Case No. 78701

In the Supreme Court of Nevada

Motor Coach Industries, Inc.,

Appellant,

VS.

KEON KHIABANI; ARIA KHIABANI, MINORS, by and through their Guardian MARIE-CLAUDE RIGAUD; SIAMAK BARIN, as Executor of the Estate of KAYVAN KHIABANI, M.D.; the Estate of KAYVAN KHIABANI; SIAMAK BARIN, as Executor of the Estate of KATAYOUN BARIN, DDS; and the Estate of KATAYOUN BARIN, DDS,

Respondents.

Electronically Filed Dec 04 2019 05:57 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

APPEAL

from the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County The Honorable Adriana Escobar, District Judge District Court Case No. A-17-755977-C

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME 32 PAGES 7751-8000

D. LEE ROBERTS (SBN 8877)
HOWARD J. RUSSELL (SBN 8879)
WEINBERG, WHEELER,
HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAL, LLC
6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Ste. 400
Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
(702) 938-3838

Daniel F. Polsenberg (SBN 2376)
Joel D. Henriod (SBN 8492)
Justin J. Henderson (SBN 13,349)
Abraham G. Smith (SBN 13,250)
Lewis Roca
Rothgerber Christie Llp
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Ste. 600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
(702) 949-8200

DARRELL L. BARGER (pro hac vice)
MICHAEL G. TERRY (pro hac vice)
HARTLINE BARGER LLP
800 N. Shoreline Blvd.
Suite 2000, N. Tower
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401

JOHN C. DACUS (pro hac vice)
BRIAN RAWSON (pro hac vice)
HARTLINE BARGER LLP
8750 N. Central Expy., Ste. 1600
Dallas, Texas 75231

Attorneys for Appellant

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS TO APPENDIX

Tab	Document	Date	Vol.	Pages
1	Complaint with Jury Demand	05/25/17	1	1–16
2	Amended Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial	06/06/17	1	17–33
3	Reporter's Transcript of Motion for Temporary Restraining Order	06/15/17	1	34–76
4	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Without Prejudice Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Motion for Order Requiring Bus Company and Bus Driver to Preserve an Immediately Turn Over Relevant Electronic Monitoring Information from Bus and Driver Cell Phone	06/22/17	1	77–80
5	Defendants Michelangelo Leasing Inc. dba Ryan's Express and Edward Hubbard's Answer to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint	06/28/17	1	81–97
6	Demand for Jury Trial	06/28/17	1	98–100
7	Defendant Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Answer to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint	06/30/17	1	101–116
8	Defendant Sevenplus Bicycles, Inc. d/b/a Pro Cyclery's Answer to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint	06/30/17	1	117–136
9	Defendant Sevenplus Bicycles, Inc. d/b/a Pro Cyclery's Demand for Jury Trial	06/30/17	1	137–139
10	Defendant Bell Sports, Inc.'s Answer to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint	07/03/17	1	140–153
11	Defendant Bell Sports, Inc.'s Demand for Jury Trial	07/03/17	1	154–157
12	Notice of Entry of Order	07/11/17	1	158–165
13	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Preferential Trial Setting	07/20/17	1	166–171

14	Reporter's Transcription of Motion for	07/20/17	1	172–213
4 =	Preferential Trial Setting	00/10/15		014 000
15	Notice of Entry of Order (CMO)	08/18/17	1	214–222
16	Notice of Entry of Order	08/23/17	1	223–227
17	Stipulated Protective Order	08/24/17	1	228–236
18	Reporter's Transcription of Motion of	09/21/17	1	237 - 250
	Status Check and Motion for		2	251 - 312
	Reconsideration with Joinder			
19	Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc.	09/22/17	2	313–323
	d/b/a Pro Cyclery's Motion for			
	Determination of Good Faith			
	Settlement			
20	Defendant's Notice of Filing Notice of	10/17/17	2	324 - 500
	Removal		3	501–586
21	Civil Order to Statistically Close Case	10/24/17	3	587–588
22	Motion for Summary Judgment on	10/27/17	3	589 – 597
	Foreseeability of Bus Interaction with			
	Pedestrians or Bicyclists (Including			
	Sudden Bicycle Movement)			
23	Transcript of Proceedings	11/02/17	3	598–618
24	Second Amended Complaint and	11/17/17	3	619 – 637
	Demand for Jury Trial			
25	Order Regarding "Plaintiffs' Motion to	11/17/17	3	638–641
	Amend Complaint to Substitute			
	Parties" and "Countermotion to Set a			
	Reasonable Trial Date Upon Changed			
	Circumstance that Nullifies the			
	Reason for Preferential Trial Setting"			
26	Motion for Summary Judgment on	12/01/17	3	642–664
	Punitive Damages			
27	Volume 1: Appendix of Exhibits to	12/01/17	3	665–750
	Motion for Summary Judgment on		4	751 - 989
	Punitive Damages			
28	Volume 2: Appendix of Exhibits to	12/01/17	4	990–1000
	Motion for Summary Judgment on		5	1001 – 1225
	Punitive Damages			

29	Volume 3: Appendix of Exhibits to	12/01/17	5	1226–1250
	Motion for Summary Judgment on		6	1251-1490
	Punitive Damages			
30	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Motion	12/04/17	6	1491-1500
	for Summary Judgment on All Claims		7	1501-1571
	Alleging a Product Defect			
31	Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 7 to	12/07/17	7	1572–1583
	Exclude Any Claims That the Subject			
	Motor Coach was Defective Based on			
	Alleged Dangerous "Air Blasts"			
32	Appendix of Exhibits to Defendant's	12/07/17	7	1584–1750
	Motion in Limine No. 7 to Exclude		8	1751–1801
	Any Claims That the Subject Motor			
	Coach was Defective Based on Alleged			
	Dangerous "Air Blasts"			
33	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 13	12/07/17	8	1802–1816
	to Exclude Plaintiffs' Expert Witness			
	Robert Cunitz, Ph.d., or in the			
	Alternative, to Limit His Testimony			
34	Appendix of Exhibits to Defendants'	12/07/17	8	1817–2000
	Motion in Limine No. 13 to Exclude		9	2001–2100
	Plaintiffs' Expert Witness Robert			
	Cunitz, Ph.D., or in the Alternative, to			
	Limit His Testimony			
35	Motion for Determination of Good	12/07/17	9	2101–2105
	Faith Settlement Transcript			
36	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 17	12/08/17	9	2106–2128
	to Exclude Claim of Lost Income,			
	Including the August 28 Expert			
	Report of Larry Stokes			
37	Plaintiffs' Joint Opposition to MCI	12/21/17	9	2129–2175
	Motion for Summary Judgment on All			
	Claims Alleging a Product Defect and			
	to MCI Motion for Summary			
	Judgment on Punitive Damages	40/04/4		
38	Appendix of Exhibits to Plaintiffs'	12/21/17	9	2176–2250
	Joint Opposition to MCI Motion for		10	2251–2500
	Summary Judgment on All Claims		11	2501–2523

	Alleging a Product Defect and to MCI Motion for Summary Judgment on Punitive Damages			
39	Opposition to "Motion for Summary Judgment on Foreseeability of Bus Interaction with Pedestrians of Bicyclists (Including Sudden Bicycle Movement)"	12/27/17	11	2524–2580
40	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Order on Motion for Determination of Good Faith Settlement	01/08/18	11	2581–2590
41	Plaintiffs' Joint Opposition to Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 3 to Preclude Plaintiffs from Making Reference to a "Bullet Train" and to Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 7 to Exclude Any Claims That the Motor Coach was Defective Based on Alleged Dangerous "Air Blasts"	01/08/18	11	2591–2611
42	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 13 to Exclude Plaintiffs' Expert Witness Robert Cunitz, Ph.D. or in the Alternative to Limit His Testimony	01/08/18	11	2612–2629
43	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 17 to Exclude Claim of Lost Income, Including the August 28 Expert Report of Larry Stokes	01/08/18	11	2630–2637
44	Reply to Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment on Foreseeability of Bus Interaction with Pedestrians or Bicyclists (Including Sudden Bicycle Movement)"	01/16/18	11	2638–2653
45	Plaintiffs' Addendum to Reply to Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment on Forseeability of Bus	01/17/18	11	2654–2663

	Interaction with Pedestrians or Bicyclists (Including Sudden Bicycle Movement)"			
46	Reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment on Punitive Damages	01/17/18	11	2664–2704
47	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment on All Claims Alleging a Product Defect	01/17/18	11	2705–2719
48	Defendant Bell Sports, Inc.'s Motion for Determination of Good Faith Settlement on Order Shortening Time	01/17/18	11	2720–2734
49	Plaintiffs' Joinder to Defendant Bell Sports, Inc.'s Motion for Determination of Good Faith Settlement on Order Shortening Time	01/18/18	11	2735–2737
50	Plaintiffs' Motion for Determination of Good Faith Settlement with Defendants Michelangelo Leasing Inc. d/b/a Ryan's Express and Edward Hubbard Only on Order Shortening Time	01/18/18	11	2738–2747
51	Calendar Call Transcript	01/18/18	11 12	2748–2750 2751–2752
52	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Pre- Trial Disclosure Pursuant to NRCP 16.1(a)(3)	01/19/18	12	2753–2777
53	Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion in Limine No. 7 to Exclude Any Claims that the Subject Motor Coach was Defective Based on Alleged Dangerous "Air Blasts"	01/22/18	12	2778–2787
54	Defendants' Reply in Support of Motion in Limine No. 13 to Exclude Plaintiffs' Expert Witness Robert Cunitz, Ph.D., or in the Alternative to Limit His Testimony	01/22/18	12	2788–2793

55 Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion in Limine No. 17 to Exclude	2794–2814
Motion in Limine No. 17 to Exclude	
Claim of Lost Income, Including the	
August 28 Expert Report of Larry	
Stokes	
	2815 – 2817
dba Ryan's Express and Edward	
Hubbard's Joinder to Plaintiffs'	
Motion for Determination of Good	
Faith Settlement with Michelangelo	
Leasing Inc. dba Ryan's Express and	
Edward Hubbard	2010 000=
	2818–2997
Defendant's Motion for Summary	
Judgment on All Claims Alleging a	
Product Defect	2000 0000
	2998–3000
	3001–3212
The second secon	3213–3250
	3251-3469
	3470–3473
Conclusions of Law, and Order	2.45.4.2.4.2.4
·	3474–3491
to Second Amended Complaint	2.400.0700
<u> </u>	3492–3500
	3501–3510
	3511–3536
	3537–3750
	3751–3817
	3818–4000
Č	4001–4037
	4038–4250
	4251–4308
	4309–4314
Negligence	
	4315–4500
Proceedings	

69	Reporter's Transcription of Proceedings	02/16/18	19	4501–4727
70	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s	02/16/18	19	4728–4747
	Response to "Bench Brief on	02/10/10	10	1,20 1,11
	Contributory Negligence"			
71	Defendant's Trial Brief in Support of	02/20/18	19	4748–4750
	Level Playing Field	02/20/10	$\frac{10}{20}$	4751–4808
72	Reporter's Transcription of	02/20/18	$\frac{20}{20}$	4809–5000
	Proceedings		$\frac{1}{21}$	5001–5039
73	Reporter's Transcription of	02/21/18	21	5040-5159
	Proceedings			
$\overline{74}$	Reporter's Transcription of	02/22/18	21	5160-5250
	Proceedings		22	5251-5314
75	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law,	02/22/18	22	5315-5320
	and Order			
76	Bench Brief in Support of	02/22/18	22	5321–5327
	Preinstructing the Jury that			
	Contributory Negligence in Not a			
	Defense in a Product Liability Action			
77	Reporter's Transcription of	02/23/18	22	5328-5500
	Proceedings		23	5501-5580
78	Reporter's Transcription of	02/26/18	23	5581-5750
	Proceedings		24	5751–5834
79	Reporter's Transcription of	02/27/18	24	5835-6000
	Proceedings		25	6001–6006
80	Reporter's Transcription of	02/28/18	25	6007–6194
	Proceedings			
81	Reporter's Transcription of	03/01/18	25	6195–6250
	Proceedings		26	6251–6448
82	Reporter's Transcription of	03/02/18	26	6449–6500
	Proceedings		27	6501–6623
83	Reporter's Transcription of	03/05/18	27	6624–6750
	Proceedings		28	6751–6878
84	Addendum to Stipulated Protective	03/05/18	28	6879–6882
	Order			
85	Jury Trial Transcript	03/06/18	28	6883–7000
			29	7001–7044

				1
86	Reporter's Transcription of	03/07/18	29	7045-7250
	Proceedings		30	7251–7265
87	Jury Trial Transcript	03/08/18	30	7266–7423
88	Reporter's Transcription of	03/09/18	30	7424-7500
	Proceedings		31	7501-7728
89	Reporter's Transcription of	03/12/18	31	7729–7750
	Proceedings		32	7751-7993
90	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Brief in	03/12/18	32	7994-8000
	Support of Oral Motion for Judgment		33	8001-8017
	as a Matter of Law (NRCP 50(a))			
91	Plaintiffs' Trial Brief Regarding	03/12/18	33	8018-8025
	Admissibility of Taxation Issues and			
	Gross Versus Net Loss Income			
92	Jury Trial Transcript	03/13/18	33	8026-8170
93	Jury Trial Transcript	03/14/18	33	8171-8250
			34	8251-8427
94	Jury Trial Transcript	03/15/18	34	8428-8500
			35	8501-8636
95	Jury Trial Transcript	03/16/18	35	8637-8750
			36	8751-8822
96	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s	03/18/18	36	8823-8838
	Opposition to Plaintiff's Trial Brief			
	Regarding Admissibility of Taxation			
	Issues and Gross Versus Net Loss			
	Income			
97	Notice of Entry of Order	03/19/18	36	8839-8841
98	Jury Trial Transcript	03/19/18	36	8842-9000
			37	9001-9075
99	Reporter's Transcription of	03/20/18	37	9076-9250
	Proceedings		38	9251 – 9297
100	Reporter's Transcription of	03/21/18	38	9298–9500
	Proceedings		39	9501-9716
101	Reporter's Transcription of	03/21/18	39	9717–9750
	Proceedings		40	9751-9799
102	Reporter's Transcription of	03/21/18	40	9800-9880
	Proceedings			
-	·	•		

103	Reporter's Transcription of	03/22/18	40	9881-10000
	Proceedings		41	10001–10195
104	Reporter's Transcription of	03/23/18	41	10196–10206
	Proceedings			
105	Proposed Jury Instructions Not Given	03/23/18	41	10207–10235
106	Amended Jury List	03/23/18	41	10236
107	Special Jury Verdict	03/23/18	41	10237–10241
108	Jury Instructions	03/23/18	41	10242–10250
			42	10251–10297
109	Proposed Jury Verdict Form Not Used at Trial	03/26/18	42	10298–10302
110	Jury Instructions Reviewed with the	03/30/18	42	10303-10364
	Court on March 21, 2018			
111	Notice of Entry of Judgment	04/18/18	42	10365–10371
112	Special Master Order Staying Post-	04/24/18	42	10372–10374
	Trial Discovery Including May 2, 2018			
	Deposition of the Custodian of Records			
	of the Board of Regents NSHE			
113	Plaintiffs' Verified Memorandum of	04/24/18	42	10375–10381
	Costs and Disbursements Pursuant to			
	NRS 18.005, 18.020, and 18.110			
114	Appendix of Exhibits in Support of	04/24/18	42	10382–10500
	Plaintiffs' Verified Memorandum of		43	10501–10750
	Costs (Volume 1 of 2)		44	10751–11000
			45	11001–11250
			46	11251–11360
115	Appendix of Exhibits in Support of	04/24/18	46	11361–11500
	Plaintiffs' Verified Memorandum of		47	11501–11735
	Costs (Volume 2 of 2)			
116	Amended Declaration of Peter S.	04/25/18	47	11736–11742
	Christiansen, Esq. in Support of			
	Plaintiffs' 4/24/18 Verified			
	Memorandum of Costs and			
	Disbursements Pursuant to NRS			
115	18.005, 18.020, and 18.110	0.4/0.0/4.0	4.7	11540 11550
117	Motion to Retax Costs	04/30/18	47	11743–11750
			48	11751–11760

118	Opposition to Motion for Limited Post- Trial Discovery	05/03/18	48	11761–11769
119	Appendix of Exhibits to: Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Motion for New Trial	05/07/18	48	11770–11962
120	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s	05/07/18	48	11963–12000
	Renewed Motion for Judgment as a		49	12001–12012
	Matter of Law Regarding Failure to			
	Warn Claim			
121	Supplement to Motor Coach	05/08/18	49	12013–12018
	Industries, Inc.'s Motion for a Limited			
	New Trial			
122	Plaintiffs' Supplemental Verified	05/09/18	49	12019–12038
	Memorandum of Costs and			
	Disbursements Pursuant to NRS			
	18.005, 18.020, and 18.110			
123	Opposition to Defendant's Motion to	05/14/18	49	12039–12085
	Retax Costs			
124	Notice of Appeal	05/18/18	49	12086–12097
125	Case Appeal Statement	05/18/18	49	12098–12103
126	Plaintiffs' Opposition to MCI's Motion	06/06/18	49	12104–12112
	to Alter or Amend Judgment to Offset			
	Settlement Proceeds Paid by Other			
	Defendants			
127	Combined Opposition to Motion for a	06/08/18	49	12113–12250
	Limited New Trial and MCI's		50	12251–12268
	Renewed Motion for Judgment as a			
	Matter of Law Regarding Failure to			
	Warn Claim			
128	Reply on Motion to Retax Costs	06/29/18	50	12269–12281
129	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Reply	06/29/18	50	12282–12309
	in Support of Renewed Motion for			
	Judgment as a Matter of Law			
	Regarding Failure to Warn Claim			
130	Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition to	09/18/18	50	12310–12321
	MCI's Motion to Alter or Amend			
	Judgment to Offset Settlement			
	Proceeds Paid by Other Defendants			

131 Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Response to "Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition to MCI's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment to Offset Settlement Proceeds Paid to Other Defendants" 132 Transcript 133 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. Only 134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Against Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) Denying Motion for Judgment as a 10/17/18 50 12373-1	2360 2365
Opposition to MCI's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment to Offset Settlement Proceeds Paid to Other Defendants" 132 Transcript Og/25/18 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. Only 134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Wrongful Death Claim Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) Og/01/19 50 12373-1	2365
Amend Judgment to Offset Settlement Proceeds Paid to Other Defendants" 132 Transcript 09/25/18 50 12333-1 133 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. Only 134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 137 Oz/01/19 50 12373-1	2365
Proceeds Paid to Other Defendants" 132 Transcript 09/25/18 50 12333-1 133 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. Only 134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373-1	2365
132Transcript09/25/185012333-1133Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. Only10/17/185012361-1134Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only10/17/185012366-1135Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Wrongful Death Claim01/31/195012371-1136Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1)02/01/195012373-1	2365
Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. Only 134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 137 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Ol/31/19 02/01/19 02/01/19 02/01/19	2365
Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. Only 134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373-1	
Against Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. Only 134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373-1	2050
Bicycles, Inc. Only 134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss O1/31/19 50 12371–1 Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373–1	2252
134 Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss 01/31/19 50 12371–1 Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373–1	2050
Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss 01/31/19 50 12371–1 Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373–1	
Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only 135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss 01/31/19 50 12371–1 Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373–1	2370
135 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss 01/31/19 50 12371–1 Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373–1	
Wrongful Death Claim 136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373-1	
136 Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1) 02/01/19 50 12373-1	2372
Denying Motion for Judgment as a	2384
Matter of Law and (2) Denying Motion	
for Limited New Trial	
137 Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, 02/01/19 50 12385-1	2395
Conclusions of Law and Order on	
Motion for Good Faith Settlement	
138 Notice of Entry of "Findings of Fact 04/24/19 50 12396–1	2411
and Conclusions of Law on	
Defendant's Motion to Retax"	
139 Notice of Appeal 04/24/19 50 12412-1	2461
140 Case Appeal Statement 04/24/19 50 12462-1	2479
141 Notice of Entry of Court's Order	2489
Denying Defendant's Motion to Alter	
or Amend Judgment to Offset	
Settlement Proceeds Paid by Other	
Defendants Filed Under Seal on	
March 26, 2019	

Filed Under Seal

142	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order on Motion for Determination of Good Faith	03/14/18	51	12490-12494
143	Settlement Objection to Special Master Order Staying Post-Trial Discovery Including May 2, 2018 Deposition of the Custodian of Records of the Board of Regents NSHE and, Alternatively, Motion for Limited Post-Trial Discovery on Order Shortening Time	05/03/18	51	12495-12602
144	Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings	05/04/18	51	12603-12646
145	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment to Offset Settlement Proceed Paid by Other Defendants	05/07/18	51	12647-12672
146	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Motion for a Limited New Trial	05/07/18	51	12673–12704
147	Exhibits G–L and O to: Appendix of Exhibits to: Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Motion for a Limited New Trial	05/08/18	51 52	12705–12739 12740–12754
148	Reply in Support of Motion for a Limited New Trial	07/02/18	52	12755–12864
149	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment to Offset Settlement Proceeds Paid by Other Defendants	07/02/18	52	12865–12916
150	Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition to MCI's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment to Offset Settlement Proceeds Paid by Other Defendants	09/18/18	52	12917–12930
151	Order	03/26/19	52	12931–12937

ALPHABETICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS TO APPENDIX

Tab	Document	Date	Vol.	Pages
84	Addendum to Stipulated Protective	03/05/18	28	6879–6882
	Order			
59	All Pending Motions Transcript	01/31/18	13	3213–3250
			14	3251–3469
2	Amended Complaint and Demand for	06/06/17	1	17–33
	Jury Trial			
116	Amended Declaration of Peter S.	04/25/18	47	11736–11742
	Christiansen, Esq. in Support of			
	Plaintiffs' 4/24/18 Verified			
	Memorandum of Costs and			
	Disbursements Pursuant to NRS			
	18.005, 18.020, and 18.110			
106	Amended Jury List	03/23/18	41	10236
114	Appendix of Exhibits in Support of	04/24/18	42	10382–10500
	Plaintiffs' Verified Memorandum of		43	10501–10750
	Costs (Volume 1 of 2)		44	10751–11000
			45	11001–11250
			46	11251–11360
115	Appendix of Exhibits in Support of	04/24/18	46	11361–11500
	Plaintiffs' Verified Memorandum of		47	11501–11735
	Costs (Volume 2 of 2)			
32	Appendix of Exhibits to Defendant's	12/07/17	7	1584–1750
	Motion in Limine No. 7 to Exclude		8	1751–1801
	Any Claims That the Subject Motor			
	Coach was Defective Based on Alleged			
	Dangerous "Air Blasts"			
34	Appendix of Exhibits to Defendants'	12/07/17	8	1817–2000
	Motion in Limine No. 13 to Exclude		9	2001–2100
	Plaintiffs' Expert Witness Robert			
	Cunitz, Ph.D., or in the Alternative, to			
	Limit His Testimony			

38	Appendix of Exhibits to Plaintiffs'	12/21/17	9	2176–2250
	Joint Opposition to MCI Motion for		10	2251-2500
	Summary Judgment on All Claims		11	2501–2523
	Alleging a Product Defect and to MCI			
	Motion for Summary Judgment on			
	Punitive Damages			
119	Appendix of Exhibits to: Motor Coach	05/07/18	48	11770–11962
	Industries, Inc.'s Motion for New Trial			
76	Bench Brief in Support of	02/22/18	22	5321–5327
	Preinstructing the Jury that			
	Contributory Negligence in Not a			
	Defense in a Product Liability Action			
67	Bench Brief on Contributory	02/15/18	18	4309-4314
	Negligence			
51	Calendar Call Transcript	01/18/18	11	2748 – 2750
			12	2751–2752
125	Case Appeal Statement	05/18/18	49	12098–12103
140	Case Appeal Statement	04/24/19	50	12462-12479
21	Civil Order to Statistically Close Case	10/24/17	3	587–588
127	Combined Opposition to Motion for a	06/08/18	49	12113–12250
	Limited New Trial and MCI's		50	12251–12268
	Renewed Motion for Judgment as a			
	Matter of Law Regarding Failure to			
	Warn Claim			
1	Complaint with Jury Demand	05/25/17	1	1–16
10	Defendant Bell Sports, Inc.'s Answer	07/03/17	1	140–153
	to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint			
11	Defendant Bell Sports, Inc.'s Demand	07/03/17	1	154-157
	for Jury Trial			
48	Defendant Bell Sports, Inc.'s Motion	01/17/18	11	2720–2734
	for Determination of Good Faith			
	Settlement on Order Shortening Time			
7	Defendant Motor Coach Industries,	06/30/17	1	101–116
	Inc.'s Answer to Plaintiffs' Amended			
	Complaint			
8	Defendant Sevenplus Bicycles, Inc.	06/30/17	1	117–136
	d/b/a Pro Cyclery's Answer to			
	Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint			

9	Defendant Sevenplus Bicycles, Inc. d/b/a Pro Cyclery's Demand for Jury Trial	06/30/17	1	137–139
19	Defendant SevenPlus Bicycles, Inc. d/b/a Pro Cyclery's Motion for Determination of Good Faith Settlement	09/22/17	2	313–323
31	Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 7 to Exclude Any Claims That the Subject Motor Coach was Defective Based on Alleged Dangerous "Air Blasts"	12/07/17	7	1572–1583
20	Defendant's Notice of Filing Notice of Removal	10/17/17	$\frac{2}{3}$	324–500 501–586
55	Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion in Limine No. 17 to Exclude Claim of Lost Income, Including the August 28 Expert Report of Larry Stokes	01/22/18	12	2794–2814
53	Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion in Limine No. 7 to Exclude Any Claims that the Subject Motor Coach was Defective Based on Alleged Dangerous "Air Blasts"	01/22/18	12	2778–2787
71	Defendant's Trial Brief in Support of Level Playing Field	02/20/18	19 20	4748–4750 4751–4808
5	Defendants Michelangelo Leasing Inc. dba Ryan's Express and Edward Hubbard's Answer to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint	06/28/17	1	81–97
56	Defendants Michelangelo Leasing Inc. dba Ryan's Express and Edward Hubbard's Joinder to Plaintiffs' Motion for Determination of Good Faith Settlement with Michelangelo Leasing Inc. dba Ryan's Express and Edward Hubbard	01/22/18	12	2815–2817
33	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 13 to Exclude Plaintiffs' Expert Witness	12/07/17	8	1802–1816

	D.1. 4 C .'4 Dl. 1' . 41.			
	Robert Cunitz, Ph.d., or in the			
0.0	Alternative, to Limit His Testimony	10/00/15		0100 0100
36	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 17	12/08/17	9	2106–2128
	to Exclude Claim of Lost Income,			
	Including the August 28 Expert			
	Report of Larry Stokes			
54	Defendants' Reply in Support of	01/22/18	12	2788–2793
	Motion in Limine No. 13 to Exclude			
	Plaintiffs' Expert Witness Robert			
	Cunitz, Ph.D., or in the Alternative to			
	Limit His Testimony			
6	Demand for Jury Trial	06/28/17	1	98–100
147	Exhibits G–L and O to: Appendix of	05/08/18	51	12705–12739
	Exhibits to: Motor Coach Industries,		52	12740–12754
	Inc.'s Motion for a Limited New Trial			
	(FILED UNDER SEAL)			
142	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of	03/14/18	51	12490–12494
	Law and Order on Motion for			
	Determination of Good Faith			
	Settlement (FILED UNDER SEAL)			
75	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law,	02/22/18	22	5315–5320
	and Order			
108	Jury Instructions	03/23/18	41	10242-10250
			42	10251-10297
110	Jury Instructions Reviewed with the	03/30/18	42	10303-10364
	Court on March 21, 2018			
64	Jury Trial Transcript	02/12/18	15	3537-3750
			16	3751-3817
85	Jury Trial Transcript	03/06/18	28	6883-7000
			29	7001-7044
87	Jury Trial Transcript	03/08/18	30	7266–7423
92	Jury Trial Transcript	03/13/18	33	8026-8170
93	Jury Trial Transcript	03/14/18	33	8171-8250
			34	8251-8427
94	Jury Trial Transcript	03/15/18	34	8428-8500
			35	8501–8636
95	Jury Trial Transcript	03/16/18	35	8637-8750

