transferred Proudfoot to lead the SPD's training unit where he had served before she promoted him to captain of the South Precinct.

Elias filed this lawsuit in November 2014. She asserted the claims described in her notice. An amended complaint filed in February 2016 added Proudfoot and another officer, Steve Strand, as plaintiffs. They each asserted retaliation claims.

On the first day of trial, Elias voluntarily dismissed her hostile work environment and gender discrimination claims. She proceeded only with her claim that the SPD transferred her in retaliation for filing her tort claim. Proudfoot and Strand proceeded with their claims that the SPD retaliated against them for opposing Elias's transfer.

The jury found that the SPD had retaliated against Elias and Proudfoot but rejected Strand's claim. The jury awarded Elias \$400,000 in economic damages and \$1.5 million in noneconomic damages. It awarded Proudfoot \$182,000 in economic damages and \$750,000 in noneconomic damages. While the damages awards totaled \$2,832,000, the officers' counsel had asked the jury to

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

award more in closing argument. The City asked the trial judge to reduce the damages awards or, alternatively, for a new trial. The trial court denied the City's request. The City appeals this decision.

ANALYSIS

Remittitur and New Trial

*2 We review the trial court's denial of a remittitur for abuse of discretion.⁷ We will not reduce the jury's damages award unless it is not supported by substantial evidence in the record, shocks the conscience of the court, or is the result of passion or prejudice. We do not review the jury's decisions about witness credibility or the weight to be given evidence.⁸ "We strongly presume the jury's verdict is correct."⁹ "A trial court's denial of a remittitur strengthens the verdict."¹⁰

We review the denial of a motion for a new trial for abuse of discretion.¹¹ "A court abuses its discretion when its decision adopts a view that no reasonable person would take or that is based on untenable grounds or reasons."¹² "We review a trial court's denial of a new trial more critically than ... its grant of a new trial because a new trial places the parties where they were before, but a decision denying a new trial concludes their rights."¹³

A. Substantial Evidence

The City challenges only the sufficiency of the evidence to support the jury's monetary awards, not its liability decisions. A damages award must be supported by substantial evidence and is not when the record contains insufficient evidence to convince " 'an unprejudiced, thinking mind.' "¹⁴ Generally, a party may raise on appeal only those issues raised at the trial court.¹⁵ But RAP 2.5(a)(2) permits a party to challenge the sufficiency of the evidence for the first time on appeal.¹⁶

1. Economic Damages Awards

First, the City claims to challenge the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the jury's economic damages awards. The City contends that the officers' expert economist, Dr.

Christina Tapia, improperly calculated the amount of Elias's past lost overtime because she relied in part on overtime wages that Elias lost before her transfer. The City asserts that this overtime was irrelevant in evaluating the lost overtime opportunities caused by her transfer. But the City's claim does not challenge the sufficiency of Tapia's admitted testimony to support the jury's award.

Instead, for the first time on appeal, the City claims that the trial court should not have allowed the jury to consider Tapia's testimony. Thus, the City really challenges the admission of evidence that it now claims is irrelevant. Failure to object at trial to the admissibility of evidence based on relevance precludes appellate review of that issue.¹⁷ The City did not ask the trial court to exclude Tapia's testimony before trial, did not object to Tapia's testimony, and did not ask the court to strike her testimony. Judge William Downing, a well-regarded trial judge with 28 years of superior court judicial experience, aptly observed in his order denying the City's request for a remittitur or new trial that "the defense case was marred by misdirection and missed opportunity." This may have been one of those missed opportunities.

*3 The City also claims that the record does not show Elias lost past or future income as a result of the transfer. It asserts that Elias's "base pay" remained the same, and no evidence indicated that she worked more overtime in any earlier year or that it would be possible for her to work more overtime in the future. Elias testified that she was on track to make more money than she had made previously at the SPD.¹⁸

Tapia, however, testified that she based her past and future lost overtime calculations for Elias on her understanding of the amount of additional overtime Elias lost access to because of the transfer. Tapia stated that in making these calculations, she relied on the documents and data she reviewed and her discussions with Elias. She assumed Elias would retire at age 56¹⁹ and concluded that the transfer caused Elias to lose \$731,008 in past and future overtime earnings and future retirement benefits. The City did not present any controverting expert testimony.

The jury awarded Elias \$400,000 in economic damages. Thus, even without any guidance from the City, the jury awarded Elias an amount less than Tapia's conclusion. The jury's award was in the range of substantial evidence. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by refusing to remit Elias's economic damages award.

We hold similarly for Proudfoot. In April 2015, the SPD demoted Proudfoot from captain to leader of its training

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

unit. This caused him to lose the 5 percent salary premium paid to captains. The City calculated that the 5 percent premium was worth \$10,700 for the 16 months that Proudfoot had been at the training unit after the transfer. The City contends that this amount reflects Proudfoot's total past economic loss, well below the jury's \$40,000 award for past economic damages.

