555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3100
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Phone: (213) 992-3299
Fax: (213) 596-0487
email: elee@LOEL.com

Joan Herrington, SB# 178988
Bay Area Employment Law Office
5032 Woodminster Lane
Oakland, CA 94602-2614
Telephone: (510) 530-4078
Facsimile: (510) 530-4725
Email: jh@baelo.com
Of Counsel to LAW OFFICE OF EUGENE LEE

Attorneys for Plaintiff
DAVID F. JADWIN, D.O.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID F. JADWIN, D.O.

VIN, D.O. Case No.: 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

VS.

COUNTY OF KERN, et al.,

Date: May 14, 2009
Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: U.S. District Court, Courtroom 3 2500 Tulare Street, Fresno, CA

Defendants.

Plaintiff.

Date Action Filed: January 6, 2007

2122

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Plaintiff hereby proposes that the Court uses applicable Ninth Circuit model jury instructions, series 1-3 as the general instructions on the trial process; the CACI instructions and verdict forms applicable to Plaintiff's claims, and Plaintiff's special instructions that clarify the CACI instructions.

2526

The Judicial Council has not mandated use of CACI to the exclusion of other jury instructions. However, under Rule 2.1050 of the California Rules of Court, the CACI instructions are designated as the "official instructions for use in the state of California." The rule

28

27

further states that use of the new instructions is "strongly encouraged" and they are recommended for use unless a judge "finds that a different instruction would more accurately state the law and be understood by jurors." Rule 2.1050(a), (e). So CACI instructions are clearly preferred, and there is an affirmative burden to make a legal case for using a non-CACI instruction if there is a CACI instruction on the subject.

Special instructions may be proposed under Code of Civil Procedure § 609, but they must conform to the format requirements of Rule 2.1055. If there is no CACI instruction on a subject on which the trial judge determines that the jury should be instructed, or if a CACI instruction cannot be modified to submit the issue properly, another instruction may be given on that subject. The instruction should be accurate, brief, understandable, impartial, and free from argument. Rule 2.1050(e).

Per the Court's instructions, Plaintiff has included the Comments and Use Notes for each instruction, which can be deleted before these instructions are submitted to the jury, and highlighted any modifications to the standard format.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED on May 11, 2009.

/s/ Joan Herrington Attorney for Plaintiff DAVID F. JADWIN. D.O.

17

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

## TABLE OF PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

### NINTH CIRCUIT MODEL CIVIL JURY INSTRUCTIONS

1.	INSTRUCTIO	NS ON	THE TRIAL	PROCESS

- 1.1A Duty of Jury (Court Reads and Provides Written Set of Instructions)
- 1.1C Duty of Jury (Court Reads and Provides Written Instructions at End of Case)
- 1.2 Claims and Defenses
- 1.3 Burden of Proof—Preponderance of the Evidence
- 1.4 Burden of Proof—Clear and Convincing Evidence
- What Is Evidence 1.6 10
- 1.7 What Is Not Evidence 11
- **Evidence for Limited Purpose** 1.8 12
- 1.9 Direct and Circumstantial Evidence 13
- 1.10 **Ruling on Objections** 14
- 1.11 Credibility of Witnesses 15
- 1.12 Conduct of the Jury 16
- 1.13 No Transcript Available to Jury 17
- 1.14 **Taking Notes** 18
- 1.15 Question to Witnesses by Jurors 19
- Bench Conferences and Recesses 1.18 20
- 1.19 Outline of Trial 21
- TYPES OF EVIDENCE 22
- 2.1 Stipulated Testimony 23
- 2.2 Stipulations of Fact 24
- 2.3 Judicial Notice 25
- 2.4 Deposition in Lieu of Live Testimony 26
- 2.5 Transcript of Tape Recording 27

28

#### http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc 1 2.8 Impeachment Evidence—Witness 2 2.10 Use of Interrogatories of a Party 3 2.11 **Expert Opinion** 4 2.12 Charts and Summaries Not Received in Evidence 5 2.13 Charts and Summaries in Evidence 6 2.14 Evidence in Electronic Format 7 3. INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING DELIBERATIONS 8 3.1 Duty to Deliberate 9 3.2 **Communication With Court** 10 3.3 Return of Verdict 11 3.4 Additional Instructions of Law 12 3.5 Deadlocked Jury 13 5. DAMAGES 14 5.1 Damages—Proof 15 5.2 Measures of Types of Damages 16 5.3 Damages—Mitigation 17 5.4 Damages Arising in the Future—Discount to Present Cash Value 18 5.6 **Nominal Damages** 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Document 348

Filed 05/11/2009

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

OWW:

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_ DUTY OF JURY

Ladies and gentlemen:

It is my duty to instruct you on the law.

You must not infer from these instructions or from anything I may say or do as indicating that I have an opinion regarding the evidence or what your verdict should be.

It is your duty to find the facts from all the evidence in the case. To those facts you will apply the law as I give it to you. You must follow the law as I give it to you whether you agree with it or not. And you must not be influenced by any personal likes or dislikes, opinions, prejudices, or sympathy. That means that you must decide the case solely on the evidence before you. You will recall that you took an oath to do so.

In following my instructions, you must follow all of them and not single out some and ignore others; they are all important.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.1B

Proposed By: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused:

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

26

27

Refused:

28

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **CLAIMS AND DEFENSES**

To help you follow the evidence, I will give you a brief summary of the positions of the parties:

The plaintiff claims that defendant interfered with his rights under the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and the California Family Rights Act (CFRA), that defendant retaliated against him for asserting his rights under the FMLA and CFRA, that defendant discriminated against him on the basis of a disability, that defendant failed to reasonably accommodate his disability, that defendant failed to engage in an interactive process to find a reasonable accommodation of his disability, that defendant retaliated against him for asserting his rights under California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), and that defendant denied him due process. The plaintiff has the burden of proving these claims.

The defendant denies those claims, asserts that it acted according to all applicable laws, and contends that [defendant's affirmative defense]. The defendant has the burden of proof on this affirmative defense.

The plaintiff denies defendant's affirmative defense.

Ninth	Circuit	Model	Civil	Jury .	Instruction,	1.2

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

OWW: \_

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### BURDEN OF PROOF—PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE

When a party has the burden of proof on any claim or defense by a preponderance of the evidence, it means you must be persuaded by the evidence that the claim or defense is more probably true than not true.

You should base your decision on all of the evidence, regardless of which party presented it.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.3 Proposed by: Joint Given: Given as Modified: Withdrawn: OWW: Refused:

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

#### WHAT IS EVIDENCE

The evidence you are to consider in deciding what the facts are consists of:

- 1. The sworn testimony of any witness;
- 2. The exhibits which are received into evidence; and
- 3. Any facts to which the lawyers have agreed.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.6
Proposed By: Joint
Given:
Given as Modified:
Withdrawn:
Refused:
OWW:

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

26

27

28

Refused:

Withdrawn:

### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### WHAT IS NOT EVIDENCE

In reaching your verdict, you may consider only the testimony, exhibits and stipulations, if any, received into evidence. Certain things are not evidence, and you may not consider them in deciding what the facts are. I will list them for you:

- Arguments and statements by lawyers are not evidence. The lawyers are not (1) witnesses. What they have said in their opening statements and closing arguments, and at other times is intended to help you interpret the evidence, but it is not evidence. If the facts as you remember them differ from the way the lawyers have stated them, your memory of them controls.
- (2) Questions and objections by lawyers are not evidence. Attorneys have a duty to their clients to object when they believe a question is improper under the rules of evidence. You should not be influenced by the objection or by the court's ruling on it.
- (3)Testimony that has been excluded or stricken, or that you have been instructed to disregard, is not evidence and must not be considered. In addition sometimes testimony and exhibits are received only for a limited purpose; when I give] [have given] a limiting instruction, you must follow it.
- (4) Anything you may have seen or heard when the court was not in session is not evidence. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence received at the trial.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.7

Proposed By: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified:

OWW:

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

26

27

28

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### EVIDENCE FOR LIMITED PURPOSE

Some evidence may be admitted for a limited purpose only.

When I instruct you that an item of evidence has been admitted for a limited purpose, you must consider it only for that limited purpose and for no other.

The testimony [you are about to hear] [you have just heard] may be considered only for the limited purpose of [describe purpose] and for no other purpose.]

Ninth	Circuit I	Model	Civil J	Jury 1	Instruction,	1.8	3
-------	-----------	-------	---------	--------	--------------	-----	---

Propose	ed By	/: .	Joint

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn: Refused:

OWW:

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

-	DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE	
Evidence may	be direct or circumstantial. Direct evidence is direct proof	f of a fact, such
as testimony by a with	ess about what that witness personally saw or heard or dic	l. Circumstantial
evidence is proof of or	ne or more facts from which you could find another fact.	You should
consider both kinds of	evidence. The law makes no distinction between the weight	ght to be given to
either direct or circums	stantial evidence. It is for you to decide how much weigh	t to give to any
evidence.		
Ninth Circuit Model C	ivil Jury Instruction, 1.9	
Proposed By: Joint		
Given:		
Given as Modified:		
Withdrawn:		
Refused:		OWW:

USDC, ED Case No. 1:07-cv-00026 OWW DLB PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

1

2

3

4 5

67

8

9

1112

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24 P

 $_{25} \parallel$ 

26

27

28

.0

0

### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **RULING ON OBJECTIONS**

There are rules of evidence that control what can be received into evidence. When a lawyer asks a question or offers an exhibit into evidence and a lawyer on the other side thinks that it is not permitted by the rules of evidence, that lawyer may object. If I overrule the objection, the question may be answered or the exhibit received. If I sustain the objection, the question cannot be answered, and the exhibit cannot be received. Whenever I sustain an objection to a question, you must ignore the question and must not guess what the answer might have been.

Sometimes I may order that evidence be stricken from the record and that you disregard or ignore the evidence. That means that when you are deciding the case, you must not consider the evidence that I told you to disregard.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.10

Proposed By: Joint

Withdrawn:

Given:

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused: OWW: \_\_\_\_

1

2

3

4

56

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES**

In deciding the facts in this case, you may have to decide which testimony to believe and which testimony not to believe. You may believe everything a witness says, part of it, or none of it. Proof of a fact does not necessarily depend on the number of witnesses who testify about it.

In considering the testimony of any witness, you may take into account:

- (1) The opportunity and ability of the witness to see or hear or know the things testified to:
  - (2) The witness's memory;
  - (3) The witness's manner while testifying;
  - (4) The witness's interest in the outcome of the case and any bias or prejudice;
  - (5) Whether other evidence contradicts the witness's testimony;
  - (6) The reasonableness of the witness's testimony in light of all the evidence; and
  - (7) Any other factors that bear on believability.

The weight of the evidence as to a fact does not necessarily depend on the number of witnesses who testify about it.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.11

Proposed By: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_\_
Refused: \_\_\_\_\_

OWW: \_\_\_\_

- 9 -

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

26

27

28

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### CONDUCT OF THE JURY

I will now say a few words about your conduct as jurors.

First, you are not to discuss this case with anyone, including members of your family, people involved in the trial, or anyone else; this includes discussing the case in internet chat rooms or through internet "blogs," internet bulletin boards or e-mails. Nor are you allowed to permit others to discuss the case with you. If anyone approaches you and tries to talk to you about the case, please let me know about it immediately;

Second, do not read or listen to any news stories, articles, radio, television, or online reports about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it;

Third, do not do any research, such as consulting dictionaries, searching the Internet or using other reference materials, and do not make any investigation about the case on your own;

Fourth, if you need to communicate with me simply give a signed note to the clerk to give to me; and

Fifth, do not make up your mind about what the verdict should be until after you have gone to the jury room to decide the case and you and your fellow jurors have discussed the evidence. Keep an open mind until then.

Finally, until this case is given to you for your deliberation and verdict, you are not to discuss the case with your fellow jurors.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.12

Proposed By: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn: Refused:

OWW:

- 10 -

1

2

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

1213

14

15

1617

18

19

20

2122

23

 $_{24} \parallel_{\text{Pro}}$ 

25

26

27

28

# TAKING NOTES

If you wish, you may take notes to help you remember the evidence. If you do take notes, please keep them to yourself until you and your fellow jurors go to the jury room to decide the case. Do not let note-taking distract you. When you leave, your notes should be left in the jury room. No one will read your notes. They will be destroyed at the conclusion of the case.

Whether or not you take notes, you should rely on your own memory of the evidence. Notes are only to assist your memory. You should not be overly influenced by your notes or those of your fellow jurors.

#### Comment

It is well settled in this circuit that the trial judge has discretion to allow jurors to take notes. United States v. Baker, 10 F.3d 1374, 1403 (9th Cir.1993), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 934 (1994). See also Jury Instructions Committee of the Ninth Circuit, A Manual on Jury Trial Procedures, § 3.4 (2004).

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.14

Proposed By: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_ Refused:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

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

26

27

28

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **QUESTIONS TO WITNESSES BY JURORS**

You will be allowed to propose written questions to witnesses after the lawyers have completed their questioning of each witness. You may propose questions in order to clarify the testimony, but you are not to express any opinion about the testimony or argue with a witness. If you propose any questions, remember that your role is that of a neutral fact finder, not an advocate.

Before I excuse each witness, I will offer you the opportunity to write out a question on a form provided by the court. Do not sign the question. I will review the question with the attorneys to determine if it is legally proper.

Some questions you propose may not be asked or may not be asked as you have written them. This might be because of the rules of evidence or other legal reasons or because the question is expected to be answered later in the case. If I do not ask a proposed question, or if I rephrase it, do not speculate as to the reasons. Do not give undue weight to questions you or other jurors propose. You should evaluate the answers to those questions in the same manner you evaluate all of the other evidence.

By giving you the opportunity to propose questions, I am not requesting or suggesting that you do so. It will often be the case that a lawyer has not asked a question because it is legally objectionable or because a later witness may be addressing that subject.

Nınth	Circuit	Model	Civil	Jury	Instruction,	1.15

-		
Given:		
OIVEII.		

Proposed: Joint

Withdrawn:

## Given as Modified:

Refused:			

OWW:

evidence and to avoid confusion and error.

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

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

26

27

28

INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

BENCH CONFERENCES AND RECESSES

From time to time during the trial, it may be necessary for me to talk with the attorneys out of the hearing of the jury by having a conference at the bench. Please understand that while you are waiting, we are working. The purpose of these conferences is not to keep relevant information from you, but to decide how certain evidence is to be treated under the rules of

We will do our best to keep the number and length of these conferences to a minimum. I may not always grant an attorney's request for a bench conference. Do not consider my granting or denying a request for a bench conference as any indication of my opinion of the case or of what your verdict should be.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.1	8
---	---

Proposed By: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn: Refused:

OWW:

OWW:

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1

2

45

67

8

9

11

1213

14

1516

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

20

Refused:

### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_ OUTLINE OF TRIAL

The next phase of the trial will now begin: First, each side may make an opening statement. An opening statement is not evidence. It is simply an outline to help you understand what that party expects the evidence will show. A party is not required to make an opening statement.

The plaintiff will then present evidence, and counsel for the defendant may crossexamine. Then the defendant may present evidence, and counsel for the plaintiff may crossexamine.

After the evidence has been presented, I will instruct you on the law that applies to the case and the attorneys will make closing arguments.

After that, you will go to the jury room to deliberate on your verdict.