			36	8751–8822
98	Jury Trial Transcript	03/19/18	36	8842-9000
			37	9001-9075
35	Motion for Determination of Good	12/07/17	9	2101–2105
	Faith Settlement Transcript			
22	Motion for Summary Judgment on	10/27/17	3	589–597
	Foreseeability of Bus Interaction with			
	Pedestrians or Bicyclists (Including			
	Sudden Bicycle Movement)			
26	Motion for Summary Judgment on	12/01/17	3	642–664
	Punitive Damages			
117	Motion to Retax Costs	04/30/18	47	11743–11750
			48	11751–11760
58	Motions in Limine Transcript	01/29/18	12	2998–3000
			13	3001–3212
61	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Answer	02/06/18	14	3474–3491
	to Second Amended Complaint			
90	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Brief in	03/12/18	32	7994–8000
	Support of Oral Motion for Judgment		33	8001–8017
	as a Matter of Law (NRCP 50(a))			
146	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Motion	05/07/18	51	12673–12704
	for a Limited New Trial (FILED			
2.0	UNDER SEAL)	1010111	-	1 101 1 200
30	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Motion	12/04/17	6	1491–1500
	for Summary Judgment on All Claims		7	1501–1571
1 4 5	Alleging a Product Defect	05/05/10	F 1	10045 10050
145	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Motion	05/07/18	51	12647–12672
	to Alter or Amend Judgment to Offset			
	Settlement Proceed Paid by Other			
96	Defendants (FILED UNDER SEAL) Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s	03/18/18	36	8823–8838
90	Opposition to Plaintiff's Trial Brief	09/10/10	อบ	0020-0000
	Regarding Admissibility of Taxation			
	Issues and Gross Versus Net Loss			
	Income			
52	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Pre-	01/19/18	12	2753–2777
	Trial Disclosure Pursuant to NRCP	01/10/10	1 =	
	16.1(a)(3)			
	· - (\alpha) (\cup)			L

120	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s	05/07/18	48	11963–12000
	Renewed Motion for Judgment as a		49	12001-12012
	Matter of Law Regarding Failure to			
	Warn Claim			
47	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Reply	01/17/18	11	2705–2719
	in Support of Its Motion for Summary			
	Judgment on All Claims Alleging a			
	Product Defect			
149	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Reply	07/02/18	52	12865-12916
	in Support of Motion to Alter or			
	Amend Judgment to Offset Settlement			
	Proceeds Paid by Other Defendants			
	(FILED UNDER SEAL)			
129	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s Reply	06/29/18	50	12282-12309
	in Support of Renewed Motion for			
	Judgment as a Matter of Law			
	Regarding Failure to Warn Claim			
70	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s	02/16/18	19	4728-4747
	Response to "Bench Brief on			
	Contributory Negligence"			
131	Motor Coach Industries, Inc.'s	09/24/18	50	12322-12332
	Response to "Plaintiffs' Supplemental			
	Opposition to MCI's Motion to Alter or			
	Amend Judgment to Offset Settlement			
	Proceeds Paid to Other Defendants"			
124	Notice of Appeal	05/18/18	49	12086–12097
139	Notice of Appeal	04/24/19	50	12412-12461
138	Notice of Entry of "Findings of Fact	04/24/19	50	12396–12411
	and Conclusions of Law on			
	Defendant's Motion to Retax"			
136	Notice of Entry of Combined Order (1)	02/01/19	50	12373-12384
	Denying Motion for Judgment as a			
	Matter of Law and (2) Denying Motion			
	for Limited New Trial			
141	Notice of Entry of Court's Order	05/03/19	50	12480-12489
	Denying Defendant's Motion to Alter			
	or Amend Judgment to Offset			
	Settlement Proceeds Paid by Other			

	Defendants Filed Under Seal on			
4.0	March 26, 2019	01/00/10		
40	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact	01/08/18	11	2581–2590
	Conclusions of Law and Order on			
	Motion for Determination of Good			
105	Faith Settlement	00/04/40		10007 10007
137	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact,	02/01/19	50	12385–12395
	Conclusions of Law and Order on			
	Motion for Good Faith Settlement	0.11.01.0		10007 10071
111	Notice of Entry of Judgment	04/18/18	42	10365–10371
12	Notice of Entry of Order	07/11/17	1	158–165
16	Notice of Entry of Order	08/23/17	1	223–227
63	Notice of Entry of Order	02/09/18	15	3511–3536
97	Notice of Entry of Order	03/19/18	36	8839–8841
15	Notice of Entry of Order (CMO)	08/18/17	1	214–222
4	Notice of Entry of Order Denying	06/22/17	1	77–80
	Without Prejudice Plaintiffs' Ex Parte			
	Motion for Order Requiring Bus			
	Company and Bus Driver to Preserve			
	an Immediately Turn Over Relevant			
	Electronic Monitoring Information			
	from Bus and Driver Cell Phone			
13	Notice of Entry of Order Granting	07/20/17	1	166–171
	Plaintiffs' Motion for Preferential Trial			
	Setting			
133	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and	10/17/18	50	12361–12365
	Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims			
	Against Defendant SevenPlus			
	Bicycles, Inc. Only			
134	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and	10/17/18	50	12366–12370
	Order Dismissing Plaintiffs' Claims			
	Against Bell Sports, Inc. Only			
143	Objection to Special Master Order	05/03/18	51	12495-12602
	Staying Post-Trial Discovery Including			
	May 2, 2018 Deposition of the			
	Custodian of Records of the Board of			
	Regents NSHE and, Alternatively,			
	Motion for Limited Post-Trial			

	Discovery on Order Shortening Time			
	(FILED UNDER SEAL)			
39	Opposition to "Motion for Summary	12/27/17	11	2524 - 2580
	Judgment on Foreseeability of Bus			
	Interaction with Pedestrians of			
	Bicyclists (Including Sudden Bicycle			
	Movement)"			
123	Opposition to Defendant's Motion to	05/14/18	49	12039–12085
	Retax Costs			
118	Opposition to Motion for Limited Post-	05/03/18	48	11761–11769
	Trial Discovery			
151	Order (FILED UNDER SEAL)	03/26/19	52	12931–12937
135	Order Granting Motion to Dismiss	01/31/19	50	12371–12372
	Wrongful Death Claim			
25	Order Regarding "Plaintiffs' Motion to	11/17/17	3	638–641
	Amend Complaint to Substitute			
	Parties" and "Countermotion to Set a			
	Reasonable Trial Date Upon Changed			
	Circumstance that Nullifies the			
	Reason for Preferential Trial Setting"			
45	Plaintiffs' Addendum to Reply to	01/17/18	11	2654–2663
	Opposition to Motion for Summary			
	Judgment on Forseeability of Bus			
	Interaction with Pedestrians or			
	Bicyclists (Including Sudden Bicycle			
4.0	Movement)"	04/40/40		
49	Plaintiffs' Joinder to Defendant Bell	01/18/18	11	2735–2737
	Sports, Inc.'s Motion for			
	Determination of Good Faith			
4.1	Settlement on Order Shortening Time	01/00/10		0501 0011
41	Plaintiffs' Joint Opposition to	01/08/18	11	2591–2611
	Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 3 to			
	Preclude Plaintiffs from Making			
	Reference to a "Bullet Train" and to			
	Defendant's Motion in Limine No. 7 to			
	Exclude Any Claims That the Motor			
	Coach was Defective Based on Alleged			
	Dangerous "Air Blasts"			

	T			,
37	Plaintiffs' Joint Opposition to MCI	12/21/17	9	2129–2175
	Motion for Summary Judgment on All			
	Claims Alleging a Product Defect and			
	to MCI Motion for Summary			
	Judgment on Punitive Damages			
50	Plaintiffs' Motion for Determination of	01/18/18	11	2738–2747
	Good Faith Settlement with			
	Defendants Michelangelo Leasing Inc.			
	d/b/a Ryan's Express and Edward			
	Hubbard Only on Order Shortening			
	Time			
42	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's	01/08/18	11	2612–2629
	Motion in Limine No. 13 to Exclude			
	Plaintiffs' Expert Witness Robert			
	Cunitz, Ph.D. or in the Alternative to			
	Limit His Testimony			
43	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's	01/08/18	11	2630–2637
	Motion in Limine No. 17 to Exclude			
	Claim of Lost Income, Including the			
	August 28 Expert Report of Larry			
	Stokes			
126	Plaintiffs' Opposition to MCI's Motion	06/06/18	49	12104–12112
	to Alter or Amend Judgment to Offset			
	Settlement Proceeds Paid by Other			
	Defendants			
130	Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition to	09/18/18	50	12310–12321
	MCI's Motion to Alter or Amend			
	Judgment to Offset Settlement			
	Proceeds Paid by Other Defendants			
150	Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition to	09/18/18	52	12917–12930
	MCI's Motion to Alter or Amend			
	Judgment to Offset Settlement			
	Proceeds Paid by Other Defendants			
	(FILED UNDER SEAL)			
122	Plaintiffs' Supplemental Verified	05/09/18	49	12019–12038
	Memorandum of Costs and			
	Disbursements Pursuant to NRS			
	18.005, 18.020, and 18.110			

91	Plaintiffs' Trial Brief Regarding	03/12/18	33	8018–8025
	Admissibility of Taxation Issues and			
	Gross Versus Net Loss Income			
113	Plaintiffs' Verified Memorandum of	04/24/18	42	10375–10381
	Costs and Disbursements Pursuant to			
	NRS 18.005, 18.020, and 18.110			
105	Proposed Jury Instructions Not Given	03/23/18	41	10207–10235
109	Proposed Jury Verdict Form Not Used	03/26/18	42	10298–10302
	at Trial			
57	Recorder's Transcript of Hearing on	01/23/18	12	2818–2997
	Defendant's Motion for Summary			
	Judgment on All Claims Alleging a			
	Product Defect			
148	Reply in Support of Motion for a	07/02/18	52	12755–12864
	Limited New Trial (FILED UNDER			
	SEAL)			
128	Reply on Motion to Retax Costs	06/29/18	50	12269–12281
44	Reply to Opposition to Motion for	01/16/18	11	2638–2653
	Summary Judgment on Foreseeability			
	of Bus Interaction with Pedestrians or			
	Bicyclists (Including Sudden Bicycle			
	Movement)"			
46	Reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition to	01/17/18	11	2664–2704
	Motion for Summary Judgment on			
	Punitive Damages			
3	Reporter's Transcript of Motion for	06/15/17	1	34–76
	Temporary Restraining Order			
144	Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings	05/04/18	51	12603–12646
	(FILED UNDER SEAL)			
14	Reporter's Transcription of Motion for	07/20/17	1	172–213
	Preferential Trial Setting			
18	Reporter's Transcription of Motion of	09/21/17	1	237–250
	Status Check and Motion for		2	251–312
	Reconsideration with Joinder			
65	Reporter's Transcription of	02/13/18	16	3818–4000
	Proceedings		17	4001–4037
66	Reporter's Transcription of	02/14/18	17	4038–4250
	Proceedings		18	4251–4308

68	Reporter's Transcription of	02/15/18	18	4315–4500
200	Proceedings	00/10/10	1.0	4501 4505
69	Reporter's Transcription of	02/16/18	19	4501–4727
	Proceedings			
72	Reporter's Transcription of	02/20/18	20	4809–5000
	Proceedings		21	5001–5039
73	Reporter's Transcription of	02/21/18	21	5040-5159
	Proceedings			
74	Reporter's Transcription of	02/22/18	21	5160 - 5250
	Proceedings		22	5251-5314
77	Reporter's Transcription of	02/23/18	22	5328-5500
	Proceedings		23	5501-5580
78	Reporter's Transcription of	02/26/18	23	5581-5750
	Proceedings		24	5751-5834
79	Reporter's Transcription of	02/27/18	24	5835-6000
	Proceedings		25	6001–6006
80	Reporter's Transcription of	02/28/18	25	6007–6194
	Proceedings			
81	Reporter's Transcription of	03/01/18	25	6195–6250
	Proceedings		26	6251-6448
82	Reporter's Transcription of	03/02/18	26	6449–6500
	Proceedings		27	6501–6623
83	Reporter's Transcription of	03/05/18	27	6624–6750
	Proceedings		28	6751–6878
86	Reporter's Transcription of	03/07/18	29	7045-7250
	Proceedings		30	7251 - 7265
88	Reporter's Transcription of	03/09/18	30	7424-7500
	Proceedings		31	7501-7728
89	Reporter's Transcription of	03/12/18	31	7729–7750
	Proceedings		32	7751-7993
99	Reporter's Transcription of	03/20/18	37	9076–9250
	Proceedings		38	9251-9297
100	Reporter's Transcription of	03/21/18	38	9298–9500
	Proceedings		39	9501–9716
101	Reporter's Transcription of	03/21/18	39	9717–9750
	Proceedings		40	9751–9799
	1 100ccumgs		40	5101 <u>—</u> 1010

102	Reporter's Transcription of	03/21/18	40	9800–9880
	Proceedings			
103	Reporter's Transcription of	03/22/18	40	9881-10000
	Proceedings		41	10001-10195
104	Reporter's Transcription of	03/23/18	41	10196–10206
	Proceedings			
24	Second Amended Complaint and	11/17/17	3	619–637
	Demand for Jury Trial			
107	Special Jury Verdict	03/23/18	41	10237–10241
112	Special Master Order Staying Post-	04/24/18	42	10372–10374
	Trial Discovery Including May 2, 2018			
	Deposition of the Custodian of Records			
	of the Board of Regents NSHE			
62	Status Check Transcript	02/09/18	14	3492–3500
			15	3501–3510
17	Stipulated Protective Order	08/24/17	1	228–236
121	Supplement to Motor Coach	05/08/18	49	12013–12018
	Industries, Inc.'s Motion for a Limited			
	New Trial			
60	Supplemental Findings of Fact,	02/05/18	14	3470–3473
	Conclusions of Law, and Order			
132	Transcript	09/25/18	50	12333–12360
23	Transcript of Proceedings	11/02/17	3	598–618
27	Volume 1: Appendix of Exhibits to	12/01/17	3	665–750
	Motion for Summary Judgment on		4	751–989
	Punitive Damages			
28	Volume 2: Appendix of Exhibits to	12/01/17	4	990–1000
	Motion for Summary Judgment on		5	1001–1225
	Punitive Damages			
29	Volume 3: Appendix of Exhibits to	12/01/17	5	1226–1250
	Motion for Summary Judgment on		6	1251–1490
	Punitive Damages			

for people, right, and he wanted to become a doctor and help people with whatever issues that they had. And he knew that if he stayed in Iran, he could do that, but it would involve him risking his life, considering, like, the conditions and the bombing and the shootings that were happening.

And so he said, "In order for me to do that, and to the best I could do it, I had to leave." And so he left on a backpack, and he walked out of the country to Pakistan at 17, and he didn't talk to his parents for two years.

And then , from Pakistan, he sort of figured things out, that Montreal was accepting people from the Middle East at the time. And so he came to Montreal with no money.

I think he worked in a few restaurants in Karachi, Pakistan, to get enough money to fly over. And then he sort of just was figuring things out on his own. And so he had to go live in the -- he was living on his own at, I think, 19, in the poorer side of Montreal. He didn't speak any French and not great English at the time. And so he had to do what he could.

So I think -- so he had to kind of get by. So he started working at McDonald's to get

himself through and other small places. And he was working night jobs and day jobs and so on and so forth.

So he kind of came all by himself. And it wasn't until he was here that he called his parents. They didn't know if he was alive, if he was well, or where he was in the world. So he kind of called them and said, "I'm here, and I've got a home, but things are still shaky."

- Q. And "here," you mean Montreal?
- A. Montreal, yeah.
- Q. And it's sort of second nature to you, but I had to learn about it. So would you explain to the jury the French issue in Montreal, French versus English?
- A. Yeah. So Montreal is a bilingual city, but the majority of it is French, and so the majority of the people speak French. That's the main culture -- the main language of the city. There's only a small part of the city that speaks English. So it's difficult -- it's difficult to get by.

So my brother and I are going through the same thing; right? We're moving there. I'm

17. I don't speak any French. And so that's been

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
a serious barrier for me, like, in terms of making
1
2
   friends, meeting people, meeting girls.
                                             Like, in
3
   school and everything, like, the only class that
4
   I'm flunking -- I study really hard, but the only
   class that I'm flunking is French class. And my
5
   brother too, like, he's -- that's the real
6
7
             That's a big barrier for us right now.
8
        Q.
                    Was that a similar barrier to the
             Okay.
9
   one your father had to overcome?
```

- A. Yeah, absolutely.
- Q. At age what?
- A. Same age, 17, 19
- Q. You mentioned that your dad worked at some point at a McDonald's.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you recently find some proof of your dad's employment?
- 18 A. Yeah.
 - Q. Tell us what you found.
 - A. So when my dad passed away and my mom was in the hospital, I was digging through stuff to find, like, love letters and stuff like that to show her. I found a bunch of them, but when I was looking through, he had kept the 1980s McDonald's hats that he used to wear with the mesh in the

back with the blue rim; right? And he had a bunch of them. He had, like, 20 of them. And I still have them. I don't -- I mean, he kept them to show where he came from; right?

But, yeah, that's what I found. That's how I really knew because, I mean, people had told me, but I was like -- I couldn't see that, right, my dad working at a McDonald's, right, to get himself by.

- Q. Was your dad proud of the path he'd taken?
- A. I think he was. I think -- I think he came from nothing and he made himself into something. And he appreciated the opportunities that were given to him. And he took everything he could get. I mean, nothing was given to him, so he knew he had to go out there and get it. So that's what he did. So I think he was proud of where he came from.
- Q. Help us understand your relationship with your father pre mom being ill.
- A. So my dad and I were always really close, still are. And we often talked about all sorts of stuff, right, whether it was sports -- mainly music. And he was, like, the main person

in my life, right, when I'd go to him for
problems, whatever problems they were.

And it was especially at this time, like, after I'd gone through most of puberty, he was, you know -- he had really taken on the task of, like, helping me decide my future and going on and teaching me lessons of what it means to be a good man and how to overcome certain things, if you have an issue with a person, how to resolve it in the proper way; right? All the things that he learned and what every father should be teaching his son. He was doing an amazing job of it at the time.

And we were just -- you know, things were really picking up and the ball was rolling, and he was helping me with college applications. And he was reading all sorts of books on how to get from Clark or from Las Vegas into one of the best schools, which is -- ultimately would be what he did at my age as well. So he was helping me, trying to put me in a better place for that.

- Q. You guys live in Las Vegas. How come your dad was reading books about universities? Was it because they're American?
 - A. Yeah, yeah. So he was reading -- he was

reading literature and books on how to get into
the best schools, right, so I could have the best
education and the best teachers, which is what he
did for -- in deciding how I went to Clark; right?
He looked at all the schools in Vegas, and he
said, "That's where my son's got to be." So
that's what he was doing for university level.

- Q. On Friday, the ladies and gentlemen of the jury listened to your mom's video deposition that I took in September 22nd of last year. Do you remember when we were getting ready for that?
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. Your mom told the people on the jury that your dad was a passionate guy about things?
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. Help us, from his oldest son's perspective, understand what that -- what that sort of looked like.
- A. Yeah. My dad was always passionate about, like, all sorts of stuff. So he would, like -- he would find a passion and totally, like, dive into it. And so, from a young age, he was always obsessed with music; right? He had a rock band back in Iran, then he had one in medical school until he met my mom.

So whatever it was, whether it was, like, cigars or watches or history of the United States or different countries, whatever it was, he really, like, dove into those topics and, like, got the best out of them, whether it was reading or so on.

He was obsessed with operas. And so he would read books or get the movies or he would -I mean he would never leave to go travel and see them, but he would really educate himself about those topics. And he would become really passionate about them and really -- when you saw him talk, like, you couldn't help but listen, right, because he was just -- he knew so much about them and he wanted to share.

And that was the same thing with medicine; right? I think, when he was going to medical school, my mom and them would bus together, right, because that was -- a lot of the time that they would spend together, he would tie surgical knots on the metal bar that's above the seat, right, when you're riding the bus, and practicing. He knew he wanted to become a doctor. He knew "this is what I got to do and I got to be the best at it," so he would tie surgical knots to

make sure they were all perfect. So he was a super passionate guy.

Q. You said something about your dad's hair. It reminded me your mom said something about your dad's hair in the video deposition.

Did your dad immediately get on super well with your mom's family?

A. No.

- Q. Help us understand that.
- A. So my mom's parents and my mom's family, they're more really proper -- I guess you'd call it a really proper Persian family. And so when my parents started dating, my dad had super-long rocker hair. He didn't look like a medical student; right? He was an extremely smart guy, top of his class, but he was, you know, wearing the jean jackets and rocking the cool sunglasses and wearing the long hair.

And so, at some point, my mom started falling in love with my dad, so they sort of, "Hey, you've got to meet my parents." And so my mom was living in an apartment that my grandparents could come and live, like, three months out of the year to visit her. And so when they were there, my dad came over for dinner.

And my grandpa really sternly, like, sat at the table, and he asked him, he said, "So what do you intend to do with my daughter?" Imagine, they'd only been dating for a few months or so, or a year. And my dad was like, "We're just dating. We're just talking and, you know, enjoying ourselves."

And my grandpa didn't really like that, like he wanted -- my grandpa met my grandma and then got married, like, three days later. So he didn't really -- that approach wasn't really the old-fashioned way. And so my grandpa told my dad, like, "You can't set foot in this apartment again. You need to leave." Right? "You can't see my daughter."

And so they left, they went back to Iran because they lived there for most of the time. And my dad abided by that. He never set foot in the apartment, but he continued to see my mom. So when she would have, like, graduation parties or after final exams, like, he would wait outside whether it was raining or something, because he wasn't allowed to come in. He respected their wishes because he knew he was going to marry her at some point, so he was going to abide the rules

of her father.

And so he'd wait outside while they had the party, and she'd come out and then they'd talk outside. He never came in. But, eventually, at my current guardian, right, my uncle's wedding, my uncle wanted my dad to be part of the wedding.

And so my grandpa had issues with that, but they made up. And then, to this day, they're good.

- Q. They got over the initial --
- A. They got over the initial bump, right.
- Q. Tell us about your father's relationship with your little brother, Keon.
- A. So my father was always just invested in us; right? I think his main role was being a father and then being a doctor and everything else. He was always at our practices for sports or our music lessons or our shows or our school plays or so on and so forth.

And I think, for me, as I started to become more of a man, he was really teaching me those lessons and he was preparing to teach my brother those lessons, and he was kind of starting that, but he never got to.

But they had a -- they had a very -- very tight relationship as well. I mean, my

brother played drums, my dad played guitar, and they played drums together. They were really close.

- Q. How about Keon and mom?
- A. Keon and mom were arguably much closer. My mom -- when he was diagnosed with ADHD, she took on that role as that person who would really be there for him. I mean, my dad was as well, but my mom was reading all the books and seeing all the doctors and getting all the tests and seeing where his IQ and everything was to see how he would -- what we needed to do for him, right, in terms of where he needed to go to school and so on.

So my mom and Keon were always -- were always really close emotionally.

Q. You talked about your immediate family. We've shown the ladies and gentlemen a couple of pictures. I'm going to show some more in a second.

Other than your mom and dad, did you and Keon have any other family here in Las Vegas in January of last year?

- A. No.
- Q. Your folks' anniversary, was it

23

24

25

regularly a big deal for them? 1 Not a huge deal, but every now 2 A. 3 and then they would express their love for each 4 other and their friends would throw a party for But, usually, they'd keep it pretty down 5 6 low, but every now and then they would show it, 7 yeah, absolutely. 8 Q. All right. See if I can find -- here. 9 Let me show you just a couple pictures, Aria. 10 This is Exhibit 259C. Who's that a 11 picture of? 12 A. My mom and my dad. 13 Q. And do you know when that was 14 approximately? 15 Α. Around the same time as the other 16 photos. 17 You've got a monitor right to your left. 0. 18 Α. Oh, okay. 19 You're free to look on either one, Q.

whichever is easier. Let me show you 259D. Is that a picture of your family?

A. Yeah. That's in -- that's somewhere in Europe. I don't remember where, but I think it was in Austria.

Q. That's you sticking your tongue out?

- 1 A. Yeah. 2 Q. All right. 3 My mom liked selfies a lot, and my dad A. 4 didn't like selfies a lot, so it was a rare shot 5 of all four of us getting a selfie together. 6 Q. 7 Α. 8
 - 259E, I'll put up for you.
 - That's -- that's myself, most of the boys in the family, and then my dad, my brother, and my two uncles.
- 10 So let's see if we can point everybody 11 out. So the jury has only seen pictures of 12 people.
- 13 Α. Okay.

- Who's this fellow? 14 Q.
- 15 That's my Uncle Siamak. Α.
- 16 Siamak is right there. He's in court Q. 17 with you?
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 Siamak is the executor of both of your Q. 20 parents' estates?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 And your uncle? Q.
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 Who's this boy? Q.
- 25 Α. That's my brother, Keon.

1 Q. This is you? 2 Α. That's me. 3 Who are these four fellows? Q. 4 Α. So we have --5 Q. Start with me right here. That's Kayvan. That's Siamak's oldest 6 Α. 7 son. 8 Q. Kayvan, like your dad was Kayvan? 9 A. Yeah, same name. 10 Who's that boy? Q. 11 That's Alec, Siamak's youngest son. Α. 12 That's Zacharia. That's Babak's 13 youngest son. Who's this one, the guy right here? 14 Q. 15 A. That's Babak. That's my mom's older 16 brother. That's my guardian now. That's who I 17 live with. 18 Babak and his wife, Marie-Claude, are Q. 19 your quardians? 20 A. Yes. 21 And, lastly, who's that boy? Q. 22 That's Noah. That's Babak's oldest son. Α. 23 Q. All right. Those are the photos people 24 on the jury have seen to date. 25 I want to show you a few more that were

Q.

```
entered by way of stipulation this morning -- I
 1
 2
    actually think the ladies and gentlemen may have
 3
    seen them in the opening statement -- and have you
 4
    tell us who's in the pictures.
 5
               259G, who's in there, Aria?
 6
         A.
               That's my dad and myself and my brother,
    yeah.
 7
 8
         Q.
               Would that have been about the time you
 9
    all made your way to Las Vegas?
10
                     My brother was born when we moved
         Α.
11
           So that would be about the time, maybe a
12
    little bit after.
13
               All right.
         Q.
               259H?
14
15
               That's again my dad and my brother and
         A.
16
    I.
17
               Your dad's got his arms around the two
         0.
18
    of you?
19
               Yeah.
         Α.
20
               You're small at the time.
         Q.
                                           Did that
21
    change over the years?
22
               A little bit. He couldn't fit around
         Α.
23
    us, but he still tried.
                              He did it every day
24
    pretty much.
```

I've tried to put these in somewhat of a

24

25

Q.

Α.