Tapia testified, however, that Proudfoot's involuntary transfer resulted in past economic damages of \$40,115. Tapia included in her calculations the additional amount Proudfoot would have earned had he become assistant chief in April 2015. Although Proudfoot did not apply for an assistant chief position, Tapia testified that she concluded he would have attained the position based on her conversations with Proudfoot and her understanding that he had several conversations with Chief O'Toole about the position. Tapia testified that the City's retaliation caused Proudfoot to lose \$467,390 in past and future overtime earnings and future retirement benefits if he retired at age 60 or \$546,763 if he retired at age 65. Again, the City did not call its own expert and did not provide the jury with its view of an appropriate damage award. The jury awarded him \$182,000 in economic damages, an award well below the range of Tapia's testimony. Substantial evidence therefore supports the award. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in failing to reduce Proudfoot's economic damages award.

2. Noneconomic Damages Awards

The City also challenges the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the jury's noneconomic damages awards to the officers. The jury awarded \$1.5 million in noneconomic damages to Elias and \$750,000 in noneconomic damages to Proudfoot. The City contends that these awards are excessive because both Elias and Proudfoot provided very limited supporting evidence.

*4 But in Bunch v. King County Department of Youth Services,¹⁶ our Supreme Court stated, "The plaintiff, once having proved discrimination, is only required to offer proof of actual anguish or emotional distress in order to have those damages included in recoverable costs pursuant to RCW 49.60." "The distress need not be severe."¹⁷ "The jury's role in determining noneconomic damages is perhaps even more essential [than its role in determining economic damages]."¹⁸ In Bunch, the Supreme Court reversed this court's remittitur and held that the jury could infer emotional distress from "limited" evidence.¹⁹ Bunch testified that the racially motivated employment discrimination he experienced overwhelmed

him.²⁰ He stated that the discrimination made him depressed and angry and required that he explain to his family why the King County Department of Youth Services fired him.²¹ He testified that after the department fired him, he worked for significantly less pay with minimal benefits.²²

Here, the officers provided more substantial evidence of emotional distress than that in Bunch. Elias identified as causes of her emotional distress the loss of overtime and employment opportunities plus exposure to rumors about why the SPD transferred her. She also testified that the SPD transferred her to the West Precinct when no work assignment existed there for her. The captain of the West Precinct told her, "I don't know why they sent you here." The SPD kept her in a "no assignments" position for five months. And she worked double shifts to make up for lost income. This resulted in her not seeing her son and feeling "tired, crabby." She described the ramifications of her transfer as "hard to take." Consistent with Bunch, Elias's testimony provides sufficient support for the jury's \$1.5 million noneconomic damages award.

Similarly, Proudfoot explained that his work at the SPD provided more than a job to him: it was a "calling." He testified that it was emotionally "gut-wrenching" to leave his work at the South Precinct and his coworkers whom he considers family. In accordance with Bunch, Proudfoot's testimony provides sufficient support for the jury's \$750,000 verdict. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in failing to remit the jury's noneconomic damages awards for lack of substantial evidence.

B. Shocks the Conscience of the Court

Next, the City asserts that the jury's noneconomic damages awards should shock the conscience of the court. They do not.

A damages award shocks a court's conscience when it is "flagrantly outrageous and extravagant."²³ The City concedes that Washington law generally does not "assess the amount of a verdict based upon comparisons with verdicts in other cases."²⁴ Instead, the City contrasts what it characterizes as the "sparse evidence" of emotional harm in this case with the evidence of emotional distress in another case involving the Washington Law Against Discrimination (WLAD),²⁵ Collins v. Clark County Fire District No. 5.²⁶

In Collins, the jury awarded \$875,000 in noneconomic damages to former employee of Clark County Fire

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

District No. 5 Valerie Larwick, who experienced sexual harassment in the workplace.³⁷ The City notes that Clark County fired Larwick after she experienced over two years of sexually harassing comments and sexist treatment.³⁸ In addition, Larwick sought treatment for related emotional distress, including recurring nightmares, insomnia, and serious depression.³⁹

*5 The City contends that unlike this case, Collins illustrates circumstances in which it is apparent how the jury reached its “sizeable” noneconomic damages award. Here, the SPD only transferred the officers as opposed to firing them. Also, the officers did not seek treatment for their emotional distress or claim serious symptoms of distress. But emotional distress damages “need not be proved with mathematical certainty, [and need only] be supported by competent evidence.”⁴⁰ The absence of more evidence in this case is not a lack of sufficient competent evidence, particularly when “[t]he distress need not be severe.”⁴¹ As discussed above, both Elias’s and Proudfoot’s testimony reflect actual anguish or emotional distress, which means the verdict is not “flagrantly outrageous.” The trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying the City’s request for a remittitur based on a shocks-the-conscience standard.

C. Passion or Prejudice

The City identifies seven sources of alleged prejudice to support its request for a remittitur or, alternatively, a new trial. We will reduce the jury’s damages awards only if

the passion or prejudice is “unmistakable.”⁴² An error prejudices a party when it affects or presumably affects the outcome of trial.⁴³ The City claims these sources of prejudice: the size of the damages awards alone; the officers’ counsel’s alleged suggestion in closing that the jury should base its damages awards on verdicts in similar cases; the officers’ counsel’s alleged misconduct during opening statements when counsel made unsupported, irrelevant statements about O’Toole; the officers’ counsel’s claimed violation of the court’s order in limine excluding reference to related media coverage; the court’s erroneous admission of expert testimony on police practices and that expert’s improper testimony about whether the SPD retaliated; the court’s failure to submit the City’s proposed mitigation instruction; and the cumulative effect of these errors. We reject the City’s claims of prejudice and hold that the trial court did not act unreasonably in its decision to deny the City’s motion for a remittitur or, alternatively, a new trial.