Given:		
Given as Modified:		
Withdrawn:		

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 1.19

28

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	INSTRUCTION No
2	STIPULATED TESTIMONY
3	
4	The parties have agreed what [witness]'s testimony would be if called as a witness. You
5	should consider that testimony in the same way as if it had been given here in court.
6	
7	Comment
8	
9	There is a difference between stipulating that a witness would give certain testimony and
10	stipulating that the facts to which a witness might testify are true. United States v. Lambert, 604
11	F.2d 594, 595 (8th Cir.1979); United States v. Hellman, 560 F.2d 1235, 1236 (5th Cir.1977).
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 2.1
23	Proposed By: Plaintiff
24	Given:
25	Given as Modified:
26	Withdrawn:
27	Refused: OWW:

- 15 -

1	INSTRUCTION No
2	STIPULATIONS OF FACT
3	
4	The parties have agreed to certain facts [to be placed in evidence as Exhibit] [that will
5	be read to you]. You should therefore treat these facts as having been proved.
6	
7	Comment
8	
9	When parties enter into stipulations as to material facts, those facts will be deemed to
10	have been conclusively proved, and the jury may be so instructed. United States v. Mikaelian,
11	168 F.3d 380, 389 (9th Cir.1999) (citing United States v. Houston, 547 F.2d 104, 107 (9th
12	Cir.1976)), amended by 180 F.3d 1091 (9th Cir.1999).
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 2.2
23	Proposed By: Plaintiff
24	Given:
25	Given as Modified:
26	Withdrawn:
27	Refused: OWW:
28	
	16

## INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_ 2.3 JUDICIAL NOTICE

3 4

1

2

The court has decided to accept as proved the fact that [state fact], even though no evidence has been introduced on the subject. You must accept this fact as true.

6 7

5

**Comment** 

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

An instruction regarding judicial notice should be given at the time notice is taken. In civil cases, Fed. R. Evid. 201(g) permits the judge to determine that a fact is sufficiently undisputed to be judicially noticed and requires that the jury be instructed that it is required to accept that fact. But see United States v. Chapel, 41 F.3d 1338, 1342 (9th Cir.1994) (in a criminal case, "the trial court must instruct 'the jury that it may, but is not required to, accept as conclusive any fact judicially noticed.") (citing Fed. R. Evid. 201(g)); Ninth Circuit Model Criminal Jury Instruction 2.5 (2003) (Judicial Notice).

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

20	
20	

Ninth	Circuit	Model	Civil	Jury	Instruction	, 2.3

Proposed By: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

Refused:

OWW:

## 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

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### DEPOSITION IN LIEU OF LIVE TESTIMONY

A deposition is the sworn testimony of a witness taken before trial. The witness is placed under oath to tell the truth and lawyers for each party may ask questions. The questions and answers are recorded.

The deposition of [witness] was taken on [date]. You should consider deposition testimony, presented to you in court in lieu of live testimony, insofar as possible, in the same way as if the witness had been present to testify.

Do not place any significance on the behavior or tone of voice of any person reading the questions or answers.]

#### Comment

This instruction should be used only when testimony by deposition is used in lieu of live testimony. The committee recommends that it be given immediately before a deposition is to be read. It need not be repeated if more than one deposition is read. If the judge prefers to include the instruction as a part of his or her instructions before evidence, it should be modified appropriately.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 2.4

Proposed By: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

OWW: \_\_\_\_ Refused:

INSTRUCTION No. \_\_

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	
•	

## 2 3

4 5

6

7

8

#### Comment

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Refused:

## IMPEACHMENT EVIDENCE—WITNESS

The evidence that a witness [e.g., has been convicted of a crime, lied under oath on a prior occasion, etc.] may be considered, along with all other evidence, in deciding whether or not to believe the witness and how much weight to give to the testimony of the witness and for no other purpose.

If this instruction is given during the trial, the committee recommends giving the second

sentence in numbered paragraph 3 of Instruction 1.7 (What Is Not Evidence) with the concluding

instructions. See also Instruction 1.8 (Evidence for Limited Purpose).

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 2.8

Proposed By: Plaintiff

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

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

26

27

28

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **USE OF INTERROGATORIES OF A PARTY**

Evidence [will now be] [was] presented to you in the form of answers of one of the parties to written interrogatories submitted by the other side. These answers [have been] [were] given in writing and under oath, before the actual trial, in response to questions that were submitted in writing under established court procedures. You should consider the answers, insofar as possible, in the same way as if they were made from the witness stand.

Comment

Use this oral instruction before interrogatories and answers are read to the jury; it may also be included in the concluding written instructions to the jury. The attorney should warn the judge ahead of time and give the judge an opportunity to give this oral instruction. This oral instruction is not appropriate if answers to interrogatories are being used for impeachment only.

Do not use this instruction for requests for admission under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36. The effect of requests for admission under the rule is not the same as the introduction of evidence through interrogatories. If an instruction is needed, a special one will have to be drafted.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 2.10

Proposed by: Joint

Refused:

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

- 20 -

OWW:

1 INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

Some witnesses, because of education or experience, are permitted to state opinions and the reasons for those opinions.

**EXPERT OPINION** 

Opinion testimony should be judged just like any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it, and give it as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness's education and experience, the reasons given for the opinion, and all the other evidence in the case.

Comment

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

28

11 See Fed. R. Evid. 602, 701–05.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 2.11

24 | Proposed by: Joint

25 || Given:

26 Given as Modified:

27 || Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused: OWW: \_\_\_\_

USDC, ED Case No. 1:07-cv-00026 OWW DLB PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### CHARTS AND SUMMARIES IN EVIDENCE

CHARTS AND SUMMARIES IN EVIDENCE
Certain charts and summaries [may be] [have been] received into evidence to illustrate
information brought out in the trial. Charts and summaries are only as good as the underlying
evidence that supports them. You should, therefore, give them only such weight as you think the
underlying evidence deserves.
Comment
This instruction applies only where the charts and summaries are not received into
evidence and are used for demonstrative purposes. See Jury Instructions Committee of the Ninth
Circuit, A Manual on Jury Trial Procedures, § 3.10A (2004).
Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 2.12
Proposed by: Joint
Given:
Given as Modified:
Withdrawn:
Refused: OWW:

USDC, ED Case No. 1:07-cv-00026 OWW DLB PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

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

26

27

28

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### CHARTS AND SUMMARIES NOT RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE

Certain charts and summaries not received in evidence [may be] [have been] shown to you in order to help explain the contents of books, records, documents, or other evidence in the case. They are not themselves evidence or proof of any facts. If they do not correctly reflect the facts or figures shown by the evidence in the case, you should disregard these charts and summaries and determine the facts from the underlying evidence.

Comment

See United States v. Johnson, 594 F.2d 1253, 1254-55 (9th Cir.1979) (error to permit the introduction of a summary of evidence without the establishment of a foundation for the evidence). See also Fed. R. Evid. 1006. See also Jury Instructions Committee of the Ninth Circuit, A Manual on Jury Trial Procedures, § 3.10A(1) (2004). This instruction may be unnecessary if there is no dispute as to the accuracy of the chart or summary.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 2.13

Proposed by: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

Refused:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

1

2

3

4

56

7

9

10 11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

22

23

**-**5 || '

24 | 25 |

26

\_\_

27

28

Refused:

#### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **DUTY TO DELIBERATE**

When you begin your deliberations, you should elect one member of the jury as your presiding juror. That person will preside over the deliberations and speak for you here in court.

You will then discuss the case with your fellow jurors to reach agreement if you can do so. Your verdict must be unanimous.

Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but you should do so only after you have considered all of the evidence, discussed it fully with the other jurors, and listened to the views of your fellow jurors.

Do not hesitate to change your opinion if the discussion persuades you that you should. Do not come to a decision simply because other jurors think it is right.

It is important that you attempt to reach a unanimous verdict but, of course, only if each of you can do so after having made your own conscientious decision. Do not change an honest belief about the weight and effect of the evidence simply to reach a verdict.

Ninth	Circuit	Model	Civil Inry	Instruction,	3 1
miller	Circuit	MIOUCI	CIVII July	msuucuon,	J.1

Proposed by: Joint

Given:

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

- 2

OWW: \_\_\_\_

23 ||1

24 Proposed by: Joint

Refused:

### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **COMMUNICATION WITH COURT**

If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with me, you may send
a note through the marshal, signed by your presiding juror or by one or more members of the
jury. No member of the jury should ever attempt to communicate with me except by a signed
writing; I will communicate with any member of the jury on anything concerning the case only
in writing, or here in open court. If you send out a question, I will consult with the parties before
answering it, which may take some time. You may continue your deliberations while waiting for
the answer to any question. Remember that you are not to tell anyoneincluding mehow the
jury stands, numerically or otherwise, until after you have reached a unanimous verdict or have
been discharged. Do not disclose any vote count in any note to the court.

Ninth	Circuit	Model	Civil Iury	Instruction,	32
MIIIIII	CIICUII	MIOUEI	CIVILJUIV	v msauchon.	3.4

Given:	
Given as Modified:	
Withdrawn:	

- 25 -

OWW:

## INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_ RETURN OF VERDICT

A verdict form has been prepared for you. [Any explanation of the verdict form may be given at this time.] After you have reached unanimous agreement on a verdict, your presiding juror will fill in the form that has been given to you, sign and date it, and advise the court that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

Comment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

28

The judge may also wish to explain to the jury the particular form of verdict being used and just how to "advise the court" of a verdict.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 3.3

24 | Proposed by: Plaintiff

25 Given:

26 Given as Modified:

27 | Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused: OWW: \_\_\_\_

1

2

4

5

6

7

9

1011

12

1314

15

16 17

. .

18 19

20

2122

23

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

#### ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS OF LAW

At this point I will give you a further instruction. By giving a further instruction at this time, I do not mean to emphasize this instruction over any other instruction.

You are not to attach undue importance to the fact that this was read separately to you. You shall consider this instruction together with all of the other instructions that were given to you.

#### [Insert text of new instruction.]

You will now retire to the jury room and continue your deliberations.

Comment

Use this instruction for giving a jury instruction to a jury while it is deliberating. If the jury has a copy of the instructions, send the additional instruction to the jury room. Unless the additional instruction is by consent of both parties, both sides must be given an opportunity to take exception or object to it. If this instruction is used, it should be made a part of the record. The judge and attorneys should make a full record of the proceedings.

See Jury Instructions Committee of the Ninth Circuit, A Manual on Jury Trial Procedures, § 5.2.C (2004).

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 3.4

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

Refused:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

1

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

1011

12

1314

15

1617

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

262728

#### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **DEADLOCKED JURY**

Members of the jury, you have advised that you have been unable to agree upon a verdict in this case. I have decided to suggest a few thoughts to you.

As jurors, you have a duty to discuss the case with one another and to deliberate in an effort to reach a unanimous verdict if each of you can do so without violating your individual judgment and conscience. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after you consider the evidence impartially with your fellow jurors. During your deliberations, you should not hesitate to reexamine your own views and change your opinion if you become persuaded that it is wrong. However, you should not change an honest belief as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinions of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

All of you are equally honest and conscientious jurors who have heard the same evidence. All of you share an equal desire to arrive at a verdict. Each of you should ask yourself whether you should question the correctness of your present position.

I remind you that in your deliberations you are to consider the instructions I have given you as a whole. You should not single out any part of any instruction, including this one, and ignore others. They are all equally important.

You may now retire and continue your deliberations.

Comment

The committee recommends that a supplemental instruction to encourage a deadlocked jury to reach a verdict should be given with great caution.

An earlier form of instruction for a deadlocked jury was approved by the Supreme Court in Allen v. United States, 164 U.S. 492, 501 (1896).

Before giving any supplemental jury instruction to a deadlocked jury, the committee recommends the court review United States v. Wills, 88 F.3d 704, 716-18 (9th Cir.1996), cert.

### http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc denied, 519 U.S. 1000 (1996); United States v. Ajiboye, 961 F.2d 892 (9th Cir.1992); United 1 2 States v. Nickell, 883 F.2d 824 (9th Cir.1989); United States v. Seawell, 550 F.2d 1159 (9th 3 Cir.1977), appeal after remand, 583 F.2d 416 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 439 U.S. 991 (1978); and 4 the Jury Instructions Committee of the Ninth Circuit, A Manual on Jury Trial Procedures, § 5.4 5 (2004).6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 3.5 24 Proposed by: Plaintiff 25 Given: \_\_\_\_\_ 26 Given as Modified: 27 Withdrawn: 28 OWW: Refused: - 29 -

Document 348

Filed 05/11/2009

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

Page 33 of 127 DSUPRA

1

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

1 /

18

19

2021

22

22

24

2.5

2526

27

28

### INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### **DAMAGES—PROOF**

It is the duty of the Court to instruct you about the measure of damages. By instructing you on damages, the Court does not mean to suggest for which party your verdict should be rendered.

If you find for the plaintiff [on the plaintiff's \_\_\_\_\_ claim], you must determine the plaintiff's damages. The plaintiff has the burden of proving damages by a preponderance of the evidence. Damages means the amount of money that will reasonably and fairly compensate the plaintiff for any injury you find was caused by the defendant. You should consider the following:

[Here insert types of damages. See Instruction 5.2 (Measures of Types of Damages)]

It is for you to determine what damages, if any, have been proved.

Your award must be based upon evidence and not upon speculation, guesswork or conjecture.

Comment

If liability is not disputed, this instruction should be modified accordingly.

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 5.1

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused:

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

<del>----</del>

OWW:

- 30 -

1 2

3

4

56

7 8

9

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

## INSTRUCTION NO. \_\_

#### MEASURES OF TYPES OF DAMAGES

In determining the measure of damages, you should consider:

[The nature and extent of the injuries;]

[The [disability] [disfigurement] [loss of enjoyment of life] experienced [and which with reasonable probability will be experienced in the future];]

[The [mental,] [physical,] [emotional] pain and suffering experienced [and which with reasonable probability will be experienced in the future];]

[The reasonable value of necessary medical care, treatment, and services received to the present time;]

[The reasonable value of necessary medical care, treatment, and services which with reasonable probability will be required in the future;]

[The reasonable value of [wages] [earnings] [earning capacity] [salaries] [employment] [business opportunities] [employment opportunities] lost to the present time;]

[The reasonable value of [wages] [earnings] [earning capacity] [salaries] [employment] [business opportunities] [employment opportunities] which with reasonable probability will be lost in the future;]

Comment

Insert only the appropriate bracketed items into Instruction 5.1 (Damages—Proof).

Additional paragraphs may have to be drafted to fit other types of damages. Particular claims may have special rules on damages. See, e.g., Instruction 7.11 (Maintenance and Cure), 11.7A (Age Discrimination—Damages—Back and Front Pay—Mitigation), and 11.7B (Age Discrimination—Damages—Willful Discrimination—Liquidated Damages).

Punitive and compensatory damages are subject to caps in Title VII cases. See 42 U.S.C. 1981a(b)(3). Regarding the amount of damages available under Title VII, see Gotthardt v. Nat'l

Document 348

Filed 05/11/2009

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

Page 36 of 127 DOUPRA

#### 1 INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_ 2 DAMAGES—MITIGATION 3 4 The plaintiff has a duty to use reasonable efforts to mitigate damages. To mitigate means 5 to avoid or reduce damages. 6 7 The defendant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence: 8 9 1. that the plaintiff failed to use reasonable efforts to mitigate damages; and 10 11 2. the amount by which damages would have been mitigated. 12 13 Comment 14 15 As to mitigation of damages in an action under the Age Discrimination in Employment 16 Act, see Instruction 11.7A (Age Discrimination—Damages—Back and Front Pay—Mitigation). 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 5.3 24 Proposed by: Plaintiff 25 Given: \_\_\_\_\_ 26 Given as Modified: 27 Withdrawn: 28 Refused: OWW:

#### 1 INSTRUCTION No. \_\_ 2 DAMAGES ARISING IN THE FUTURE—DISCOUNT TO PRESENT CASH VALUE 3 4 [Any award for future economic damages must be for the present cash value of those 5 damages.] 6 [Noneconomic damages [such as] [pain and suffering] [disability] [disfigurement] [and] 7 [\_\_\_\_] are not reduced to present cash value.] 8 Present cash value means the sum of money needed now, which, when invested at a 9 reasonable rate of return, will pay future damages at the times and in the amounts that you find 10 the damages [will be incurred] [or] [would have been received]. 11 The rate of return to be applied in determining present cash value should be the interest 12 that can reasonably be expected from safe investments that can be made by a person of ordinary 13 prudence, who has ordinary financial experience and skill. [You should also consider decreases 14 in the value of money which may be caused by future inflation.] 15 16 Comment 17 18 There must be evidence to support this instruction. See Monessen Southwestern Ry. Co. 19 v. Morgan, 486 U.S. 330, 339–42 (1988). See also Passantino v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer 20 Prods., Inc. 212 F.3d 493, 508–09 (9th Cir.2000). 21 22 23 Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 5.4 24 Proposed by: Plaintiff 25 Given: \_\_\_\_\_ 26 Given as Modified: 27 Withdrawn: 28 OWW: Refused:

# INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_ NOMINAL DAMAGES

The law which applies to this case authorizes an award of nominal damages. If you find for the plaintiff but you find that the plaintiff has failed to prove damages as defined in these instructions, you must award nominal damages. Nominal damages may not exceed one dollar.