```
chronological order. 259I, looks like you guys
 1
 2
    are getting a little bit older?
 3
               Yeah, missing two teeth.
          A.
 4
          Q.
               That's you without the teeth?
 5
          A.
               Yeah.
                      That's me on the left, my brother
 6
    on the right, and then my dad is in the middle.
 7
    Again, the same pose.
 8
          Q.
               259J?
 9
          Α.
               Yeah.
                      That's us biking.
                                          I don't
10
    remember.
                I think -- I don't remember where we
11
    were --
12
               That's okay.
          Q.
               -- but that's me on the left, my brother
13
          Α.
14
    in the middle, and my dad on the right.
15
          Q.
               Who is the great photographer in all
16
    these pictures?
17
          A.
               My mom.
18
               All right.
          Q.
19
               Yeah.
          Α.
20
               259K?
          Q.
21
               That's again the three of us:
          A.
22
    my dad, and my brother. I think we were skiing.
```

you think you are in that picture, Aria?

I'd say I'm 13, maybe.

And I'm terrible with ages.

How old do

- Q. About the age your brother was when your father passed?
 - A. Yeah.

- Q. Okay. 259L?
- A. That's again my brother, my dad, and I. We were jumping in waterfalls.
- Q. The ladies and gentlemen of the jury on Friday got to hear your mom tell stories about your dad always encouraging you to take off your clothes and jump in the water.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Is that something you guys did a lot?
- 13 A. Absolutely.
 - Q. Did your dad like the water?
 - A. Absolutely.
 - His rule was -- like, when we would go, like, hiking some places, like, whatever body of water we'd see, we had to be in it. So whether it was a lake or a river or a waterfall, we'd go in.
 - Q. He was passionate about that too?
 - A. Yeah, exactly. Passionate about nature and being outside and -- yeah, being with nature in the mountains and the forests and everything like that.
 - Q. In the family, Aria, before mom is ill,

who's the planner of all these excursions?

- A. My dad, a hundred percent.
- Q. And in what fashion did your dad plan things, sort of a casual, nonchalant, when we get there, we'll see what's going on, or was it different?
- A. No. When we did trips, my dad had everything planned so we could see the most -- because he was extremely passionate about these countries. So he would read about all their history from the time they became a country until today, what was cool to see, what was fun to do, what would be good for us, what would be good for my mom.

My mom didn't always -- you know, she wanted to do some girly stuff. And so he would plan the trip for every day and everything. But there was still a level of freedom; right? You weren't stuck on this schedule, but he knew about everything. He was like a personal tour guide; right? He would know, oh, that's that or this is that and we're here for this and so on and so forth.

Q. All right. You talked about your mom.

Let me show you some pictures of your mom and dad,

```
Exhibit 259M, which has been entered into
 1
 2
    evidence.
 3
               Is that your folks?
 4
         Α.
               Yes.
               In the -- just by way of a
 5
         Q.
 6
    demonstrative, we all saw your mom in the video
 7
    deposition -- and I'll just put it up, Aria, for
 8
    you -- September 22nd of last year.
 9
               Katy -- I'm sorry -- your mother had
10
    short hair?
11
         Α.
               Yeah.
12
         Q.
               How did your mom prefer to keep her
13
    hair?
14
         A.
               Long and -- yeah, long.
15
               And was mom particular relative to
         0.
16
    her -- you called it girly stuff -- her
17
    appearance?
18
                     She loved her -- if I can quote
         Α.
19
    her friends, she loved her makeup and she loved
20
    her shoes and her hair. She always had -- she cut
21
    it once, I think, when my brother was born.
22
    she didn't like it at all, so she hides those
23
    pictures.
                She loves her long hair.
24
               Let me show you a few more pictures,
         0.
25
    Aria.
```

1 259N, another photo of your folks?

2 A. Yes.

- Q. 2590. This is sort of a different pose. What's this a picture of your parents doing?
- A. This is them dancing and having a -having a really good time. I remember I took this
 photo. And so this is, like, a party they had. I
 don't know if it was for their anniversary or,
 like, New Year's maybe, but they were just having
 a ball. You can see the way they're looking at
 each other. And they were always really good at
 dancing too.
- Q. And the last picture I've got for you at this point is 259P. They're sort of two photos within a photo. Help us -- maybe you can orient us as to what we're looking at, Aria.
- A. So the photo in the white frame is a photo of their wedding, and this photo was taken on their anniversary. And so they're kissing on their anniversary above the photo of their wedding.
- Q. So the wedding is on October the 23rd, 19-ish years ago?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And this is another October the 23rd a

25

Aria?

Α.

```
few years back?
 1
 2
         Α.
               Yes.
 3
               Is that sort of typical of the
         Q.
 4
    anniversary parties that you witnessed as a boy
 5
    growing up?
 6
         A.
                     Absolutely.
               Yes.
 7
               All right. Prior to January the 22nd,
         Q.
 8
    did both your parents work full-time?
 9
         Α.
               Yes.
10
               You started to tell the ladies and
         Q.
11
    gentlemen of the jury when you learned that your
12
    mom was sick. Do you remember in time when that
13
    was?
14
               End of January, January 27th.
         A.
15
         0.
               If we use your birthday as --
16
    February 2nd as a watermark, were you getting kind
17
    of close to your birthday?
18
               Yeah, within a week.
         Α.
19
               And what does -- a young man turning 16,
         Q.
20
    what kind of test does a guy like you want to take
21
    so you can drive?
22
               I had my permit test that I had to take.
         Α.
23
         Q.
               How many times did you have to take it,
```

I had to take it once.

study."

25

1 Q. Well, how many times did you pass it? 2 Α. Once. 3 How many times did you not pass it? Q. 4 Α. Twice. All right. So the jury heard -- or 5 Q. 6 watched in opening statements the speech you gave 7 at your dad's funeral here in Las Vegas. 8 going to play it again for them right now. 9 there was reference to, the day before, you 10 getting your learner's permit. And I wondered in 11 my own mind, why are you waiting until so late in 12 the day to get your learner's permit? 13 Can you help us -- did you really wait, 14 or did you sort of get forced to wait? 15 Α. Funny story. So when I turned $15 \frac{1}{2}$, 16 which is when you can go get your permit, the day 17 after I went to go get to take the test. 18 thought that, if I could do other stuff, I could 19 do this test without studying. And so my mom told 20 me, "You need to study," and I didn't study. So I 21 went and I didn't pass. 22 And she was, like, "How did you not 23 pass? I told you to study." 24 And then I was like, "Yeah, I didn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then two months passed, and then I went to go try to take the exam again. Again, I really wanted to do it without studying, so -- typical teenager. So I didn't pass again.

Then my dad said, "Okay. This day we're going and you're going to pass. And that's it."

My mom took me the two times before, and my dad was, like, this is getting ridiculous. And especially my mom was diagnosed with cancer, and it would be much easier if I could drive. Right? My dad's at work, and she needs to go to appointments and get checkups.

So I went to go take the test. went to the first DMV. I think it was the one on Flamingo. So we walked in. He picked me up from school, and we drove like a half hour to get there. We walked in, and they said, okay, everything is open except for the testing units, the computers. So I was ready to go home. Right? I was, like, I don't have to do it today. I don't have to fail again. And then he said, "No, no. We're driving 45 minutes the other way to Sahara. You're going to get it today," which is very much Right? You're going to go; you're going my dad. to get it done; we're going to get it done today.

So we're driving over there. Now I'm getting scared, right, because we've invested, like, an hour and a half, two hours into me getting my permit. We're going to have to get there; we're going to have to wait.

So we get there, I go in, and I passed.

And that was -- that was the day before he passed away.

Q. All right. We're going to get to that date.

When your family learns your mom is sick, what changes in the house?

A. I mean, we knew she was sick, but the fact that my dad was there, like, we weren't -the fact that nobody was scared -- right? My dad wasn't scared. My dad was, "Okay. This has happened. She's going to beat it." That's it.
And my mom was confident. Right? But my dad was confident. He was taking action and getting her the best treatment and so on and so forth.

So not much changed in that sense.

Right? We were still functioning. My mom was still working full-time. My dad was still working full-time. We're still getting picked up from school. Everything was still going really well,

L	and	everything	was	looking	positive
---	-----	------------	-----	---------	----------

- Q. Okay. Did mom continue to work?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Have you been to your mom's office?
- 5 A. Yes, many times.
 - Q. After mom was diagnosed, did she have to undergo chemotherapy?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. I'm going to show you what's been entered as 259F into evidence. And the jury has seen it.

Help us understand what this is at your mom's office, Aria.

A. That's -- that's a picture of the kitchen in the office, and that's a bed that one of the people who worked there made for her so she could -- because she knew she had to see patients.

There's people who needed care, and there's people who had been with her for 10 years that she needed to see and she cared about them. But she knew she had to rest, right, if she wanted to overcome the cancer. So she would rest in the kitchen and then go back to work. And this is -- yeah.

Q. All right. Now let's talk about April

the 18th. Where were you and what were you doing when you learned that something had happened to your dad?

A. So -- well, I was picked up from school by a family friend, which wasn't abnormal, right, because both my parents were working. So that would happen on occasion, once a month, once every two weeks. And they took me to their house. And we were preparing to study for a math test that we had the next day, which we were going to cram for because we didn't study. We procrastinated.

So what happened was we went to her house, and then they kind of sat me down and they said, "Okay. Your dad's been in an accident."

And I was, like, okay. I mean, actually my -- yeah, they said, "Your dad's been in an accident."

And I was like -- I wasn't -- I wasn't freaking out because I thought by "accident," they meant car accident. Right? I mean, he'd been rear-ended once before, like, 10 years ago. So I was, like, okay. And that's all they told me. That's all they knew.

So I immediately went, and I called my brother and I asked him. He's like, "Aria, what's

```
going on?" He asked me, "Do you know what's going
 1
 2
    on?"
 3
              And I said no.
              He's like, "Dad's been in an accident."
 4
              And I said, "Yeah, I know that."
 5
 6
              And I was kind of confused about why he
 7
    was so worried, and he told me he was on his bike.
 8
    That's when I realized, okay, it was something --
 9
    something serious.
10
              And so I told him -- he was with my
11
    dad's parents at home. So he told them, "I gave
12
    them, like, a fidget spinner and stuff to keep
13
    them calm." These are toys for ADHD, so he gave
14
    it to them to keep them calm.
15
              And so then he said -- he's like --
16
    he's, "Okay. We'll figure out what's going on."
17
              So I called my mom.
                                   My mom answered.
18
                   Right? Her voice was stable.
    She was calm.
19
              And I was, like, "Okay. Well, can I
20
    speak to him?" I was like, "Is everything okay?"
21
    It's, like, dad went to the hospital.
                                            I said,
22
    "Can I speak with him?"
23
              She's like, "No, no, no. He can't speak
24
    right now. Talk to you later."
25
              I was like okay.
```

And it just kind of progressed from there. I just kind of hung out at the house for a little while. I told my grandparents -- talked to them on the phone. They don't speak English, so I was speaking in Farsi with them, trying to let them know.

Because they were at home, and they said bye to my dad, but he never came back. They were the ones who -- they were like, well, he's been gone for three hours. This is not normal.

Yeah, that's kind of the progression of...

- Q. At some point, who sort of organizes the scene where you and your brother talk to your mom about what's occurred to your father?
- A. My mom? We were brought into another family friend's home. And there my mom said we'll talk about it later. So we went there, and we saw my mom. And she greeted us like usual. I mean, obviously, it was quiet. You could feel there was something, like, in the air.

And then she said, "Okay. We need to sit down". So we sat down on the couch. There were other people in the house, and they kind of gave us privacy. And it was then that she told

```
007779
```

1	us.				
2	Q.	What did she tell you?			
3	A.	She said, "Your dad has been in a bike			
4	accident and didn't make it."				
5		And then I have an essay that I wrote			
6	for English class about what my body went through				
7	when it happened.				
8	Q.	Would that maybe be easier than talking			
9	about it				
10	A.	Yeah.			
11	Q.	reading what you wrote?			
12		MR. CHRISTIANSEN: May I approach,			
13	Judge?				
14		THE COURT: Yes.			
15	BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN:				
16	Q.	Rather than having you describe it, you			
17	wrote an essay for school?				
18	A.	Yeah.			
19	Q.	Would you prefer to read that?			
20	A.	Yes. So my English teacher told us			
21	asked to write a narrative about something that				
22	had happened to us.				
23		MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Aria, before you do,			
24	Judge, Mr. Barger would like to approach, I think.				
25		THE COURT: Certainly.			

1	(A discussion was held at the bench,			
2	not reported.)			
3	THE COURT: Just going to go off the			
4	record for a few minutes. If you need to stand up			
5	and stretch or anything like that, please feel			
6	free to do so.			
7	(Discussion off the record.)			
8	MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Judge, I think we're			
9	ready whenever the Court is.			
10	May I proceed, Your Honor?			
11	THE COURT: Absolutely. Are we back on			
12	the record?			
13	BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN:			
14	Q. All right, Aria. Go ahead and read what			
15	it is you wrote for school to describe that day.			
16	A. So it's titled "The Silence of the			
17	Sight."			
18	"My skin began to burn. The feeling of			
19	a searing metal so close to my skin that my ears			
20	would begin to melt. My ears began to ring.			
21	Thoughts crashed like waves directed on a single			
22	concentrated area, creating an overload of			
23	incomprehensible signals. My body began to shake.			
24	A traumatic state of agony. Temples throbbing,			

though my fists could not remain still. My eyes

immediately filling with a salty fluid that would drip onto my lower lip, finding its way out to my parched taste buds. Although I was seated on the old tea-stained couch, I could no longer feel my feet on the rug, my back against the pillow. I felt as though I was falling, falling through the carpet.

"My alarm went off three times, but I never heard it. My mother walked in and opened my blinds, her usual method of quietly but effectively waking me up. Like any other day, I woke up and took my time getting dressed. Once dressed and groomed, I proceeded to go downstairs to prepare to leave. After saying good-bye to my father's parents, who were visiting from Iran, and kissed my mother, I jumped in the car ready to take on the day.

"I was more lively than usual. The thrill of receiving my drivers permit the day before had not yet rubbed off. On the way to school, like every other morning, my father and I had one of our very common 20-minute-long conversations about what was going on in the world. With the sunrise ahead of us and the silence of the city at 6:30 a.m., we had a very

peaceful commute.

"Once at the school, I said good-bye and went to my first class. The bell rang, and the halls flooded with 3,000 students. Being one of them, I pushed my way through the bevy of angsty teens to the classroom in which my club was meeting. During the meeting, I received a text. The text message came from a classmate and a very close family friend. She was offering me a ride home.

"After my club's meeting, I headed out to the front of the school and met my friend and older sister. The ride offered by my peer was not a surprise. It happened frequently on days when my club met. They mentioned that I was heading to their home to do homework and study with their daughter. We were in the same math class, and we had an exam scheduled for the following day. Once at their home, I set up my study materials to prepare for the long night of cramming that awaited me.

"Before diving in, sister told me that she had something else to tell me. 'Your father has been in a car accident,' the older sister told me with the utmost solemnity.

"My initial reaction, a laugh. I began to laugh at how it was possible that a God or a universe could put my family in such a position, how my mother could have had a metastasizing set of rogue cells and a husband who has wrecked his car in an accident. Despite this, I was not too worried. My father had been rear-ended before, and it only ever ended with repairs in a car shop, never a hospital.

"Being away from home, I immediately called. My brother, flustered, answered the phone and asked me where the hell I was. He asked me if I knew what was going on. I respond with a 'Yes. Dad has been in a car accident.'

"My brother, after a silence so deafening, responded, 'He went for a bike ride and hasn't come back yet.'

"I began to run through every possible and impossible stream of events that could have occurred. My brain went into overdrive while my voice remained calm. I spoke to my father's parents, being bombarded with questions about his current state. These questions I could not answer with the very questions my mind had been answering on its own. My mind had created hundreds of

answers to tens of questions that were burning holes in the minds of my family members. None of these answers were correct.

"I wanted to speak to him. I dialed my mother. She answered like she would any other day. After hearing the stability in her voice, my heart rate eased. She told me he was not able to talk now, but she would call me back soon.

"I spent the next hour on the phone with my brother and grandparents, making sure to keep everyone calm. I spoke to them about my day and asked to hear about theirs. I made sure to keep their minds from wandering to precarious places. Wandering was the worst thing we could do.

"I was taken to a neighbor's home, along with my brother, to see my mom. As I arrived, I was welcomed with hugs and kisses from family members. My brother and I walked up the driveway and to the front door. Without knocking, we walked in through the front door that was already left ajar.

"Through the caliginous hallway, we walked together with my mom in the kitchen. She greeted us both with a hug, as she always did.
Guiding us to the old tea-stained couch, she

wanted to speak to us. As people entered the home, the sight of three of us alone on that couch brought them to tears. My mother began to speak with an arm around us.

"My skin began to burn."

- Q. Did you write this essay close in time to when you went through this?
- A. I wrote this essay about three weeks ago, four weeks ago.
- Q. Does it fairly and accurately reflect sort of your memory of that bad day?
 - A. Yeah. I couldn't forget it.
- Q. Now I want you to, if you can, tell us what you observed your brother go through that day.
- A. My -- my brother -- so he got home from school. He was picked up. He didn't -- he was picked up before me. And when he got home, my grandparents told him, "Where is your dad? He hasn't come back yet."

My brother doesn't speak much Farsi, but he understood enough and he was confused. And so he called my mom. And I think he spoke to her briefly, and she told him, like, "Oh, your dad's been in a bike accident, but don't worry.

Everything is okay."

So he wrote a letter to my dad, like a page letter, telling him that -- how he hopes everything is okay. He's going to speak to him later. Tell him about the day, how everything is going, and hopes -- he's fine and that everything is good and that he's taking care of his parents, that his parents -- he doesn't have to worry about his own parents, that he took care of them. He gave them his little toy that keeps people distracted.

And then my brother -- my brother and I met at the home. And he -- he -- he couldn't take it.

- Q. Okay. How old was Keon?
- A. 13.
 - Q. About the age that one picture I put up of you?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And when you say Keon couldn't take it, help me understand what that means.
 - A. It's hard to put into words, but he -he already -- he started having trouble in school,
 more trouble than he used to with his ADHD. He
 had trouble with his friends. His friends didn't

24

25

Q.

1 know how to approach him. 2 He was having problems at home. 3 just -- he just didn't know -- he would dive into 4 video games, which is what he spent most of his 5 time doing. 6 I told him, "You should stop playing so 7 much video games because it's just not good for 8 you." 9 And he's like, "That's the only thing that could take my mind off of it." 10 11 For me that was music, but for him it 12 was going into a different world and playing a different character. 13 14 So that's what he did when he -- he 15 was -- he struggled with it, and he's still 16 struggling with it. I don't think he's -- yeah. 17 We saw your speech. The judge let me 18 play it for the people in the jury during opening 19 statement. 20 The letter that you're referring to, is 21 that the last, sort of, part of your speech? 22 Α. Yes.

A. We asked my brother -- when they asked

what's he doing during that speech?

And who's standing next to you and

```
me if I wanted to speak at my dad's funeral, I said yes. They said, "Can you ask your brother if he wants to speak?"
```

I asked him, and he said, "No. But just read my letter. I'll come up with you."

So he came up with me. I gave my speech, which you heard, and then I read his letter. He was fidgeting with his hand on the side and he was crying his eyes out.

Q. You told us about yourself. You told us about your brother.

Mom. Tell us about your mom.

A. My mom -- there's so much to say. She was the most caring person I'd ever met, like, ever, whether it was in books, in movies, or in real life. And that -- that always confused me at how somebody could be so -- so kind, because -- I mean, at this point I was just being exposed to the world and seeing all the sorts of terrible people there are in the world out there.

And I was, like, how is somebody so kind? She never judges anybody and she cares so much about her patients that she'd go in on weekends, on Saturdays, on Sunday nights. Like, during the middle of dinner, she'd get a call and

1 | she'd go.

And that was the main thing that stuck out to me about my mom, was her ability, when she'd see somebody, to not judge them. And she always told me -- I spoke about it in my speech at her funeral -- that, like, when you see somebody on the street, don't judge them.

And I always said people -- we judge people. Right? That's just what we do as human beings, or even as animals. Like, you judge people. You have perceptions of them based off of what they're doing at the time or what they're wearing or if somebody cuts you off on the highway, you immediately think, oh, wow, what a mean person. But maybe they're in a rush to go do something that's much more important or so on and so forth.

So she always taught me these lessons, and we'd often get into arguments about how I should never judge anyone. And sometimes I'd say, "Well, that's just what humans do."

But she was always able to keep her eyes open, and she never -- she's the only person I've ever met who doesn't have any enemies. Everybody loved her. Everybody who I met loved -- even

people who did bad things to her, took advantage
for her, she still -- she never wanted revenge,
never wanted anything bad for them.

- Q. Okay. That's your mom generally?
- A. Yeah.

- Q. Tell us what you observed the night she had to tell you and your brother your father had passed.
- A. She -- after she told us, we went into a room, a bedroom, in the same house. And we just -- I mean, I was freaking out. Not openly, right. I wasn't, like, running in circles. But in my mind, I was just in overdrive, and my brother, the same thing. We were kind of talking to each other but not really talking to each other.

She had known for longer than we had, but she -- I mean, she -- she held together on the outside, but I could tell on the inside she was falling apart. The one person she had been with her whole life, you know, is gone now in the time that she needs him most. So she -- like she'd often sleep with his T-shirt at nighttime and all sorts of stuff.

Q. Explain if you would -- the time your

1 dad passes, mom is going through chemotherapy?

A. Yes.

- Q. Before your mom -- before your dad passed, who took your mom to lots of her doctors appointments?
 - A. My dad.
 - Q. Dad is a doctor; right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What was the family -- I think you told us -- the family's outlook was generally positive?
- A. Yeah. My dad -- my dad wasn't -- wasn't worried. He took care of the situation. "We're going to get you the best treatment." Just like he was passionate about cigars or operas or my college education, he became passionate about helping my mom and making sure she got better. That's what he spent his time doing. Reading, seeing people who were in the same age group, who had the same genetic makeup, what's happened to them, and what he could do to help her.
 - Q. Supportive?
 - A. Yes. Extremely.
- Q. Did you have a chance, after your father passed away, to see how the lack of his support, his absence, affected your mother?

A. Yes.

Q. Help us understand -- none of us were there, Aria, so help us understand how it affected your mom.

A. My mom and my dad, it was -- like I said, they were a good team. Right? They bounced off each other with everything. Right? No one person did everything alone. And so everything they did as a family and everything we did together was all a joint decision between the two them.

And especially when you have to make huge decisions about who's your doctor, what kind of chemotherapy you're getting, what's going to happen in the future, you know what I mean? You know, like, all those big decisions that happens when somebody is diagnosed with stage 4 cancer, she needed him, and she — they were always together and they were always making decisions together and they were always real good at that.

And my dad, after she was diagnosed, the only thing that kept her positive was my dad being there and being, okay, this is all working well. Everything was going well. So we weren't worried. Although she was stage 4, she was -- she was doing

1 | amazing. Right? She was still able to work.

She was -- every day she was getting better. And my dad was there to keep kind of the energy going in the house to make sure everything was still flowing the same way, to make sure that nothing skipped a beat. Right? He was there to make sure everything was working.

And then when he wasn't there, like, none of us -- none of us knew what to do. Right? Not because we all depended on him, but we all depended on each other. So when one piece is missing, especially in a time when you need all the pieces there and working all together, it made it extremely difficult.

- Q. Did your mom grieve privately?
- A. Yes. Well, my mom felt that she needed to -- she needed to hold it together for me and Keon. And she felt that she -- she had to hold on and fight for me and my brother. But -- so most of her grieving was done in private, but you'd catch her every now and then on the couch or when she was doing something or on her way or driving or see something that reminded her of him, yeah, she'd cry.
 - Q. Sound like prior to your dad's passing,

he offered a lot of support and comfort to your mom. Is that fair?

A. Absolutely.

- Q. Did you have a chance to observe your mom without that support and comfort after your dad passed?
- A. Yes. After my dad passed, my mom -- my mom needed that support and comfort. And she was getting it to some extent from me and my brother and all her friends and community. It was -- I mean, the people who came when they heard what happened, it was -- it was insane.

And they were offering so much love and support, but nothing could ever match what my dad would have given her and what he was giving her.

And you could tell she wasn't the same person.

And then slowly, after time went by, her health started to decline because, I mean, she needed somebody there with her, right, like she had her whole life, my dad. And even when she was diagnosed, the months leading up to before he died, everything was working out well because he was there. And then, after, when he wasn't, everything went to hell.

Q. Did your mom keep a piece of your

father's jewelry on her after he passed?

A. Yes. She wore his wedding band on her neck, a necklace.

- Q. Aria, you told me about your brother and your mom. How did you grieve?
- A. I -- I mean -- when my dad passed, I'm the oldest son. So I had -- I took on the role in the family as the man of the family. And I felt that I had to hold it together. As long as I was holding it together, my mom could hold it together, my brother could hold it together, my mom's parents could hold it together, my dad's parents could hold it together, everything would be fine. And so that's what I had to do on the exterior; right? So I very, very rarely cried in the open; privately and through music.
- Q. I'm not musically inclined, so help me understand how one grieves through music.
- A. So I play multiple instruments. I play guitar -- mostly guitar and piano, violin, drums, bass. And I listen to a lot of music. I listened to a lot of music with my dad and he influenced my tastes, but also we butted heads on a lot of stuff.

But I ended up listening to a lot of

music and recording a lot of music. And I recorded a lot of songs, not necessarily they had vocals or lyrics, but just a lot of guitar songs or piano songs, and so on and so forth, to kind of help me express what I needed to express because there's no words in English, right, to express what you feel. And music, it's like, for me, was the channel. Like, for my brother, it was something else. For my mom, it was something else. But, for me, that's how I did it, and how I continue to do it.

- Q. Your dad passed in April of last year. The next window of time is -- if I -- we'll do this. Why don't I just use the day of your mom's deposition, September 22nd. This is just a photo from the video the ladies and gentlemen of the jury saw on Friday. It is about 20 days before your mom passed away?
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. Physically, how is your mom doing at this time?
- A. I mean, you can see she doesn't look the same as like she used to in the other photos with my dad and with us. And she was -- she was starting to get really tired and fatigued and

couldn't do as much, which frustrated her because her whole life she was somebody who was always doing stuff; right? Whether it was as a mom, as a wife, or as a dentist, or as a friend, she was always actively doing things; right? She could never just sit. And that can get hard for her. She couldn't do things. She would get tired halfway through the day and she would have to take a nap, which she never had to before.

- Q. At some point in time, sort of towards the end of September, did your mom have to go to the hospital?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Around that time, what discussions, if any, did your mom have with you and your brother about your future, you and Keon, what was going to happen to you?
- A. She -- she spoke to us about what the plan would be if she passed away, which was not an easy conversation. You can imagine, right?

 Because, at that point, I was not thinking it would be anytime soon and neither was my brother.

And so she -- I mean, it was pretty cool. She involved us in the planning of what would happen to us. Usually, I guess, most

parents would sign a document and say, okay, this
is what I want for my children. But she involved
us in that conversation.

So she said, "Well, Babak and Marie-Claude are going to be your guardians. You're going to move to Montreal," and so on and so on.

- Q. Did you want to pick up in the middle of your junior year and move to Montreal?
 - A. No.

- Q. Where did you want to finish school?
- A. I wanted to finish at Clark High School. And I honestly fought for that, but I really, really tried to make that work to make sure I could stay at Clark. That's where my parents wanted me to go, that's where they set it up, and that's where I thought would be the best place for me.

I was trying to get into one of the hardest schools to get into in the world, and I had set up, like, my teachers and who was going to write my letters of recommendation and when I would take my SATs. I was really studying really hard. And so that was all, like, planned. My dad helped me plan that. I didn't want to throw that

away and move to a different country and start at a new school because they have a different education system there. But that's where I wanted to finish, and that's where I still want to finish, but it just didn't work.

- Q. Part of your desire to finish at Clark have something to do with that's where your dad wanted you to go?
 - A. Yes. Absolutely.
- Q. And you said you fought. Knowing you a little bit, was it more of a healthy debate?
- A. Yes. Oh, absolutely. I mean, the fact that my uncles even let me look at the options and let me talk to them about it like I was a real adult was really good for me. Because I was, like, okay, we can make the decision together versus somebody is making it for me, which is what my mom ultimately wanted for us.
- Q. How about Keon? Did you get to observe what Keon had to sort of process through upon realizing your mom might not make it?
- A. He -- he had a hard time coming to the realization. Like, he had a hard time facing that -- that this was going to happen. He didn't want to believe that this was going to happen,

that he was going to move. I mean, he had just started high school, and being a freshman in high school with 3,000 kids is not easy. And he had just started to make friends and meet girls and so on.

And he had -- and then the whole thing was coming to him that, oh, I might be moving soon. I might have a completely different life. I'm going to be speaking a different language in a different country and living in a different home with different parents. Like, all of that at one time was too much for a kid like him to handle.

- Q. When you say "for a kid like him," does Keon outwardly express emotions differently?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You're his big brother. Tell me how he does it.

A. He's a very complex individual. He -- I can't even fully understand it. And my mom and my dad had a hard time, and his teachers and his friends have a hard time understanding him. But he has a very difficult time handling grief and pain and everything like that.

And so whether it's physical or emotional, he channels it through anger; right?

25