1. The Size of the Awards

First, the City asserts that the size of the damages awards alone shows that the jury acted out of passion or prejudice, a claim replete with irony. The following table summarizes the expert testimony and closing argument about damages provided to the jury.

	Elias	Proudfoot	Strand
Officers’ expert testimony about economic damages	\$731,008	\$467,390 - \$546,763	\$714,335 - \$812,682
City’s expert testimony about economic damages	None	None	None
Officers’ closing recommendation: economic damages	\$731,008	\$467,390 - \$546,763	\$714,335 - \$812,682

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

Officers' closing recommendation: total damages	\$1 million - \$3 million	\$1 million - \$3 million	\$1 million - \$3 million
City's closing recommendation: economic damages	No recommendation	No recommendation	No recommendation
City's closing recommendation: total damages	No recommendation	No recommendation	No recommendation
Economic damages awarded	\$400,000	\$182,000	\$0.00
Noneconomic damages received	\$1.5 million	\$750,000	\$0.00
Total damages received	\$1.9 million	\$932,000	\$0.00

The jury awarded Elias about 55 percent of the economic damages calculated by her expert and total damages in the middle of the range suggested by her counsel as reasonable. The jury awarded Proudfoot about 39 percent of the low end of the economic damages calculated by his expert and total damages less than the minimum suggested by his counsel as reasonable. The City did not provide the jury with any expert testimony or closing argument to guide the jury's damage decision. As Judge Downing observed, the officers' damages evidence and closing argument recommendations were "not challenged or contradicted by the defense and the jury ultimately settled on amounts toward the lower end of what they may then have seen as an agreed range."

*6 The City cannot credibly claim the size of the verdict shows passion or prejudice when it failed to provide the jury with any evidence or argument to guide the jury's damage decisions. And the fact that the jury rejected Strand's claim and did not award the other officers the full amount requested further suggests that it acted not out of passion, but deliberately.

In addition, damages awards within the range of substantial evidence are not the result of passion or prejudice as a matter of law.⁴¹ The trial court therefore did not abuse its discretion in denying a remittitur or a new trial based on the amount of the awards alone.

Elias v. City of Seattle. Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

2. Counsel's Alleged Misconduct in Closing Argument
Again for the first time on appeal, the City claims that the officers' counsel's misconduct in closing argument prejudiced it. Because the City did not object below, it may not raise this issue on appeal unless it proves that the alleged misconduct was "so flagrant that no instruction could have cured the prejudicial effect."³⁵ Conduct is flagrant when a party engages in repetitive prejudicial conduct that is ill intentioned; generally, flagrant misconduct means pervasive misconduct.³⁶ In State v. Walker,³⁷ for example, Division Two held that the cumulative effect of the prosecutor's repetitive prejudicial misconduct warranted reversal because "the prosecutor made the improper comments not just once or twice, but frequently." In addition, the "case was largely a credibility contest, in which the prosecutor's improper arguments could easily serve as the deciding factor."³⁸

The City asserts that the officers' counsel engaged in prejudicial misconduct during closing argument by suggesting that the jury decide the case based on a "typical" award in similar cases. The City mischaracterizes counsel's statements. The officers' counsel stated, "[A] jury verdict award in cases like this, for a proper reasonable one, again your decision, would be in the range of one to three million for each [plaintiff]." She then told the jury, "And I give you a range for a reason. Even though anywhere in that range would be consistent with what we have heard in this case, I submit to you. It's your decision. You get to figure it out."

Counsel may suggest a range of damages to a jury, but "[i]t is improper for counsel to invite the jury to decide a case based on anything other than the evidence and the law, including appeals to sympathy, prejudice, and bias."³⁹ At trial, however, the officers' counsel stated only that a "reasonable" award in "cases like this" would be within a certain range. "Typical" and "reasonable" are distinct. "Typical" would improperly suggest that the jury should base its awards on what are usual damages awards in similar cases. "Reasonable," however, is a subjective determination that does not suggest the jury should necessarily return an award that is influenced by any other; a reasonable award may not be the typical award in similar cases. Because the City has not shown that counsel's statement constitutes misconduct, we decline to review the issue.

3. Counsel's Alleged Misconduct during Opening Statements

*7 Next, the City claims that the officers' counsel committed prejudicial misconduct during his opening statement when he personally attacked O'Toole with unsupported, irrelevant statements. "Testimony may be anticipated [in opening] so long as counsel has a good faith belief such testimony will be produced at trial."⁴⁰ The City again concedes, however, that at trial it failed to object based on misconduct. As discussed above, the City's failure to object means it may not raise the issue on review unless the statements were so flagrant that an instruction could not have cured the prejudice.⁴¹ The City asserts that neither party presented evidence at trial to support any one of the following five statements the officers' counsel made during his opening statement. It claims that no curative instruction could have prevented the prejudice resulting from this "smear" campaign.