Comment

9 ||

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

28

Nominal damages are not available in every case. The court must determine whether nominal damages are permitted. See, e.g., Chew v. Gates, 27 F.3d 1432, 1437 (9th Cir.1994) (Section 1983 action), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 1148 (1995); Parton v. GTE North, Inc., 971 F.2d 150, 154 (8th Cir.1992) (Title VII action).

Regarding cases brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, see George v. City of Long Beach, 973 F.2d 706 (9th Cir.1992); Floyd v. Laws, 929 F.2d 1390, 1401 (9th Cir.1991).

Ninth Circuit Model Civil Jury Instruction, 5.6 Proposed by: Plaintiff

25 Given: \_\_\_\_

26 Given as Modified:

27 Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused: \_\_\_\_\_

OWW: \_\_\_\_

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

10

1112

13 14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

25

26

2728

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

#### WILLFUL SUPRESSION OF EVIDENCE

You may consider whether one party intentionally concealed or destroyed evidence. If you decide that a party did so, you may decide that the evidence would have been unfavorable to that party.

#### DIRECTIONS FOR USE

This instruction should be given only if there is evidence of suppression. (In re Estate of Moore (1919) 180 Cal. 570, 585 182 P. 285; Sprague v. Equifax, Inc. (1985) 166 Cal.App.3d 1012, 1051 213 Cal.Rptr. 69; County of Contra Costa v. Nulty (1965) 237 Cal.App.2d 593, 598 47 Cal.Rptr. 109.)

If there is evidence that a party improperly altered evidence (as opposed to concealing or destroying it), users should consider modifying this instruction to account for that circumstance.

In Cedars-Sinai Medical Center v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal.4th 1, 12 74 Cal.Rptr.2d 248, 954 P.2d 511, a case concerning the tort of intentional spoliation of evidence, the Supreme Court observed that trial courts are free to adapt standard jury instructions on willful suppression to fit the circumstances of the case, "including the egregiousness of the spoliation and the strength and nature of the inference arising from the spoliation."

#### SOURCES AND AUTHORITY

Evidence Code section 413 provides: "In determining what inferences to draw from the evidence or facts in the case against a party, the trier of fact may consider, among other things, the party's failure to explain or to deny by his testimony such evidence or facts in the case against him, or his willful suppression of evidence relating thereto, if such be the case."

Former Code of Civil Procedure section 1963(5) permitted the jury to infer "that the evidence willfully suppressed would be adverse if produced." Including this inference in a jury instruction on willful suppression is proper because "Evidence Code section 413 was not intended as a change in the law." (Bihun v. AT&T Information Systems, Inc. (1993) 13 Cal.App.4th 976, 994 16 Cal.Rptr.2d 787, disapproved of on other grounds in Lakin v. Watkins Associated Industries (1993) 6 Cal.4th 644, 664 25 Cal.Rptr.2d 109, 863 P.2d 179.)

# Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 41 of 127 DSUPRA

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	"A defendant is not under a duty to produce testimony adverse to himself, but if he fails	
2	to produce evidence that would naturally have been produced he must take the risk that the trier	
3	of the fact will infer, and properly so, that the evidence, had it been produced, would have been	
4	adverse." (Breland v. Traylor Engineering and Manufacturing Co. (1942) 52 Cal.App.2d 415,	
5	426 126 P.2d 455.)	
6	Secondary Sources	
7	7 Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1997) Trial, § 313, p. 358	
8	3 Witkin, California Evidence (4th ed. 2000) Presentation at Trial, § 115	
9	48 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 551, Trial, § 551.93 (Matthew Bender)	
10	WEST'S EDITORIAL REFERENCES	
11	Direct References: See BAJI 2.03	
12	Related References:	
13	BAJI 2.22, 12.35	
14	Statutory References: West's Ann.Cal.Evid.Code § 413	
15	Secondary References:	
16	7 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (4th ed. 1997) Trial, § 313(b) California Practice Guide (Rutter), Civil Trials and Evidence, §§ 13:105, 13:298	
17 18	Library References: Cal.Jur. 3d, Evidence §§ 100, 129, 703, 704	
19	Analytical Cross References: Simons, California Evidence Manual, § 1:45	
20	Research References:	
21	West's Key Number Digest, Evidence k78; Trial k234(8), 211, 252(22) C.J.S. Evidence §§ 163 to 165, 167; Trial §§ 501 to 504, 568, 586, 623, 631, 663, 665	
22		
23	CACI 204	
24	Proposed by: Plaintiff	
25	Given:	
26	Given as Modified:	
27	Withdrawn:	
28	Refused: OWW:	
	27	

1

# 2

## 3 4

5

## 7

6

8

# 9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_

#### **DEFINITION OF MENTAL DISABILITY**

"Mental disability" includes, but is not limited to, all of the following:

- (1) Having any mental or psychological disorder or condition, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, or specific learning disabilities, that limits a major life activity;
- (2) Any other mental or psychological disorder or condition not described in paragraph (1) that requires special education or related services.
- (3) Having a record or history of a mental or psychological disorder or condition described in paragraph (1) or (2), which is known to the County of Kern;
- (4) Being regarded or treated by the County of Kern as having, or having had, a mental or psychological disorder or condition that has no present disabling effect, but that may become a mental disability as described in paragraph (1) or (2).

"Limits" shall be determined without regard to mitigating measures such as medication, assistive devices, prosthetics, or reasonable accommodations, unless the mitigating measure itself limits a major life activity.

"Major life activities" must be broadly construed and include physical, mental, and social activities, as well as working.

#### **USE NOTE**

Government Code § 12926 provides that notwithstanding subdivisions (i) and (k) if the definition of "disability" used in the ADA of 1990 would result in broader protection of the civil rights of individuals with a mental disability or physical disability, as defined in subdivision (i) or (k), or would include any medical condition not included within those definitions, then that broader protection or coverage shall be deemed incorporated by reference into, and shall prevail over conflicting provisions of, the definitions in subdivisions (i) and (k). If that situation arises in

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

23

 $^{23}$  | BAJI 12.13

24 | Proposed by: Plaintiff

25 | Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn:

26 Given as Modified:

2728

Refused:

- 39 -

OWW: \_\_\_\_

### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

#### REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION /ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS EXPLAINED

A reasonable accommodation is a workplace modification so that an individual with a disability can apply for a job, perform the essential functions of the job, and enjoy the job benefits.

#### **Reasonable accommodation** may include, but is not limited to:

- a. Making existing facilities used by employees readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities;
- b. Job restructuring, reassignment to a vacant position, part-time or modified work schedules, acquisition or modification of equipment or devices, adjustment or modification of examinations, training materials or policies, the provision of qualified readers or interpreters, and other similar accommodation for individuals with disabilities.
- c. Holding a job open for a disabled employee who needs time to recuperate or heal is in itself a form of reasonable accommodation and may be all that is required where it appears likely that the employee will be able to return to an existing position at some time in the foreseeable future.

While the employer has an obligation to provide a reasonable accommodation, the employee cannot require the employer to provide a specific accommodation. The employer is not required to choose the best accommodation or the accommodation the employee seeks so long as the employer provides a reasonable accommodation.

The phrase "**essential functions**" means the fundamental job duties of the employment position which the individual with disability holds or desires. The phrase "essential functions" does not include the marginal functions of the position.

- 1. A job function may be considered essential for any of several reasons, including, but not limited to, any one or more of the following:
- a. The function may be essential because the reason the position exists is to perform that function.

1 2

3

56

7 8

9

1011

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

1920

2122

23

2425

26

2728

7

12

13 14

1516

17

18

19

2021

2223

2425

26 27

28

b. The function may be essential because of the limited number of employees available among whom the performance of that job function can be distributed.

- c. The function may be highly specialized, so that the incumbent in the position is hired for that person's expertise or ability to perform the particular function.
- 2. Evidence of whether a particular function is essential includes, but is not limited to, the following:
  - a. The employer's judgment as to whether functions are essential.
  - b. Written job descriptions prepared before advertising or interviewing applicants for the job.
  - c. The amount of time spent on the job performing the functions.
  - d. The consequences of not requiring the incumbent to perform the function.
  - e. The terms of a collective bargaining agreement.
  - f. The work experiences of past incumbents in the job.
  - g. The current work experience of incumbents in similar jobs.

As used in this instruction, "incumbent" means the person holding the position, about to hold the position, or the person who formerly held the position.

#### **USE NOTE**

This instruction is necessary to supplement BAJI 12.12, 12.12.5, or 12.12.6.

If the employer claims an inability to provide reasonable accommodations because of undue hardship, use BAJI 12.15.

The various ways that reasonable accommodation may occur is taken from Government Code § 12926(n).

The 2008 revision incorporates two additional bracketed paragraphs following the first paragraph. The first incorporates language found in Jensen v. Wells Fargo Bank (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 245, 266, 102 Cal.Rptr.2d 55. The second is based upon Hanson v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 215, 228, 87 Cal.Rptr.2d 487. Do not give either paragraph unless

24 25 Given: \_\_\_\_\_ 26 Given as Modified: 27 Withdrawn:

28

Refused:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

OWW: \_\_\_\_

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6c

#### INSTRUCTION No.

#### EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATON DAMAGES

If you find that plaintiff is entitled to recover damages for unlawful employment discrimination, the damages must include: the value of any loss of compensation and benefits under the employment contract any consequential economic damages any damages for emotional distress suffered by plaintiff \_\_\_\_(other)\_\_\_\_, provided that you find that the harm or loss was or will be suffered by the plaintiff and was or will be caused by the act or omission upon which you base your finding of liability.

#### **USE NOTE**

Other items of damage should be added if deemed appropriate by the trial judge. See BAJI 12.72, defining emotional distress.

If punitive damages are claimed and there is evidence to support such claim (see Civil Code §§ 3294 and 3295), BAJI 14.71 should be given. If punitive damages are sought against a principal for the acts of an agent, BAJI 14.73 should be given.

If the discrimination results in termination, plaintiff has a duty to mitigate damages. BAJI 10.16 can be modified to read, "An employee who was damaged as a result of unlawful employment discrimination resulting in termination has a duty ...."

The committee notes that 42 U.S.C.A. § 2000e-5(g)(2)(B) excludes the recovery of damages if the employer can establish that he, she or it would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, but permits declaratory relief, some types of injunctive relief, and attorney's fees and costs. It is unknown how this provision of law will be treated, if at all, by the California Courts. It appears to be a statutory recognition, at least in part, of the defense discussed in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins (1989) 490 U.S. 228, 109 S.Ct. 1775, 104 L.Ed.2d 268. See BAJI 12.26 and its comment.

#### **COMMENT**

In a situation where an employee following an unlawful demotion based upon age discrimination, sustained an industrial injury coupled with emotional distress, the subsequent

- 43 -

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

USDC, ED Case No. 1:07-cv-00026 OWW DLB PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6d

# INSTRUCTION No. \_

#### CAUSATION: SUBSTANTIAL FACTOR

A substantial factor in causing harm is a factor that a reasonable person would consider to have contributed to the harm. It must be more than a remote or trivial factor. It does not have to be the only cause of the harm.

#### **DIRECTIONS FOR USE**

As phrased, this definition of "substantial factor" subsumes the "but for" test of causation, that is, "but for" the defendant's conduct, the plaintiff's harm would not have occurred. (Mitchell v. Gonzales (1991) 54 Cal.3d 1041, 1052 1 Cal.Rptr.2d 913, 819 P.2d 872; see Rest.2d Torts, § 431.) The optional last sentence makes this explicit, and in some cases it may be error not to give this sentence. (See Soule v. GM Corp. (1994) 8 Cal.4th 548, 572-573 34 Cal.Rptr.2d 607, 882 P.2d 298; Rest.2d Torts § 432(1).)

"Conduct," in this context, refers to the culpable acts or omissions on which a claim of legal fault is based, e.g., negligence, product defect, breach of contract, or dangerous condition of public property. This is in contrast to an event that is not a culpable act but that happens to occur in the chain of causation, e.g., that the plaintiff's alarm clock failed to go off, causing her to be at the location of the accident at a time when she otherwise would not have been there. The reference to "conduct" may be changed as appropriate to the facts of the case.

The "but for" test of the last optional sentence does not apply to concurrent independent causes, which are multiple forces operating at the same time and independently, each of which would have been sufficient by itself to bring about the same harm. (Viner v. Sweet (2003) 30 Cal.4th 1232, 1240 135 Cal.Rptr.2d 629, 70 P.3d 1046; Barton v. Owen (1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 484, 503-504 139 Cal.Rptr. 494; see Rest.2d Torts § 432(2).) Accordingly, do not include the last sentence in a case involving concurrent independent causes.

In cases of multiple (concurrent dependent) causes, CACI No. 431, Causation: Multiple Causes, should also be given.

In asbestos-related cancer cases, Rutherford v. Owens-Illinois, Inc. (1997) 16 Cal.4th 953, 977 67 Cal.Rptr.2d 16, 941 P.2d 1203 requires a different instruction regarding exposure to a particular product. Give CACI No. 435, Causation for Asbestos-Related Cancer Claims, and do not give this instruction.

#### SOURCES AND AUTHORITY

This instruction incorporates Restatement Second of Torts, section 431, comment a, which provides, in part: "The word 'substantial' is used to denote the fact that the defendant's conduct has such an effect in producing the harm as to lead reasonable men to regard it as a cause, using that word in the popular sense, in which there always lurks the idea of responsibility, rather than in the so-called 'philosophic sense' which includes every one of the great number of events without which any happening would not have occurred."

"California has definitively adopted the substantial factor test of the Restatement Second of Torts for cause-in-fact determinations. Under that standard, a cause in fact is something that is a substantial factor in bringing about the injury. The substantial factor standard generally produces the same results as does the 'but for' rule of causation which states that a defendant's conduct is a cause of the injury if the injury would not have occurred 'but for' that conduct. The substantial factor standard, however, has been embraced as a clearer rule of causation--one which subsumes the 'but for' test while reaching beyond it to satisfactorily address other situations, such as those involving independent or concurrent causes in fact." (Rutherford, supra, 16 Cal.4th at pp. 968-969, internal citations omitted.)

"The term 'substantial factor' has not been judicially defined with specificity, and indeed it has been observed that it is 'neither possible nor desirable to reduce it to any lower terms.' This court has suggested that a force which plays only an 'infinitesimal' or 'theoretical' part in bringing about injury, damage, or loss is not a substantial factor. Undue emphasis should not be placed on the term 'substantial.' For example, the substantial factor standard, formulated to aid plaintiffs as a broader rule of causality than the 'but for' test, has been invoked by defendants whose conduct is clearly a 'but for' cause of plaintiff's injury but is nevertheless urged as an insubstantial

contribution to the injury. Misused in this way, the substantial factor test 'undermines the principles of comparative negligence, under which a party is responsible for his or her share of negligence and the harm caused thereby.' " (Rutherford, supra, 16 Cal.4th at pp. 968-969, internal citations omitted.)

"The substantial factor standard is a relatively broad one, requiring only that the contribution of the individual cause be more than negligible or theoretical. Thus, 'a force which plays only an "infinitesimal" or "theoretical" part in bringing about injury, damage, or loss is not a substantial factor', but a very minor force that does cause harm is a substantial factor. This rule honors the principle of comparative fault." (Bockrath v. Aldrich Chemical Co. (1999) 21 Cal.4th 71, 79 86 Cal.Rptr.2d 846, 980 P.2d 398, internal citations omitted.)

"The text of Restatement Torts second section 432 demonstrates how the 'substantial factor' test subsumes the traditional 'but for' test of causation. Subsection (1) of section 432 provides: 'Except as stated in Subsection (2), the actor's negligent conduct is not a substantial factor in bringing about harm to another if the harm would have been sustained even if the actor had not been negligent.' ... Subsection (2) states that if 'two forces are actively operating ... and each of itself is sufficient to bring about harm to another, the actor's negligence may be found to be a substantial factor in bringing it about.' " (Viner, supra, 30 Cal. 4th at p. 1240, original italics.)