```
1
    He'll get angry, and he'll put that anger into
 2
    something else because he doesn't want to yell at
 3
    someone or do something. So he'd go on his drums
 4
    and bang it out, or he would play his video games
 5
                 I could tell he had trouble because he
    and so on.
 6
    didn't know how to talk to someone about it.
 7
    didn't have somebody he could talk to about it.
 8
              He wanted to talk to my mom about it,
 9
    but he thought, "If I talk to my mom about it,
10
    it's just going to remind her of the pain," and so
11
    on and so forth.
12
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
                                  Ms. Court Recorder,
13
    can I have the control to my side, please.
14
               Shane, can you show me the Keon clip,
15
    please.
16
               (Video played.)
17
              "QUESTION:
                          Tell me to the extent you can
18
         what you went through when you learned your
19
         father passed.
20
                        It was really hard for me.
              "ANSWER:
21
         just, like, couldn't believe what happened.
22
         It was just, like, what the hell?
                                             It was so,
23
         like -- it was so surprising."
```

MR. CHRISTIANSEN:

That's good, Shane.

BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN:

- Q. That's a clip the jury got to hear of Keon last week. As his big brother, what's that saying to you?
- A. He's -- he's all cried out. He's -- he doesn't know what to do -- he doesn't know what else to say. He's just beyond -- beyond any of that.
- Q. Did Keon ever have blond hair before your parents passed?
 - A. No.
- Q. That depo was taken November the 3rd, so about three weeks after your mom passed?
 - A. Yep.
- Q. Help us understand the last few days of your mom's life, Aria.
- A. So my mom was taken to the hospital, and my brother and I were told that she was being taken for a test. And then she never left after the test. So we were -- I slept in the hospital for one or two nights. It's a string of a blur of not comprehending what's going on; right?

You're in the hospital at 17 with your 14-year-old brother and, like, everybody is flying in from everywhere. You're kind of confused.

And, basically, it took me a few days to hit me, but I understood that it's either going to happen -- she's going to pass -- she could pass in the next hour or the next three days or the next two weeks.

And I didn't comprehend that at the time. Like, I couldn't -- I knew I had to do certain things because I knew I had to do them, but I didn't know why I had to do them. And those certain things were I went back to the house and I'd dig through a bunch of stuff. I wanted her to see old letters, pictures, like my dad's diploma, her diploma, pictures of them together, love letters written back and forth, all that sort of stuff, the McDonald's hat, all that sort of things, right? I mean, ultimately, she's preparing to go with him.

So it was -- it was, like, days of not sleeping and sort of sleeping during the day and so forth. And I wasn't in school. And the family was coming in. People were flying in from all over the world. And I was told by my mom, she said, "Call these people. I want to say goodbye to them."

And that was the toughest thing because

```
I had to make phone calls and tell people, "You need to come." So people drove, they flew. And it was just -- like, looking back at it, it was just a blur. It was -- it was extremely difficult.
```

- Q. We heard from your aunt, Marie-Claude, last week via her videotaped deposition that, at times, she even slept with your mother at the hospital. Do you recall that?
 - A. Yes.

Q. Physically, what was your mom going through?

A. I don't know the medical terms, but I can tell you what I saw. I mean, she was thinning in the face. I had never seen her look like that. And her hair was thinner than what you saw there. She had, like, a yellowish tint in her eyes from some sort of chemical or something in her body. She had all these tubes tied up to her. Her legs were bloating, they were growing. They were, like, three times their size. And she couldn't move.

So she had -- I mean, seeing your mom like that, somebody who you had seen your whole life who was working out, running, doing all sorts

of stuff with the family and enjoying that, was really difficult to see.

- Q. In your mind, had your dad been around, how would things have been different? Not physically; I don't want to talk about that. How would the dynamics of your family have been different had your dad been there to go through this with your mother?
- A. I think -- I think she would have been in a much better place knowing that he was there with her; right? Because she -- ultimately, she wanted that. She was wearing his ring. She had a bunch of pictures of him in the room. And she was trying to mimic or create the environment of him being there, right, although he couldn't be there.

So -- right? She had her wallet, pictures on her phone. She would go through them every day and so on. And so I think my dad being there would have helped her mental state. I'm not sure about physical. I mean, I'm pretty sure she would have done much better than she would have if he was there, but in terms of mentally and the family dynamic, everything would have been much stronger.

Q. Aria, what day did your mom pass?

- 1 A. October -- October 12th.
 - Q. Early morning hours, sort of right after the midnight hour?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Before your mom passed, you talked -the ladies and gentlemen of the jury heard your
 mom explain that there were some documents you and
 your brother got to read and sign. Is that what
 you were referring to as being pretty cool that
 your mom involved you with?
- A. Yes. Those documents were the list of 20 or so things that would happen in case she passed away, who the family trust would go to, where we would live, who would take care of us, where we'd go to school, all those decisions.
- Q. After your mom passes, we know the order -- which I may not have covered with you, Aria.

Back when your dad, in April, dies, the funeral that we saw your speech of was from Las Vegas. Was that the first service?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Where did you bury your father? I'm sorry. I forgot to ask you that question.
 - A. In Montreal.

A.

1	Q. Did you have another service for your
2	dad in Montreal?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Jump forward with me to October. Your
5	mom passes on the 12th. What's the order of the
6	services for Katy, for your mother?
7	A. We did the reverse. So we did Montreal
8	service first and then we did a service in Las
9	Vegas.
10	Q. Do you remember in time when the
L1	Montreal service was from the time she passed
12	away?
13	A. I don't remember exactly, but within a
L 4	few days.
15	Q. Marie-Claude, your aunt, told the jury
16	on the video that she recalled taking her and
L 7	Alicia taking their eight kids and then you, Babak
18	and Siamak and your brother showing up the next
19	day with suitcases to Montreal.
20	Do you remember that?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. What was it like to pack a suitcase and
23	leave your house?

I mean, everybody moves in their

lifetime, but moving under these circumstances

25

Q.

A.

Yes.

```
was -- I mean, again, like, I'm in shock the whole
 1
 2
    time; right? I'm like how -- like, six months
 3
    ago, right, my dad passed away and now I'm flying
 4
    to a different country to live there.
 5
               I mean, I was in disbelief.
                                             I was -- I
 6
    was just doing stuff by doing stuff.
                                            I wasn't
 7
    even like -- it was -- I can't really even explain
 8
    what it was like.
 9
               Were those the first words you uttered
         Q.
10
    in the speech at your mom's funeral in Montreal,
11
    "six months ago, I was standing here doing the
12
    same thing"?
13
         Α.
               Yeah.
14
         Q.
              Where did you bury your mom?
15
              Right next to my dad in Montreal.
         Α.
16
               I'm going to show you what's been
         Q.
17
    entered by way of stipulation as Exhibit 118.
18
               MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Ms. Court Recorder,
19
    can I have back the ELMO.
                                I'm sorry.
                                             That's my
20
    fault.
            Sorry about that.
21
    BY MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
22
               What's that exhibit, Aria?
         Q.
23
         Α.
               That's my mom and dad's headstone.
```

At the Mount Royal Cemetery in Montreal?

- O. Buried next to each other?
- 2 A. Yes.

- Q. Let's talk about -- so when you arrive in Canada with the suitcases, as we heard from Marie-Claude and you, did you -- was it to stay?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. How does an American citizen go about getting into a Canadian school?
- A. It's probably one of the most difficult things to do. So coming from the U.S., the Canadian high school system is different. They finish in 11th grade and not 12th grade.

And every student is bilingual, so you speak English and French. And so we only speak English.

And every student, at the end of their high school career, has to take certain exams, certain tests, right, in order to pass, get a high school diploma. I mean, I was planning on getting a high school diploma in the states, but things didn't work out. And so I had to take -- I had to take five exams that I had no idea what they were within the span of two months, three months in order to graduate high school or else I wouldn't have graduated high school.

And in order to get -- I went to school in an English school, but in order to get that, it was weeks and weeks of calls between the government and the ministry of education in Canada to allow us to go to an English school because most students in Montreal go to French school.

All of Babak and Marie-Claude's kids go to French school. And to get my brother and I to go to English school was a task.

And then, even after that, I had to learn all of Canada's history in the span of five weeks in order to pass and graduate high school. I had to learn all of physics in six weeks. My math, I got an equivalency for because I went to an advanced math school. But the English test and the French tests, those were extremely challenging. And so I studied like crazy, which helped me keep my mind off of what was going on. But, about a month ago, I passed the exams and I'm set to graduate high school.

Q. Aria, after your mom and dad passed away, did you have any family members -- adult family members, here in Las Vegas, Nevada, that could care or provide parental love and support for you?

A. No.

Q. What was the -- during the healthy debate about Aria staying at Clark or going elsewhere, what was the straw that broke the camel's back? What was the final thing that made you decide to go to Canada? Who was it?

A. My brother.

I wanted to stay at Clark. Like I said before, I had a lot of good friends. I had -- I mean, we -- just three weeks ago, they got three kids into Stanford and two into Harvard and so on. And that's what I wanted to go for and I didn't want to leave that.

I had spent 2 1/2 years developing that, working towards becoming the president of clubs, and really studying extremely hard with these other kids who were also studying really hard.

And I didn't want to leave. But my brother had to leave. He couldn't stay and finish high school because he was only in 9th grade.

And I knew that my parents put me at Clark and put my brother at Clark for me to take care of him; right? That was their vision. It was for me to go to the same school as my brother so I could take care of a kid with ADHD who had

now lost both his parents. So I knew that that's exactly what I needed to do. So, in the end, I decided to go to school in Montreal regardless of having to study for six weeks all of Canadian history and physics and math and English and French and so on and having to make new friends and go to a completely different school because my brother, he needed me. He needed me to be there for him.

- Q. The extended family that you live with in Montreal, are they close?
 - A. Extremely.
- Q. What are your feelings about them? Grateful?
- A. Absolutely. We've always been close. My mom, it's her older brother. We'd go visit every summer or every other summer to see them and the kids. We're a group of 10 cousins. I'm the oldest. But, again, that comes with its own -- its own problems.
- Q. Given your choice, would you rather be here with your dad?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How about your brother?
- 25 A. Here with my dad. It's not -- it's not

easy living there. It's difficult. I mean, we have great support, but --

- Q. Did you have -- it sounds like, in your mind, you believed your mom gave you some choices. Did your brother have any choices at 13?
- A. She gave him -- she gave him the ability to choose, but he knew -- he knew that he was going to move and that's what was going to happen to him.
- Q. You described for the ladies and gentlemen of the jury some of the experiences you got to have with your dad as you got a little older. And you used puberty, I think, as the watermark of what you remembered.

What experiences did you get to have that Keon missed with your father?

A. My dad was always -- I mean, you can see in the photos, he was always there for us. Like, we'd wrestle on the couch or, like, we'd make a band. My brother would play drums, I'd play bass, and my dad would play guitar. We'd play rock songs and so on. He was very hands-on in that sense at soccer games and band performances.

And then when we got older, even more, which is amazing. Right? Because usually kids

distance themselves from their parents. I got even closer. My dad was there to not only help me with academics but just in terms of life advice. Like, what happens when you have a problem with a friend, right, and you want to fix that problem? Like, the best way to learn is from your dad or a guy who's been through that.

Or if you want to ask a girl out on a date, how do you do that? How do you go about doing that? And he was the master at that.

So all these sort of lessons that I got to learn as I got older, my brother, unfortunately, won't get -- or at least not the same from his own father.

- Q. What do you do to try to fill that void for your brother?
- A. I -- it's -- it's hard. I try to -- I try to think like my dad would, which is not easy. When something happens to Keon, what do I tell him that's something that my dad would tell him? How do I teach the messages that my dad would teach? Like, if he has an issue with a friend at school or he's having behavioral problems because of his ADHD, what would my parents tell him?

And I don't know what it is. So I have

L	to kind of think like my parents would.	He's not
2	going to get the same thing that I got.	So I have
3	to do my best to translate that.	

- Q. Was it discussed within your family whether you and your brother would go on past high school to college and graduate school?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And what was the expectation relative to your father helping with those types of things?
- A. He was the -- just like he was the main leader in terms of planning the vacations, he was the one planning our futures and helping us plan our futures to where we would go to school and help us with whatever it is you want to do -- doctor or musician or businessman or whatever it is.
- Q. Financially, was your dad the main breadwinner in the family?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Any doubt in your mind he would have always taken care of your mother?
 - A. No doubt in my mind.
 - Q. Junior year is this year?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. They have proms in Canada? Dances?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Is that a type of a thing that your dad won't get to see you go through, and your brother?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. High school graduation?
- A. Yep.
- Q. College?
- A. Yeah.
 - Q. Girlfriends?
- A. Yeah.
- Q. Wife?
- A. Yeah.
- B Q. Kids?
- A. Yeah.
 - Q. Lastly, Aria, why don't you help us understand the thing that makes you the most proud about your dad.
 - A. What makes me the most proud of my dad is his ability to come from nothing, zero, with no family and no support, to being able to create a family where he is the -- where he is the support and he is the one who's putting us in a better place than he was because of his ability to do good and to strive and to study hard and to really create opportunities for himself and for his

family.

Like, I've never met somebody who's able to overcome what he did. Right? Leaving your parents at 17 and going to a different country and learning a new school system there and being able to manage that and work at a McDonald's and to drink the condensed milk there because you couldn't afford milk at a grocery store and to do all those things that he did just so he could create a better life for his kids. That's what will ultimately drive me into, hopefully, being as good a dad as he was.

- Q. How about as good of a husband? Tell us about the running joke between your mom and your dad. The ladies and gentlemen got to hear it from your mom. She said your dad was picky and she told your dad she felt lucky he picked her.
- A. Yes. They always had a running joke of who loved who more. It was a big game of flirting. They were really good at it. And I said it in my speech, but, like, if I can find, like, love like that at some point in my life, I'm super, super lucky.

And he was -- he was a picky guy.

There's a funny story, actually, that he -- I

24

25

1 mean, when he wanted to -- he knew he was going to 2 marry my mom, but he gave her a test. So he came 3 home one day and he said, "I've been robbed. 4 Everything I've got is gone." It wasn't much at 5 the time, but "Everything I've got is gone." 6 And my mom -- and he was testing to see 7 if my mom would stay with him. Right? He knew 8 she would, but he just wanted -- he just wanted --9 would play games with her, and he continued to do 10 this all throughout -- all throughout their 11 marriage. Right? April Fool's jokes or so on. 12 They'd plan a trip, a staycation at a hotel here 13 or so on and so forth. He always -- he always 14 played games with her, and she loved it. 15 acted like she was angry. It was a big flirting 16 I told you, it's true love. 17 But he asked her. He said, "Everything 18 I've got is gone." 19 And she said, "Let's fix it." 20 started taking steps. Eventually he told her, 21 "I'm just kidding," and she got really angry at 22 him.

But that was -- I mean, they'd play these sorts of games with each other about who loved who more and what they would do if certain

things happened.

And that was their relationship. And it stayed like that until the very end. I mean, it would amaze me. Like, I'd see my friends' -- my friends' parents grow old and kind of grow separate. And you don't see that among them, but their love was like the same day. Like, in that picture, it's like the same picture. Right? It happened, like, 20-something years or 19 years later, and then 19 years ago was the same, same thing.

Q. Aria, you reminded me of a housekeeping matter that I need to take care of.

At your dad's funeral, not only did you give a speech, which the people of the jury have seen, but you also put a musical compilation and some photos together; is that fair?

- A. Yes.
- Q. We've marked that as Exhibit 117, I think, B. Did you pick the music?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. I remember one of the songs was a Bee Gees song?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- Q. And what was that?

A.	"How	Deep	Is	Your	Love.	•
----	------	------	----	------	-------	---

- Q. Was that something your dad sang to your mom regularly?
 - A. Yeah.

- Q. And that video stream is just to music.

 After you went through the introduction, there's
 no words to it; is that right?
 - A. Pardon?
- Q. The collage that kind of you did of all the family photos, it's played to music of your choosing?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Music that had important sentimental value to your parents?
- A. Yes. Yes. The songs, like "How Deep Is Your Love" or two Persian songs was -- I mean, I made a joke of my dad, like, if he didn't play guitar or sing, he couldn't have got my mom. But those are songs that he used to sing for her on, like, their first dates or on stage and so on. That's what he did.

He had a band in medical school, and he invited her to a gig, right, to woo her. So he played a love song, and he fell off the stage and broke his back. And my mom -- my mom took care of

1	him, took him back to his apartment and made him			
2	pasta.			
3	Q. You mean he got hurt. He didn't really,			
4	like, snap his back or any			
5	A. No. He he injured his back.			
6	Q. Got it, got it.			
7	A. But I'm sure he acted like it was worse			
8	so he could get her to take care of him.			
9	Q. Hamming it up big.			
10	Finally, Aria, your family had expenses			
11	for the burial of your dad and transport of him			
12	back to Canada?			
13	A. Yes.			
14	Q. We won't go through that. Mr. Barger			
15	has been kind enough to stipulate to those, but I			
16	wanted to make sure that was incurred. It was?			
17	A. Yes.			
18	MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Court's indulgence.			
19	THE COURT: Certainly.			
20	MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Aria, nothing else			
21	from me, buddy.			
22	MR. BARGER: Can we take a short break,			
23	restroom break?			
24	THE COURT: 10-minute break?			
25	We're going to take a 15-minute break,			

ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to admonish you.

You're instructed not to talk with each other or with anyone else about any subject or issue connected with this trial. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case or by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet, or radio.

You're not to conduct any research on your own relating to this case, such as consulting dictionaries, using the internet, or using any reference materials. You're not to conduct any investigation, test any theory of the case, re-create any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case on your own.

You're not to talk with others, text others, tweet others, message others, google issues, or conduct any other kind of book or computer research with regard to any issue, party, witness, or attorney involved in this case.

You are not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

```
15-minute break.
 1
 2
              THE MARSHAL: All rise.
                                        Jury is
 3
    exiting.
 4
                 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
 5
                 (The following proceedings were held
 6
                  outside the presence of the jury.)
 7
               THE MARSHAL: Please remain seated.
 8
    Come to order.
 9
              THE COURT: Are we on the record?
                                                   Let's
10
    go back on the record.
11
               THE COURT RECORDER:
                                    We're on the
12
    record, Your Honor.
                          All right.
13
              THE COURT:
                                      Before the
    plaintiff rests, I have a couple questions about
14
15
    exhibits, but we can do that during the -- once we
16
    have the jury.
17
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN: We were going to try
18
    to do the housekeeping stuff.
                                    I think Ms. Works
19
    has already talked to your clerk. We're going to
20
    double-check over lunch, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT:
                           Very good.
22
              MR. ROBERTS:
                            Your Honor, I had
23
    something.
                Marshal --
24
              THE MARSHAL: I'll just get them lined
25
    up.
```

1 MR. ROBERTS: May I approach? 2 THE COURT: Certainly. Thank you. 3 MR. ROBERTS: Your Honor, there's one 4 thing that we're considering going into on 5 cross-examination of this witness. 6 THE COURT: Yes. 7 And it goes back to MR. ROBERTS: 8 Friday, to the videotaped deposition of Katy 9 Barin. 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 And we believe that that's MR. ROBERTS: 12 opened the door to otherwise inadmissible 13 evidence, but because this is a very sensitive 14 issue, I thought it appropriate to raise it with 15 the Court and to get the Court's permission on 16 both whether the subject can be inquired into and 17 permissible scope. 18 Certainly. THE COURT: 19 The trial testimony from MR. ROBERTS: Friday is what I've handed the Court, page 238 of 20 21 the official transcript. This is Katy Barin 22 talking, and she talks about how we don't have his 23 income, her husband, Dr. Khiabani. "So it's had a 24 huge -- I mean, my older son," and that's the

witness that's on the stand now.

1 Yes. What line are you? THE COURT: 2 MR. ROBERTS: I'm on line 22, Your 3 Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. MR. ROBERTS: "So it's had a huge -- I 5 6 mean, my older son, and I think even Keon, they're 7 very conscious of that. They're always worried, 8 and they're constantly worrying about the future 9 and, oh, we're broke. Honestly, one of the first 10 things Keon, he was like, 'Can we afford to live 11 in this house?'" 12 Line 8 and 9 on page 239, but "Can we 13 afford to do that for me the same way we did for 14 my brother?" 15 Later on in the page, they're worried 16 they can't afford birthday gifts for friends 17 because they're broke and they don't have any 18 money. 19 And then with regard to Aria also, 20 scholarships --21 What page? I'm sorry. THE COURT: 22 Page 239, lines 12 through MR. ROBERTS: 23 16, is where this witness is concerned that he 24 can't afford birthday gifts for friends "because 25 we're broke. We don't have any money."

THE COURT: Understood.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, the Court has already held that evidence of the settlements with the other defendants are not admissible. And, in fact, we're very aware of the general rule set forth in Moore v. Bannen, 799 P.2d, 564, where the court adopted the Vermont rule and that said in order to avoid speculation by the jury, improper speculation, that the jury cannot be informed about the existence of settling co-defendants and that both the amount of the settlement and the existence of a settlement is inadmissible due to that concern.

The statutory prohibition is at NRS 41.141, Subsection 3, where the legislature provided that if a defendant in such an action settles with the plaintiff before the entry of judgment, the comparative negligence of that defendant in the amount of the settlement must not thereafter be admitted into evidence nor considered by the jury.

So we've got two prohibitions, the comparison negligence of the defendant that settled out and the settlement. We've got to be careful that, inquiring about this issue, we don't

run afoul of that statutory prohibition and the general rule in Moore v. Bannen.

I think, without the plaintiffs playing this testimony, that this witness and his younger brother believed they had no money and they were broke, there would be no need to go into this.

But, really, the fact that they're broke and have no money is not relevant to any issue the jury has to determine. And it would seem to only be played to the jury to attempt to influence the jury to render a decision through improper sympathy to the boys because they're broke and this is the only way they'll have money, is if they give them an award.

We're all familiar with the idea of opening the door. I think a very helpful description from the 9th Circuit was, quote, "Under the rule of curative admissibility, or the opening-the-door doctrine, the introduction of inadmissible evidence by one party allows an opponent, in the court's discretion, to introduce evidence on the same issue to rebut any false impression that may have resulted from the earlier admission."

So in this case the false impression is

that the boys have no money and that they're broke. And as the Court is aware, there is on -- we have -- it's under seal and we have an audience here, but the Court is aware of the substantial nature of the prior settlement. So, therefore, there is a false impression with the jury now due to the plaintiff eliciting testimony that the boys are broke and have no money.

There may be a way to address this without eliciting any implication of settlement, and that deals with the testimony by the witness just before the break that he was now familiar with the terms of the family trust and that had been shared with him.

So my thought was is to remind the jury of the testimony from Dr. Barin, tell the witness what the jury heard. "You mentioned before the break that you've had the terms of the family trust explained to you. Is it fair to say, based on your total knowledge of the finances of you and your brother, you're no longer concerned about having enough money? You don't think you're broke anymore?"

And that's all I would want to do and leave it at that. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. KEMP: Your Honor, first of all, there was a motion in limine ruling on this, and the Court has ruled that they cannot bring in the fact or amount of the prior settlements. They've never filed a motion for a hearing on this. The testimony he's referring to of Dr. Barin was played on Friday. That is not testimony that the kids are broke. That is testimony that, after the death, the kids had a discussion with their mother about whether they're broke or not. This discussion took place in April 2017, which is six months before the Michelangelo settlement.

And also point out the Michelangelo settlement still hasn't been approved by the probate court or the state court, so it's still a contingent settlement.

But, in any event, there was no evidence presented by the plaintiffs that the kids were broke at this point in time. All there is is a discussion in this deposition of a concern about being broke.

And if they had had a problem with this area, they should have brought it up when we did the page/line designations of Dr. Barin. They didn't object to this. They didn't make one

comment about it. They just let it come in.

So, first of all, there's been no opening the door here because this is not a discussion about the current financial situation of the children. It's a discussion about their concerns after their father died.

Second of all, they should have raised this earlier, Your Honor. And so to suggest that we're going to violate a motion in limine, do something that's prohibited by Nevada law, the Moore case, never done by any court in this jurisdiction, allowing evidence of settlements of other defendants, based upon this, Your Honor, this is just a real -- I wouldn't even call in a Hail Mary pass, Your Honor.

So for this reason, there should be no discussion whatsoever about the trust, the amount, you know, anything of that nature, Your Honor, no discussion whatsoever. There's been no door opening here whatsoever.

THE COURT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honor, I haven't suggested that I should be able to get either the existence or the amount of settlement into evidence. And even if none of the settlements had

happened, they've now brought in the fact that he thought he was broke in April, and they've now elicited evidence that there's a family trust.

Certainly, I should at least be able to inquire that "The jury heard these discussions. They happened right after your father died. You weren't aware of the family finances. You're now aware of the family trusts and the general finances of the family. You don't have that concern anymore, do you?" And leave it at that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I have a question for you,
Mr. Roberts. Were you or anyone on the defense -any of the defense counsel, did you have an
opportunity to view Dr. Barin's deposition before
it was played?

MR. ROBERTS: I did not, Your Honor.

Another attorney in my office did. Mr. Barger reviewed and tried to resolve the conflicts that remained, but he was only looking at things the parties had objected to. So he hadn't read -- he had not looked at this either.

MR. KEMP: Judge, Mr. Roberts was at the deposition. He attended.

MR. ROBERTS: I did. I did. I did

1 attend the deposition. 2 THE COURT: Yes, I heard you 3 cross-examine. 4 MR. ROBERTS: I didn't know it hadn't 5 been objected to until I heard it in court. 6 MS. WORKS: Your Honor, Mr. Barger and I 7 negotiated, with respect to those page/line 8 designations, at length. The clips in their 9 entirety, a transmission of the transcript was 10 sent to defense counsel the night before the 11 deposition was played. The video -- the video 12 clip in its entirety was sent to the defense the 13 night before it was played. They had the 14 opportunity to object, to review the designations. 15 Even after we argued, they had a final before it 16 was presented to the jury, and not once was the 17 objection raised. 18 So, again, Your Honor, MR. ROBERTS: 19 assuming that any objection has been waived, what 20 we're left with is them putting in this 21 evidence -- them putting in this evidence, not 22 us -- and them eliciting that he now knows about 23 the family trust. 24 So I should at least be able to inquire 25 with the witness about the things they have

23

24

25

1 affirmatively put into evidence, even if I've 2 waived any objection with regard to the fact of 3 the settlement making it very misleading for the 4 jury to believe that the boys are broke at this 5 point in time. 6 THE COURT: Anything else, 7 Mr. Christiansen, Mr. Kemp? 8 Judge, the only thing MR. CHRISTIANSEN: 9 I'd ask you to do is take a look at the pattern 10 jury instruction that says that whether or not 11 something is received or paid is irrelevant. 12 "The right to receive support from 13 another is not destroyed by the fact that the 14 former does not need the support or by the fact 15 that the latter has not provided it." 16 That's our pattern instruction that 17 you're going to give. So none of this is 18 relevant. All it is is an effort to taint the 19 jury against this family. 20 And there's nothing -- I'm looking at 21 the quote from Aria, and I didn't ask any

questions about a trust. Aria answered who the

Didn't say the money, who the family trust would

go, where we would live, who would take care of

family trust would go, where we would live.

007833

us, where we would go to school, all those decisions.

Nothing about money. The trust doesn't elicit money necessarily. It could be who's going to take care of you, you know, who's going to be your guardian.

So, clearly, they're just making stuff up in an effort to taint the jury.

MR. ROBERTS: Nothing further, Your Honor. They've elicited this. It isn't relevant.

As Mr. Christiansen said, under the instruction, what support he got before Dr. Khiabani died is not relevant one way or another. It doesn't preclude him from getting it, but the fact that it would be relevant, they could put it on if he did get support.

But I'm really a little bit lost as to why -- whether he's broke is not relevant to his claim for loss of support. So the only reason they would want the jury to know he's broke is to cause the jury to render an award based on an improper basis.

So if we can fix this if the jury has been misled because they've heard evidence he was broke in April but he's no longer -- feels he's

broke today, I should be able to fix the misleading of the jury through that evidence they elicited.

THE COURT: I understand the variegated concept. It's -- the inability to discuss settlements or any type of settlement negotiations or anything like that, that's almost paramount, right --

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I agree.

THE COURT: -- you know, in the law.

And I would like to review the Moore case. I know
I've read it before, but sometimes it's good for
me to take a look at it. But I must tell you that
understanding that -- and, you know, parties -- I
mean, it's not the shortest trial. I know there
are much longer ones, and objections perhaps are
not made and so forth. And it happens to both
parties -- okay? -- or more parties when there are
more parties.

But I am concerned that this came in after having the ability to review it because, the truth is, I probably wouldn't have let that in, but it didn't have anything to do with me. So, you know, I'm not the one that stipulated or was involved in that, because, when I reviewed it, I