(1) The officers' counsel showed a photo of O'Toole standing behind Michele Obama and said, "[W]hat we have found is the evidence in this case suggests that Chief O'Toole is not so much invested in Seattle as she is invested ...with Seattle potentially as being a stepping stone."

(2) "What you are going to hear is that even back in Boston, Chief O'Toole was known for catering to the people that can get her next job more than catering to the front line officers that she's designed to support."

(3) "What you are going to hear is that in Boston, Chief O'Toole was actually found, by virtue of a no confidence vote by an oversight committee, to be unable to effectively manage ... a diverse work force back in Boston."

(4) Although Seattle City Council "allocated ... \$40,000 for her move when her husband still lives on the east coast.... It turns out that [she] still rents an apartment. And I think the evidence is going to show I think she even rents her furniture."

(5) Chief O'Toole was "going out and speaking in these different environments, spending a lot of time on the east coast," and the jury should therefore consider whether she was making decisions about the South Precinct in a "misguided effort to serve [her]self."

The City contends that the officers' counsel improperly made these prejudicial statements to persuade the jury that O'Toole was making short-term decisions to satisfy the Department of Justice at the expense of the long-term welfare of the SPD. Although the officers do not contest the City's assertion that they presented no evidence at trial to support these statements, they assert that the

Elias v. City of Seattle. Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

statements were not ill intentioned. They contend that their counsel had a good-faith basis to inquire about O'Toole's work history and motivations because they were relevant in a retaliation action.

We conclude that the challenged conduct was not sufficiently pervasive to be prejudicial. Thus, we do not need to decide whether counsel made those statements in good faith. The parties either did not repeat the challenged statements in front of the jury or witness testimony rebutted the claims. Before O'Toole's testimony and outside the presence of the jury, the trial court ordered the officers' counsel not to question O'Toole about the substance of statement (3) unless O'Toole first raised the issue when discussing her background. Neither party raised the issue again. The jury therefore heard about the "no confidence vote" only the one time during the officers' counsel's opening statement.

In addition, O'Toole testified that contrary to statement (4), her husband lives in Seattle and she does not rent her furniture. Although the City claims that it had "no effective means of rebutting the false insinuation [embodied in the remaining three statements] that [O'Toole] saw Seattle as a stepping stone," O'Toole rebutted the contention through her testimony. She stated, "At this point in my career, this is not a stepping stone.... As far as I'm concerned, this is it."

*8 We distinguish this case from Walker. In Walker, the prosecutor made improper comments "not just once or twice, but frequently."¹⁰ That did not happen here. For each challenged statement, either counsel did not repeat it or O'Toole's testimony negated it. Because the City has not shown that the alleged misconduct was flagrant, it did not preserve the issue.

4. Counsel's Violation of the Court's Order in Limine

The City also asserts that the officers' counsel committed prejudicial misconduct by violating an order in limine excluding any reference to "evidence regarding media/news coverage of the lawsuit." Here, the City objected to each of the three instances in which the officers' counsel referenced related media coverage at trial. "[A] court properly grants a new trial where (1) the conduct complained of is misconduct, (2) the misconduct is prejudicial, (3) the moving party objected to the misconduct at trial, and (4) the misconduct was not cured by the court's instructions."¹¹

In violation of the court's original order in limine, the

officers' counsel questioned both O'Toole and Elias about newspaper articles related to the case and mentioned the articles in closing. But a court may revise its order or ruling at any time before final judgment.¹² The court's conduct at trial implies that it revised its order in limine to allow reference to media coverage to establish the timing of events and whether the SPD retaliated. Based on the court's conduct described below, the officers' counsel did not violate the court's modified order in limine.

The officers' counsel first referenced related newspaper articles when questioning O'Toole. O'Toole stated that she routinely Googled her name and the SPD in the morning to apprise herself of any issues. The officers' counsel then asked, "Do you think if there were multiple newspaper articles in the news about and alleging Chief Metz running a gravy train in relation to the Robert Squad in the South Precinct, that's something you probably would have read?" When O'Toole said that she recalled the headline, the officers' counsel asked if she was referring to articles "from November 2014, the gravy train articles?" The City objected. The trial court did not rule on the objection but instead asked O'Toole if she "arrived [at the SPD] in the summer of '14?" and if she "became familiar with the issue we're talking about" at that point. O'Toole answered that she remembered seeing a headline and scanning an article. Here, the court suggested that it was permissible to use media coverage to establish a timeline of events.

The officers' counsel again referenced the "gravy train" articles when questioning Elias. Elias testified that she could not remember the exact date on which she filed her lawsuit and needed "something to refresh [her memory]." The officers' counsel then asked if a document it had provided her "helped assist [her] in remembering when an article appeared in the Seattle Times indicating—." The City objected. The trial court again did not rule on the objection but suggested that the officers' counsel ask the date Elias filed the lawsuit and if and when a story appeared in the press about the filing of that lawsuit. Counsel then asked, "Do you recall the date that there was an article in the Seattle Times about the filing of the lawsuit?" Elias answered, "December 2, 2014." Again, the trial court indicated that counsel could use media coverage to establish a timeline.