"The first element of legal cause is cause in fact ... . The 'but for' rule has traditionally been applied to determine cause in fact. The Restatement formula uses the term substantial factor 'to denote the fact that the defendant's conduct has such an effect in producing the harm as to lead reasonable men to regard it as a cause.' " (Mayes v. Bryan (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 1075, 1095 44 Cal.Rptr.3d 14, internal citations omitted.)

"Whether a defendant's conduct actually caused an injury is a question of fact ... that is ordinarily for the jury ... .' 'Causation in fact is ultimately a matter of probability and common sense: "A plaintiff is not required to eliminate entirely all possibility that the defendant's conduct was not a cause. It is enough that he introduces evidence from which reasonable persons may conclude that it is more probable that the event was caused by the defendant than that it was not.

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	The fact of causation is incapable of mathematical proof, since no person can say with absolute
2	certainty what would have occurred if the defendant had acted otherwise. If, as a matter of
3	ordinary experience, a particular act or omission might be expected to produce a particular result,
4	and if that result has in fact followed, the conclusion may be justified that the causal relation
5	exists. In drawing that conclusion, the triers of fact are permitted to draw upon ordinary human
6	experience as to the probabilities of the case." '.
7	' "A mere possibility of causation is not enough; and when the matter remains one of pure
8	speculation or conjecture, or the probabilities are at best evenly balanced, it becomes the duty of
9	the court to direct a verdict for the defendant." ' " (Raven H. v. Gamette (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th
10	1017, 1029-1030 68 Cal.Rptr.3d 897, internal citations omitted.)
11	"However the test is phrased, causation in fact is ultimately a matter of probability and
12	common sense." (Osborn v. Irwin Memorial Blood Bank (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 234, 253 7
13	Cal.Rptr.2d 101, relying on Rest.2d Torts, § 433B, com. b.)
14	Restatement Second of Torts, section 431, provides: "The actor's negligent conduct is a
15	legal cause of harm to another if (a) his conduct is a substantial factor in bringing about the
16	harm, and, (b) there is no rule of law relieving the actor from liability because of the manner in
17	which his negligence has resulted in the harm." This section "correctly states California law as to
18	the issue of causation in tort cases." (Wilson v. Blue Cross of Southern California (1990) 222
19	Cal.App.3d 660, 673 271 Cal.Rptr. 876.)
20	Secondary Sources
21	6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 1185-1189, 1191
22	California Tort Guide (Cont.Ed.Bar 3d ed.) §§ 1.13-1.15
23	1 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 2, Causation, § 2.02 (Matthew Bender)
24	4 California Trial Guide, Unit 90, Closing Argument, § 90.89 (Matthew Bender)
25	California Products Liability Actions, Ch. 2, Liability for Defective Products, § 2.22, Ch. 7,
26	Proof, § 7.06 (Matthew Bender)
27	33 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 380, Negligence, § 380.71 (Matthew Bender)

	Tittp://www.jusupra.com/pos/document/viewer.aspx?nu=aeo2core-3090-4e2a-96t
1	16 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, Negligence, §§ 165.260-165.263 (Matthew
2	Bender)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
$\begin{bmatrix} 21 \\ 22 \end{bmatrix}$	
23	CACI 430
$\begin{bmatrix} 23 \\ 24 \end{bmatrix}$	Proposed by: Plaintiff
25	Given:
26	Given as Modified:
27	Withdrawn:
28	Refused: OWW:
	- 49 -

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 53 of 127 DSUPRA

# 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

#### 26

## 27

28

#### **INSTRUCTION No.** \_

#### **RETALIATION** [Gov't Code § 12940(h); 29 U.S.C. § 2615(b)(1)]

David O. Jadwin, D.O. claims that County of Kern retaliated against him for EITHER complaining internally about discrimination, harassment, or retaliation; OR filing a charge with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, OR filing a lawsuit containing claims based on the Fair Employment and Housing Act, the California Family Rights Act, or the Family and Medical Leave Act. To establish this claim, Dr. Jadwin must prove all of the following:

- 1. That Dr. Jadwin complained internally about discrimination, harassment, or retaliation; OR filed a charge with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing; OR filed a lawsuit containing claims based on the Fair Employment and Housing Act or the California Family Rights Act.
- 2. That County of Kern EITHER demoted him, OR cut his pay, OR did not renew his employment contract; OR created a hostile work environment for him;
- That Dr. Jadwin's internal complaint about discrimination, harassment, or retaliation; filing of a charge with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing; OR filing of a lawsuit was a motivating reason for County of Kern's decision to EITHER demote, OR cut his pay, OR not renew his employment contract; OR for County of Kern's conduct in creating a hostile work environment for him.
- That Dr. Jadwin was harmed; and
- That County of Kern's conduct was a substantial factor in causing Dr. Jadwin's harm.

#### **DIRECTIONS FOR USE**

In elements 1 and 3, describe the protected activity in question. Government Code section 12940(h) provides that it is unlawful to retaliate against a person "because the person has

opposed any practices forbidden under Government Code sections 12900 through 12966 or because the person has filed a complaint, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under the FEHA."

Read the second option for element 2 in cases involving a pattern of employer harassment consisting of acts that might not individually be sufficient to constitute retaliation, but taken as a whole establish prohibited conduct. Give both options if the employee presents evidence supporting liability under both a sufficient-single-act theory or a pattern-of-harassment theory. (See, e.g., Wysinger v. Automobile Club of Southern California (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 413, 423-424 69 Cal.Rptr.3d 1.) Also select "conduct" in element 3 if the second option or both options are included for element 2.

#### SOURCES AND AUTHORITY

Government Code section 12940(h) provides that it is an unlawful employment practice "for any employer, labor organization, employment agency, or person to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because the person has opposed any practices forbidden under this part or because the person has filed a complaint, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this part."

The FEHA defines a "person" as "one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, limited liability companies, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, and receivers or other fiduciaries." (Gov. Code, § 12925(d).)

2
 3
 4

5

67

8

11

10

1213

1415

1617

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

2627

28

The Fair Employment and Housing Commission's regulations provide: "It is unlawful for an employer or other covered entity to demote, suspend, reduce, fail to hire or consider for hire, fail to give equal consideration in making employment decisions, fail to treat impartially in the context of any recommendations for subsequent employment which the employer or other covered entity may make, adversely affect working conditions or otherwise deny any employment benefit to an individual because that individual has opposed practices prohibited by the Act or has filed a complaint, testified, assisted or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing conducted by the Commission or Department or their staffs." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 7287.8(a).)

"Employees may establish a prima facie case of unlawful retaliation by showing that (1) they engaged in activities protected by the FEHA, (2) their employers subsequently took adverse employment action against them, and (3) there was a causal connection between the protected activity and the adverse employment action." (Miller v. Department of Corr. (2005) 36 Cal.4th 446, 472 30 Cal.Rptr.3d 797, 115 P.3d 77, citing Flait v. North Am. Watch Corp. (1992) 3 Cal.App.4th 467, 476 4 Cal.Rptr.2d 522.)

"Retaliation claims are inherently fact-specific, and the impact of an employer's action in a particular case must be evaluated in context. Accordingly, although an adverse employment action must materially affect the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment to be actionable, the determination of whether a particular action or course of conduct rises to the level of actionable conduct should take into account the unique circumstances of the affected employee as well as the workplace context of the claim." (Yanowitz v. L'Oreal USA, Inc. (2005) 36 Cal.4th 1028, 1052 32 Cal.Rptr.3d 436, 116 P.3d 1123.)

"Appropriately viewed, section 12940(a) protects an employee against unlawful discrimination with respect not only to so-called ultimate employment actions such as termination or demotion, but also the entire spectrum of employment actions that are reasonably likely to adversely and materially affect an employee's job performance or opportunity for advancement in his or her career. Although a mere offensive utterance or even a pattern of social slights by either the employer or coemployees cannot properly be viewed as materially affecting

the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment for purposes of section 12940(a) (or give rise to a claim under section 12940(h)), the phrase 'terms, conditions, or privileges' of employment must be interpreted liberally and with a reasonable appreciation of the realities of the workplace in order to afford employees the appropriate and generous protection against employment discrimination that the FEHA was intended to provide." (Yanowitz, supra, 36 Cal.4th at pp. 1053 -1054, footnotes omitted.)

"Contrary to defendant's assertion that it is improper to consider collectively the alleged retaliatory acts, there is no requirement that an employer's retaliatory acts constitute one swift blow, rather than a series of subtle, yet damaging, injuries. Enforcing a requirement that each act separately constitute an adverse employment action would subvert the purpose and intent of the statute." (Yanowitz, supra, 36 Cal.4th at pp. 1055-1056, internal citations omitted.)

"Moreover, defendant's actions had a substantial and material impact on the conditions of employment. The refusal to promote plaintiff is an adverse employment action under FEHA. There was also a pattern of conduct, the totality of which constitutes an adverse employment action. This includes undeserved negative job reviews, reductions in his staff, ignoring his health concerns and acts which caused him substantial psychological harm." (Wysinger, supra, 157 Cal.App.4th at p. 424, internal citations omitted.)

"A long period between an employer's adverse employment action and the employee's earlier protected activity may lead to the inference that the two events are not causally connected. But if between these events the employer engages in a pattern of conduct consistent with a retaliatory intent, there may be a causal connection." (Wysinger, supra, 157 Cal.App.4th at p. 421, internal citation omitted.)

"Both direct and circumstantial evidence can be used to show an employer's intent to retaliate. 'Direct evidence of retaliation may consist of remarks made by decisionmakers displaying a retaliatory motive.' Circumstantial evidence typically relates to such factors as the plaintiff's job performance, the timing of events, and how the plaintiff was treated in comparison to other workers." (Colarossi v. Coty US Inc. (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1142, 1153 119 Cal.Rptr.2d 131, internal citations omitted.)

"The employment action must be both detrimental and substantial ... . We must analyze plaintiff's complaints of adverse employment actions to determine if they result in a material change in the terms of her employment, impair her employment in some cognizable manner, or show some other employment injury ... . We do not find that plaintiff's complaint alleges the necessary material changes in the terms of her employment to cause employment injury. Most of the actions upon which she relies were one time events ... . The other allegations ... are not accompanied by facts which evidence both a substantial and detrimental effect on her employment." (Thomas v. Department of Corrections (2000) 77 Cal.App.4th 507, 511-512 91 Cal.Rptr.2d 770, internal citations omitted.)

"The retaliatory motive is 'proved by showing that plaintiff engaged in protected activities, that his employer was aware of the protected activities, and that the adverse action followed within a relatively short time thereafter.' 'The causal link may be established by an inference derived from circumstantial evidence, "such as the employer's knowledge that the employee engaged in protected activities and the proximity in time between the protected action and allegedly retaliatory employment decision." ' " (Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hospital (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 590, 615 262 Cal.Rptr. 842, internal citations omitted.)

"An employer generally can be held liable for the retaliatory actions of its supervisors." (Wysinger, supra, 157 Cal.App.4th at p. 420.)

"The employer is liable for retaliation under section 12940, subdivision (h), but nonemployer individuals are not personally liable for their role in that retaliation." (Jones v. The Lodge at Torrey Pines Partnership (2008) 42 Cal.4th 1158, 1173 72 Cal.Rptr.3d 624, 177 P.3d 232.)

"Under certain circumstances, a retaliation claim may be brought by an employee who has complained of or opposed conduct, even when a court or jury subsequently determines the conduct actually was not prohibited by the FEHA. Indeed, this precept is well settled. An employee is protected against retaliation if the employee reasonably and in good faith believed that what he or she was opposing constituted unlawful employer conduct such as sexual

1	harassment or sexual discrimination." (Miller, supra, 36 Cal.4th at pp. 473-474, internal citations				
2	omitted.)				
3	" 'The legislative purpose underlying FEHA's prohibition against retaliation is to prevent				
4	employers from deterring employees from asserting good faith discrimination complaints'				
5	Employer retaliation against employees who are believed to be prospective complainants or				
6	witnesses for complainants undermines this legislative purpose just as effectively as retaliation				
7	after the filing of a complaint. To limit FEHA in such a way would be to condone 'an absurd				
8	result' that is contrary to legislative intent. We agree with the trial court that FEHA protects				
9	employees against preemptive retaliation by the employer." (Steele, supra, 162 Cal.App.4th at p.				
10	1255, internal citations omitted.)				
11					
12	Secondary Sources				
13	8 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Constitutional Law, §§ 922, 940, 941				
14	Chin, et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation (The Rutter Group) 7:680-7:841 1 Wrongful Employment Termination Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) Discrimination Claims, §§				
15	2.83-2.88				
16	2 Wilcox, California Employment Law, Ch. 41, Substantive Requirements Under Equal Employment Opportunity Laws, § 41.131 (Matthew Bender)				
17	11 C 1'C ' E CDI 1' 1D ' CI 115 C' '1D' 1 E 1				
18	California Civil Practice: Employment Litigation (Thomson West), §§ 2:74-2:75				
19					
20					
21					
22	CACI 2505 (modified & combined with FMLA retaliation claim)				
23	Proposed by: Plaintiff				
24	Given:				
25	Given as Modified:				
26	Withdrawn:				
27	Refused: OWW:				
28					
	55 -				

# 1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

2728

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

#### "MOTIVATING REASON" EXPLAINED

A "motivating reason" is a reason that contributed to the decision to take certain action, even though other reasons also may have contributed to the decision.

#### **DIRECTIONS FOR USE**

Read this instruction with CACI No. 2500, Disparate Treatment--Essential Factual Elements, CACI No. 2505, Retaliation, or CACI No. 2540, Disability Discrimination--Disparate Treatment--Essential Factual Elements.

#### SOURCES AND AUTHORITY

Government Code section 12940(a) provides:

It shall be an unlawful employment practice, unless based upon a bona fide occupational qualification, or, except where based upon applicable security regulations established by the United States or the State of California:

(a) For an employer, because of the race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, sex, age, or sexual orientation of any person, to refuse to hire or employ the person or to refuse to select the person for a training program leading to employment, or to bar or to discharge the person from employment or from a training program leading to employment, or to discriminate against the person in compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment.

Title 42 United States Code section 2000e-2(m) (a provision of the Civil Rights Action of 1991 amending Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) provides: "Except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, an unlawful employment practice is established when the complaining party demonstrates that race, color, religion, sex, or national origin was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice."

"Because of the similarity between state and federal employment discrimination laws, California courts look to pertinent federal precedent when applying our own statutes." (Guz v. Bechtel National, Inc. (2000) 24 Cal.4th 317, 354 100 Cal.Rptr.2d 352, 8 P.3d 1089.)

"While a complainant need not prove that discriminatory animus was the sole motivation behind a challenged action, he must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that there was a 'causal connection' between the employee's protected status and the adverse employment decision." (Mixon v. Fair Employment and Housing Com. (1987) 192 Cal.App.3d 1306, 1319 237 Cal.Rptr. 884.)

"The employee need not show 'he would have in any event been rejected or discharged solely on the basis of his race, without regard to the alleged deficiencies. ... In other words, 'while a complainant need not prove that racial animus was the sole motivation behind the challenged action, he must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that there was a "causal connection" between the employee's protected status and the adverse employment decision.' " (Clark v. Claremont University Center (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 639, 665 8 Cal.Rptr.2d 151, citing McDonald v. Santa Fe Trail Transp. Co. (1976) 427 U.S. 273, 282, fn. 10 96 S.Ct. 2574, 49 L.Ed.2d 493, 502 and Mixon, supra, 192 Cal.App.3d at p. 1319.)

But see Horsford v. Board of Trustees (2005) 132 Cal.App.4th 359, 377 33 Cal.Rptr.3d 644 ("A plaintiff's burden is ... to produce evidence that, taken as a whole, permits a rational inference that intentional discrimination was a substantial motivating factor in the employer's actions toward the plaintiff"), italics added.