```
1
    had the same concern. But I'm trying to let you
 2
    try your own cases instead of interjecting myself.
 3
              But I'm not -- I'm not, Mr. Roberts,
 4
    open to, you know, turning this basic tenet in our
 5
    law about discussing settlements, settlement
 6
    negotiations, or anything that even comes clear
 7
    because I think that's a very -- that's very
 8
    dangerous. I mean, it's been pretty clear always.
 9
              So -- and I know I need to -- I'm going
10
    to take five to ten minutes -- I'm sorry -- and
11
    then -- before -- before you start your cross.
12
    Excuse me.
13
               (Whereupon a short recess was taken.)
14
              THE MARSHAL:
                             Please be seated.
15
    order.
16
                          Are we back on the record?
              THE COURT:
17
              THE COURT RECORDER:
                                    Just a moment, Your
18
    Honor.
19
              Okay. We are on the record.
20
              THE COURT: All right. We're on the
21
    record.
22
                     I've just reviewed Moore
    v. Bannen and also NRS 41.13 -- or excuse me --
23
24
            And considering the legal issues and the
25
    paramount -- the understanding of the paramount
```

consistent rules in our jurisprudence with respect to not bringing existence or amount of settlement, I am -- I do understand your risk -- your concern about the possible prejudice, Mr. Roberts.

However, because there was no objection at the time of this deposition, but especially because the defense had the ability to review the tape and go through this, I feel that, the other side, the risk of prejudice that they discuss in Moore is that the jury may believe that there's a windfall to the plaintiffs already. So I'm not going to allow that. Okay?

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BARGER: Judge, there's one suggestion that I would like for the Court to consider.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BARGER: And I understand it's the Court's ruling. I'm not trying to change your mind at all.

The suggestion is maybe counsel could agree that that -- those paragraphs wouldn't be argument, because I think it is kind of misleading. In other words, that they wouldn't argue that the kids were all concerned --

```
1
              MR. KEMP: We won't show it or arque it.
 2
              MR. BARGER:
                            That may be helpful.
 3
              THE COURT:
                           Happy to hear.
                                           I think
 4
    that's very reasonable.
                              Okay?
 5
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
              MR. BARGER:
                            I'm not going to have any
 7
    cross for the young man, but I would think he
 8
    probably, just for the record, has to take the
 9
    stand and I'll say no questions. I'm not going to
10
    ask him anything.
11
              THE COURT:
                           Okay.
12
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Can I bring him back
13
    in, Your Honor?
14
              THE COURT:
                           Sure.
15
              THE MARSHAL: Are we ready on both
16
    sides, Counsel?
17
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
                                  Yes.
18
              MR. BARGER: Yes.
19
              THE MARSHAL: Ready, Your Honor?
20
              THE COURT:
                           Is there any
21
    cross-examination?
22
              MR. BARGER:
                            There won't be, but I think
23
    I need to say for the record, "no questions."
24
              THE COURT:
                           Yes.
25
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN: After that, would the
```

```
Court be wanting to take our lunch break at that
 1
 2
    point and then do the housekeeping stuff we talked
 3
    about and then the defense can start after lunch?
              THE COURT: I think that's probably a
 4
 5
    good idea.
 6
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Okay. Thank you,
 7
    Your Honor.
 8
              MR. ROBERTS: And, as you recall,
 9
    Mr. Henriod also is going to make a motion for the
10
    defense at the close of their case.
11
              THE COURT:
                         Yes.
12
              MR. BARGER: And I think a brief was
13
    filed.
14
              THE COURT: I haven't had a chance to
15
    look at it.
16
              MR. BARGER: I understand.
17
              THE COURT: You're excused.
18
              THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
19
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Judge, I think we
20
    need the --
21
              THE COURT: Oh, wait. I'm sorry. We
22
    may have questions from the jury.
23
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
                                  That's true, Judge.
24
              MR. BARGER: I think, on the record, I
25
    have to, in front of the jury, say there's no
```

```
1
    questions.
 2
              THE COURT:
                           Okay.
 3
              Jerry, sorry about that.
                 (The following proceedings were held
 4
                  in the presence of the jury.)
 5
 6
              THE MARSHAL: All rise.
 7
              All the jurors are present, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT:
                           Thank you, Marshal.
 9
              THE MARSHAL: Please be seated. Come to
10
    order.
11
              THE COURT:
                         Do the parties stipulate to
12
    the presence of the jury?
13
              MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Your Honor.
14
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Yes, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: Mr. Barger?
16
              MR. BARGER: May it please the Court.
17
              Sir, I have no questions for you.
18
    you.
19
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. All right.
20
              THE MARSHAL: Any questions?
21
                           Any questions from the jury?
              THE COURT:
22
              THE MARSHAL: No questions, Your Honor.
23
              THE COURT:
                          You're excused.
24
                             Thank you.
              THE WITNESS:
25
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. I think at this time
```

we should take our afternoon break, our lunch break. And we are going to be going over some legal issues during that break, so I think we should take a little bit longer. Let's have you back at 2 o'clock. And I'm going to admonish you quickly.

You're instructed not to talk with each other or with anyone else about any subject or issue connected with this trial. You're not to read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial by any person connected with this case or by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, the internet, or radio.

You're not to conduct any research on your own relating to this case, such as consulting dictionaries, using the internet, or using any reference materials. You're not to conduct any investigation, test any theory of the case, re-create any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case on your own.

You're not to talk with others, text others, tweet others, message others, google issues, or conduct any other kind of book or

```
1
    computer research with regard to any issue, party,
 2
    witness, or attorney involved in this case.
 3
              You are not to form or express any
 4
    opinion on any subject connected with this trial
    until the case is finally submitted to you.
 5
 6
              Please make sure that you refrain from
 7
    speaking to one another about any testimony that
 8
    you've heard and any notes you've taken.
 9
              Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
                                                 See
10
    you at 2 o'clock.
11
               THE MARSHAL:
                             All rise.
12
               (Jury excused.)
13
                 (The following proceedings were held
14
                  outside the presence of the jury.)
15
              THE COURT:
                          Please be seated.
              All right. Do you prefer to go on the
16
17
    record now or take care of things at 1:30?
18
    haven't had a chance to read the --
19
                            I would think it would be
              MR. BARGER:
20
    more appropriate that you'd have a chance to read
21
    the documents, and then we'll come back early and
22
    make the arguments. That would be what I would
23
    think would be appropriate.
24
                          Are we talking about the
              MR. KEMP:
25
    Rule 50 motion?
```

2	MR. KEMP: That's fine with me, Your
3	Honor.
4	THE COURT: Also, I'd like you, during
5	that time, to take a look at Plaintiffs'
6	Exhibits 197 and 198. I just don't show that
7	they've been admitted into evidence.
8	And I would alert the defense to the
9	same thing, should any of your exhibits not be
10	admitted.
11	MR. KEMP: 197 has not been admitted
12	into evidence, Your Honor.
13	We understand that 198 was admitted when
14	we were at a side conference.
15	THE COURT: Was it? Do you have the
16	date?
17	MR. KEMP: That was the one that was
18	admitted for constructive notice. We were
19	supposed to fashion some sort of jury instruction.
20	THE COURT: What date?
21	MR. BARGER: And 197 has not been.
22	MR. KEMP: 197 has not been offered or
23	admitted, and 198 was admitted at the side
24	MP BARCER: With some sort of counsel

getting together with an instruction.

Yeah.

MR. BARGER:

```
1
               THE COURT:
                          All right. Let's meet
 2
    here -- do you think 1:30 is sufficient time?
 3
               MR. KEMP: That's fine with me, Your
 4
    Honor.
 5
                           Is there anything else I
               THE COURT:
 6
    need to review?
 7
                          Maybe 1:45, Your Honor.
              MR. KEMP:
 8
                            Yeah, it might be, so
              MR. BARGER:
 9
    everybody can eat real quick.
10
               THE COURT: I'm open to whatever works
11
    for everyone.
12
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
                                  Thank you, Your
13
    Honor.
14
               (Luncheon recess taken.)
15
               (The following proceedings were held
16
                 Outside the presence of the jury.)
               THE MARSHAL: All rise. Department 14
17
18
    is back in session. Please be seated.
19
    order.
20
               THE COURT:
                           I've reviewed the matter,
21
    the brief by Motor Coach Industries, Inc.
22
              MR. BARGER:
                            Judge, may I ask a
23
    question? Not to interrupt.
                                   I am from out of
24
    state, but don't they have to rest in front of the
25
    jury first before we argue the motion?
```

1 THE COURT: Before they rest, I wanted 2 to make sure about a couple of exhibits. Yes, 3 they do. 4 MR. BARGER: I'm sorry. I didn't mean 5 to interrupt. 6 THE COURT: No, no, no. They can rest 7 when the jury comes back. I purposely didn't do 8 that just in case. By the way, I would do the 9 same thing if they were defense exhibits. 10 Of course. I understand. MR. BARGER: 11 THE COURT: Okay. So let's see. 12 MR. HENRIOD: Do I take it, then, that 13 you are prepared for us to argue that as soon as 14 they do close? 15 THE COURT: Well, the way that I am, I 16 would study this more, but I think -- I've 17 reviewed everything that you've given me, and I've 18 taken a look at, you know, what's coming up about 19 the trial. 20 Would you like to argue it now? 21 I mean, once it becomes MR. HENRIOD: 22 appropriate after they've closed. 23 THE COURT: They have to rest. 24 But, yes, we'd prefer to MR. HENRIOD: 25 do it as soon as it's appropriate.

THE COURT: Let's see --

MR. KEMP: Judge, I don't think we want to bring the jury back and send them out. I've agreed with them to stipulate to allow them to make a motion to the Court and we can argue it after we're done today. They have to make the motion after we rest. There's nothing that says we have to make the argument after we rest. We just have to preserve it.

MR. HENRIOD: We don't want to draw it out today, and I respect the fact that the jury is out there. And I don't think it will take that long. I can try to be succinct.

Our concern is -- and we just want this to be clear -- I think especially the punitive damages claim and the fact that that's hanging out there has been an excuse to bring up a lot of junk in questioning. And I don't think that it ought to infect the trial any longer.

So I just want that to be clear as to why our preference is to argue it as soon as possible.

THE COURT: Certainly. Are you comfortable, Mr. Henriod, with Mr. Kemp stipulating to being able to argue this before

```
1
    they rest or would you prefer --
 2
              MR. HENRIOD:
                             I am okay doing it at the
 3
    end of the day if it's clear that that is our
 4
    reservation, but we really would prefer not to.
 5
              MR. ROBERTS:
                            You want to argue it now.
 6
              MR. BARGER: What she's saying is do you
 7
    want to bring the jury in and rest and then bring
 8
    them back out and then argue? That's what she's
 9
    saying.
10
                            Or do you want to argue it
              MR. ROBERTS:
11
    now?
12
              MR. HENRIOD:
                            We can argue it now.
13
              MR. KEMP:
                         The problem I see, Your
14
    Honor -- it's their case. If they have an expert
15
    here and we argue this --
16
              MR. BARGER: We'll take him out.
17
                          I don't care if he's here.
              MR. KEMP:
                                                       I
18
    just care about the time.
19
              THE COURT:
                           I'm concerned about the
20
    record. And I've never reviewed an order like
21
    this before resting. So I don't know if that's
22
    going to be an error. I hate this whole thing
23
    that --
24
              MR. HENRIOD:
                             I appreciate that.
25
    prefer to do it by the book as well. I know it's
```

```
going to seem odd for the jury, but I think they'll understand that there's a transition when they hear plaintiff rest.
```

of the jury, but Marshal Ragsdale tells me that they're having a great time together. There's a difference between that and an angry jury. So at least they're not upset. They're happy when it takes a little bit longer. That's not why I'm taking a little bit longer, but doesn't seem to be a problem.

MR. HENRIOD: I hear you. I won't drone on.

MR. KEMP: Judge, maybe I wasn't clear. What I was suggesting is we rest, they approach and make their formal motion, we get the expert out of the way, and we argue at the end of the day. The expert is probably going to take at least two hours. If we piddle around until 3:00, we may not be able to get it done today.

MR. HENRIOD: I won't belabor points.

I'll be quick. We'd like to do it before we start our case. Thank you.

THE COURT: Very good. So we're going to bring the jury in. Before we do that, I just

23

24

25

1 wanted to -- did you review any exhibits that --2 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Judge, we've checked 3 with Ms. Clerk. There are two exhibits, 117A, 4 which is Aria's speech at his dad's funeral, and 117B, which is the collage that his mom spoke 5 6 about Friday and Aria spoke about today, which is 7 at the end of the funeral. We need to extract 8 those from 117 as a whole. 9 We've submitted 117, which is the entire 10 I'm told that Ms. Clerk says if we funeral. 11 extract those and bring them tomorrow, that's 12 fine. Subject to those two, we have everything in 13 that we need in. 14 MR. BARGER: If I recall, the funeral 15 video was they originally submitted the whole 16 thing. We objected. You said take out a few 17 parts, and they did. 18 THE COURT: Yes. I allowed some viewing 19 of the quests and the speech given by his son and 20 when he read the other son's statement. 21 MR. BARGER: Can I inquire from Pete,

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: What's in evidence -or what's not in evidence. The proposed exhibit
is the entire funeral. What I intend to extract

that's what's on the tape; right?

```
1
    from that is the speech you allowed me to play in
 2
    opening statements, which we preadmitted, and then
 3
    what I had Aria testify to today, which is just
 4
    essentially it's a PowerPoint presentation of a
 5
    bunch of family in pictures with music in the
 6
    background.
 7
                            I've told counsel that I
              MR. BARGER:
 8
    don't have an objection to that music -- those
 9
    pictures, but I think for the record we probably
10
    need not to have the whole funeral admitted into
11
    evidence.
12
              THE COURT: No, I didn't admit the
13
    entire --
14
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
                                  We're on the same
15
    page, Mr. Barger and I.
16
                          Just so you know what page
              THE COURT:
17
    I'm on, and it's not an ego thing. I just want to
18
    make sure. Remember you offered three videos, I
19
    think, at the beginning, and two are not to come
20
         One was to come in with exactly what you
21
    showed --
22
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
                                  Yes, ma'am.
23
              THE COURT:
                           -- at the beginning.
24
              MR. BARGER: With that understanding,
25
    we're on the same page.
                              I understand.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 2 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I agree with 3 everything the Court said. 4 THE COURT: And you want to augment? I want to augment via 5 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: 6 Dr. Barin's testimony on Friday, and then I closed 7 the loop, I thought, with Aria today that he did a 8 collage of pictures of his parents that's played 9 at the end of the video with music that was 10 There's no testimony on it special to them. 11 besides sort of the Bee Gees music playing in the 12 background. 13 THE COURT: Is the collage -- some of 14 the photographs that you extracted for opening, 15 were they part of that collage? 16 They were, Your MR. CHRISTIANSEN: 17 Honor. 18 And I told him I was fine MR. BARGER: 19 with that. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 I'll make sure I show MR. CHRISTIANSEN: 22 Mr. Barger that. Those two items I need to 23 extract from the entire 117, and I'll bring them 24 to your clerk tomorrow, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: And make sure Mr. Barger has

1 a chance to review that. 2 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I will, Your Honor. 3 MR. BARGER: That's fine. THE COURT: One other thing, 4 5 Mr. Pepperman. How are you today? 6 MR. PEPPERMAN: I'm good, Your Honor. 7 How are you? 8 THE COURT: I'm doing well. Thank you 9 very much. 10 The gentleman from The Venetian is 11 asking -- I don't know. 12 Marshal Ragsdale? 13 THE MARSHAL: He was just following up 14 from what he stated on Friday that he could wait 15 until Monday, and he just wanted some instruction 16 on what's going on. 17 MR. PEPPERMAN: Yes, Your Honor, as 18 discussed on Friday, I emailed Ms. Lesani, the 19 associate general counsel for The Venetian this 20 morning. I advised her that Mr. Lennon -- how we 21 left it on Friday, we were to give Mr. Lennon the 22 cashier's checks and that we'd work it out 23 separately. 24 And then this morning I wrote and 25 advised her that he said he didn't need the money

1 until today, so we did not give him the cashier's 2 check on Friday. 3 Hoping that they would --THE COURT: MR. PEPPERMAN: I said if it's your 4 preference to pay him directly, then we won't give 5 6 him the cashier's checks, but it has to be done 7 If you cannot -- if The Venetian cannot today. 8 pay him today or The Venetian prefers for us to 9 use the cashier's checks, let me know and we'll 10 give him the cashier's check today. I also said, 11 "If I don't hear back from you by today, we'd give 12 him the cashier's check this afternoon." And so far I haven't heard back from 13 14 her. 15 Okay. THE COURT: Mr. Pepperman, 16 actually, the preference was for them to pay, not 17 what her preference was, but --18 MR. PEPPERMAN: That's what I said. 19 the preference is to pay him directly, we would 20 rather do that and give the cashier's check. 21 you're unable to pay him by today, let me know and 22 we'll give him the cashier's check. 23 My concern was just that he gets paid 24 I asked The Venetian to pay him directly today.

if they could and, if I didn't hear back from her,

```
1
    that we'd give him the cashier's check.
 2
              THE COURT:
                          All right. We'll wait until
    the end of the day. But here's the issue.
 3
 4
    you please -- this can't be that difficult.
 5
    really have a concern because it's an unusual
 6
    situation. The parties have stipulated to it or I
 7
    would not do this. But for -- Marshal Ragsdale
 8
    represents me. Do you see what I'm saying?
 9
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
                               Of course.
10
              THE COURT:
                          So, essentially, his
11
    reaching out and handing the envelope to
12
    Mr. Lennon is coming from the Court, which I've
13
    explained many times on the record that that's
14
    really not -- that's not something that's
15
    generally done.
                     I can't -- again, it can't come
16
    from the Court.
                     I can't -- you know, isn't there
17
    any way that this woman -- I forgot her name right
18
    now, but counsel can give you the amounts that are
19
    going to be deducted? Because then Marshal
20
    Ragsdale is going to have to explain to him that
21
    this is a check for this much, but then you're
22
    going to have to be deducted later for this.
23
    That's asking too much.
24
              Do you understand what I'm saying?
25
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
                               Yes.
                                     And I've talked to
```

her about the amount, and she said that the amount 1 2 is in line with what his check would be. 3 Including all of his THE COURT: 4 deductions for social security? Yes, after deductions. 5 MR. PEPPERMAN: 6 THE COURT: All right. Well, I need to 7 know that amount before the jury is released 8 today. 9 MR. PEPPERMAN: Before the cashier's 10 check's released? 11 THE COURT: Before the jury is released, 12 which means Mr. Lennon will have the cashier's check or however we decide to do it or you decide 13 14 to do it. I need to know what those deductions 15 are going to be. 16 Didn't we have that from his MR. KEMP: 17 checks that the marshal gave us on Friday? 18 THE COURT: I think it's possible, but, 19 you know, depending on -- you know, sometimes 20 there are certain deductions that are taken out 21 every two weeks, sometimes -- I don't know what 22 system they're under. I don't know if he has to 23 pay certain dues. 24 So if they mirror that, it would be no 25 problem, Mr. Kemp, you know. But I don't know

that.

And, Mr. Pepperman, is it impossible that we can't find that out -- this is 2018, and I've been asking for these numbers for a few days now.

MR. PEPPERMAN: Your Honor, maybe that's where the confusion comes from. The Venetian will be paying Mr. Lennon with all the deductions and everything worked out. This \$1,100 is just so he gets it today and he's not delayed in receiving the amount.

But any amount -- he's going to get paid his regular amount from The Venetian. It's just this \$1,100 in cashier's check, if we end up giving it to him, will be credited to what we reimburse The Venetian.

So if you look at it separately, The Venetian will be paying him his regular pay minus all the deductions. All that will be in the normal course. And this \$1,100 is just so he gets paid today, by today, when he needs it, and it will be given back to The Venetian as reimbursement. So he would get, like, a check with no money, so to speak.

THE COURT: Did you sign the agreement

```
1
    yet?
 2
              MR. PEPPERMAN: We have not signed any
 3
    agreement.
 4
              THE COURT: Why? I'm not trying to be
    difficult, but, I mean, seriously, that's part of
 5
    this entire -- this is all predicated on the
 6
 7
    agreement; correct?
 8
              MR. PEPPERMAN: Well, we have an
 9
    agreement. The agreement is in place.
10
              THE COURT: The agreement isn't
11
    signed -- it's not executed yet; right?
12
              MR. PEPPERMAN: Well, The Venetian
13
    requested something in writing to memorialize it
14
    for that end, for their end. But for our
15
    purposes, everything has been agreed to. They're
16
    getting paid. This is some sort of administrative
17
    error.
18
              THE COURT: It hasn't been memorialized
19
    in writing.
20
                              Yes, we've agreed in
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
21
    writing. We've agreed on the phone. We've talked
22
    about it in email.
23
              THE COURT:
                          I know about the phone.
24
    thought you didn't have an email about it.
25
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
                              I have communications
```

```
1
    with them going back and forth about what we
 2
    talked about on the phone.
 3
                          Judge, they did pay the one
              MR. KEMP:
 4
    juror his two weeks.
 5
                           I know.
              THE COURT:
                                    But he's in a
 6
    different department.
 7
                          I know.
                                   But it kind of
              MR. KEMP:
 8
    shows --
 9
                               That's kind of the
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
10
                    I'm dealing with Ms. Lesani, but
    problem here.
11
    she's -- she's contacting payroll and they're
12
    dealing with different departments.
                                          It's an
13
    administrative error on The Venetian's side of why
14
    he didn't get paid on time.
15
               THE COURT: At the end of the day, it's
16
    not going to matter. It's going to be my error if
17
    you don't have an agreement in place that's been
18
    executed. Usually we all know that that's
19
    critical.
20
              So I'd like you to please make sure
21
    that's executed before the end of the day.
22
    want to see at least a photocopy of the agreement
23
    that's executed.
24
              That's a reasonable request,
25
    Mr. Pepperman.
```

```
1
              MR. KEMP: We're not arguing, Your
 2
    Honor.
 3
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
                               Your Honor, I can only
 4
    promise to do my best. Like, I've emailed her
 5
    this morning a couple times and haven't heard
 6
    back.
           So I will --
 7
                          Mr. Pepperman, have someone
              THE COURT:
 8
    drive there with authority and have it executed.
 9
    I mean, we're in the same city. The Venetian is
10
    right there.
11
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
                               I will do everything
12
    within my power to get it signed by today.
13
              MR. KEMP:
                          Judge, I will send him.
                                                   He
14
    will go.
15
              THE COURT:
                           Thank you. Thank you.
                                                    It's
16
    just that I need to have backup. I've already
17
    done something highly unusual, even though it's
18
    been stipulated to.
19
                          I just want to make sure none
              MR. KEMP:
20
    of this conversation can be construed as a waiver.
21
    We are still taking the position that we agreed to
22
    the two weeks. We filed the letter of references
23
    to the court.
24
              THE COURT:
                           I understand that.
                                               I'm not
25
    arguing that point.
```

```
1
              MR. KEMP:
                          Fine.
 2
              THE COURT:
                          But the agreement is
 3
    something that should have been in place already.
 4
              MR. KEMP:
                          I understand.
              THE COURT: All right. We took care of
 5
 6
           So we're going to bring them in. You're
 7
    going to rest.
 8
              And then, Jerry, we're going to give
 9
    them a little break while we hear this motion, and
10
    then they'll be back in.
11
               THE MARSHAL: All rise.
12
                 (The following proceedings were held
13
                  in the presence of the jury.)
14
              THE MARSHAL: All the jurors are
15
    present, Your Honor.
16
                          Thank you.
              THE COURT:
17
                             Please be seated.
              THE MARSHAL:
                                                Come to
18
    order.
19
              THE COURT: Do the parties stipulate to
20
    the presence of the jury?
21
              MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Your Honor.
22
              MR. KEMP:
                         Yes, Your Honor.
23
              THE COURT:
                           Mr. Christiansen.
24
              MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Your Honor, subject
25
    to the matters we spoke to a few minutes ago,
```

```
1
    plaintiffs rest.
 2
              THE COURT: So with respect to the trial
 3
    chronology, I just want to inform you that the
 4
    plaintiffs have now presented their case, and
 5
    we're going to take a break to discuss some legal
 6
    matters that have taken me a little bit longer.
 7
    Don't be mad at them.
 8
              So as soon as you come back, it's my
 9
    understanding that the defense will start with
10
    their case. Correct?
11
              MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: So moving to the second part
13
          Okay?
    now.
14
              Do you stipulate to not reading the
15
    admonishment for a few minutes? They're just
16
    going straight back.
17
              MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Your Honor.
                                               That's
18
    correct.
19
              THE COURT: Jerry, they can't leave the
20
    room or the restrooms.
21
                             Okay.
                                    All rise.
              THE MARSHAL:
22
                 (The following proceedings were held
23
                 outside the presence of the jury.)
24
              THE COURT:
                         Please be seated.
25
              Jerry, just close that door. I know
```

they're down the hall. Okay.

Good afternoon, Mr. Henriod.

MR. HENRIOD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. At this time MCI moves for judgment as a matter of law on all claims pursuant to NRCP 50A. I'll be as brief as I can, and I think I can be pretty brief.

Let me start on compensatory damages. I don't think that there has been sufficient evidence that this coach was more dangerous than the ordinary user with ordinary knowledge in 2007 would have expected. I don't think there has been any evidence that the ordinary user with ordinary knowledge would have expected rear tires to not be a dangerous place to be.

There's been no evidence that in 2007 the ordinary user with ordinary knowledge in the community would have expected side sensors. As a matter of fact, the only evidence is that that was cutting edge and that it was still experimental, but at very least that it was cutting edge. And the fact that a vehicle is not cutting edge does not make it defective. That would make every new development cause every other road -- or every other vehicle on the road to be defective

automatically, and that's just not the law.