*9 The officers' counsel mentioned the "gravy train" articles for a third time in closing to reference the date that Elias filed her lawsuit and to emphasize that O'Toole permanently transferred Elias one day after the press published the articles. The court overruled the City's objections by stating, "[W]e have discussed it and established the context is proper context because the jury

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

will consider whether [the articles] did or did not relate to the decision making at issue.” The court again effectively revised its order in limine to allow counsel to reference the fact of news coverage as it related to a retaliatory motive. Because the officers’ counsel’s questioning comported with the court’s revised order in limine, counsel’s statements did not constitute misconduct.

5. Erroneous Admission of Expert Testimony

The City next contends that the trial court abused its discretion when it permitted former Bellevue Chief of Police D.P. Van Blaricom to testify as an expert and offer a legal conclusion. In its order in limine, the trial court permitted expert witness Van Blaricom to testify only about “matters of police administration such as ‘chain of command’ and the role of ‘officer morale’ and related problems of ‘preferential assignments.’ ” The court prohibited Van Blaricom from expressing “opinions on whether there was or was not ‘discrimination,’ ‘retaliation,’ ‘an EEO violation’ or a ‘hostile work environment.’ Nor [could] he opine as to whether anything occurred ‘because’ of race or gender.”

ER 702 allows expert testimony if the witness qualifies as an expert and his opinions will assist the trier of fact.⁴⁵ We review the court’s admission of expert testimony for abuse of discretion.⁴⁶ We will not disturb the trial court’s ruling “[i]f the basis for admission of the evidence is ‘fairly debatable.’ ”⁴⁷

First, the City claims that the trial court abused its discretion when it allowed Van Blaricom to testify as an expert about the soundness of the SPD’s management decisions. Van Blaricom told the jury that he was an expert in “[p]olice practices.” He explained why he believed the officers’ transfers were not “quality management decisions.” He also discussed how the SPD should have addressed Elias’s comment about her preference for supervising white males under the age of 40. The City maintains that in permitting this “expert” opinion, the court gave Van Blaricom license to “second-guess Chief O’Toole’s personnel decisions.” The City asserts that if this is proper expert opinion testimony, “any plaintiff challenging a manager’s decision in any employment case could simply hire a manager who once served in a similar role to offer ‘expert’ testimony that plaintiff’s manager made the wrong decisions.”

If relevant, however, expert testimony describing good and bad police practices is admissible.⁴⁸ Here, the officers claimed that the SPD transferred them as a retaliatory

measure. Van Blaricom was a police officer for the city of Bellevue for 29 years and was chief of police for the last 11 of those years. His testimony about the propriety of the SPD’s management decisions based on his experience and knowledge of police practices was therefore relevant. In addition, the jury is unlikely to be familiar with best practice for resolving conflict within a police department. Van Blaricom’s testimony therefore assisted the jury in accordance with ER 702.

*10 The City also asserts that Van Blaricom offered a legal conclusion and thus violated the province of the jury. ER 704 prohibits experts from offering legal conclusions, including opinion “testimony that the defendant’s conduct violated a particular law.”⁴⁹ “Such an improper opinion undermines a jury’s independent determination of the facts, and may invade the defendant’s constitutional right to a trial by jury.”⁵⁰ Van Blaricom testified that the SPD’s actions suggested that “there’s some ulterior motive.” The City contends that this testimony violated the court’s order in limine prohibiting him from opining on whether the SPD “retaliated” and assumed the jury’s role. A statement that the SPD had an ulterior motive, however, is not equivalent to a statement that the SPD retaliated. As the officers claim, Van Blaricom did not say what the ulterior motive was or explicitly state any legal conclusions that the order in limine prohibited. The trial court therefore did not abuse its discretion in allowing Van Blaricom to testify as an expert or testify that he believed the SPD had an ulterior motive.

6. Mitigation Instruction

The City asserts that the trial court abused its discretion when it did not provide the jury with the City’s proposed mitigation instruction. It claims this deprived the City of its failure-to-mitigate defense.

We review a trial court’s jury instructions for abuse of discretion.⁵¹ “A trial court does not abuse its discretion in instructing the jury, if the instructions: (1) permit each party to argue its theory of the case; (2) are not misleading; and (3) when read as a whole, properly inform the trier of fact of the applicable law.”⁵² The court’s failure to give a necessary instruction requires reversal only if it was prejudicial.⁵³

The City’s proposed mitigation instruction mirrored Washington pattern jury instruction 330.83.⁵⁴ The proposed instruction told the jury to reduce damages if the City proved that either Elias or Proudfoot unreasonably

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)
2 Wash.App.2d 1039

failed to reduce or avoid damages. The City claims that the court's failure to give this instruction prevented it from arguing that Proudfoot failed to mitigate his damages. Economist expert Tapia's damages calculation assumed that Proudfoot would have become an assistant chief in April 2015. The City contends that Proudfoot failed to mitigate his damages when he did not apply for the position.

Judge Downing provided the following explanation for not giving the mitigation instruction:

You know, the burden of proof remains upon the plaintiff to establish damages, and so whether it's treated as a duty to mitigate with the burden of proof allocated to the defense, it seems to me it's simpler in a case of this nature, given the evidence that was presented, to simply argue failures on the plaintiffs' part to meet the burden, rather than asserting a mitigation.