#### **Secondary Sources**

Chin, et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation (The Rutter Group) 7:485-7:508

1 Wrongful Employment Termination Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) Discrimination Claims, §§

2.61-2.65, 2.87

2 Wilcox, California Employment Law, Ch. 41, Substantive Requirements Under Equal Employment Opportunity Laws, § 41.111 (Matthew Bender)

# 11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 115, Civil Rights: Employment Discrimination, § 115.232 (Matthew Bender) 1 California Civil Practice: Employment Litigation (Thomson West) Discrimination in Employment, §§ 2:20-2:21, 2:75 **CACI 2507** Proposed by: Plaintiff Given: \_\_\_\_\_ Given as Modified: Withdrawn: Refused: OWW:

Document 348

Filed 05/11/2009

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

Page 62 of 127 DSUPRA

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

1

2

4

56

7

8

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

18 19

1,

2021

22 | 23 |

24

24

25

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

# DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION - DISPARATE TREATMENT

#### ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS [Gov't Code § 12940(a)]

David F. Jadwin, D.O. claims that County of Kern wrongfully discriminated against him based on his mental disability. To establish this claim, Dr. Jadwin must prove all of the following:

- 1a. That the County of Kern knew OR thought Dr. Jadwin had a mental condition (chronic depression) that limited his ability to work full-time OR enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia; OR
- 1b. That County of Kern knew OR thought Dr. Jadwin had a history of having a mental condition (chronic depression) that limited his ability to work full-time OR enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia.
- 2. That Dr. Jadwin was able to perform the essential job duties with reasonable accommodation for his condition;
- 3. That County of Kern demoted Dr. Jadwin, cut his pay, created a hostile work environment, OR did not renew his employment contract;
- 4a. That Dr. Jadwin's mental condition OR history of a mental condition (chronic depression) was a motivating reason for Dr. Jadwin's demotion, paycut, creation of a hostile work environment, OR nonrenewal of his employment contract: OR
- 4b. That County of Kern's belief that Dr. Jadwin had mental condition OR a history of a mental condition (chronic depression) was a motivating reason for the discharge/refusal to hire/other adverse employment action;
  - 5. That Dr. Jadwin was harmed; and
  - 6. That County of Kern's decision OR conduct was a substantial factor in causing Dr.

Jadwin's harm.

**CACI 2540** 

Withdrawn:

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused: \_\_\_\_\_

OWW: \_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

# INFERENCE OF BIAS FROM SUSPECT TIMING OF AN ADVERSE EMPLOYMENT ACTION

You may infer from the closeness in time between the adverse employment actions (demotion, paycut, creation of a hostile work environment, or nonrenewal) and Dr. Jadwin's protected activity (taking of medical leave, complaining internally about discrimination or retaliation, filing a charge with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, or filing a law suit containing claim based on the Fair Employment and Housing Act, the California Family Rights Act, or the Family and Medical Leave Act) that discrimination or retaliation was a motivating factor for the County of Kern taking these adverse employment actions against Dr. Jadwin.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hospital (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 590, 615 262 Cal. Rptr. 842 ("one may infer retaliation by the "proximity in time between protected activity and the allegedly retaliatory employment decision."); Bell v. Clackamas County (9th Cir., 2003) 341 F.3d 858, 865 ("Temporal proximity between protected activity and an adverse employment action can by itself constitute sufficient circumstantial evidence of retaliation in some cases. (Cite) "Causation can be inferred from timing alone where an adverse employment action follows on the heels of \*866 protected activity.")

2021

22 | Plaintiff's Special Instruction

23 Proposed by: Plaintiff

24 || Given: \_\_\_\_\_

25 Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

26 Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

28

27

- 60 -

1

2

4

5

7

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

# INFERENCE OF BIAS FROM AN EMPLOYER'S SHIFTING REASONS FOR TAKING AN ADVERSE EMPLOYMENT ACTION AGAINST AN EMPLOYEE

You may infer that discrimination or retaliation was a motivating factor for the adverse employment actions (demotion, paycut, creation of a hostile work environment, or nonrenewal of his employment contract) that County of Kern took against Dr. Jadwin if you find that the County of Kern changed its story about why it took any of these adverse actions against Dr. Jadwin.

Payne v. Norwest Corp. (9th Cir., 1997) 113 F.3d 1079, 1080 ("A rational trier of fact could find that the employer's varying reasons shows that the stated reason was pretextual, for one who tells the truth need not recite different versions of the supposedly same event.")

Plaintiff's Special Instruction

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given:

Withdrawn:

Given as Modified:

Refused:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

1 2

3

45

6 7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

# INFERENCE OF BIAS FROM AN EMPLOYER'S FAILURE TO FOLLOW ITS OWN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

You may infer that discrimination or retaliation was a motivating factor is you find that the County of Kern failed to follow its own policies and procedures when taking any of the adverse employment actions (demotion, paycut, nonrenewal of contract, creation of a hostile work environment, or nonrenewal of his employment contract) against Dr. Jadwin.

Village of Arlington Heights v. Met. Hous. Dev. Corp. (1977) 429 U.S. 252, 267 ("Departures from the normal procedural sequence also might afford evidence that improper purposes are playing a role."); Stewart v. Rutgers, State Univ. (3d Cir. 1997) 120 F.3d 426 ("arbitrary and capricious" decision-making, coupled with "procedural errors," constitutes circumstantial evidence of discrimination.)

Plaintiff's Special Instruction

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused:

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

OWW: \_\_\_\_

- 62 -

1 2

3

4 5

6

8

7

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

\_\_ || ------

23 || I

24

25

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

# INFERENCE OF BIAS FROM AN EMPLOYER'S EVALUATION OF AN EMPLOYEE'S JOB PERFORMANCE USING SUBJECTIVE CRITERIA

You may infer that discrimination or retaliation was a motivating factor for any of the adverse employment actions (demotion, paycut, creation of a hostile work environment, or nonrenewal of his employment contract) that the County of Kern took against Dr. Jadwin if you find that County of Kern relied on subjective criteria when evaluating Dr. Jadwin's job performance instead of focusing on objective criteria.

Liu v. Amway Corp. (9th Cir. 2003) 347 F.3d 1125, 1136 (sujective evaluation of "soft skills" are "susceptible of abuse and more likely to mask pretext."); Nanty v. Barrows Co. (9th Cir., 1981) ("subjective job criteria present potential for serious abuse and should be viewed with skepticism. Use of subjective criteria...provides a convenient pretext for discriminatory practices.").

Plaintiff's Special Instruction

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

OWW: \_\_\_\_

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Withdrawn:

Refused:

OWW: \_

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

# INSTRUCTION No. \_

# INFERENCE OF BIAS FROM AN EMPLOYER'S EVALUATION OF AN EMPLOYEE'S JOB PERFORMANCE BASED ON STALE CRITIQUES

You may infer that discrimination or retaliation were a motivating factor for any of the adverse employment actions (demotion, paycut, creation of a hostile work environment, nonrenewal of contract) that the County of Kern took against Dr. Jadwin if you find that it relied on stale discipline or job performance deficiencies that it had previously tolerated. Giancoletto v. Amax Zinc. Co. (7th Cir., 1992) 954 F.2d 424, 426-427 (factfinder may infer discriminatory intent where an employer gives an employee good reviews despite known performance issues, and then later tries to justify an adverse employment action on those same performance issues); Hassiani v. Western Missouri Medical Center (8th Cir., 1996) (the employer knew about and previously tolerated performance deficiencies); Garrett v. Hewlett Packard, 305 F.3d 1210, 1218 (10th Cir. 2002) (use of stale critiques to justify discharge is evidence of pretext) Plaintiff's Special Instruction Proposed by: Plaintiff Given: \_\_\_\_\_ Given as Modified:

- 64

1

2 3

4 5

6 7

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

INSTRUCTION No. \_\_

# INFERENCE OF BIAS FROM BEING TREATED WORSE THAN OTHER SIMILARLY SITUATED CO-WORKERS

You may infer that discrimination or retaliation was a motivating factor for any of the adverse employment actions (demotion, paycut, creation of a hostile work environment, or nonrenewal of employment contract) that the County of Kern took against Dr. Jadwin if you find that he was treated worse than similarly situated employees who were not in his protected class (individual with a disabling mental condition) or who had not engaged in any of his protected activities (taking medical leave, complaining internally about discrimination or retaliation, filing a charge with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, or filing a law suit containing claims based on the Fair Employment and Housing Act, the California Family Rights Act, or the Family and Medical Leave Act).

An employee is "similarly situated" to another if they have the same supervisor, or are subject to the same policies and procedures, or engage in the same conduct; but do not have to be identically situated. The critical question is whether Dr. Jadwin and the other employee are similarly situated in "all material aspects." Bowden v. Potter (N.D. Cal. 2004) 308 F.Supp.2d 1108, 1117 (quoting McGuinness v. Lincoln Hall (2nd Cir. 2001) 263 F.3d 49, 53)

Plaintiff's	Special	Instruction

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

OWW: \_\_

1

2

3

4 5

7

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Refused:

INSTRUCTION No. \_\_

#### INFERENCE OF BIAS FROM AN EMPLOYER'S FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE

An employer has a duty to investigate an employee's complaints of discrimination and retaliation. You may infer that discrimination and retaliation were a motivating factor for any of the adverse employment actions (demotion, paycut, creation of a hostile work environment, and nonrenewal of employment contract) that County of Kern took against Dr. Jadwin if you find that the County of Kern failed to investigate his complaints of discrimination and retaliation.

Fuller v. City of Oakland (9th Cir. 1995) 47 F.3d 1522, 1259 (an employer has a duty to take steps to stop current discrimination, harassment, and retaliation and to prevent future discrimination, harassment, and retalition from occuring.); Northrop Grumman Corp. v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (2nd Dist. 2002) 103 Cal.App.4th 1021, 1035 ("Prompt investigation of a discrimination claim is a necessary step by which an employer meets its obligation to ensure a discrimination-free work environment."); deLesstine v. Ft. Wayne State Hosp., 682 F.2d 130, 136 (7th Cir. 1982) (retaliation shown through employer's "utter disregard of information at their disposal relevant to plaintiff's conduct").

Plaintiff's Special Instruction	LI

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

OWW:

OWW:

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

# 1 INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_ 2 INFERENCE OF BIAS FROM FALSE DENIALS OF KNOWLEDGE

4

3

False statements made to evade liability are evidence of a consciousness of guilt.

56

7

8

9

Donchin v. Guerrero (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1832, (41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 192) ("Just as a criminal defendant's false exculpatory statement is evidence of his or her consciousness of guilt, such statements by a civil defendant can be evidence of his or her consciousness of liability, and casts doubt on his or her denial of knowledge affecting liability.")

10

1112

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 | Plaintiff's Special Instruction

24 | Proposed by: Plaintiff

25 Given: \_\_\_\_

Withdrawn:

26 Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

27

28

Refused:

-	67	-

PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

1

2

# 3

4

5

67

8

9

10

11

1213

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

#### AN AGENT'S KNOWLEDGE IS IMPUTED TO THE PRINCIPAL

You must conclude that the County of Kern knew of information that its agents (officers,

managing agents, or attorneys) had a duty to tell them. California Fair Employment and Housing Comm'n v. Gemini Aluminium Corp. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1004 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 906 (when an agent has acquired knowledge which he or she has a duty to communicate to his or her principal, a conclusive presumption arises that the agent performed that duty.); Freeman v. Superior Court (1955) 44 Cal.2d 533 282 P.2d 857; Kimbro v. Atlantic Richfield Co. 889 F.2d 869 (9th Cir.1989) (Notice to Plaintiff's supervisor is imputed to the person(s) who made the final decisions regarding an adverse action.) Plaintiff's Special Instruction Proposed by: Plaintiff Given: Given as Modified: Withdrawn: Refused: OWW:

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

9

1011

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

2223

24

25

26

2728

#### 60

### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_ BIAS AT ANY STAGE CAN INFECT THE ULTIMATE DECISION.

You may infer that bias at any stage in the County of Kern's decision-making regarding any of the adverse employment actions (demotion, payout, creation of a hostile work environment, or nonrenewal of his employment contract) that it took against Dr. Jadwin may have tainted the ultimate decision.

DeJung v. Superior Court (2008) 169 Cal.App.4th 533, 87 Cal.Rptr.3d 99 ("All but one of the federal circuits have adopted the "cat's paw" principle, as have the California courts. (See \*552 Reeves, supra, 121 Cal.App.4th at pp. 114-116, 16 Cal.Rptr.3d 717.) The principle has been applied, for example, in suits against educational institutions by faculty members who have been denied tenure. (See, e.g., Morgan, supra, 88 Cal.App.4th 52, 105 Cal.Rptr.2d 652; Clark, supra, 6 Cal.App.4th 639, 8 Cal.Rptr.2d 151; Roebuck, supra, 852 F.2d 715.) In discussing these cases, the Morgan court stated that "in the context of the academic tenure system, in which decisions and recommendations made in earlier levels of review may be available to decision makers at subsequent levels, it clearly makes sense to acknowledge that the final decision may be influenced by the discriminatory intent of individuals playing a role at any point in the decision making process." (Morgan, supra, 88 Cal.App.4th at p. 74, 105 Cal.Rptr.2d 652.) In the present case, it can hardly be argued that Hardcastle, as the presiding judge and the chair of the Executive Committee, was not a direct and important participant in the Superior Court's decisionmaking process when it decided not to retain DeJung in the full-time commissioner position. In addition, the evidence supports an inference that Hardcastle was speaking at least for the Executive Committee when he said that "they," and for himself and the Executive Committee when he said later that "we," were "looking for someone younger" than DeJung. Moreover, as in the academic tenure cases, the decisionmaking process in this case involved multiple levels where the information acquired at the first level was available to later levels. In fact, Hardcastle was personally involved at three pertinent levels: the Executive Committee, the interview panel,

## 1 and in the final decision made by the full court at the judicial business meeting on May 7, 2004. 2 Given these facts, it would be entirely reasonable for a trier of fact to infer that Hardcastle's 3 discriminatory animus influenced the process. Accordingly, the trial court erred in granting 4 summary judgment on the ground that there was no triable issue of fact as to whether age 5 discrimination played a part in the Superior Court's decision not to appoint DeJung.") 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 Plaintiff's Special Instruction 24 Proposed by: Plaintiff 25 Given: \_\_\_\_\_ Given as Modified: 26 27 Withdrawn: 28 Refused: OWW: - 70 -

Document 348

Filed 05/11/2009

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

Page 74 of 127 DSUPRA

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_

# AN EMPLOYER KNOWS OF A DISABILITY IF IT KNOWS OF THE LIMITATIONS **CAUSED BY THE DISABILITY**

You must conclude that the County of Kern knew that Dr. Jadwin's chronic depression was disabling if you find that the County of Kern knew that it limited his ability to work fulltime.

Taylor v. Principal Financial Group, Inc. 93 F.3d 155, 164 (5th Cir. 1996) ("It is
important to distinguish between an employer's knowledge of an employee's disability versus a
employer's knowledge of any limitations experienced by the employee as a result of that
disability. This distinction is important because the ADA requires employers to reasonably
accommodate limitations, not disabilities.") Faust v. California Portland Cement Co. (2007)150
Cal.App.4th 864 (work status report advising the employer that an employee is "unable to
perform regular job duties" is sufficient to provide notice of a limitation.0 "In deciding
whether the employees' limitations make them 'disabled' under FEHA, the Proper
comparative baseline is either the individual without the impairment in question or the average
unimpaired person." Arteagav. Brink's, Inc., 163 Cal. App. 4th 327, 345 (2008) (emphasis
andinternal quotation marks omitted). An average person can work 40hours in a week, as "40
hours is considered a full work week in ourculture." Arteaga, 163 Cal. App. 4th at 346 (internal
quotationmarks omitted); Sanglap v. LaSalle Bank, FSB, 345 F.3d 515, 520 (7th Cir. 2003)
("Liability for disability discrimination does not require professional understanding of the
plaintiff's condition. It is enough to show that the defendant knew of symptoms raising an
inference that the plaintiff was disabled.")
Plaintiff's Special Instruction
Proposed by: Plaintiff
Given:
Given as Modified:
Withdrawn:
Refused: OWW:

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

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_

# DISCRIMINATION BASED ON THE EMPLOYEE'S LIMITATION OR ACCOMMODATION IS DISCRIMINATION BASED ON THE EMPLOYEE'S **DISABILITY**

You must conclude that the County of Kern discriminated against Dr. Jadwin based on his disability if you find that the County of Kern took any of the adverse employment actions (demotion, paycut, creation of a hostile work environment, non-renewal of his employment contract) against Dr. Jadwin because he needed accommodation in the form of recuperative leave.