Every one -- you've heard a lot of evidence about air disruption, and even Erika Bradley talked about at times that she's been walking down the street or riding a bike casually and felt air disruption.

I think we've all felt air disruption, whether we're on the sidewalk, whether we're riding a bike casually, when we're on the road and being passed by a semi. In general, it is a concept that we're all familiar with.

The issue is whether or not there is some type of critical mass of that air disruption to cause a real danger, so much so that it makes a vehicle dangerous, more dangerous than might otherwise be expected for a very large vehicle.

We haven't heard that.

In terms of visibility, well,
Mr. Hubbard didn't testify that he was somehow
surprised by the extent of visibility in this
coach, and he drives them professionally. He's
around them.

And even on visibility -- you know what?

Let's talk about causation. We saw the schematic

that was drawn up to demonstrate what the view

would have been while the bicyclist is right down there in the lower right-hand corner. And the idea there was to show how obstructed the view of that person was.

Except that, even if that's the case -and, again, I'm making assumptions on Rule 58,
construed the evidence in a light most favorable
to them. Even if at that very moment, if he was
that close, if the view of him would have been
obstructed, well, the evidence from virtually
everyone was that the bus had overtaken him. So
there would have been a long period of time when
he was visible.

Also on causation, the side sensors.

Haven't heard that those even would have come into play since the bus didn't turn, and, in particular, there was no turn signal that

Mr. Hubbard initiated.

Any of us who have a side sensor in our car, we know that you only start to see that when you've actually indicated that you're going to turn; otherwise, it would just be going off all the time on a freeway when you have cars going past. And here there was no evidence that he took any action that would have activated a side sensor

1 | alarm even if they had one.

2 MR. BARGER: He can step out.

3 Bob, just step out.

MR. KEMP: I didn't realize you were going to go into factual detail.

MR. HENRIOD: On the S-1 Gard causation, there was medical testimony that this particular crush injury might have been avoided. I recognize that there was that. But I don't think that there is substantial evidence that death overall or even -- well, yeah -- that death would have been avoided, because we have a bus hitting not just the head but the head on the end of a neck at 25 miles an hour.

And a lot of us have been in cases where you can need a fusion surgery even when you are in a traffic accident case. But there's been no evidence that -- a head getting knocked around at 25 miles an hour, that there would have been survival in that case. To some extent, we are all bobbleheads, so to speak, and nobody spoke about that.

So I think we have real causation issues and liability issues on the defects themselves, but let me jump to the punitive damages. This is

not a punitive case. I don't think there has been any evidence that we acted with conscious disregard. And that needs to be clear and convincing evidence to the reasonable person.

I mean, I understand that there is a range on reasonableness, and that's what we're looking at with the Court's gatekeeping function right now, what is within the realm of reasonable findings that a jury can make? And, here, by the clear and convincing standard, I don't think there is any evidence that would substantiate a reasonable person finding that we acted despicably.

What do they have to show? I mean, this is statutory. Under 42.001, they have to show that we had knowledge. Let's assume that all of their defect claims in and of themselves have merit. Let's assume, for the sake of argument, that the product is defective.

But to warrant punitive damages, even assuming that, the Court would have to find that a reasonable jury could find by clear and convincing evidence that MCI knew of these dangers and they knew that they were probable dangers and that we deliberately did nothing about it.

This is not a Ford Pinto case, where there was an awareness of some danger and we elected not to do it because of bean counters telling us that it would be expensive.

The best thing that they have in support of this punitive theory is to bring up a bunch of people and say, "Hey, did you know about X, Y, and Z? Did you know about air blasts? Did you know about suction at the tires? Did they do anything about it? Was there any type of training on that?"

And what they keep getting from everybody is, "Well, I knew about air disruption in general, but air blasts? No. Suction at the rear tires? No."

What they've asked are questions that are designed to make it seem like there are dangers. The questions assume there are those dangers. And then they try to get the witnesses to suggest MCI despicably didn't tell people about them.

Well, really, what we're seeing from all of that testimony is that there was no knowledge of these probable dangers, even assuming that they exist. Put simply, a defendant cannot be unaware

of a product's defect. Well, a defendant that is unaware can hardly be said to consciously disregard. That is a serious standard. We had to actually know. We had to actually know of the particular defect, and we had to know that there's something that we could do about it.

I know that a knife is sharp; I don't know that there's anything I can do about that. Some things are unavoidably unsafe. So to warrant punitive damages, you have to not only be aware of the potential danger, but you have to be aware that there's something you can do about it. And there's no evidence of that.

On warnings, well, one, we have to know of the danger. And even assuming we know of the danger, we have to know that our users don't also know that. We have to be aware of their potential ignorance such to disavow them. We don't see that.

There is, in punitive damages, no constructive notice. Red flags is the closest that you come to constructive notice.

It's interesting. I was searching online in a punitive damages treatise for the term "red flags." I found one reference in the entire

thing to red flags, and it was a parenthetical to a Nevada case, Countrywide. But even there, the notion of red flags is chosen carefully, I think, by Justice Parraguirre, because a red flag by definition has to be something that is conspicuous, something that the normal person would see and notice and something that flags in red that you should be aware of and act on.

Something being out in the world such as this 1980 article, that is not a red flag. There are a number of things that we saw in their motion -- in their opposition to our motion for summary judgment that never came in, a 2000 press release about the 2008 Volvo. We never got into that correctly. We never got into an article about the VORAD from 1994. We never got into "Today's Trucking" from 2005. We never got into what had been their Exhibit No. 7 about the Bugatti.

The punitive damage claim got this far because there was a lot of stuff thrown up on the wall. But now we're looking -- all the cards are on the table. What did we have? What did we know? And the one thing that we actually possessed was that 1993 wind tunnel test.

and the evidence all bears this out. What we were looking for was the impact on fuel consumption.

We weren't looking for any safety ramifications of that. There's no issue that is mentioned in the report or the findings that would create some flag, much less a red flag, that there are safety implications that a professor from Washington might come in and connect dots to a safety issue.

We don't have any of that. And we need not only the information from which you could infer some type of safety issue; we have to know there is a safety issue. It's like drugs that are prescribed off-label. They are designed to treat something, they're approved to treat something, and then, later on, as people continue to do R&D and doctors look at problems, people begin to wonder, well, is there something else that this information is useful for? Is there something else that this drug could be used for?

And, here, I think that that's what we have with the 1993 information from which Dr. Breidenthal could come in and say, "Well, this data is enough for me to extrapolate to a safety issue, given my background knowledge and

connecting the dot with another study from the '80s. That is not a red flag to us that there was something in the 1993 test with a safety implication.

Even assuming that Dr. Khiabani fell because he was knocked over by an air blast or even that an air blast caused him to wobble, there is no evidence that a bus has ever knocked over a pedestrian or a bicyclist because of air displacement. There's plenty of evidence about tragic accidents and collisions, but there is no evidence that anybody has ever been knocked over by an air blast.

There's a reason none of us have uttered the sentence "one of those bus air blast cases."

This is all new. And I don't even buy it. But it's new and there couldn't be conscious disregard.

And then, on managing agent, that is a different managing agent under the statute than the evidentiary managing speaking agent. There, we're not talking about somebody who comes in as a witness because they have knowledge and bind the company; we're talking about something much more particular.

We're talking about the ultimate decision-maker who, on these plans, would have to know that there is this dangerous aspect to the vehicle, and I don't care. This is a dangerous vehicle, and I greenlight production anyway.

That's what you need when it comes to ratification by a managing agent. We don't have any evidence of that either.

And I don't think this is a can that can be kicked down the road. Every day that this goes forward, that they're allowed to ask inflammatory questions that suggest that we were negligent in the way that we trained or that we were negligent in the way that we designed, that there are safer ways that we could do this, it just continues to exacerbate a prejudice that's already there, but we could at least stop it from getting worse.

And so, Your Honor, that is why we are making the motion now. If we need to, we'll make it again later. But, at very least, I think that we need to get rid of this punitive damage claim so that it does not continue to infect the trial.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KEMP: Judge, this is the -- let me put this on for a better record.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Judge, this is the same issue that was 2 addressed in their motion for summary judgment. 3 They filed two motions for summary judgment. 4 was to get rid of the defect claim and one was to 5 get rid of the punitive claim. We filed an 6 opposition to it, and that opposition cited a lot 7 of the same evidence I'm going to cite now. 8 addition, we have a lot more evidence in trial. 9 He started out with compensatory, so I'm 10 going to start out with compensatory. 11 THE COURT: Will you please speak 12 slower. 13 MR. KEMP: Yeah.

He started out with compensatory damages, so I'm going to start out with compensatory damages.

First, he said we've had no testimony from an ordinary user about any of these products. That's not true. We had testimony from Mr. Hubbard, the driver of the bus, who testified that, in his opinion, there should be a proximity sensor. We had testimony from Ms. Witherell, the She said that a bus should have woman from Reno. a proximity sensor. We had a bus safety specialist that's employed by the bus drivers

union, the 200,000 persons, Mr. Sherlock. He said there should be a proximity sensor.

So three different -- those are bus drivers, all three of them. And all three of them said that this bus should have had a proximity sensor.

And he referred to it as cutting edge.

Well, the evidence -- and Mr. Sherlock testified to this -- is that Eaton was available in 2005.

The Eaton side sensor was available in 2005. And, also, we've admitted an exhibit that shows that BCI, Bus Coach International, actually put an Eaton proximity sensor on their bus in 2007.

Okay?

And, you know, counsel says, well, MCI didn't know about it. Again, Your Honor, that is the story that they put the ad right under it for the MCI bus. So, clearly, they knew about it. But, in any event, it was clearly available. And I don't think waiting two years to put on a pretty compelling safety device is something that can't be argued to be conscious disregard.

Two years, Your Honor? If it had been two days, maybe -- two weeks, two months -- but two years it was available and their competitor

difference in this case.

causation."

15 Ms. Recorder, would you switch me over,

was using the proximity sensor?

16 please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT RECORDER: Yes.

> What was number two? THE COURT:

All right. Flipping over to visibility.

Well, Mr. Sherlock testified, one, that

Two, he testified specifically that the

We have direct testimony from Mr. Sherlock that

this was a dangerous condition, the right-side

there's been no testimony linking it together in

the side sensor, a proximity sensor, would make a

right-side defects would have made a difference.

visibility problem. And counsel says, "Well,

This is Mr. Sherlock's MR. KEMP: testimony on both points, Your Honor. This is the causation testimony he says doesn't exist in this case.

(Video played.)

"QUESTION: Okay. And with regards to

the good right-side visibility that you've

outlined and the bad right-side visibility
that -- that this bus has, if you had cured
those problems, would that have made a
difference, in your opinion?

"ANSWER: It seems extremely likely that Mr. Hubbard would have seen the bicycle coming his way earlier if the bicycle wasn't something like 90 percent obscured."

MR. KEMP: It's direct expert testimony on the causation with regards to the first problem, the right-side visibility.

The second issue was this proximity sensor issue. And, again, counsel kind of took the same tack that Mr. Terry took with Sherlock, that, oh, it's just a side proximity sensor, you wouldn't see anything in front of you. That was directly contradicted by Mr. Sherlock. And let me show you this clip, where he again ties causation to that defect.

(Video played.)

"QUESTION: Okay. So if that's the kind of sensor that is on the bus, the side proximity sensor that's on the bus, that sensor would provide no information about Dr. Khiabani, would it?

"ANSWER: I don't think that's true. It depends on the sensor range of operation. If it's one of these that has 180 degrees, it's going to alert you to the presence of the doctor. If it's the 360 designs, it's going to alert you to the presence of the doctor. If it's a wide sensor on the front which is integrated into these systems, then it would tell you about the doctor."

MR. KEMP: Your Honor, I don't want to play his whole testimony, but he continued to say that if the bus driver had been given a warning .10 or .12 seconds earlier, that would have allowed him to steer away. And, as you know, defense contends that the bus just hit him by 1 or 2 inches. So, obviously, it would have then been causation in this case.

So those go to the compensatory claim. Now let's move to the punitive claim.

In their brief, they say that punitives are unusual or rare in products cases. That is flat-out not true.

In the Pinto case, 100 million punitive award.

In the Teva case that we tried in front

of Judge Walsh for the defective propofol sizing, \$500 million award.

In an Actos case a couple years ago in federal court, \$2 billion award.

In the Wyeth case, the one from Reno that they cite in the brief, Wyeth was making, I think, Prempro, and they were supposedly hiding European studies, there's a punitive award there.

Usually, the punitives come in the product cases. That's the typical case for them.

And they cite Granite States on page 5 of their brief. That's a case I like to discuss because that illustrates the conscious disregard standard. And in that case, that was the one up in Reno where Granite Construction Company was building a road -- I think that's I50 up there connecting Reno and Carson City.

So they were building a road and there was a bull going back and forth in some pasture there. And the reason that they allegedly were consciously disregarding known safety measures is that they didn't build a fence there. The court found that they knew that if you put a fence, that would separate the bull from coming into the highway. And what happened, of course, is the

bull went into the highway and it collided with
some motorists who got killed.

But that case held that general knowledge that a bull was dangerous and could go onto a freeway, and general knowledge that if you built a fence, you could separate bulls from freeways, that was sufficient for punitive damages. And it's conscious disregard of known safety measures. Okay? And that's pretty much the standard that's used in all the cases.

But let's take a look at this particular case. We talk about aerodynamics. Okay? It's different than the Pinto case. In the Pinto case, Ford Motor Company had not yet designed and made the barrier to protect gas from leaking out of a Pinto. The testimony in that case was that it would cost \$5 to do so, but they hadn't even made that part yet.

In this case, they made the safer alternative part back in 1993. That's 26 years ago. That's a full 15 years before the bus in this case was made. They made the safer alternative part, being the streamlined part that would prevent air blasts.

And, you know, they say, "Well, we were

just testing for fuel." Your Honor, they hired Dr. Cooper, who was the aerodynamics guy who wrote the article back in 1985 on the optimum radii to get a better aerodynamic efficiency. That's the guy who did it. And it was a very -- I mean, you've seen the test over and over again. It was a very extensive round of testing.

absolute fact from that testing that they had a poor-performing product because that testing showed that the CJ3 bus that was tested -- which, if you recall, we had a picture of that on the left and a picture of that on the right -- and Dr. Breidenthal testified that, you know, if the picture didn't tell you that already, Dr. Breidenthal testified that's pretty much the same as the J4500. That test had a .60 drag coefficient. Dr. Breidenthal also testified that the CJ4500, in his opinion, would have a .6.

But they knew from that testing that the Volvo, their competitor, only had a .4. So they knew about it. And this was back in 1993, 15 years before they made the subject bus. And we've heard nothing -- it's unbelievable. The silence on the other side as to why they didn't use the

1 safer alternative part, it's amazing. They
2 develop it, but they just didn't use it.

But they certainly knew about a known safety measure because they actually built it.

And, again, you go back to the Granite States.

Yeah, they knew bulls could travel across the road, they knew fences would stop bulls, but they didn't make an actual alternative safer part and neither did the Pinto case.

The next thing they talk about is the right-side blind spots. "Oh, we didn't know about it." Mr. Hoogestraat was designated as the PMK on right-side blind spots. He admitted knowing about it. He was on the design team for this bus. So the PMK on the design team knew about the right-side blind spot. They didn't do anything about it.

And we heard from Mr. Sherlock going on for an hour what they could have done about it.

They could have -- rather than have the opaque door, they could have had glass down there.

Rather than have a wide side pillar -- A-pillar, they could have had a more narrow A-pillar.

Rather than have the high dash, the highest in the industry -- which not only he confirmed, but

Mrs. Witherell testified about this -- rather than having that high dash, they could have had a low dash like we had with the BCI.

And, if you remember, when we presented his testimony, we put the BCI dash right side by side with the J4500 dash and showed that they knew about it. They could have obviously put on the proximity sensor. I mean, that would have been a simple solution.

And then, you know, not only did
Hoogestraat admit to it, but Couch testified that
they did line-of-sight studies on the right-side
blind spot, which they conveniently could not find
to produce to the plaintiffs in this case.

So, anyway, there's actual knowledge of the right-side blind spot by Couch, who's the vice president of design. He's not -- he's not just a designer like Lamothe was; he's the vice president in charge of the entire design project. And Hoogestraat, who, again, he's the PMK. So they knew about that, Your Honor.

Moving to proximity sensors. You know, Hoogestraat testified that he knew that there was off-market kit. That's what he testified to.

Again, he was the PMK they produced on proximity

sensors. And of course they knew there was off-market kit because Eaton was out there selling this proximity sensor to a lot of people, including the competitor on the leading industry publication that they put the ad on. So, clearly, they knew about it.

Now, moving to protective barriers. They always try to make the issue from the protective barriers in general to a specific kind of protective barrier, the S-1 Gard. On protective barriers in general, Hoogestraat said that he knew that there were protective barriers that could protect a right rear tire. Couch said that they had the expertise to make one. So they clearly knew about this potential. And, again, Hoogestraat was produced as the person most knowledgeable on protective barriers.

All right. Now, referring specifically to the S-1 Gard, here's the testimony on that: 50,000 buses had the S-1 Gard. And then we had Mr. Barron's testimony. Barron said he told MCI. He didn't say he told just Universal Coach. If you take a close look at his deposition, he said he told MCI.

But assuming that the only knowledge

that was transmitted was to the Universal Coach president -- which was Mr. Pablo Ferraro or Fierros, something like that -- he was directly supervised by Mr. Bernacchi, the president of MCI.

So to suggest that they didn't have knowledge of the S-1 Gard, I don't think is appropriate. But, like I said, they've already admitted that they had knowledge of barrier protectors in general.

And so for those reasons, we have a lot more conscious disregard of not one, not two, not three, but four different types of safety devices -- one, the safer part; two, the right-side blind spot problem; three, the proximity sensors; and four, the S-1 Gard -- than we had in the Granite States case. And like I said about the Pinto case, they actually made the safer alternative part in this case, they just didn't use it, referring to the aerodynamic front.

For those reasons, Your Honor, and for all the reasons that we've set forth in the opposition brief, the punitive damages claim is well-supported in this case and should go to the jury.

MR. HENRIOD: I hear that we knew in

1993 that there was a safer alternative and that we didn't use that safer alternative, except that there was no issue about safety discussed in 1993.

So whether or not a decision was made to spend -- to adapt the vehicle based on the information that we found for fuel economy purposes, it doesn't have anything to do with what was understood at the time to be safety-related and it doesn't matter how many times they just say that. And it's one of the problems with allowing this claim to linger around.

Another issue, again, that just taints the idea of barrier guards in general, and the fact that, well, you could have put on a spat, but you didn't even do that. Well, there's been no argument that having a spat on this vehicle would have made any difference.

So the problem with this punitive damage case, when there was nothing in our records or in any of the people that were asked — in the testimony of anybody that was asked about the known safety ramifications of any of these issues at the time, is that it gives them excuse to just continue to throw junk up against the wall like this spat issue.

And even on the 1993 wind tunnel test, Breidenthal didn't testify. He didn't have a substantial basis for concluding that the J4500 didn't integrate lessons that we had learned from the 1993 test. There isn't even something to connect that dot.

So what we knew, what could have been safer, what could have been safer alternatives, what we knew about those alternatives, linking those to safety, is really just a rhetorical assertion. There has not been any evidence of that.

Yes, you have -- everybody knows that bulls can be dangerous on the road. And everybody knows that, if you put up a fence, you might keep the bull from getting onto the road. And that is the type of knowledge that we're talking about.

Here, not everybody knows, assuming it's true, that air blasts knock over pedestrians, and I don't hear it contested that there was any evidence that that was known to be a dangerous condition, and that is the only potential dangerous condition to which the 1993 wind tunnel testing would have been relevant.

I understand there are a lot of cases, a

lot of product cases, that can support a punitive damage claim. But by their rationale, virtually every product case would support a punitive damage claim. Whenever there is an assertion that a manufacturer is aware of an alternative design that might be a little safer and isn't using it, well, that would make a punitive damage claim of almost every product defect case. Otherwise, we would all be driving Hummers because there is something about my vehicle that makes it not as safe as a Hummer, and Volvo knows that. That's not the test.

Yes, there are product cases that support them. This isn't one of them.

Unless Your Honor has any questions, I'm done.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to deny

Motor Coach Industries' brief -- or motion for
judgment as a matter of law NRCP 58. I do believe
that the plaintiffs have proffered sufficient
evidence -- they have produced enough evidence,
sufficient evidence, that a jury could find
oppression or malice or basically with respect to
conscious disregard.

I agree that with respect to --

```
actually, I have notes that are very similar to
 1
 2
    the ones Mr. Kemp just enunciated. So there have
 3
    been witnesses that testified to sufficient --
 4
    with respect to the compensatory damages and the
 5
    punitives as well.
 6
               I can give you this in writing later,
 7
    but, basically, my notes are very similar to what
 8
    Mr. Kemp just enunciated.
 9
              MR. HENRIOD: Very well.
10
              THE COURT: All right. Why don't we
11
    bring the jury in.
12
              MR. BARGER: Can we have two minutes
13
    before we start?
14
              THE COURT:
                           Sure.
15
                 (Discussion off the record.)
16
                 (The following proceedings were held
17
                  in the presence of the jury.)
18
              THE MARSHAL: All rise.
19
              All the jurors are present, Your Honor.
20
                         Okay. Thank you very much.
              THE COURT:
21
              THE MARSHAL:
                             Please be seated.
                                                Come to
22
    order.
23
              THE COURT:
                           We are going to get started
24
    with the defense case, defendants' case.
25
              MR. BARGER: May it please the Court.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: Yes, please.
              MR. BARGER: We call Robert Rucoba, Your
 2
 3
    Honor.
 4
              THE MARSHAL:
                             Remain standing and raise
 5
    your right hand towards the clerk.
 6
              THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the
 7
    testimony you're about to give in this action
 8
    shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing
 9
    but the truth, so help you God.
10
              Be seated.
11
              MR. BARGER: Your Honor, we've had
12
    previously marked and identified as Defendants'
    Exhibits 515 through 566, and we would offer those
13
14
    at this time.
15
                         No objection, Your Honor.
              MR. KEMP:
16
              THE COURT: Very good. They're
17
    admitted.
18
              THE CLERK: Sir, would you please state
19
    and spell your name.
20
              THE WITNESS:
                             Yes. My name is Robert
21
             That's spelled R-u-c-o-b-a.
    Rucoba.
22
              MR. BARGER: May I proceed, Your Honor?
23
              THE COURT:
                           Please proceed.
24
            DIRECT EXAMINATION OF ROBERT RUCOBA
25
    BY MR. BARGER:
```

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

21

22

23

Houston, Texas.

1	Q. Please introduce yourself to the ladies
2	and gentlemen of the jury.
3	A. Yes. Hello. As I said, my name is
4	Robert Rucoba. I am an engineer. I live in

- Q. Okay. And what is your profession?
- A. I am a -- I have a bachelor of science in mechanical engineering. My profession is accident investigation and reconstruction.
 - Q. And who do you work for, sir?
- A. I work for a company called Carr Engineering, Incorporated.
 - Q. And where is that company located?
 - A. They are located in Houston, Texas.
 - Q. And what does that company do?
- A. That company does a couple of things.
- Number one, it's involved in accident
 investigation and reconstruction. It also is
 involved with vehicle dynamics, testing, as well
 as some large-scale computer simulations.
 - Q. Now, would you call yourself an accident reconstructionist?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And that's what you've been retained here to discuss; correct?

- A. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. Now, what I want to do is go over your background and just generally where you went to school and what you did after you went to school, your career pattern.
- A. Sure. My college career began at Purdue University. I transferred to the University of Houston, which is where I got my degree, my bachelor of science degree, in mechanical engineering.

While at University of Houston, I was a member of Pi Tau Sigma, which is a national mechanical engineering honor society. I was a member of Tau Beta Pi, which is also a national engineering honor society.

Since I graduated, I went to work briefly for a company called TH Hill Associates, and they were doing failure analysis in the field of oil field pipeline products. But then I went in to work for Carr Engineering in 1986.

- Q. And what have you done since 1986 with respect to Carr Engineering?
- A. With respect to Carr Engineering, I have been involved primarily in the areas of accident investigation and reconstruction. I get involved

in vehicle dynamics testing. And I also getinvolved in the computer simulation areas as well.

- Q. Approximately how many accidents have you investigated or reconstructed since 1986 through today?
- A. In my 30-plus year -- 30-year-plus career, I've reconstructed over 1800 crashes.
- Q. Would you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what societies -- what professional societies that you're a member of?
- A. Yes. I'm a member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. I'm a member of the Society of Automotive Engineers. And I'm also a registered professional engineer in the state of Texas.
- Q. Okay. Have you authored some publications that have been published in peer-reviewed magazines and articles?
- A. Yes. As part of the role at Carr
 Engineering to try to push the envelope or to move
 the technology ball down the road, we -periodically we will publish peer-reviewed
 technical articles, and those are generally
 published through the Society of Automotive
 Engineers, and I've been a part of those.

1	Q. So the jury has heard from a gentleman
2	named Robert Caldwell. Is he kind of your
3	counterpart in this case to some extent?
4	A. Yes, I'd agree with that.
5	Q. The jury has heard from Mr. Caldwell
6	that he was an accident reconstructionist. We're
7	going to go through your testimony. Candidly, you
8	guys don't disagree too much, do you?
9	A. I would agree with that, yes.
10	Q. All right. So I have a duty to my
11	client to put on the facts. I'm going to be a
12	little bit repetitious, but I'm going to try not
13	to be too much repetitious. Okay?
14	A. That sounds fine.
15	MR. BARGER: All right. So at this
16	time, Your Honor, I would tender Mr. Rucoba as an
17	expert in accident reconstruction.
18	MR. KEMP: No objection, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Rucoba is
20	qualified as an expert in accident reconstruction.
21	Go on.
22	BY MR. BARGER:
23	Q. I think the jury understands what
24	accident reconstruction is, but would you tell

them briefly in your own words how you consider

yourself and what you do as an accident reconstructionist?

A. Sure. I often get asked that question. I think the real simple answer is that it's sort of like putting together a jigsaw puzzle. I think we've all put together jigsaw puzzles where you dump them out on the table, take it out of the box and dump them on the table. You've got all these pieces, and you've got to start to organize these pieces and put them in the proper sequence; otherwise, you're not going to have the right picture. If pieces sort of fall off the table, you know, you're going to have some incomplete pictures of the puzzle when it's all put together.

Accident reconstruction, I tell people, is very much like that. You're starting with pieces of information. You're trying to understand what happened out there on a given crash day, and you're trying to put that information together with all of these various bits and pieces of information that you've been given and try to put together a picture that agrees not only with the physical evidence but also agrees with the laws of physics.

Q. When were you first contacted in this

1 | case?

- A. I was first contacted back in 2017.
- Q. And did you perform an accident reconstruction of what happened out there on the day of the accident?
 - A. I did.
- Q. All right. Tell the ladies and gentlemen what you looked at and what you did. Okay?
- A. Okay. Sure. Well, of course, the first thing that we'll start off with is the information that was taken on the day of the crash, things that would be helpful to me to understand the conditions immediately -- just immediately after the event happened. So I will be looking at things such as police photos or the police report. Those are things that I would look and ask for.
- Q. Let me show Exhibit 515, please. And we're just going to look at some photos that were taken on the day of the accident and some photos that were taken by you and some other people; correct? Eventually?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. That's not 517. The next one, please.

 MR. BARGER: I'm sorry. We have to do

1 it from here? May I hand this clicker to the 2 witness?

Let's go to Exhibit 515, which is the next one, please.

THE WITNESS: All right.