As stated by Judge Downing, without a mitigation instruction, the City still could argue that the jury should not award Proudfoot damages based on an assistant chief's salary because he never applied for the position. The City highlighted this issue during its cross-examination of both Tapia⁵⁵ and O'Toole⁵⁶ but failed to pursue it during its closing. A tactical decision by the City and not an instructional error by the court caused this omission.

*11 The City also may be asserting that it was unable to argue its theory of the case for Elias. The City contends that Tapia overestimated Elias's damages because Tapia did not consider any overtime Elias actually earned after the SPD transferred her. It claims that "Elias asked the jury to award her damages as if she had failed to mitigate her damages." (Emphasis added.) If the court had given its instruction, the City maintains that a jury "would have awarded [Elias], at most, nominal past economic damages arising from overtime lost in the transition to her new West Precinct position." But a mitigation instruction does not ask the jury to reduce damages because a plaintiff appropriately mitigated them; it asks the jury to reduce damages because a plaintiff unreasonably failed to do so. The trial court's failure to give the City's mitigation instruction is therefore not relevant to the City's theory of the case for Elias.

Because the City was able to argue that Proudfoot failed to mitigate his damages, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in failing to submit the City's proposed mitigation instruction.

7. Cumulative Errors

Finally, the City asserts that the alleged errors cumulatively require a new trial. "The cumulative error doctrine applies 'when there have been several trial errors that standing alone may not be sufficient to justify reversal but when combined may deny a defendant a fair trial.'" ⁵⁷ When the errors have little or no effect on the outcome at trial, no new trial is required. ⁵⁸ Because we did not identify any prejudicial misconduct or error, the cumulative error doctrine does not apply, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in not granting a remittitur or a new trial based on grounds of prejudice.

Attorney Fees

The officers request an award of reasonable attorney fees on appeal. They rely on RCW 49.60.030(2). This statute grants reasonable attorney fees, both at the trial court and on appeal, to individuals who suffer violations of the WLAD. ⁵⁹ Because the statute entitles the officers to reasonable attorney fees, we award the officers attorney fees as the prevailing party on appeal.

CONCLUSION

We affirm. Substantial evidence supports the jury's economic and noneconomic damages awards. The awards do not shock the conscience and were not the result of passion or prejudice. The City fails to show that the trial court abused its discretion when it denied both a remittitur and a new trial.

WE CONCUR:

Dwyer, J.

Appelwick, J.

All Citations

Not Reported in Pac. Rptr., 2 Wash.App.2d 1039, 2018 WL 993644

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)

2 Wash.App.2d 1039

Footnotes

- 1 Elias based her claims on the hostility she experienced after informing her lieutenant and captain in 2011 that four African American officers from the South Precinct were “hand picked” for a nightclub emphasis overtime assignment. She claimed the program was not open to all patrol officers as it should have been. The alleged hostile acts toward Elias included select officers filing equal employment opportunity (EEO) complaints against her, claiming that she created a hostile work environment for African American patrol officers.
- 2 Bunch v. King County Dep’t of Youth Servs., 155 Wn.2d 165, 172–73, 116 P.3d 381 (2005).
- 3 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 179.
- 4 State v. Smith, 31 Wn. App. 226, 228, 640 P.2d 25 (1982).
- 5 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 179.
- 6 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 180.
- 7 State v. Boyle, 183 Wn. App. 1, 12, 335 P.3d 954 (2014).
- 8 Boyle, 183 Wn. App. at 12–13.
- 9 M.R.B. v. Puyallup Sch. Dist., 169 Wn. App. 837, 848, 282 P.3d 1124 (2012).
- 10 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 179 (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting Indus. Indem. Co. v. Kallevig, 114 Wn.2d 907, 916, 792 P.2d 520 (1990)).
- 11 In re Det. of Brown, 154 Wn. App. 116, 121, 225 P.3d 1028 (2010).
- 12 RAP 2.5(a)(2) allows a party to raise for the first time on appeal the claimed error of “failure to establish facts upon which relief can be granted.”
- 13 State v. Florczak, 76 Wn. App. 55, 72, 882 P.2d 199 (1994).

Elias v. City of Seattle. Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)

2 Wash.App.2d 1039

14 The City asked Elias if she was “on track to make \$178,326 this year,” and she answered, “Yes.” The City then asked, “That’s more money than you’ve ever made since you’ve been with the Seattle Police Department; right?” Elias answered, “I might have made more in 2013 and 2014 if my overtime hadn’t been cut.”

15 Elias testified that she plans to retire at age 56 because she has an autoimmune disease that could prevent her from working.

16 155 Wn.2d 165, 180, 116 P.3d 381 (2005) (quoting Dean v. Mun. of Metro. Seattle, 104 Wn.2d 627, 641, 708 P.2d 393 (1985)).

17 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 180.

18 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 179–80 (quoting Sofie v. Fibreboard Corp., 112 Wn.2d 636, 646, 771 P.2d 711, 780 P.2d 260 (1989)).

19 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 167, 180.

20 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 180.

21 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 180.