Humphrey v. Memorial Hosps. Assn.,239 F. 3d 1128, 1139-1140 (9th Cir. 2001) ("...conduct resulting from a disability is considered part of the disability, rather than a separate basis for termination. The link between the disability and the termination is particularly strong where it is the employer's failure to reasonably accommodate a known disability that leads to discharge for performance inadequacies resulting from that disability"); Borkowski v. Valley Cent. School Dist., 63 F. 3d 131, 143 (2nd Cir. 1995) ("Failure to consider the possibility of reasonable accommodation for such disabilities, if it leads to discharge for performance inadequacies resulting from the disabilities, amounts to discharge...because of the disabilities.").

Plaintiff's	s Special	Instruction

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

Refused: OWW:

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Refused:

OWW:

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

# INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_ CHRONIC DEPRESSION IS LISTED AS A DISABILITY IN FEHA INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

You must conclude that Dr. Jadwin had a disabling mental condition if you find that he had chronic depression. "Chronic depression" is expressly recognized as a disabling condition. Gov't C. § 12926.1(c). Plaintiff's Special Instruction Proposed by: Plaintiff Given: \_\_\_\_\_ Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_ Withdrawn:

USDC, ED Case No. 1:07-cv-00026 OWW DLB PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

OWW:

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1 2

3

45

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No.

# ABILITY TO PERFORM ESSENTIAL JOB FUNCTIONS WITH ACCOMMODATION IS DETERMINED AFTER REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION IS PROVIDED

When considering whether Dr. Jadwin was able to perform his essential job functions, you must consider whether the leave of absence was likely to enable him, upon his return from leave, to resume performing his essential job functions rather than his ability to do so during his leave of absence.

FEHA expressly provides that part-time work is a form of reasonable accommodation. Gov't C. § 12926(n); *Hanson v. Lucky Stores, Inc.*, 74 Cal. App. 4th 215, 226 (1999) ("A finite leave can be a reasonable accommodation under FEHA, provided it is likely that at the end of the leave, the employee would be able to perform his or her duties."); *Humphrey v. Mem'l Hosps. Ass'n*, 239 F.3d 1128, 1135-36 (9th Cir. 2001) (recognizing that a leave of absence may be a reasonable accommodation under the ADA where it "would reasonably accommodate an employee's disability and permit him, upon his return, to perform the essential functions of the job"); Working part-time while making a "gradual return to full-time work" can be a reasonable accommodation. *Pals v. Schepel Buick & GMC Truck, Inc.*, 220 F.3d 495, 498 (7th Cir. 2000)

Plaintiff's Special Instruction

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given:

Refused:

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

- 74 -

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

26

27

28

# INSTRUCTION No. \_\_

# AN EMPLOYER CANNOT FORCE AN EMPLOYEE TO TAKE MORE LEAVE THAN IS MEDICALLY NECESSARY

The County of Kern could not require Dr. Jadwin to take more leave that was medically necessary. Dr. Jadwin had the right to take medical leave on a part-time basis if his need for medical leave could best be accommodated by taking leave on a part time basis.

"An employee may not be required to take more FMLA leave than necessary to resolve the circumstances that precipitated the need for leave." 29 C.F.R. § 825.311(c). To take intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule, "there must be a medical need for leave and it must be that such medical need can be best accommodated through an intermittent or reduced leave schedule." 29 CFR § 825.202(b); Timmons v. General Motors Corp. 469 F.3d 1122, 1128 (Placing an employee on an involuntary disability leave is an adverse employment action.)

Plaintiff's Special Instruction

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Withdrawn:

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Given as Modified:

OWW: \_ Refused:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

28

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

# 1 INSTRUCTION No. \_

#### "SERIOUS HEALTH CONDITION" EXPLAINED

A "serious health condition" means an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves either of the following:

- (A) Inpatient care in a hospital, hospice, or residential health care facility.
- (B) Continuing treatment or continuing supervision by a health care provider.

Government Code section 12945.2(c)(8) provides: "Serious health condition" means an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves either of the following:

- (A) Inpatient care in a hospital, hospice, or residential health care facility, or
- (B) Continuing treatment or continuing supervision by a health care provider.

Plaintiff's Special Instruction

24 | Proposed by: Plaintiff

25 | Given: \_\_\_\_\_

26 Given as Modified:

27 | Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused: OWW: \_\_\_\_

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

# INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_

#### PART-TIME LEAVE MEDICAL LEAVE IS CALCULATED ON A PRO-RATA BASIS

If you find that it was medically necessary for Dr. Jadwin to take his medical leave on a part-time basis, then the County of Kern had the right to deducted only the amount of leave Dr. Jadwin actually took from his leave entitlement. To calculate the number of hours of medical leave to which Dr. Jadwin was entitled, you determine the number of hours he was expected to work during a week and multiply it by twelve. "... When an employee takes leave on an intermittent or reduced work schedule, only theamount of leave actually taken may be counted toward the employee leave entitlement. The actual workweek is the basis of the entitlement... if a full-time employee who wouldotherwise work 8-hour days works 4-hour days under a reduced leave schedule, the employee would use "1/2" week of FMLA leave..." 29 C.F.R. § 825.205(b)(1). Plaintiff's Special Instruction Proposed by: Plaintiff Given: \_\_\_\_\_ Given as Modified: Withdrawn: OWW: \_ Refused:

- 77 -

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

26 27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_

# CONSEQUENCES OF AN EMPLOYER'S FAILURE TO NOTIFY AN EMPLOYEE OF MEDICAL LEAVE RIGHTS

If Defendant notified its employees that 30 days' advance notice was required before the leave was to begin, then Plaintiff must show that he gave that notice, or, if 30 days' notice was not reasonably possible under the circumstances, that he gave notice as soon as possible. "Failure of the employer to give or post such notice shall preclude the employer from taking any adverse action against the employee, including denying CFRA leave, for failing to furnish the employer with advance notice of a need to take CFRA leave." 2. C.C.R. § 7297.4(5).

If Defendant notified its employees that 30 days' advance notice was required before the leave was to begin, then Plaintiff must show that he gave that notice, or, if 30 days' notice was not reasonably possible under the circumstances, that he gave notice as soon as possible. "Failure of the employer to give or post such notice shall preclude the employer from taking any adverse action against the employee, including denying CFRA leave, for failing to furnish the employer with advance notice of a need to take CFRA leave." 2. C.C.R. § 7297.4(5).

Plaintiff's Special Instruction

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

OWW: \_

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

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_

#### AN EMPLOYER MUST DESIGNATED THE TYPE OF LEAVE TAKEN

Under all circumstances, the County of Kern was responsible for designating any qualifying leave as medical leave based on the information that Dr. Jadwin provided, and for notifying Dr. Jadwin of its designation within two days of receiving notice that his leave was being taken for a qualifying reason absent extenuating circumstances.

If you find that the County of Kern designated any of Dr. Jadwin's leave that qualified as medical leave as "Personal Necessity Leave", then you must find that the County of Kern interfered with Dr. Jadwin's medical leave rights.

**Authority:** Under all circumstances, it is the employer's responsibility to designate leave, paid or unpaid, as CFRA or CFRA/FMLA qualifying, based on information provided by the employee or the employee's spokesperson, and to give notice of the designation to the employee. 2 C.C.R. 7297.4(a)(1); 29 C.F.R. § 825.208 (b)(1) ("Once the employer has acquired knowledge that the leave is being taken for an FMLA required reason, the employer must promptly (within two business days absent extenuating circumstances) notify the employee that the paid leave is designated and will be counted as FMLA leave. If there is a dispute between an employer and an employee as to whether paid leave qualifies as FMLA leave, it should be resolved through discussions between the employee and the employer. Such discussions and the decision must be documented").

An employer interferes with an employee's rights under the FMLA by mislabeling an employee's leave as "personal leave" or something else when, in reality, the leave qualified as FMLA leave. Xin Liu v. Amway Corp., 347 F.3d 1125, 1132 (9th Cir. 2003).

Proposed by:	Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Given as	Modified:	

Withdrawn:	
Refused:	

-

OWW:

# 1 INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_

#### AN EMPLOYER'S DUTY TOWARDS AN EMPLOYEE WITH A KNOWN DISABILITY

Once the County of Kern became aware of Dr. Jadwin's limitations due to his chronic depression, it had a duty to engage in good faith in an interactive process to determine whether Dr. Jadwin needed accommodation, and what accommodation would enable Dr. Jadwin to perform his essential job functions. When leave is needed as an accommodation, the employee's ability to perform his essential job functions is determined at the time he returns to work from leave, not during the leave.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

"Once an employer becomes aware of the need for accommodation, that employer has a mandatory obligation under the ADA to engage in an interactive process with the employee to identify and implement appropriate reasonable accommodations. *Barnett v. U.S. Air*, 228 F.3d 1105, 1114 (9th Cir. 2000). "An appropriate reasonable accommodation must be effective, in enabling the employee to perform the duties of the position." *Id.* at 1115. The interactive process requires communication and good-faith exploration of possible accommodations between employers and individual employees, and neither side can delay or obstruct the process. *Id.* at 1114-15" *Humphrey v. Memorial Hosps. Assn.*, 239 F.3d 1128, 1137 (9th Cir. 2001).

19

20

21

22

Plaintiff's Special Instruction

23 | Proposed by: Plaintiff

24 || Given: \_\_\_\_\_

25 Given as Modified:

26 Withdrawn:

Refused:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

28

27

- 80 -

OWW:

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

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

26

27

28

Refused:

INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_

#### "WILLFUL" VIOLATION OF FMLA EXPLAINED

If you find that the County of Kern failed to act in good faith and lacked reasonable grounds for believing that any of the adverse employment actions (demotion, payout, creation of a hostile work environment, nonrenewal of his employment contract) that it took against Dr. Jadwin were not violations of the Family and Medical Leave Act, then you must find that the County of Kern's actions were "willful" violations of the Family and Medical Leave Act. Defendant's violation of FMLA was willful in that Defendant failed to act in good faith and lacked reasonable grounds for believing its actions were not a violation of FMLA. 29 USC2617(a)(1)(A)(iii); Bachelder v. Am. W. Airlines, Inc., 259 F.3d 1112, 1130 (9th Cir. Ariz. 2001). Plaintiff's Special Instruction Proposed by: Plaintiff Given: Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_ Withdrawn:

> USDC, ED Case No. 1:07-cv-00026 OWW DLB PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

OWW:

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1 2

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

Withdrawn:

**CACI 2541** 

24

25

26 27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION - REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS [Gov't Code § 12940(m)]

David F. Jadwin, D.O. claims that County of Kern failed to reasonably accommodate his mental condition (chronic depression). To establish this claim, Dr. Jadwin must prove all of the following:

- 1. That County of Kern knew OR thought that Dr. Jadwin had a mental condition (chronic depression) that limited his ability to work full-time OR enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia;
- 2. That County of Kern failed to provide reasonable accommodation for Dr. Jadwin's mental condition (chronic depression);
  - 3. That Dr. Jadwin was harmed; and
- 4. That County of Kern's failure to provide reasonable accommodation was a substantial factor in causing Dr. Jadwin's harm.

In determining whether David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s condition (chronic depression) limits his ability to work full-time OR enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia, you must consider the condition (chronic depression) in its unmedicated state without his prescribed medication.

Proposed by: Plaintiff
Given:
Given as Modified:

Refused:

1 2

3

45

67

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION**

#### REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION EXPLAINED

A reasonable accommodation is a reasonable change to the workplace that allows an employee with a disability to perform the essential duties of the job;

Reasonable accommodations may include the following:

- a. Making the workplace readily accessible to and usable by employees with disabilities;
  - b. Changing job responsibilities or work schedules;
  - c. Reassigning the employee to a vacant position;
  - d. Modifying or providing equipment or devices;
  - e. Modifying tests or training materials;
  - f. Providing qualified interpreters or readers; or
  - g. Providing other similar accommodations for an individual with a disability.

If more than one accommodation is reasonable, an employer satisfies its obligation to make a reasonable accommodation if it selects one of those accommodations in good faith.

CACI 2542

Given:

Given as Modified:

Withdrawn:

Refused: \_\_\_\_\_ OWW: \_\_\_

- 83 -

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

# DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION - REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION -FAILURE TO ENGAGE IN INTERACTIVE PROCESS [Gov't Code § 12940(n)]

David F. Jadwin, D.O. contends that County of Kern failed to engage in a good faith, interactive process with him to determine whether it would be possible to implement effective reasonable accommodations so that Dr. Jadwin could work full-time. In order to establish this claim, Dr. Jadwin must prove the following:

- 1. That Dr. Jadwin had a mental disability that was known to County of Kern;
- 2. That Dr. Jadwin requested that County of Kern make reasonable accommodation for his disability so that he would be able to perform the essential job requirements;
- 3. That Dr. Jadwin was willing to participate in an interactive process to determine whether reasonable accommodation could be made so that he would be able to perform the essential job requirements;
- 4. That County of Kern failed to participate in a timely good-faith interactive process with Dr. Jadwin to determine whether reasonable accommodation could be made;
  - 5. That Dr. Jadwin was harmed; and
- 6. That County of Kern's failure to engage in a good-faith interactive process was a substantial factor in causing Dr. Jadwin's harm.

New December 2007

Directions for Use

- 84 -

Modify elements 3 and 4, as necessary, if the employer perceives the employee to have a disability. (See Gelfo v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 34, 61, fn. 21 [43] Cal.Rptr.3d 874].) In element 4, specify the position at issue and the reason why some reasonable accommodation was needed. In element 5, you may add the specific accommodation requested, though the focus of this cause of action is on the failure to discuss, not the failure to provide. For an instruction on a cause of action for failure to make reasonable accommodation, see CACI No. 2541, Disability Discrimination—Reasonable Accommodation—Essential Factual Elements. For an instruction defining "reasonable accommodation," see CACI No. 2542, Disability Discrimination—"Reasonable Accommodation" Explained. **Sources and Authority** • Government Code section 12940(n) provides that it is an unlawful employment practice, unless based on a bona fide occupational qualification or on applicable security regulations established by the United States or the State of California, "[f]or an employer or other entity covered by [the FEHA] to fail to engage in a timely, good faith, interactive process with the employee or applicant to determine effective reasonable accommodations, if any, in response to a request for reasonable accommodation by an employee or applicant with a known physical or mental disability or known medical condition." • Government Code section 12926.1(e) provides that the Legislature affirms the importance of the interactive process between the applicant or employee and the employer in determining a reasonable accommodation, as this requirement has been articulated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in its interpretive guidance of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The Interpretive Guidance on Title I of the Americans With Disabilities Act, Title 29 Code of

23 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Federal Regulations Part 1630 Appendix, provides, in part:

25

26

When a qualified individual with a disability has requested a reasonable accommodation to assist in the performance of a job, the employer, using a problem solving approach, should:

27 28

(1) Analyze the particular job involved and determine its purpose and essential functions;