BY MR. BARGER:

- Q. What I want to do is walk you through and ask you, is that a diagram that was done by people on the scene on the day of the accident?
 - A. Yes, that is.
 - Q. That was not done by you, right?
- A. No, that is not.
 - Q. So what does that show you, Exhibit 515?
 - A. Well, what you can see there is a layout of the roadway, and you can see that there's some evidence that has been recorded. You can see that there's some -- the bicycle you can see with an arrow pointing towards the bicycle, and then you can see that there is an aerial that's pointing to another piece of evidence called blood.

So those are kinds of things that people are documenting on the day of the crash, the physical evidence that's being recorded and the way that that evidence is positioned in the intersection.

1	Q. Mr. Rucoba, you can't put a laser on									
2	that particular screen because it won't show up.									
3	So we have a pointer, and I'm going to get the									
4	Court's permission if you need to point to what									
5	you're talking about because we can't put one of									
6	those red lights on it.									
7	A. Okay.									
8	MR. BARGER: Do I have permission?									
9	THE COURT: Of course.									
10	MR. BARGER: Thank you.									
11	BY MR. BARGER:									
12	Q. Let me turn to Exhibit 516. You have to									
13	click it, I think. There you go.									
14	What is that showing?									
15	A. That is a may I step down?									
16	MR. BARGER: With the Court's									
17	permission?									
18	THE COURT: Yes. Absolutely.									
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you. So what you're									
20	looking at here is an aerial photograph of the									
21	crash site. And I've put here where the impact									
22	location is. So you can see this is Charleston									
23	Drive; this is the direction where the vehicles									
24	were traveling, where the bus and the bicycle are									

traveling down Pavilion Center. And then this is

25

1 Griffith Peak Drive at the intersection here, 2 and then over here is the Red Rock Casino that 3 we'll be talking about. BY MR. BARGER: I don't want to go into any detail, but 5 0. 6 did you have an opportunity to read the 7 depositions in this case? 8 A. I did. 9 And we may or may not talk about that Q. 10 The jury has heard a lot of it. And for 11 your information, this is a Google map that's out 12 in front of you here that we may or may not use. 13 But you had a chance to look at that this morning; 14 correct? 15 I did. Α. 16 Okay. Now, anything about Exhibit 516 Q. 17 that you need -- the jury has seen this, but I 18 just want to put it in perspective. Anything else 19 you need to see? 20 Α. No. We can move on. 21 Q. So you can go to the next one. 22 What is 517? 23 Α. So, again, another aerial view but sort

A. So, again, another aerial view but sort of getting a little bit closer to the intersection. Again, I've put down here where the

impact location is, but it just gives you an idea of just what the general area looks like of the intersection as you get a little bit closer.

- Q. Okay. Let's turn to Exhibit 518.
- A. Okay. 518, what I've put down here is the bike lane. And you can see where the bike lane is on either side of the intersection. The purpose of this aerial photograph was to show you how the bike lane is aligned when you're on the north side of the intersection and when you're on the south side of the intersection. In other words, you can pretty much just go straight down the bike lane. You don't have to jog to the left or jog to the right in order to connect back up with this particular bike lane on the south side of the intersection.

I thought that the way that this photo was taken and its closeup view and an overhead view would be helpful for everybody to understand how that bike lane is laid out on both sides of the intersection.

- Q. Let me ask you a question. In reconstructing an accident, do you go to the scene?
 - A. Yes.

	Q.	Did	you	and	your	group	of	folks	go	to
this	accio	dent	scer	ne?						

A. Yes, we did.

- Q. Obviously, you didn't go the day of the accident. When did you go, approximately?
 - A. Approximately in September of last year.
- Q. And when you went to the accident scene, what did you do?
- A. Well, we did several things. What I do is, first off, get myself familiar with the intersection. It's the first time for me to be there, just to sort of get an understanding of how the traffic is moving, where things are coming from -- east, west, north, and south -- just to get an understanding where everything is at.

And then the next thing is to try to sort of figure out where is the physical evidence laid out in the intersection? Where did everything sort of generally lie?

And then I'll take a 100-foot tape measure, and I will define a reference point. I will literally paint something in orange paint on the roadway surface, and then I'll go up and down the roadway north and south in 100-foot intervals because it's going to be something that will be

helpful to me when I'm placing all of this 1 2 physical evidence. And I'll document that with 3 notes or photographs. 4 We also surveyed this particular scene. 5 And then the last thing we did, we 6 actually flew a drone over the scene itself, and 7 the drone took a number of photographs that it can 8 stitch together and then ultimately end up with a 9 three-dimensional view of the scene just based on 10 on the aerial pictures. 11 In addition to going to the scene, did Q. 12 you have an opportunity to inspect the actual bus that was involved in this particular accident? 13 14 Α. I did. 15 Okay. And when did you do that? 0. 16 I also did that in September of last Α. 17 year. 18 Okay. And what did you do -- and were Q. 19 there other experts there as well? 20 A. Yes. 21 That we'll hear from in this case? Q.

2223

Q. And there were experts from Mr. Kemp's client as well there, correct?

Yes, there were other experts that day.

2425

A. That's true.

Α.

	Q.	And	all	you	ladies	and	gentlemen	went
out	there	and	insp	pecte	ed the b	ous 1	together?	

- A. That is correct.
- Q. All right. And what did you do when you inspected the bus? What was your goal and what did you do?
- A. Well, what we did was to sort of document what physical evidence is on the bus, try to understand what marks are on the bus that might be related to the crash and sort of document where are they physically on the exterior of the bus?

We also look at the bus itself just to make sure that there isn't anything mechanically wrong with the bus that might have been a contributor or a cause to the crash itself.

And then one of the things that I'll do to sort of document my findings is I will take photographs. And we also did a laser scan of the exterior of the bus so that we could bring that back to my office and I could look at that in a three-dimensional view and be able to use that in my accident reconstruction.

- Q. What's a laser scan?
- A. A laser scanner is a device that allows you to literally map the exterior of the bus

itself. It's almost like a laser beam, but it's like a wand. It's almost like a laser beam that's actually capturing the entire exterior. You end up with what is called a cloud, a cloud of data points.

But what the laser allows you to do is, as you move the laser around the exterior of the bus, you end up with all of these clouds of data points. Then you can take it back to the computer software and be able to put the clouds together. It will find all of the similar points.

And then when it's all done, you end up with a model that you can actually spin around and you can look at in three dimensions.

- Q. Now, in addition to looking at photographs that were taken the day of the accident and other photographs that were taken, cell phone video and some video from the actual Red Rock Casino, did you utilize that information in an attempt to reach your opinions?
 - A. I did.
- Q. All right. And by the way, before I forget, when you -- when I ask you for a conclusion or an opinion, I would like for you to base it upon reasonable engineering probability.

1 Okay?

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

- A. That will be fine.
- Q. All right. Now, let's look at Exhibit
- 4 | No. 519. This is 519. What is that?
 - A. That is a still from the cell phone video that was taken by one of the witnesses that was there shortly after the crash happened.
 - Q. That was the gentleman Mr. Sacarias?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. What is this showing you?
- A. Well, what it shows is point of rest -that's what P-O-R means -- point of rest of
 Dr. Khiabani. What was helpful to me to
 understand where Dr. Khiabani came to rest based
- 15 on what I could see in this particular snapshot
- 16 | from the video.
- For instance, there are some very
- 18 distinctive cracks that are here on the roadway
- 19 surface. So when I was out at the scene, I wanted
- 20 to make sure that I could find those same kinds of
- 21 | cracks so I could be able to properly and
- 22 accurately locate the point of rest of
- 23 Dr. Khiabani.
- Q. Okay. Now, I want to go back. Point of
- 25 | rest means what?

	A.	Mean	s that's	where	he	came	to	rest	when
the	crash	was	over.						

- Q. Okay. I think the jury has heard terms and will hear terms from you of point of impact.

 Is that different from point of rest?
- A. Yes, it is. Point of impact is different from point of rest in this particular matter.
- Q. And what is point of impact that we'll talk about later?
- Point of impact is going to be the point Α. of impact between Dr. Khiabani and the motor coach. Point of rest is going to be something different. It will be what happened after Dr. Khiabani ended up -- after engaging with the motor coach and then going off to his point of rest.
 - Q. Okay. So your job is accident reconstruction; right?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. You're not here to talk about aerodynamics and other things; you're here to talk about what you saw at the scene. Right?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. All right. Now, Exhibit No. 520, let's

go over that. What is that showing you?

A. Okay. This is another still from the cell phone video by Mr. Sacarias. And, again, what was useful to me is that it shows the crosswalk. And I can see some of the signal posts. And, again, we've got another crack here.

But I can also see now the point of rest of the bike. And I can tell you that I said that that's the bike's initial point of rest. And what I mean by that is that, in later photos, we discovered that the bike has actually been moved to a different location. And so that was helpful to me to understand, okay, there's things that are being moved around, and I need to take that into consideration when I'm doing my accident reconstruction.

- Q. Okay. So this is the photo taken by the cell phone video; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. All right. So that is before the bicycle was moved?
- 22 A. Correct.
- Q. And, obviously, I would assume that the bicycle was moved by people who were attending to Dr. Khiabani. Is that your understanding?

- A. I believe that is correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, let's look at 521.

3 And tell us what this is.

- A. Again, this is just another still from the cell phone video of Mr. Sacarias. Again, it's just showing things in the background that are close to the bike's initial point of rest: cracks, crosswalks, things that allow me to get myself in the proper position so that I know where to document the point of rest of the bike and the point of rest of Dr. Khiabani.
- Q. So you going to the actual scene, you stood there, with your eyes --
 - A. I did.
- Q. -- and you took photographs, and you determined -- did you determine from looking at the video and the other photographs taken by other folks where the point of rest was, and you were satisfied that it was accurate?
 - A. Yes. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. In the same way that the point of impact that we will prove after a while?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. All right. Let's go to 522.
- What are we seeing here?

A. Well, this is another photo. This one happens to be taken by one of the bus passengers, Mr. Pears. And in this particular picture, you can see now what we learned from standing out at the scene. And when you compare the angle that that photo was taken, we learned for the first time that the bike had been moved and that now we needed to document its second position so that we could make sure that we had that factored into our reconstruction.

So this is a photo again showing some crosswalks. There are some manhole covers that were right here. So there were some things that I could use to help me properly place the bike after it had been moved and to also help me properly place Dr. Khiabani's point of rest.

- Q. Let's go to the next photograph, 523.
- A. So this is another photo that was taken by Mr. Pears. But what you could see here is this, you can see, is where the coach or the bus came to its stopping position.

So this was the first picture that actually captured that. So it was important for me to understand where that coach came to rest so that, as I was putting together my reconstruction,

I made sure that the path that I created with the bus would take it to its proper point of rest, because, later on, what we determined is that the coach or the bus itself had also been moved to another location.

Q. Now, look at 524 and tell us what you're showing there, and point out -- you know, the jury has heard this, but just to keep your testimony in mind, I want to talk about the right travel lanes, the bike lane, and the right turn lane. Okay?

A. All right.

So this is a photo that's taken on the day of the incident. So what I've done is I've added certain things. You're looking to the south on Pavilion Center Drive. And I've added certain labels. So you can see here is the right travel lane, here is the bike lane, and there is the right turn lane.

And, remember, I had said earlier that you've got the bike and you've got the coach that began and had their points of rest at one location, and then, later on, we learned that they got moved? Well, now you can see, at least when this photo was taken, we've determined that the bike and the coach had been moved to a different

location, just sort of down the road a little bit for the coach. The bike itself was dragged a little bit to the south down the road.

But we at least know that, at the time that this particular photo was taken, the bike and the coach had been moved.

- Q. Okay. And nobody is criticizing that movement; it's just the fact that it happened after --
 - A. Correct.
- Q. -- so when you do your reconstruction, you have to go back to where it actually was at the time?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, just for a moment again -- and I hate to be repetitious -- but when you say "right travel lane," what does that mean?
- A. Well, that means that if you're driving south on this road, you've got two lanes here that allow you to just keep on going straight or keep going south through the intersection. When I say that there's a right turn lane, that means there's a lane here where you have to make a right turn when you come to the intersection.

So these -- this travel lane here, you

could just keep going straight and continue to go south through the intersection without having to turn left or right.

- Q. And then there's the bike lane?
- A. And then there is the bike lane here going up to the intersection, and then you'll see it goes onto the other side of the intersection, like I showed in that aerial photograph.
- Q. We'll talk a little bit more about this later, but Mr. Caldwell, I believe, testified that the impact occurred in the right travel lane. Is that your understanding?
 - A. Yes, that is my understanding.
- Q. Do you agree that the impact between the bicycle and the motor coach occurred in the right travel lane?
 - A. Yes. Mr. Caldwell and I agree on that.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall approximately how far he said into the right travel lane that the impact occurred?
- A. As I recall, I believe he's got it approximately 6 feet into the right travel lane.
- Q. Is that from the edge of the bicycle lane?
 - A. Yes, that is from the edge of the

1	bicycle lane.				
2	Q. Would that be the which edge?				
3	A. That would be the western edge of the				
4	bicycle lane.				
5	Q. All right. So if he				
6	A. Excuse me. That would be the eastern				
7	edge of the bicycle lane.				
8	Q. Show us which edge it is.				
9	A. It's going to be this edge right here.				
10	Q. Okay. And do you and doctor excuse				
11	me.				
12	Do you and Mr. Caldwell agree that it				
13	occurred in that right travel lane?				
14	A. Yes, we do.				
15	Q. And what did you determine how far into				
16	the right travel lane that the impact occurred?				
17	A. Approximately 6 feet.				
18	Q. Okay. So you and is it Mr. Caldwell				
19	or Dr. Caldwell I don't remember expert				
20	Caldwell.				
21	Y'all agree on point of impact in the				
22	bus lane traveling lane; right?				
23	A. Yes, we do.				
24	Q. All right. Show me, if you would,				
25	Exhibit 525, the next exhibit.				

A. That would be it.

- Q. And what are you showing us there?
- A. So all I've done is just taken another photo that was taken on the day of the incident. And what I've tried to do is sort of walk you closer and closer to the middle of the intersection.

So the next picture, we're moving a little bit further to the south. And now what you're looking at again here, this is the right travel lane. I've put a label in here for the bike lane. There's the right turn lane.

But, again, it's just moving a little bit further to the south closer to the middle of the intersection.

- Q. Okay. So if -- using this model, you're getting closer to this intersection up there with these photographs; is that correct?
- A. Right. So we're starting back here and we're walking this way, getting closer to this area here.
- Q. All right. Show me, if you would, Exhibit No. 526.
- A. Similar picture -- a similar picture, again, just moving a little bit closer to the

south, getting closer to the middle of the intersection.

- Q. Exhibit 527. Okay.
- A. Okay. Same thing, just a few more steps closer. You'll see that the bicycle is here. And you'll see, as we step closer and closer, the bike will be getting closer and closer.
 - Q. And 528 is you get closer?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. All right. And let's look at 529.

 Now, where are we there?
- A. 529, we're just about to enter the intersection. And so this is -- right here, this is what is called a stop bar. When you and I drive up to a stoplight, you'll see that white stripe laid across the road. You're not supposed to go any further than that.

But that is what is technically called a stop bar. And so what I've tried to do is identify that, because a lot of the reference measurements that people have made in this case are tied to that position on the stop bar, and things are going north and south, and people are making measurements relative to this line here. So it's important. It was important for me to

identify this in the picture.

And then I've also added the bike lane and the right travel lane. And then you can also see these dashed lines here, and that's the crosswalk just before you get into the intersection.

- Q. Okay. Now, let's look at 530. Where are we there?
- A. Just about to step onto the crosswalk in this picture, and that's why I've identified the crosswalk. We're getting a little closer to the bike's point of rest in the middle of the intersection.
- Q. Okay. You see the two white-looking objects to the right of the bike? There's been some testimony as to what people thought that were. Do you know what those were?
- A. Yes, I know what those are. Those are water bottles that were on the bike.
 - Q. If you will, look at Exhibit 531.
 Where are we now?
- A. Getting a little bit closer. Now we're almost on top of the bike, but you can see now that we are about -- somewhere near the middle of the intersection. And now you can see this is the

bike. And then you can see a little bit better
that those are water bottles.

- Q. All right. Looking at 532, which is obviously closer, where are we there?
- A. So at 532, what we're looking at is the bike. And then there is an area here that I've identified as the point of rest. And that would be the point of rest of Dr. Khiabani.

And then there's also some gouges that are here. And what's also noticeable is that this whole area of the bike and the gouges all lie in the right travel lane.

- Q. Is that the lane the bus was in?
- A. And that is the lane that the bus was in.
- Q. I want to step back. Is that bicycle after it was moved, or is that the final resting place of the bicycle?
- A. That is at the position of the bike after it was moved.
- Q. And you see the bus way up at the corner? Is that where it was moved?
- A. Right. And that's where the bus was moved after that first photograph was taken.
 - Q. Okay. We're going to see some video,

1	and the jury has seen several videos. That bus				
2	would not be in the video at that location;				
3	correct?				
4	A. Correct.				
5	Q. Okay. Now, let's look at 533.				
6	And tell us what you're trying to show				
7	in this particular exhibit.				
8	A. So if you were to continue south, and				
9	you were to step over the bike, and then if you				
10	were to turn and look back towards the north in				
11	the middle of the intersection, this is what you				
12	would see.				
13	So what I've showed here is				
14	MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Judge, can we				
15	approach just briefly, Your Honor?				
16	THE COURT: Yes.				
17	(A discussion was held at the bench,				
18	not reported.)				
19	MR. BARGER: May I proceed?				
20	THE COURT: Certainly.				
21	MR. BARGER: Thank you.				
22	BY MR. BARGER:				
23	Q. What is shown by Exhibit No. 533?				
24	A. Okay. So, like I said, if you were				
25	to				

- Q. We can't use --
- A. Okay. Yeah.
 - Q. Let's talk about just approach. Okay?
 - A. Okay.

All right. So looking back towards the north, the bike. And now looking back in the direction, you can see the right travel lane and you can see that there are some gouges which are -- now been marked with some cones.

And you can see the bike lane is over here, and that's what the -- the purpose of this particular photo was so that I could help you understand what that intersection looks like and where the physical evidence came to rest.

- Q. So if a person standing there taking this photograph, they're looking back towards Charleston?
 - A. That's correct. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Now, let's look at Exhibit 534.

What is the significance of the cones there? What is it trying to demonstrate?

A. Well, you can see the cones are here, and they've got some little white things beside them. And you can see the location of the cones

are in the right travel lane. So, again, this is a photo looking towards Charleston.

- Q. What are the little white things that the cones are showing?
 - A. May I flip to the next exhibit?
- Q. Yes.

For the record, that will be 535.

- A. So the cones are identifying gouges -fresh gouges that were on the pavement. And you
 know they're fresh because they have -- kind of a
 whitish appearance to them. So that's what the
 cones were marking.
- Q. And why is that important for your reconstruction?
- A. Again, that's some physical evidence that I need to take into account when I'm trying to position all of the vehicle -- or trying to position the bike and the bus and the points of rest and try to understand how all of these events unfolded, I have to take into account the location of those gouges.
- Q. Look at 536. Is this a photograph taken by the coroner?
- A. Yes, that is. That is a photograph taken by the coroner of Dr. Khiabani's bike.

1	Q. And, if you would, go to 537.					
2	What is that showing?					
3	A. 537 is a closeup area of the left-side					
4	handlebar of Dr. Khiabani's bike. And what's of					
5	interest is here in this area. That round,					
6	blackish thing is called the brake hood. It's					
7	sort of a cover that goes over the left brake					
8	handle. And you can see that this is marked by me					
9	as the abraded it has an abrasion to the top of					
10	that brake hood.					
11	Q. And I think the jury has seen the actual					
12	bicycle, so we can bring it in if we need to.					
13	But, right now, do we need to do that?					
14	A. No.					
15	Q. Okay.					
16	You see to the right on the handlebars					
17	that round object with a an orange strap?					
18	A. Yes.					
19	Q. What is that?					
20	A. That's a speaker, a music speaker.					
21	Q. If we go to the next slide, which is					
22	538, does that show the bike and it shows the					
23	speaker?					
24	A. Yes. This is a view looking down on top					
25	of the handlebars, and now you can see that					

1	circular music speaker.				
2	Q. If you would go to 539.				
3	And is that a photograph that was taken				
4	that day?				
5	A. Yes, that is. That's a photo that was				
6	taken of the bus on the day of the crash.				
7	Q. And without being extremely				
8	repetitious because people will start throwing				
9	rocks at me but what are you showing there as a				
10	scuff mark?				
11	A. There's a black scuff mark that we				
12	learned after doing the investigation, that that				
13	was a scuff mark being made by that brake hood				
14	from the bike.				
15	Q. And I think all the experts on both				
16	sides agree that's a scuff mark made by the				
17	bicycle?				
18	A. Yes, we do.				
19	Q. All right. Look at 540.				
20	Obviously, we're going to look at that				
21	again, but that's the scuff mark?				
22	A. Yeah. It's a little bit closer view of				
23	that same scuff mark that we've been talking				
24	about.				

Q. All right. Now, let's go to 541.

1	You told us that you personally
2	inspected the bus and the bike that were involved
3	in this accident; correct?
4	A. I did.
5	Q. At the top, it says "CEI inspection
6	photo." What is that?
7	A. CEI is my company, Carr Engineering,
8	Inc. So we just abbreviate it as CEI.
9	Q. Is this the day of the inspection at the
10	yard?
11	A. Yes. This is one of the many pictures
12	that I took.
13	Q. Okay. And a lot of people took photos
14	that day, did they not?
15	A. Yes, they did.
16	Q. Okay. So let's look at 542. Does that
17	show the scuff mark?
18	A. Yes. That's my photo that shows the
19	scuff mark just behind the right front wheel.
20	Q. When you folks up there when you took
21	these photographs, did you actually take
22	measurements and inspect the bus and measure it
23	and look at things like that?
24	A. Yes, we took measurements, photos. Like

I said earlier, we did this laser scan.

There was

1	a lot of things that were done to document our
2	findings.
3	Q. Okay. Look at, if you will, again, 543.
4	A little bit repetitious, but that's the scuff
5	mark.
6	You actually measured that from
7	different points on the bus, did you not?
8	A. Yes, I did.
9	Q. And measured the length of it?
10	A. Yes, I did.
11	Q. All right. Look at again 544.
12	Now, was this the bike that was involved
13	in the accident?
14	A. Yes. That is Dr. Khiabani's bike.
15	Q. And on that particular day, did you get
16	a chance to thoroughly inspect the bike with
17	everybody else?
18	A. Yes, I did.
19	Q. All right. Now, look at 545. You
20	talked about the abraded brake hood. Can you
21	explain a little bit more I don't think there's
22	any disagreement on this, but explain a little bit
23	more what that means and the significance of that.

Yes. What was significant about that

was that is the object that made the scuff on the

1 | side of the bus.

So one of the things that needed to be done was to try to understand how the bike and the bus came into contact with one another. And what had to happen is we have to have this brake hood match up with that scuff. They have to align.

It's the only object that's on the bike that can make that scuff against the side of the -- against the side of the bus.

Q. Look at Exhibit 546.

Is that the same that you're talking about with respect to the brake hood?

- A. Yes. And, again, that's sort of a closer view of how that brake hood is abraded. It's been smeared. You can see that this sort of a rubberish cover has been smeared by something that has come from rear to front. In other words, it's some object that is moving from behind the bike and moving forward or beyond the front of the bike.
- Q. Is that the -- which handlebar -- is that the left side of the handlebar?
 - A. Yes, that is the left-side handlebar.
- Q. Now look at the next photograph,
 Exhibit 547. What are you doing there and what

are you measuring?

A. Well, what we tried to do is put the abraded brake hood up against that scuff mark that was on the side of the bus, the point being that we're trying to understand just what the bike has to do in order to reach that mark.

- Q. Did you make a determination as to what degree lean it had to be to make that mark?
- A. Yes. We found that if the bike was completely upright, the brake hood mark -- or the brake hood was too high above the mark. So what we found is that we had to move the bike a little bit away from the side of the bus and lean the bike against the bus at approximately a 25-degree angle.
 - Q. What is that telling you?
- A. Well, it tells me that the bike is leaning to the left as it went into contact against the side of the bus.
- Q. Approximately -- did you get a chance to estimate the distance -- I see you have a measuring tape there. What's the purpose of that measuring tape?
- A. Well, the purpose of the tape was to try to record just how far away the bottom of the bike

was, or the bottom tires of the bike were, from
the side of the bus when the scuff mark was in
contact or when the the brake hood was in
contact with the scuff mark.

- Q. Did you make a determination how far that was?
- A. Yes. I estimated it's about 18 to 20 inches.
- Q. Now, what I want to ask you is, from your inspection of the bus itself or the bicycle, were there any mechanical problems with either one that you saw?
- A. I found no mechanical problems with the bus, no mechanical problems with the bike that caused or contributed to the crash.
- Q. Now, look at the next one, 548. Is that just a closeup of how the bike came in contact with the bus?
- A. Yes. That's a closeup of the brake hood on the scuff mark on the side of the bus.
 - Q. Is that still at a 25-degree angle?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Now, I want to go back to your scene inspection. Okay? And at the scene inspection, you've told the ladies and gentlemen of the jury

what you did. But you mentioned something about you flew a drone over on the day that you went out there.

What was the purpose of that?

- A. Well, the purpose is to ultimately end up with a --
- Q. Before you go on, describe the drone.

 It's not some big, giant thing, is it?
- A. No, no, it's not. It's a small, sort of a helicopter-looking thing. It's got four propellers on it. It's probably about 18 inches by 18 inches.

But the purpose is to try to photograph the site, because then it can -- we can take the data and put all of those pictures together. And it does a three-dimensional kind of a matchup of all of the photos so that you can end up with a scene that has all of the poles sticking up and the buildings sticking up. So things that will help me when I need to do some three-dimensional video work that we're going to talk about down the road here in just a little bit.

Q. Is the survey that you do out there, is that important to help you determine how the accident happened?

22

23

24

25

1	A. Yes, it is.					
2	Q. All right. Now, when you were at the					
3	site, what physical evidence did you still see in					
4	September of last year?					
5	A. Well, the things that were still present					
6	were things like the manhole covers or those					
7	cracks that I had showed you earlier or the stop					
8	bar or the crosswalk. Those things were present.					
9	The gouges, the small gouges, were sort					
10	of worn away, but the gouges were sort of close					
11	enough to some very distinctive rock patterns that					
12	were in the pavement, so it was pretty easy to					
13	figure out where those where those gouges were					
14	located from the photographs.					
15	Q. I want you to put up 549.					
16	And what is the purpose did you take					
17	that photograph?					
18	A. I did.					
19	Q. And what's the purpose of that					
20	photograph, please?					
21	A. Well, this is a photo that I took, and					

k, and I'm sort of at the intersection of Charleston and Pavilion Center Drive. So like I told you earlier, I painted on the roadway a reference point. That is my zero.

And then I started going in 100-foot intervals to the north. And I found that, in order to get to the intersection of Charleston, you're at about 611 feet. So I painted that on the roadway surface.

- Q. Okay. And the next photograph is where? Exhibit 550.
- A. So here we are walking -- here I am walking south on Pavilion Center Drive. And I put a blue arrow here on the bike lane, and I am 300 feet away from my reference point. I've put a yellow arrow here on the right -- on the right travel lane.
- Q. I think there's been some testimony there was a transit bus stop prior to getting to the 300-foot mark. Do you recall that transit bus stop?
- 18 A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Okay. So if that's 300 and I'm standing, would the transit bus stop be back the bottom of the picture towards me?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Show me the next slide if you would, which is Exhibit No. 551.
 - A. So 551, I walked to the south. I'm very

close to my 100-foot mark. So I'm about 100 feet away from my reference point. Again, the blue arrow, it shows you the bike lane; the yellow arrow shows you the right travel lane.

- Q. Are you still walking towards the intersection?
 - A. Yes.