22 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 180.

23 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 179 (quoting Bingaman v. Grays Harbor Cmty. Hosp., 103 Wn.2d 831, 836–37, 699 P.2d 1230 (1985)).

24 Washburn v. Beatt Equip. Co., 120 Wn.2d 246, 268, 840 P.2d 860 (1992); Bertero v. Nat’l Gen. Corp., 13 Cal.3d 43, 65 n.12, 529 P.2d 608, 118 Cal. Rptr. 184 (1974) (“The vast variety of and disparity between awards in other cases demonstrates that injuries can seldom be measured on the same scale.”).

25 Ch. 49.60 RCW.

26 155 Wn. App. 48, 231 P.3d 1211 (2010).

27 Collins, 155 Wn. App. at 73.

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)

2 Wash.App.2d 1039

28 Collins, 155 Wn. App. at 57–60.

29 Collins, 155 Wn. App. at 86, 90–93.

30 Hill v. GTE Directories Sales Corp., 71 Wn. App. 132, 140, 856 P.2d 746 (1993).

31 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 180.

32 Bunch, 155 Wn.2d at 179 (quoting Bingaman, 103 Wn.2d at 836); **see also** RCW 4.76.030.

33 Herring v. Dep't of Soc. & Health Servs., 81 Wn. App. 1, 23, 914 P.2d 67(1996).

34 **See** Brundridge v. Fluor Fed. Servs, Inc., 164 Wn.2d 432, 453–58, 191 P.3d 879 (2008) (denying Fluor's CR 59 motion for a new trial or amended judgment and holding that the awards in question were supported by the evidence and therefore not the result of passion or prejudice as a matter of law).

35 M.R.B., 169 Wn. App. at 857–58 (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting Collins, 155 Wn. App. at 94).

36 **See, e.g.**, State v. Walker, 164 Wn. App. 724, 737, 265 P.3d 191 (2011) (holding prosecutor's repetitive prejudicial misconduct warranted reversal); Teter v. Deck, 174 Wn.2d 207, 223–25, 274 P.3d 336 (2012) (affirming trial court's grant of a new trial based on the officers' counsel's repeated misconduct).

37 164 Wn. App. 724, 738, 265 P.3d 191 (2011).

38 Walker, 164 Wn. App. at 738.

39 M.R.B., 169 Wn. App. at 858.

40 State v. Campbell, 103 Wn.2d 1, 16, 691 P.2d 929 (1984).

41 **See** M.R.B., 169 Wn. App. at 857–58.

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)

2 Wash.App.2d 1039

42 Walker, 164 Wn. App. at 738.

43 Teter, 174 Wn.2d at 226.

44 State v. Kinard, 39 Wn. App. 871, 873, 696 P.2d 603 (1985).

45 Queen City Farms, Inc. v. Cent. Nat'l Ins. Co. of Omaha, 126 Wn.2d 50, 102, 882 P.2d 703 (1994).

46 Weyerhaeuser Co. v. Commercial Union Ins. Co., 142 Wn.2d 654, 683, 15 P.3d 115 (2000).

47 Johnston-Forbes v. Matsunaga, 181 Wn.2d 346, 352, 333 P.3d 388 (2014) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting Grp. Health Coop. of Puget Sound, Inc. v. Dep't of Revenue, 106 Wn.2d 391, 398, 722 P.2d 787 (1986)).

48 See Davis v. Mason County, 927 F.2d 1473, 1484–85 (9th Cir. 1991) (affirming the trial court's decision to admit D.P. Van Blaricom's testimony that Sheriff Stairs was reckless in failing to adequately train his employees who were found liable for damages for using excessive force).

49 State v. Olmedo, 112 Wn. App. 525, 532, 49 P.3d 960 (2002).

50 Olmedo, 112 Wn. App. at 530–31.

51 Herring, 81 Wn. App. at 22.

52 Herring, 81 Wn. App. at 22–23.

53 Herring, 81 Wn. App. at 23.

54 6A Washington Practice: Washington Pattern Jury Instructions: Civil 330.83, at 396 (2012).

55 During its cross-examination of Tapia, the City underscored that she based her damages calculations on the assumption that Proudfoot would have obtained an assistant chief position. In addition, she stated that although she was aware that Proudfoot

Elias v. City of Seattle, Not Reported in Pac. Rptr. (2018)

2 Wash.App.2d 1039

had discussed the assistant chief position with O'Toole, she did not know whether he had actually applied for it.

56 Chief O'Toole testified that to the best of her knowledge, Proudfoot did not apply for an assistant chief position.

57 In re Pers. Restraint of Morris, 176 Wn.2d 157, 172, 288 P.3d 1140 (2012) (quoting State v. Greiff, 141 Wn.2d 910, 929, 10 P.3d 390 (2000)).

58 Morris, 176 Wn.2d at 172.

59 RCW 49.60.210.

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved. Original U.S. Government Works.

HONORABLE TANA LIN

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PAUL BERNAL and JACK COE, individuals,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE BOEING COMPANY,

Defendant.