- (2) Consult with the individual with a disability to ascertain the precise job-related limitations imposed by the individual's disability and how those limitations could be overcome with a reasonable accommodation;
- (3) In consultation with the individual to be accommodated, identify potential accommodations and assess the effectiveness each would have in enabling the individual to perform the essential functions of the position; and (4) Consider the preference of the individual to be accommodated and select and implement the accommodation that is most appropriate for both the employee and the employer.
- An employee may file a civil action based on the employer's failure to engage in the interactive process. (*Claudio v. Regents of the University of California* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 224, 243 [35 Cal.Rptr.3d 837].)
- "Two principles underlie a cause of action for failure to provide a reasonable accommodation. First, the employee must request an accommodation. Second, the parties must engage in an interactive process regarding the requested accommodation and, if the process fails, responsibility for the failure rests with the party who failed to participate in good faith. While a claim of failure to accommodate is independent of a cause of action for failure to engage in an interactive dialogue, each necessarily implicates the other." (*Gelfo, supra*, 140 Cal.App.4th at p. 54, internal citations omitted.)
- "FEHA's reference to a 'known' disability is read to mean a disability of which the employer has become aware, whether because it is obvious, the employee has brought it to the employer's attention, it is based on the employer's own perception—mistaken or not—of the existence of a disabling condition or, perhaps as here, the employer has come upon information indicating the presence of a disability. (*Gelfo, supra,* 140 Cal.App.4th at p. 61, fn.21.)
- "[Employer] asserts that, if it had a duty to engage in the interactive process, the duty was discharged. 'If anything,' it argues, 'it was [employee] who failed to engage in a good faith interactive process.' [Employee] counters [employer] made up its mind before July 2002 that

# Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 91 of 127 DSUPRA

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	it would not accommodate [employee]'s limitations, and nothing could cause it reconsider that
2	decision. Because the evidence is conflicting and the issue of the parties' efforts and good faith is
3	factual, the claim is properly left for the jury's consideration." (Gelfo, supra, 140 Cal.App.4th
4	at p. 62, fn.23.)
5	Secondary Sources
6	8 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Constitutional Law, § 936(2)
7	Chin, et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation (The Rutter Group) ¶¶ 9:2280–
8	9:2285
9	1 Wrongful Employment Termination Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.)
10	Discrimination Claims, § 2.79
11	2 Wilcox, California Employment Law, Ch. 41, Substantive Requirements Under Equal
12	Employment Opportunity Laws, § 41.51[3][b] (Matthew Bender)
13	11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 115, Civil Rights:
14	Employment Discrimination, § 115.35[1][a] (Matthew Bender)
15	1 California Civil Practice: Employment Litigation (Thomson West)
16	Discrimination in Employment, § 2:50
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	CACI 2546
24	Given:
25	Given as Modified:
26	Withdrawn:
27	Refused: OWW:
28	Keruseu OWW:
	- 87 -

1

2

4

5

6

7

9

1011

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

28

Refused:

# INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

#### INTERACTIVE PROCESS EXPLAINED

When you consider whether County of Kern and David F. Jadwin, D.O. engaged in good faith in a interactive process, you should consider that when a qualified individual with a disability has requested a reasonable accommodation to assist in the performance of a job, the employer, using a problem solving approach, should:

- (1) Analyze the particular job involved and determine its purpose and essential functions;
- (2) Consult with the individual with a disability to ascertain the precise job-related limitations imposed by the individual's disability and how those limitations could be overcome with a reasonable accommodation;
- (3) In consultation with the individual to be accommodated, identify potential accommodations and assess the effectiveness each would have in enabling the individual to perform the essential functions of the position; and
- (4) Consider the preference of the individual to be accommodated and select and implement the accommodation that is most appropriate for both the employee and the employer.

[The Interpretive Guidance on Title I of the Americans With Disabilities Act, Title 29 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1630 Appendix]

Plaintiff's Special Instruction No. 1

Proposed by: Plaintiff
Given:
Given as Modified:
Withdrawn:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

- 88

1 2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

1011

12

13 14

15

1617

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

#### VIOLATION OF CFRA RIGHTS - ESSENTIAL FACTUAL ELEMENTS

David F. Jadwin, D.O. claims that County of Kern refused to grant him an extension of his reduced work schedule medical leave OR forced him to take more leave than was medically necessary. To establish this claim, David F. Jadwin, D.O. must prove all of the following:

- 1. That Dr. Jadwin requested an extension of his reduced work schedule leave to care for Dr. Jadwin's own serious health condition that made him unable to perform the functions of his job with County of Kern;
- 2. That Dr. Jadwin provided reasonable notice to County of Kern of his need for medical leave, including its expected timing and length. If County of Kern notified its employees that 30 days' advance notice was required before the leave was to begin, then David F. Jadwin, D.O. must show that he gave that notice or, if 30 days' notice was not reasonably possible under the circumstances, that he gave notice as soon as possible;
- 3. That County of Kern refused to grant Dr. Jadwin's request for an extension of his reduced work schedule medical OR forced him to take more leave than was medically necessary;
  - 4. That Dr. Jadwin was harmed; and
  - 5. That County of Kern's decision was a substantial factor in causing Dr. Jadwin's harm.

CACI 2600

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given:

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

- 89

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

### VERDICT FORM

#### **VIOLATION OF CFRA RIGHTS**

١	
	We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:
I	1. County of Kern had admitted that David F. Jadwin, D.O. requested and was granted a
I	reduced work schedule leave for his own serious health condition. Did David F. Jadwin, D.O.
I	request an extension of his reduced work schedule leave for his own serious health condition?
I	Yes No
I	
I	2. Did Dr. Jadwin provide reasonable notice to County of Kern of his need for an
I	extension of his reduced work schedule medical leave?
I	Yes No
I	If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop
I	here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
I	
I	3. The County of Kern has admitted that it granted David F. Jadwin's request for reduced
I	work schedule medical leave. Did County of Kern refuse to grant Dr. Jadwin's request for an
I	extension of his reduced work schedule medical leave OR force him to take more leave than was
I	medically necessary?
I	Yes No
I	If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop
I	here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
I	
I	4. Was County of Kern's decision a substantial factor in causing harm to Dr. Jadwin?
I	Yes No
I	
	If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop
	here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
1	

1011

12

13

1415

16

17

18

1920

2122

23

2425

26

2728

5. What are Dr. Jadwin's damages? Go to the last page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Presiding Juror

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

After all verdict forms have been signed, deliver this verdict form to the clerk.

#### **DIRECTIONS FOR USE**

The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to be modified depending on the facts of the case.

This verdict form is based on CACI No. 2600, Violation of CFRA Rights--Essential Factual Elements.

Other factual situations can be substituted in question 2 as in element 2 of CACI No. 2600.

If specificity is not required, users do not have to itemize all the damages listed in question 6 and do not have to categorize "economic" and "noneconomic" damages, especially if it is not a Proposition 51 case. The breakdown of damages is optional depending on the circumstances.

If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms into one form.

This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.

#### WEST'S EDITORIAL REFERENCES

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn: \_\_\_\_\_

Refused: \_\_\_\_\_

- 92 -

1 2

3

45

67

8

10

11

1213

1415

16 17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

# INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_

#### REASONABLE NOTICE OF CFRA LEAVE

For notice of the need for leave to be reasonable, David F. Jadwin, D.O. must make County of Kern aware that he needs medical leave, when the leave will begin, and how long it is expected to last. The notice can be verbal or in writing and does not need to mention the law. An employer cannot require disclosure of any medical diagnosis, but should ask for information necessary to decide whether the employee is entitled to leave.

New September 2003

#### **Sources and Authority**

- Government Code section 12945.2(h) provides: "If the employee's need for a leave . . . is foreseeable, the employee shall provide the employer with reasonable advance notice of the need for the leave."
- "An employee 'shall provide the employer with reasonable advance notice of the need for the leave." 'An employee shall provide at least verbal notice sufficient to make the employer aware that the employee needs CFRA-qualifying leave, and the anticipated timing and duration of the leave. The employee need not expressly assert rights under CFRA..., or even mention CFRA..., to meet the notice requirement; however, the employee must state the reason the leave is needed, such as, for example, the expected birth of a child or for medical treatment. The employer should inquire further of the employee if it is necessary to have more information about whether CFRA leave is being sought by the employee and obtain the necessary details of the leave to be taken."

(*Gibbs v. American Airlines, Inc.* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 1, 6–7 [87 Cal.Rptr.2d 554], internal citation omitted.)

#### Secondary Sources

Chin et al., Cal. Practice Guide: Employment Litigation (The Rutter Group) ¶¶ 12:852–12:853, 12:855–12:857

- 93 -

1   11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 115, Civil Rights: Employment  Discrimination, § 115.32[6][e] (Matthew Bender)  1	a-900
3	
4	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
6	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	
11	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	
14         15         16         17         18         19	
15 16 17 18 19	
16 17 18 19	
17 18 19	
18 19	
19	
20	
21	
22 CACI 2602	
Proposed by: Plaintiff	
24 Given:	
Given as Modified:	
Withdrawn:	
27 Refused: OWW:	
28	
<u> 94 - </u>	

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009

1

2

### 3

45

67

8

9 10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 ||

24

25

26

27

--

28

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

#### **VIOLATION OF FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS [42 U.S.C. § 1983]**

David F. Jadwin, D.O. claims that County of Kern violated his civil rights. To establish this claim, David F. Jadwin, D.O. must prove all of the following:

- 1. That County of Kern intentionally deprived David F. Jadwin, D.O. of "active duty" by placing him on administrative leave for approximately ten months;
- 2. That County of Kern was acting or purporting to act in the performance of its official duties;
- 3. That County of Kern's conduct violated David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s right to "active duty" by placing him on administrative leave without affording him with adequate procedural due process;
  - 4. That David F. Jadwin, D.O. was harmed; and
- 5. That County of Kern's placement of David F. Jadwin, D.O. on administrative leave without affording him adequate procedural due process was a substantial factor in causing David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s harm.

CACI 3000 (modified)

Proposed by: Plaintiff

Given: \_\_\_\_\_

Withdrawn:

Given as Modified:

Refused:

OWW: \_\_\_\_

- 95

1 2

# INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_ "OFFICIAL POLICY" EXPLAINED

3

J

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

"Official policy/custom" means: insert one of the following:

A rule or regulation approved by the city/county's legislative body; or

A policy statement or decision that is officially made by the city/county's lawmaking officer or policymaking official; or

A custom that is a permanent, widespread, or well-settled practice of the city/county; or

An act or omission approved by the city/county's lawmaking officer or policymaking official.

New September 2003

#### **Directions for Use**

These definitions are selected examples of official policy drawn from the cited cases. The instruction may need to be adapted to the facts of a particular case. The court may need to instruct the jury regarding the legal definition of "policymakers."

#### **Sources and Authority**

- "The [entity] may not be held liable for acts of [employees] unless 'the action that is alleged to be unconstitutional implements or executes a policy statement, ordinance, regulation, or decision officially adopted and promulgated by that body's officers' or if the constitutional deprivation was 'visited pursuant to governmental "custom" even though such a custom has not received formal approval through the body's official decisionmaking channels.' "(*Redman v. County of San Diego* (9th Cir. 1991) 942 F.2d 1435, 1443–1444, internal citation omitted.)
- "While a rule or regulation promulgated, adopted, or ratified by a local governmental entity's legislative body unquestionably satisfies *Monell's* policy requirement, a 'policy' within the meaning of § 1983 is not limited to official legislative action. Indeed, a decision properly made by a local governmental entity's authorized decisionmaker—i.e., an official who 'possesses final

- 96 -

authority to
constitute of
Authority to
delegated by
policymakin
(9th Cir. 198
"As with o
dentificatio

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

authority to establish [local government] policy with respect to the [challenged] action'—may constitute official policy.

'Authority to make municipal policy may be granted directly by legislative enactment or may be delegated by an official who possesses such authority, and of course whether an official had final policymaking authority is a question of state law.' "(*Thompson v. City of Los Angeles* 

(9th Cir. 1989) 885 F.2d 1439, 1443, internal citations and footnote omitted.)

• "As with other questions of state law relevant to the application of federal law, the identification of those officials whose decisions represent the official policy of the local governmental unit is itself a legal question to be resolved by the trial judge *before* the case is submitted to the jury." (*Jett v. Dallas Independent School Dist.* (1989) 491 U.S. 701, 737 [109 S.Ct. 2702, 105 L.Ed.2d 598].)

• "[I]t is settled that whether an official is a policymaker for a county is dependent on an analysis of state law, not fact." (*Pitts v. County of Kern* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 340, 352 [70 Cal.Rptr.2d 823, 949 P.2d 920], internal citations omitted.)

• "Once those officials who have the power to make official policy on a particular issue have been identified, it is for the jury to determine whether *their* decisions have caused the deprivation of rights at issue by policies which affirmatively command that it occur, or by acquiescence in a longstanding practice or custom which constitutes the 'standard operating procedure' of the local governmental entity." (*Jett, supra,* 491 U.S. at p. 737, internal citations omitted.)

• "Discussing liability of a municipality under the federal Civil Rights Act based on 'custom,' the California Court of Appeal for the Fifth Appellate District recently noted, 'If the plaintiff seeks to show he was injured by governmental "custom," he must show that the governmental entity's "custom" was "made by its lawmakers or by those whose edicts or acts may fairly be said to represent official policy." '" (*Bach v. County of Butte* (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 554, 569, fn. 11 [195 Cal.Rptr. 268], internal citations omitted.)

• "The federal courts have recognized that local elected officials and appointed department heads can make official policy or create official custom sufficient to impose liability under section

28

# Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 102 of 127 DSUPRA

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	1983 on their governmental employers." ( <i>Bach, supra,</i> 147 Cal.App.3d at p. 570, internal
2	citations omitted.)
3	Secondary Sources
4	8 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Constitutional Law, §§ 816, 819 et seq.
5	1 Matthew Bender Practice Guide: Federal Pretrial Civil Procedure in California, Ch. 8, Answers
6	and Responsive Motions Under Rule 12, 8.40
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	CACI 3008
24	Proposed by: Plaintiff
25	Given:
26	Given as Modified:
27	Withdrawn:
28	Refused: OWW:

# 

# 

### 

#### **VERDICT FORM**

#### **CFRA RIGHTS RETALIATION**

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:
1. County of Kern has admitted that it demoted David F. Jadwin, D.O. and cut his pay.
Did County of Kern also create a hostile work environment for Dr. Jadwin; OR not renew his
employment contract?
Yes No
2. Was Dr. Jadwin's taking of medical leave a motivating reason for County of Kern's
decision to demote Dr. Jadwin, OR cut his pay, OR not renew his employment contract; OR for
County of Kern's conduct in creating a hostile work environment for Dr. Jadwin?
Yes No
If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
3. Was County of Kern's retaliatory conduct a substantial factor in causing harm to Dr.
Jadwin?
Yes No
If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
4. What are Dr. Jadwin's damages? Sign and date the verdict form, then go to the last
page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages.
Signed: Presiding Juror
Dated:

- 99 -

#### Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

Document 348

Filed 05/11/2009

Page 104 of 127 DSUPRA

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated, deliver this verdict
2	form to the clerk.
3	New September 2003; Revised April 2007
4	
5	Directions for Use
6	The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to be
7	modified depending on the facts of the case.
8	This verdict form is based on CACI No. 2620, CFRA Rights Retaliation—Essential Factual
9	Elements.
10	If specificity is not required, users do not have to itemize all the damages listed in question 6 and
11	do not have to categorize "economic" and "noneconomic" damages, especially if it is not a
12	Proposition 51 case. The breakdown of damages is optional depending on the circumstances.
13	If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms into one
14	form.
15	This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code section
16	3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	CACI VF-2602
24	Proposed by: Plaintiff
25	Given:
26	Given as Modified:
27	Withdrawn:
28	Refused: OWW:
	- 100 -

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

27

26

28

- 101

# VERDICT FORM

FMLA RIGHTS RETALIATION

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows: 1. County of Kern has admitted that it demoted David F. Jadwin, D.O. and cut his pay. Did County of Kern also create a hostile work environment for Dr. Jadwin; OR not renew his employment contract? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No 2. Was Dr. Jadwin's taking of medical leave a negative factor in County of Kern's decision to demote Dr. Jadwin, OR cut his pay, OR not renew his employment contract; OR for County of Kern's conduct in creating a hostile work environment for Dr. Jadwin? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form. 3. Was County of Kern's retaliatory conduct a substantial factor in causing harm to Dr. Jadwin? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form. 4. Was County of Kern's violation of FMLA rights willful? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No 5. What are Dr. Jadwin's damages? Sign and date the verdict form, then go to the last page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages.

# Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 106 of 127 DSUPRA

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	
2	Signed:
3	Presiding Juror
4	
5	Dated:
6	
7	After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated, deliver this verdict
8	form to the clerk.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Plaintiff's Special Instruction No. 2
24	Proposed by: Plaintiff
25	Given:
26	Given as Modified:
27	Withdrawn:
28	Refused: OWW:
	- 102 -

1 2

# VERDICT FORM PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS VIOLATION

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:
1. Did County of Kern intentionally deprive David F. Jadwin of "active duty" by placing
him on administrative leave for approximately ten months?
Yes No
If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
2. Did County of Kern violate David F. Jadwin's right to "active duty" while acting or
purporting to act in accordance with an official policy?
If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
3. Did County of Kern afford David F. Jadwin adequate due process in connection with
his placement on administrative leave?
Yes No
If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
4. Was County of Kern's enforcement of its policy without affording Dr. Jadwin
adequate due process a substantial factor in causing harm to David F. Jadwin, D.O.?
Yes No
If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
5. What are David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s damages? Sign and date the verdict form, then go to
the last page of these instructions to calculate David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s damages.

- 103 -

# Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 108 of 12 Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

-	
2	
3	Signed: Presiding Juror
4	
5	Dated:
6	After it has been signed/After all verdict forms have been signed, and any
7	damages calculated, deliver this verdict form to the clerk/bailiff/judge.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	- 104 -
	- 104 -

### Page 109 of 12 7 DSUPRA http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-988c-b9d33ecbb6dc CACI VF-3000 (modified) Proposed by: Plaintiff Given: \_\_\_\_\_ Given as Modified: \_\_\_\_\_ Withdrawn: Refused: OWW: \_\_ - 105 -

Document 348

Filed 05/11/2009

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

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 26

27

28

VERDICT FORM

**RETALIATION** (Gov't Code § 12940(h))

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:

1
1. Did David F. Jadwin, D.O. EITHER complaint internally about unlawful
discrimination, harassment, or retaliation, OR file charges with the Department of Fair
Employment and Housing, OR file a lawsuit containing claims based on the Fair Employment
and Housing Act or the California Family Rights Act?
Yes No
If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

2. County of Kern has admitted demoting Dr. Jadwin and cutting his pay. Did County of Kern decide not to renew Dr. Jadwin's employment contract?

Yes	No

3. Was David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s internal complaint about unlawful discrimination, harassment, or retaliation; OR his filing of charges with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, OR his filing of a lawsuit containing claims based on the Fair Employment and Housing Act, the California Family Rights Act, or the Family and Medical Leave Act a motivating reason for County of Kern's decision to demote him, OR cut his pay, OR not renew his employment contract; OR for County of Kern's conduct in creating of a hostile work environment for him?

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

4. Was County of Kern's conduct a substantial factor in causing harm to David F. Jadwin, D.O.?

If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop 1 2 here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form. 3 4 5. What are David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s damages? Sign and date this verdict form, then go 5 to the last page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages. 6 7 8 Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ 9 10 **Presiding Juror** 11 12 Dated: 13 14 After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated, deliver this 15 verdict form to the clerk. 16 17 **DIRECTIONS FOR USE** 18 The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to 19 be modified depending on the facts of the case. 20 This verdict form is based on CACI No. 2505, Retaliation. 21 Read the second option for question 2 in cases involving a pattern of employer 22 harassment consisting of acts that might not individually be sufficient to constitute retaliation, 23 but taken as a whole establish prohibited conduct. Give both options if the employee presents 24 evidence supporting liability under both a sufficient-single-act theory or a pattern-of-harassment 25 theory. Also select "conduct" in question 3 if the second option or both options are included for 26 question 2. 27 If specificity is not required, users do not have to itemize all the damages listed in 28

question 5 and do not have to categorize "economic" and "noneconomic" damages, especially if

### Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 112 of 12 Comment hosted at JDSUPRA

1	it is not a Proposition 51 case. The breakdown of damages is optional depending on the
2	circumstances.
3	If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms
4	into one form.
5	This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code
6	section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23	CACI VF-2504 (modified)
24	Proposed by: Plaintiff
25	Given:
26	Given as Modified:
27	Withdrawn:
28	Refused: OWW:
20	- 108 -

### 

# 

### **VERDICT FORM**

#### **DISABILITY DISCRIMINATON - DISPARATE TREATMENT**

[Gov't Code § 12940(a)]
We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:
1. Did County of Kern know that Dr. Jadwin had a mental condition (chronic depression)
that limited his ability to work full-time OR enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia?
Yes No
If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
2. Was Dr. Jadwin able to perform the essential job duties with reasonable
accommodation for his condition?
Yes No
If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
3. County of Kern has admitted demoting Dr. Jadwin and cutting his pay. Did County
of Kern decide not to renew Dr. Jadwin's employment contract?
Yes No
4. Was Dr. Jadwin's mental condition (chronic depression) a motivating reason for
County of Kern's decision to EITHER demote Dr. Jadwin, OR cut his pay, OR not renew his
employment contract?
Yes No
If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
5. Was County of Kern's decision to EITHER demote Dr. Jadwin, OR cut his pay, OR
not to renew his employment contract a substantial factor in causing harm to Dr. Jadwin?

Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 114 of 127 DSUPRA

1	Yes No
2	If your answer to question 5 is yes, then answer question 6. If you answered no, stop
3	here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
4	
5	6. What are Dr. Jadwin's damages? Sign and date this verdict form, then go to the last
6	page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages.
7	
8	
9	
10	Signed:
11	Presiding Juror
12	
13	Dated:
14	
15	After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated, deliver this verdict
16	form to the clerk.
17	
18	DIRECTIONS FOR USE
19	The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to
20	be modified depending on the facts of the case.
21	This verdict form is based on CACI No. 2540, Disability DiscriminationDisparate
22	TreatmentEssential Factual Elements.
23	Relationships other than employer/employee can be substituted in question 1, as in
24	element 1 of CACI No. 2540. Depending on the facts of the case, other factual scenarios can be
25	substituted in questions 3 and 6, as in elements 3 and 6 of the instruction.
26	If specificity is not required, users do not have to itemize all the damages listed in
27	question 8 and do not have to categorize "economic" and "noneconomic" damages, especially if
28	it is not a Proposition 51 case. The breakdown of damages is optional depending on the

#### Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 115 of 127 DSUPRA

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

1	circumstances.
2	If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms
3	into one form.
4	This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code
5	section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	CACI VF-2508 (modified)
22	Proposed by: Plaintiff
23	Given:
24	Given as Modified:
25	Withdrawn:
26	Refused: OWW:
27	
28	
	-111 -

to

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=ae62c61e-3b98-4e2a-985c-b9d33ecbb6dc

## 

## 

#### **VERDICT FORM**

#### DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION - REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

[Gov't Code § 12940(m)]
We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:
1. Did Dr. Jadwin have a mental condition (chronic depression) that limited his ability t
work full-time OR to enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia?
Yes No
If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
2. Did County of Kern know of Dr.Jadwin's mental condition (chronic depression) that
limited his ability to work full-time OR to enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia?
Yes No
If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
3. Did County of Kern fail to provide reasonable accommodation for Dr. Jadwin's
mentalcondition (chronic depression)?
Yes No
If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
4. Was County of Kern's failure to provide reasonable accommodation a substantial
factor in causing harm to Dr. Jadwin?
Yes No
If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

- 112 -

### Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 117 of 127 DSUPRA

1	5. What are Dr. Jadwin's damages? Sign and date this verdict form, the go to the last
2	page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages.
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	Signed:
8	Presiding Juror
9	
10	Dated:
11	
12	After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated, deliver this verdict
13	form to the clerk.
14	
15	DIRECTIONS FOR USE
16	The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to be modified depending on the facts of the case.
17	This verdict form is based on CACI No. 2541, Disability DiscriminationReasonable AccommodationEssential Factual Elements.
18	If specificity is not required, users do not have to itemize all the damages listed in question 7 and do not have to categorize "economic" and "noneconomic" damages, especially if
19	it is not a Proposition 51 case. The breakdown of damages is optional depending on the circumstances.
20	If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms into one form.
21	This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.
22   23	
24	CACI VF-2509 (modified)
25	Proposed by: Plaintiff
26	Given:
27	Given as Modified:
28	Withdrawn: OWW:
	Refused: OWW:

## 

# 

### 

### 

#### **VERDICT FORM**

## DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION - FAILURE TO ENGAGE IN GOOD FAITH IN AN INTERACTIVE PROCESS

INTERACTIVE PROCESS
[Gov't Code § 12940(n)]
We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:
1. Did David F. Jadwin, D.O. have a mental condition (chronic depression) that limited
his ability to work full-time OR to enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia?
Yes No
If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
2. Did the County of Kern know of Dr. Jadwin's mental condition (chronic depression)
that limited his ability to work full-time OR to enjoy life without anxiety or insomnia?
Yes No
If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
3. Did Dr. Jadwin request that County of Kern accommodate his disability so that he
would be able to perform his essential job functions?
Yes No
If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
4. Was Dr. Jadwin willing to participate in an interactive process to determine whether
reasonable accommodation could be made so that he would be able to perform his essential job
functions?
Yes No
If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop

USDC, ED Case No. 1:07-cv-00026 OWW DLB PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

- 114 -

### Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

Document 348

Filed 05/11/2009

Page 119 of 127

1	here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
2	5. Did County of Kern fail to participate in a timely good-faith interactive process with
3	Dr. Jadwin to determine whether reasonable accommodation could be made?
4	Yes No
5	If your answer to question 5 is yes, then answer question 6. If you answered no, stop
6	here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
7	
8	6. Was County of Kern's failure to participate in a timely good-faith interactive process
9	with Dr. Jadwin a substantial factor in causing harm to Dr. Jadwin?
10	Yes No
11	If your answer to question 6 is yes, then answer question 7. If you answered no, stop
12	here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
13	
14	7. What are Dr. Jadwin's damages? Sign and date this verdict form, then go to the last
15	page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages.
16	
17	Signed:
18	Presiding Juror
19	Dated:
20	
21	After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated, deliver this verdict
22	form to the clerk.
23	CACI 2546 (modified)
24	Proposed by: Plaintiff
25	Given:
26	Given as Modified:
27	Withdrawn:
28	Refused: OWW:
	115 -

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

26

27

28

#### - 116 -

#### VERDICT FORM

**RETALIATION** (Gov't Code § 12940(h); 29 U.S.C. § 2615(b)(1))

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows: 1. Did David F. Jadwin, D.O. EITHER complaint internally about unlawful discrimination, harassment, or retaliation, OR file charges with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, OR file a lawsuit containing claims based on the Fair Employment and Housing Act, the California Family Rights Act or the Family and Medical Leave Act? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form. 2. County of Kern has admitted demoting David F. Jadwin, D.O. and cutting his pay. Did County of Kern also EITHER create a hostile work environment for him, OR not renew his employment contract? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No 3. Was David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s internal complaint about unlawful discrimination, harassment, or retaliation; OR his filing of charges with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, OR his filing of a lawsuit containing claims based on the Fair Employment and Housing Act or the California Family Rights Act a motivating reason for County of Kern's decision to demote him, OR cut his pay, OR not renew his employment contract; OR for County of Kern's conduct in creating of a hostile work environment for him? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

1	4. Was County of Kern's conduct a substantial factor in causing harm to David F. Jadwin,
2	D.O.?
3	Yes No
4	If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop
5	here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
6	
7	5. What are David F. Jadwin, D.O.'s damages? Sign and date this verdict form, then go
8	to the last page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages.
9	
10	
11	
12	Signed:
13	Presiding Juror
14	
15	Dated:
16	
17	After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated, deliver this
18	verdict form to the clerk.
19	DIRECTIONS FOR USE
20	The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to
21	be modified depending on the facts of the case.
22	This verdict form is based on CACI No. 2505, Retaliation.
23	Read the second option for question 2 in cases involving a pattern of employer
24	harassment consisting of acts that might not individually be sufficient to constitute retaliation,
25	but taken as a whole establish prohibited conduct. Give both options if the employee presents
26	evidence supporting liability under both a sufficient-single-act theory or a pattern-of-harassment
27	theory. Also select "conduct" in question 3 if the second option or both options are included for
28	question 2.
	- 117 -

### Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 122 of 127 Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB

1	If specificity is not required, users do not have to itemize all the damages listed in
2	question 5 and do not have to categorize "economic" and "noneconomic" damages, especially if
3	it is not a Proposition 51 case. The breakdown of damages is optional depending on the
4	circumstances.
5	If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms
6	into one form.
7	This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code
8	section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	CACI VF-2504 (modified)
24	Proposed by: Plaintiff
25	Given:
26	Given as Modified:
27	Withdrawn:
28	Refused: OWW:
	- 118 -

1 ||

#### INSTRUCTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

#### **VIOLATION OF CFRA RIGHTS**

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:
1. Did David F. Jadwin, D.O. request an extension of his reduced work schedule leave for
his own serious health condition?
Yes No
If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
2. Did Dr. Jadwin provide reasonable notice to County of Kern of his need for an
extension of his reduced work schedule medical leave?
Yes No
If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
3. Did County of Kern refuse to grant Dr. Jadwin's request for an extension of his
reduced work schedule medical OR force him to take more leave than was medically necessary?
Yes No
If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
4. Was County of Kern's decision a substantial factor in causing harm to Dr. Jadwin?
Yes No
If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop
here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.
- 119 -
- 119 -

1	5. What are Dr. Jadwin's damages? Sign and date this verdict form, then go to the last
2	page of these instructions to calculate Dr. Jadwin's damages.
3	
4	
5	
6	Signed:
7	Presiding Juror
8	
9	
10	Dated:
11	
12	After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated, deliver this verdict
13	form to the clerk.
14	DIRECTIONS FOR USE
15	
16	The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to
17	be modified depending on the facts of the case.
18	This verdict form is based on CACI No. 2600, Violation of CFRA RightsEssential
19	Factual Elements.
20	Other factual situations can be substituted in question 2 as in element 2 of CACI No.
21	2600.
22	If specificity is not required, users do not have to itemize all the damages listed in
23	question 6 and do not have to categorize "economic" and "noneconomic" damages, especially if
24	it is not a Proposition 51 case. The breakdown of damages is optional depending on the
25	circumstances.
26	If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms
27	into one form.
28	
	- 120 -

### Case 1:07-cv-00026-OWW-DLB Document 348 Filed 05/11/2009 Page 125 of 127 DSUPRA

1	This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code				
2	section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.				
3					
4	WEST'S EDITORIAL REFERENCES				
5	Doloted Deferences				
6	<b>Related References:</b> BAJI 7.90, 12.00 et seq., 14.10, 14.11, 14.12, 14.13				
7	Statutory References: West's Ann.Cal.Gov.Code § 12945.2				
8					
9	763D				
10					
11	Library References: Cal.Jur. 3d, Labor § 56				
12	Research References:				
13	West's Key Number Digest, Labor and Employment k390; Trial k352.1(3) C.J.S. Trial §§ 818, 928, 957				
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23	CACI VF-2600 (modified)				
24	Proposed by: Plaintiff				
25	Given:				
26	Given as Modified:				
27	Withdrawn:				
28	Refused: OWW:				
	- 121 -				

1		CALCULATION OF DAVID F.	JADWIN, D.O	O.'s DAMAGES	
2					
3	a.	Past economic loss			
4		lost earnings	\$		
5		lost profits	\$		
6		medical expenses	\$		
7		other past economic loss	\$		
8 9		Total Past Economic	Damages:	\$	
10					
11	b.	Future economic loss			
12		lost earnings	\$		
13		lost profits	\$		
14		medical expenses	\$		
15		other future economic loss	\$		
16		Total Future Econom	nic Damages:	\$	
17					
18	c.	Past noneconomic loss, including pl	nysical		
19		pain/mental suffering:		\$	
20					
21	d.	Future noneconomic loss, including	physical		
22		pain/mental suffering:		\$	
23					
24			TOTAL	\$	
25					
26					
27		Signed:			
28		Presiding Juror			
		- 122 -			

1	
2	Dated:
3	
4	After all verdict forms have been signed, and any damages calculated,
5	deliver this verdict form to the clerk/bailiff/judge.
6	
7	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED on May 11, 2009.
8	
9	
10	/s/ Joan Herrington Attorney for Plaintiff DAVID F. JADWIN, D.O.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	
28	
20	- 123 -