NO. 2:22-CV-00533-TL

DECLARATION OF MARGARET
BOYLE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING ON
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS DAMAGES

I, Margaret Boyle, hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that the following is true and correct to the best of my knowledge:

1. I am the attorney for the Plaintiffs in this matter. I am over the age of eighteen years, competent to testify as a witness herein, and make this declaration based upon my personal knowledge;
2. Attached as Appendix 1 is a true and correct copy of Paul Bernal's response to Boeing's discovery requests in this matter;

**BOYLE DECLARATION FOR
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING ON
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS DAMAGES**
No. 2:22-cv-00533-TL - 1

BOYLE MARTIN THOENY, PLLC
100 WEST HARRISON, SOUTH TOWER, STE. 300
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98119
TELEPHONE: 206.217.9400
FACSIMILE: 206.217.9600

1 3. Bernal’s response to Interrogatory No. 5 was intended to convey that at trial he would be
2 relying only upon the testimony of himself and other nonexpert witnesses to support his
3 claim for emotional distress damages;

4 4. Bernal’s use of the term “garden variety” to describe his emotional distress damages was
5 simply to confirm the information that he had previously provided in his discovery
6 response: he would not present or rely upon expert testimony or medical records to
7 support or establish his claim for emotional distress damages.
8

9 SIGNED THIS this 17th day of November, 2023 in Seattle, Washington.

10 BOYLE MARTIN THOENY, PLLC

11 

12 Margaret M. Boyle, WSBA#17089

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

1 I hereby certify that on November 17, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the
2 Court using the ECF system so that notification of such filing will be sent to the following attorneys
3 of record for defendants:
4

5 Larry Shapero: laurence.shapero@ogletree.com

6 Brenda Bannon: brenda.bannon@ogletreedekins.com

7 SIGNED this 17th day of November, 2023, in Seattle, Washington.
8
9
10



MARGARET BOYLE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPENDIX

**BOYLE DECLARATION FOR
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING ON
EMOTIONAL DISTRESS DAMAGES**
No. 2:22-cv-00533-TL - 4

BOYLE MARTIN THOENY, PLLC
100 WEST HARRISON, SOUTH TOWER, STE. 300
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98119
TELEPHONE: 206.217.9400
FACSIMILE: 206.217.9600

HONORABLE TANA LIN

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PAUL BERNAL and JACK COE, individuals,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE BOEING COMPANY,

Defendant.

NO. 2:22-CV-00533-TL

DEFENDANT’S FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES AND
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION TO
PLAINTIFF PAUL BERNAL AND
ANSWERS AND RESPONSES
THERE TO

PLAINTIFF BERNAL’S GENERAL OBJECTIONS

By way of general objections that shall be incorporated into each of the answers and responses provided by plaintiff:

Plaintiff does not agree with, or stipulate to, defendant’s introductory statements, instructions, or definitions, and objects to the extent they, or any of defendant’s discovery requests, are inconsistent with the common meaning of words used in these requests, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure regarding the scope and duties regarding discovery, or seek information

**BERNAL’S ANSWERS AND RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT’S DISCOVEY REQUESTS 2:22-CV-
00533-TL - 1**

BOYLE MARTIN THOENY, PLLC
100 WEST HARRISON, SOUTH TOWER, STE. 300
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98119
TELEPHONE: 206.217.9400
FACSIMILE: 206.217.9600

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:** Produce all documents (including any record
2 of verbal or written communication) related to each health care professional, including, without
3 limitation, all medical personnel, physicians, hospitals, clinics, psychologists, psychiatrists,
4 counselors, social workers, or mental health care providers with whom you have consulted for
5 treatment or examination since January 8, 2018, including, but not limited to:

6 a. medical records, reports, prescriptions, notes, medical histories, findings,
7 treatment records, x-ray readings, billing records or invoices, diagnoses and prognoses; and

8 b. communication or correspondence of any kind.

9 (Releases are included if Plaintiff prefers to have Defendant obtain the records directly from the
10 health care providers. If Plaintiff prefers to have Defendant obtain the records directly, please
11 complete the enclosed releases and forward the signed releases to Defendant within fourteen
12 days, to allow sufficient time to obtain the records from Plaintiff's health care providers within
13 30 days of service of these requests.)

14 **RESPONSE:** Objection. This request seeks production of privileged health care
15 information (see, RCW 49.60.510). Bernal is not asserting that defendant's conduct resulted in a
16 diagnosed physical or psychiatric injury, nor will he introduce or rely upon records or testimony
17 of any health care provider or expert witness to support his claim for emotional distress damages.

18
19 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:** Please list all social media websites or applications
20 (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc.) for which you have created, maintained, or owned an account
21 from January 1, 2018, to the present and state your user name(s), handle(s), or profile name(s)
22 for each.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CR 26(g) CERTIFICATION

I have read the foregoing responses and objections to these discovery requests and certify that to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, formed after a reasonable inquiry, they comply with the requirements of CR 26(g).

DATED this 6th day of January, 2023.

BOYLE MARTIN THOENY, PLLC

By:



Margaret M. Boyle, WSBA No. 17089
Attorney at Law
100 West Harrison Street, Ste. S300
Seattle, WA 98119
Tel: 206-217-9400
Email: margaret@bmtlitigation.com
Attorney for Plaintiffs