Q. Show us Exhibit 552.

What are you showing us there?

A. So in 552, right here is where it says 000. That is my reference point. So that is where I started all of my measurements. And I chose the middle of the stop bar as that starting point.

And, again, we're looking at the blue arrow for the bike lane, the yellow arrow for the right travel lane. And then up here you can see is -- in the middle of the intersection is what I've identified as the approximate point of rest of Dr. Khiabani.

- Q. Okay. That's not point of impact.
 That's point of rest; right?
 - A. That is point of rest.
- Q. All right. Look at 553 and tell us what that's showing.

A. This is showing what it looks like if
you were to walk through the intersection and now
you're looking to the south. And you would see
that I'm 100 feet beyond my reference point, and
the blue arrow is identifying the location of the
bike lane where it starts on the south side of the
intersection

- Q. All right. Now let's look at 554.

 Now, what is that showing?
- A. This is what is called 3-D photo analysis, or the real fancy term for this is called photogrammetry. What we're doing here is trying to identify and properly place the point of rest of the bus based on this cell phone photograph.

So what's happened here in this particular photo is the drone has created the 3-D view of the scene. It creates and measures the placement of the various poles and the overhead sign posts. And now we can align ourselves in the same fashion as that particular photo and then finally determine just where the point of rest of the bus is based on that picture.

BY MR. BARGER:

Q. Let's slow down just a second. Where it

says "Cell phone photo" on the left, is that the one that's the actual photo taken by Mr. Pears?

- A. Yes. Yes, that is correct.
- Q. Now, the one on the right, when you do 3-D photo analysis, are you using a computer and a computer program?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. So be a little bit more specific of what you were doing there and what you were trying to accurately re-create. Okay?
 - A. Sure.
 - Q. And for what purpose.
- A. Sure. So we're using a program that is called 3D Studio Max. That's the program that takes the drone information and the survey information and puts it together so that I will end up with a scene that I can look at from all kinds of different angles at ground level.

But I have all of these posts, if you can see, are done up in green here. I can align myself with the posts relative to the palm trees. I can align myself with the overhead sign and this sign that's right here on the side of the road.

So you can use all of that information to basically put yourself in the same position as

1	the photographer and then also be able to use a					
2	three-dimensional view of the coach and be able to					
3	align that and determine where the coach came to					
4	rest.					
5	Q. And did you do that with your					
6	A. I did.					
7	Q photo analysis?					
8	Look at the next slide, which is					
9	Exhibit 555. What is that?					
10	A. We had some security video footage from					
11	the Red Rock Casino. And just like with that cell					
12	phone photo that was down on ground level, because					
13	we now had a three-dimensional scene, we could now					
14	look at the view of the scene from the perspective					
15	of the security camera.					
16	And the thing that I was trying to do is					
17	use that three-dimensional scene to try to					
18	accurately place the point of rest of					
19	Dr. Khiabani.					
20	Q. I'm going to ask you to stop for a					
21	second.					
22	So let's go back. This is you					
23	obviously have a video camera that's moving.					
24	You're able to stop it and take a still photo. Is					
25	that what that is?					

- A. Yeah, that's right.
- Q. And what are we showing with this particular exhibit, which is No. 555? Do you actually see -- is this after the accident?
 - A. Yes, this is.
- Q. Do you actually see Dr. Khiabani's area, where he is?
 - A. Right. Yes, we do.
- Q. I want to delicately ask you what you're seeing here. Okay?
- A. So this is sort of one snapshot taken from the security camera video. In fact, the coach is still moving through this scene. We just happened to capture it while it sort of was still in the scene in the middle of the view. But the coach is still moving through this scene.

What you see here is the palm frond from a tree that is between the security camera and the location where the accident happened. What you can see here is the outline here of Dr. Khiabani. This is a leg. This is a leg. And then there is his left arm is there extending out from just behind the palm frond. He's laid on his back and his legs are pointing towards the security camera in this image.

Q.	And	this	is	after	the	accident,
obvious	sly?					

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, let's go to your next slide, which is Exhibit 556. What is this showing you?
- A. Again, this is a 3-D photo analysis.

 This is photogrammetry. Same concept that we had before when we were talking about trying to position the point of rest of the coach.

Using this security camera footage, using the perspective where it was up on top of the building and the 3-D scene that we now have, we are able to line up the point of rest of Dr. Khiabani and pinpoint his point of rest and his position as the -- as shown in this still image from the security camera footage.

- Q. So on the left photo, that's the actual video stopped; right?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And on the right side, is that -- what are you doing with your photo analysis?
- A. So what we've done here is we're using the things that are on the ground that we could use. So there were the cracks, the manhole covers, the drone head going overhead so we knew

where the security camera was so we could get that proper angle. And then, ultimately, we were trying to lay in the point of rest of Dr. Khiabani so that it would match the security camera.

- Q. And on the right, on the coach itself where it says "3-D photo analysis," there seems to be some red circles. What are those intended to be?
- A. Yeah, that is what is called a wire frame. So after we had laser-scanned the bus, we converted it to what is called a wire frame. It's like taking the outline of the bus and just putting a red line on it. But now we have this three-dimensional bus that we could position on this security camera footage. And it was another way to be able to help us create the path of the bus as well as as it passes by Dr. Khiabani's point of rest.
- Q. Now, those red circles are not intended to be a bicycle, are they?
- A. No. The red circles represent the tires and the wheels on the bus.
- Q. Okay. Go to 557. And what are you showing us there?
 - A. Okay. So this is the view again from

the Red Rock security camera video. And this is the finished product of our three-dimensional analysis. What we know from the Red Rocks camera footage is that there are 10 frames per second. So what that means is if you were to click, click, click, click, you would count ten times and that would be equal to one second. So every frame that you see in this Red

So every frame that you see in this Red Rocks video means it's one-tenth of a second. The bus has moved one-tenth of a second. The action in the video has progressed one-tenth of a second with each click.

Q. Now, it says switch to Attachment 1.

MR. BARGER: For the record, Your Honor, Attachment 1 is Exhibit 565.

16 | BY MR. BARGER:

- Q. And what I want to do is -- where is the bus in this particular attachment?
- A. You'll see the bus is starting to come into view here.
- Q. Is this approximately the first time you could see the bus in the video?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. All right. And that, for the record, is frame No. 4?

1	A.	Yes, that's
2	Q.	All right. Now, in evidence under 565
3	is frames	No. 4 through 61. Is that your
4	recollect	ion?
5	A.	That is correct.
6	Q.	All right. And what is each frame
7	one-tenth	of a second?
8	A.	Right.
9	Q.	So in order to go one whole second, how
10	many frame	es that's kind of a silly question.
11	I'm sorry	

How many frames do you have to go to get to one second?

- A. Ten.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

Now, I want you to walk us through and describe what you're seeing with respect to this particular attachment. Okay?

A. So like I said before, we've got our three-dimensional scene. We now know where the camera is, the security camera. So now we've got our three-dimensional bus. You'll see it come into view. This is the red wire frame bus. And we know where Dr. Khiabani's point of rest is, and we know where the crosswalks are, and we know

where the curbs are. We have all of that mapped.

The ultimate purpose is to try to accurately plot the path of the bus as it goes through the security camera video, because we're looking at it from an angle. What we really want to do is to eventually swing our camera's eye and look directly down on top of it so we can see where everything is as if we were in a helicopter looking down on top of all of the evidence.

But you've got to begin with this view, and then you've got to match the bus's position with each frame.

Now, I've stopped it at frame No. 9 because we could tell from the lineup of the red wire frame on top of the bus in the video, we could tell that the bus is now turning. It's starting to change its heading angle. It's moving to the left or it's rotating to the left.

Q. Let me stop you for a second.

The jury has heard testimony that at some point, the bus went to its left. Okay? All right.

- A. Yes, that's right.
- Q. So is what you're trying to do is to show, through the actual video with your photo

computer information, when that occurred and how it occurred; is that correct?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. And why is it you want to actually do that to show the jury?
- A. Well, you want to understand when is it that the bus is actually starting to turn? You want to understand where the point of impact takes place, because that's also captured in the video. You want to understand the path of the bus as it went through the intersection. You want to understand whether or not the bus ran over Dr. Khiabani when he was laid out on his point of rest.

Those are the things that need to be understood and need to be analyzed before you can move forward with this reconstruction.

- Q. Okay. So let's go -- what I want you to do to make this go a little bit faster is to walk through your slides, and each time -- at least for the record -- show what frame number it is. Like that's frame 9 we're looking at.
 - A. Right.
- Q. Can you walk through that and show what you're trying to accomplish and what you did

accomplish? Okay?

A. Yes. So I'm going to be stepping through, and each frame we've numbered. So, again, each frame is a tenth of a second. And what we're trying to do is capture certain things that are happening in the video.

So as the bus begins to move through the intersection, one of the things that we're seeing, as I've said before, is the coach is turning to the left. The bus is turning to the left in this portion of the video.

- Q. I think we're clear on this. You're not suggesting the bus was making a left-hand turn?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry.
- A. Now, the next thing that comes up in this video is there is a dark area that is just behind the right front wheel. And this area that's around the wheel itself, that's called the wheel well. On our cars, that's the thing that kind of goes around the tires. That's called the wheel well.

So you can see the wheel well here on the right front. You can see that there's a dark area just behind the wheel well. But as I advance

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

```
these next few frames, you're going to see that
that dark area sort of falls further and further
behind against the side of the bus.
```

- Q. What is your opinion of what the dark area is?
- A. It's my opinion that that is the point of impact between Dr. Khiabani's bike and the side of the bus.
- Q. Okay. Now, before you continue, what frame is it that you first see the bus? Can you go back?
- A. Yes. You first see the bus at frame No. 4.
- Q. Okay. And so at frame 4, when you first see the bus, do you see the bicyclist?
- 16 A. No, you do not.
 - Q. Do you have any idea at that point -- and we'll talk further about this -- where the bicyclist is at that point?
 - A. No, I do not.
 - Q. Okay. Now, because it's not on the video, is it?
- 23 A. It is not.
- Q. He's not on the video? The bicyclist,
 Dr. Khiabani, is not on the video?

1 A. He is not.

Q. Go back to frame 19.

By the way, when do we first see the dark spot that you think is Dr. Khiabani? What frame, just for the record?

- A. 15.
- Q. All right. At frame 15 is the first time that you can see what you think is Dr. Khiabani on the Red Rock video; right?
 - A. That's right. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. Continue with your discussion, if you will.
- A. As I said, if you go from 15 to 16, 17, 18, 19, you can see that there is this gap from this dark spot in the wheel well. That's how we know that it's not something that's attached to the bus; it's some other object.

Then if you continue, you'll see that the bus goes by where Dr. Khiabani's point of rest ultimately takes place. And as you step through this video, you'll see this is now Dr. Khiabani is at his point of rest. The bus is departing the --

Q. For the record, go back to frame 38. Is is that where you first see Dr. Khiabani at his point of rest?

hour.

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And we've discussed that it's your
3	opinion, obviously, at that point, that's
4	Dr. Khiabani; correct?
5	A. That is correct.
6	Q. Now, continue past 38.
7	A. And then you'll see that, as the bus
8	continues, we're able to keep the wire frame
9	lineup on the exterior of the bus, and then
10	finally it exits the video.
11	Q. Now, I think Mr. Caldwell testified that
12	you and he agreed on the approximate speed of the
13	bus at that point in time.
14	What do you recall that number is?
15	A. We both agreed it's approximately
16	25 miles per hour.
17	Q. There's no real disagreement there?
18	A. No, there isn't.
19	Q. All right. Do you know if the bike
20	speed was estimated by some experts in this case?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And what's the approximate consensus of
23	the bike speed?

A. It's approximately 13 to 14 miles per

Q.	Okay.	Now, I was	nt to step	p back	and go
back to	frame 15	. And have	e you r	what I	want you
to expla	ain to the	e ladies a	nd gentler	men of	the jury
is, usi	ng these :	frames, 15	, probably	y back	to 9,
what amo	ount of t	ime has ela	apsed whe	n we fi	rst see
Dr. Khia	abani and	when you	get to fra	ame 153	?

- A. Well, from where the coach begins to turn at frame 9 to where Dr. Khiabani first appears in the video at frame 15, it says that the bus is turning to the left and it is 6/10 of a second into its turn from frame 9 to frame 15. It's 6/10 of a second into its turn when the collision happens.
- Q. Now, the jury has heard from
 Mr. Hubbard, the driver, that, I believe, he did
 make a movement to the left, and they can recall
 what was said.

What is the bus doing as it's making its movement to the left?

- A. Well, it's turning. It's changing its heading and it is moving out of its right travel lane and is starting to move away from the bike lane.
- Q. Did you read the testimony as to why that maneuver was being made?

1 A. Yes.

- Q. And what do you recall that testimony to be?
- A. The maneuver is being made because the bike is starting to come into the travel lane.

 It's starting to encroach into the bus's lane of travel.
- Q. Okay. So let's go back. From frame 9, when you first see Dr. Khiabani, and that's when the bus starts its -- excuse me. Frame 4 is when you first saw it?
 - A. Frame 4 is where we first see the bus.
- Q. Right.
 - A. Frame 9 is where we can see the bus is turning. Frame 15 is where we first see Dr. Khiabani.
- Q. Okay. What does that tell you in that 6/10 of a second? What does that tell you?
 - A. What it's telling me is that the bus is in its turn. It is already moving out of its travel lane or trying to move away from the bike that is coming into the side of the bus. And it's in that turn, the driver has the bus driver has made a decision to turn to the left. And it's 6/10 of a second into that turn when the collision

O. Okay. Now, there was some discu

Q. Okay. Now, there was some discussion with some of the witnesses about perception-reaction time. Can you discuss perception-reaction time. Is that something you use in your expertise on a daily basis?

A. Yes, we use perception-reaction time all the time in accident reconstruction.

It's something that basically describes, for drivers like us, if an event happens, we have a certain amount of time to perceive it; meaning, we see something that happens. And then we've got a certain amount of time to react to that, either apply the brakes or steer. If you add up that time, it's called the perception-reaction time.

And so for someone like myself in accident reconstruction, it's important because we have to understand what is happening -- in the phase of the perception-reaction time, where are the vehicles during that phase.

- Q. Okay. And did you utilize and come into some of your opinions of perception-reaction time?
 - A. I did. I did.
- Q. And tell us how you utilized that and what perception-reaction time you used.

70	0
A	Sure

range anywhere from about a second and a half to 2 1/2 seconds. There's a group of people by the title of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. That's the federal government. And they sort of dictate certain things with regard to roadway safety. And one of the things they look at is what is a typical perception-reaction time for drivers. And it's about a second and a half.

But there's also another group. And they're called the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials. And they're the ones that design the roads that you and I drive on. They're the ones that lay out how the turnpike needs to be curved and how wide the lanes need to be. And they also have a perception-reaction time. And their perception-reaction time is typically around 2 1/2 seconds.

So you've got a typical range for an accident reconstructionist like myself to use that can range from anywhere from a second and a half to 2 1/2 seconds.

1 Okay. Now, go to the next slide, which 0. 2 I believe is Exhibit No. 558. 3 Are we -- I want you to be able to tell 4 your story, but are we there to switch to 5 Attachment 2 at this point? 6 Α. Yes, I think we are. 7 MR. BARGER: Your Honor, for the record, 8 Attachment 2 is Exhibit 566. 9 Okay. Very good. THE COURT: 10 For the record, Your Honor, MR. BARGER: 11 Attachment 2 is the same slides, Nos. 4 through 12 And it's in evidence. Okay? 13 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. 14 BY MR. BARGER: 15 Now, at some point, you've reached some Q. 16 conclusions, and we'll talk about that. But what 17 did you do -- what is Attachment 2? 18 So Attachment 2 is the thing that Α. Okay. 19 I was talking about earlier, where, once we are 20 able to take the Red Rock security camera footage, 21 and knowing that you're at that angle, what you 22 really want to do is you really want to look at

what's going on as if we're up in a helicopter

trying to understand, is what's the bus doing?

looking down. Because that's really what you're

23

24

What is it doing as it's going through the intersection?

So if you know where the bus is in this three-dimensional analysis that I've done, then the last step is to take the camera's eye and then look down on top. And so that's what we're looking at now.

So those same -- so those same frames that we were looking at earlier, they're the same frames that correspond to what you're about to see. So if you were to look at this intersection from a bird's-eye view, this is what you would see. And this is the motion of the bus based on all of that three-dimensional photogrammetric work.

- Q. Okay. You stopped with -- go back to frame 9. Is that the same as the actual frame 9 in the video?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Let me ask you a question. From a reasonable engineering probability, are your computer -- is your computer work accurate?
 - A. Yes. Yes, it is.
- O. You're satisfied with that?
- 25 A. Yes, I am. I think we had good data

1	with which to work with, and I believe that the
2	accuracy was very good.
3	Q. All right. So what happens at this
4	frame 9 under this computer model?
5	A. At frame 9, the bus is turning left.
6	You can see here you'll start to see the bus
7	itself starts to rotate just as the front end is
8	going up through that crosswalk.
9	Q. At that frame, where is the bus?
10	A. Well, this is the bus.
11	Q. I know. But what lane is it in?
12	A. Oh, it is in the right lane. And that's
13	what I did here, is I shaded the right travel lane
14	and I shaded the bike lane in the light blue.
15	Q. Okay. So the brown is the bus's right
16	travel lane?
17	A. Yes, that would be the initial travel
18	lane of the bus.
19	Q. And the bike lane is the blue?
20	A. Is the light blue.
21	Q. And the bike lane is approximately how
22	wide?
23	A. Approximately 4 feet wide.
24	Q. And the right travel lane is

approximately how wide?

About 11 feet wide. 1 A. 2 All right. Do you have -- can you go Q. 3 back to Slide 4. 4 Okay. Now, at this point, is that the 5 same as Slide 4 in the actual video? 6 Α. Yes, that is. 7 Is that the first time you saw, in the Q. 8 video, the coach? 9 That is correct. Α. 10 All right. Now, before Slide 4, do you Q. 11 have any idea as to -- there's been several 12 witnesses testify. Okay? And you've read their 13 testimony, have you not? 14 Α. Yes. 15 All right. Do you know exactly where Q. Dr. Khiabani was before Slide 4? 16 17 A. No, we do not. 18 It's not in the video? Q. Okay. 19 It is not in the video. Α. 20 Okay. So we have Erika Bradley who says Q. 21 one thing; we have Mr. Hubbard who says something; 22 correct? 23 Α. Correct. 24 You have Ms. Kolch on the other side of 0.

the street who says something?

A. Right.

- Q. And the jury will hear from two other gentlemen on the bus, Mr. Pears and Mr. Plantz; right?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And you're not saying any one of them is right and any one of them is wrong, are you, at this point, because you don't know where the bicycle was at this point; correct?
 - A. That is correct. I do not.
- Q. Okay. But let's go back, and let's walk to square 9, frame 9. And tell us what you did after that.
- A. What we did after that is we continued to plot the path of the bus because now we could see where it's at in the bird's-eye view. And we can watch the path that it takes as it goes by --well, these are those cones. And you can see that the bus turns to the left and then just continues on a path that's on an angle but continues to go through the intersection sort of pointed slightly to the southeast.
- Q. Do you know what frame that the impact occurred in?
 - A. Yes. So we would go back to -- the

1 | first time we see Dr. Khiabani was frame 15.

- Q. And where is that located in the right travel lane?
- A. You can see the bus is turned. Half of it is now outside of the right travel lane. The point of impact is here against the side of the bus. So you can see the point of impact is inside of the right travel lane.
- Q. From the center of the bike lane to the point of impact in the right travel lane, how far is it?
- A. From this position right here at the tip of the pointer to the side of the bus at the point of impact would be 8 feet approximately.
 - Q. And why is it 8 feet?
- A. Well, it's 6 feet from this line to the side of the bus.
- Q. And you and Mr. Caldwell agree on that; correct?
- A. We do.
 - And then the bike lane is 4 feet wide. So half of the bike lane would be 2 feet. So add 2 plus another 6 gives you the approximate 8 feet.
 - Q. So if there was a bicyclist in the bike lane -- if -- and they were in the center of the

1 lane approximately, it would be how far to where
2 it came into contact with the bus?

A. 8 feet.

- Q. And if it -- if a bicyclist was in the bike lane but was riding right down the east side of the bike lane, the ones closest to the bus, how far would that be?
 - A. That would be 6 feet.
- Q. So the bicycle lane, would it be anywhere from 6 to 10 feet, right, away from the bus?
- A. Right. You would be anywhere from 6 to here. And then if you went over to this side of the bike lane, you would add another 4. So that would give you the 10 feet.
- Q. With respect to -- now, let's don't talk about who saw who in the bike lane or when, if they did. Let's talk about you and Mr. Caldwell agree the accident occurred clearly in the right-hand travel lane; correct?
 - A. Yes, we do agree on that.
 - Q. There's no argument about that?
- A. No, we do not argue about that.
- Q. Now, do you need to continue with any slides in this Attachment 2, which is 566?

- A. No, I think we're good.
- Q. All right. Now, I want to go back -- actually, let's use that slide -- this slide.

Now, what is this slide meant to be?

A. Well, now that I had my
three-dimensional model and I could see where the
bus was moving at each tenth of a second -- if you
know how fast an object is moving or how much
ground is covered in a tenth of a second, then you
could determine the speed of the object.

And so what we had done was looked at it on that frame-by-frame basis and had broken it down to a tenth of a second. But one of the things I wanted to do is to make sure that my three-dimensional analysis agreed with what we could see just in some really basic things that stood out in the video.

So, for instance, we could see where the front of the bus passed the stop bar. And I could see where the front of the bus was at the manhole cover. I knew physically where the stop bar was located. I knew physically where the manhole cover was located. And I could tell you that those were 55 feet apart from one another. And I knew that all of that took place in 1 1/2 seconds.

So it was pretty easy for me to just run through a quick calculation to make sure that my three-dimensional analysis was right, and I came up with a 25-mile-an-hour speed, which agreed with what the three-dimensional analysis showed.

- Q. And agreed with Mr. Caldwell?
- A. And ultimately agreed with Mr. Caldwell.

 MR. BARGER: For the record, Your Honor,
 we were looking at Exhibit 559 for that last one.

 BY MR. BARGER:
 - Q. So I want you to turn to 560.

What are you trying to show here? It says "security video analysis." What does that mean?

A. So after we now had an accurate three-dimensional model, one of the things I wanted to look at is at the first time that the bus is visible in the video, what is the position of the bus in its travel lane? Is it centered? Is it over to the left?

That's the thing that was helpful from the three-dimensional analysis because it told us that the bus was actually positioned to the left of its travel lane, that there was a gap between the side of the bus and the white stripe for the bike lane of about 3, 3.4 feet.

So the thing that I learned from the three-dimensional analysis were two things: The bus was positioned over to the left side of his travel lane and that the bus is traveling straight in its travel lane. It's not turned one way or the other; he's going straight down the road, but he is over to the left side of his travel lane.

- Q. Okay. And what does that tell you as to when the bus started going to the left, if anything?
- A. Well, we'll know that it's going to the left on frame 9 when we can actually see it turn.
- Q. Okay. And where is this in relation to frame 9?
- A. This is at the very beginning. So this is going to be at the first time that it's visible in the video, which was frame No. 4. We're about a half second later.
- Q. So, going back, the distance -- the time between when you first see the bus starting to go left in this particular frame is 6/10 of a second?
- A. This is frame 4. So this is when it's first visible.
 - Q. Okay. And then frame No. 9 is where we

A.

Right.

```
could see it actually beginning the turn.
 1
 2
         Q.
               Okay. Do we have frame 9 -- slide
    there?
 3
 4
               No, we had it on the other one.
               Okay. We've seen frame 9?
 5
         Q.
               Yes, we have.
 6
         Α.
 7
               So we've got a lot of frames jumping
         Q.
 8
    around here.
                   I want to make sure we're clear.
 9
    This is frame 4, when you can first see the bus in
10
    the video; right?
11
         A.
               Right.
12
         Q.
               Is that when the bus starts to make a
    movement to the left, first time?
13
14
         A.
               No.
15
               When is the time that the bus starts to
         0.
    make a movement to the left?
16
17
               About another half second from this
18
    position as it moves down the road, you can see it
19
    actually turning.
               That's frame 9?
20
         Q.
               At frame No. 9.
21
         Α.
22
               Okay. Now, now we can talk about
         Q.
23
    perception-reaction time as it relates to this;
24
    correct?
```

Q.	So what does that mean with respect to
the perc	eption-reaction time in that 6/10 of a
second?	How much time will elapse and how much
time wil	l you travel?

A. Well, what we're talking about is, in this particular frame for the perception-reaction time, this is the phase where the perception-reaction time is taking place.

In other words, we know that, later on, the bus actually begins to turn. And that happens in five frames down the road. But what's happening is, in this particular section of the video, the bus driver must be perceiving and reacting and then getting ready to put in the steer, which is going to happen in frame No. 9.

- Q. So if someone perceives something and wants to make a steer, is there a period of time that it takes to make that steer?
 - A. Right. Yes.
- Q. And in that period of time that it takes to make that steer, a moving vehicle, does it move?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And at 25 miles an hour, how is it moving? How far?

A. So, like I was talking about earlier, we have a perception-reaction time of a second and a half to 2 1/2 seconds. So let's just say -- let's take the middle of that range. And let's just say it's 2 seconds.

So a bus that is traveling at 25 miles an hour is using up 37 feet -- or is traveling at 37 feet per second. So if we're talking about a bus that's traveling at 37 feet per second, in 2 seconds it's going to travel 74 feet.

So in the perception-reaction time period, the bus is still going straight because the driver hasn't done anything with the bus. He's perceiving and reacting, and he's going to travel 74 feet before the bus begins to start to move.

- Q. Okay. If a person is on a bicycle traveling 13 to 14 miles per hour, the jury has heard how far they're traveling.
- A. Same thing. So in that same 2-second time period, if you're going to look at just 2 seconds of travel, a bicycle that's going 13 to 14 miles an hour, if you take the middle of that, is traveling at about 20 feet per second. So in 2 seconds, a bike will travel 40 feet.

25

1 So if, in fact -- okay. So let's go 0. 2 back. 3 If, in fact -- just assume for me for a 4 moment that the bicyclist was in the bicycle lane. 5 Okay? Just assume Erika Bradley is right. Okay? 6 What is the frame, or the distance back, 7 that the bicyclist would be out in front? 8 making sense? 9 Doesn't sound like it, does it? 10 Yeah, I think -- I think there's --11 you've got to throw in one other factor in there. 12 And that is going to be the fact that we know that 13 the bus is actually in its turn when the collision 14 happens. 15 Q. Okav. 16 And there is another piece of the --Α. 17 piece of the information that needs to be considered. 18 And that is the bus is already 19 turned, and we're 6/10 of a second into the 20 collision -- into the travel before the collision 21 takes place. 22 So if you're looking at 23 perception-reaction time and the 6/10 of a second

that it took to get to the point of impact -- so

when we talk about perception-reaction time

1	and then the collision time phase, you've got to
2	take into account 2 seconds plus the additional
3	6/10 of a second because the bus was already in
4	its turn when the collision took place.
5	Q. So if you take back the
6	perception-reaction time to 2 seconds, is that
7	what you used?
8	A. Yes, I looked at it I chose a really
9	quick time, and I used a second and a half.
10	Q. Okay. So you used less than 2 seconds?
11	A. I did.
12	Q. So do you have an opinion as to, if
13	Dr. Khiabani was in the bicycle lane, where he
14	would have been with respect to the front of the
15	bus when the bus is perceived and starts its left
16	turn?
17	Does that make sense?
18	A. Yeah, where the bus driver would begin

- A. Yeah, where the bus driver would begin to perceive and react to the presence of Dr. Khiabani?
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Is that what you're asking?
- Q. Yes.

A. Yes. The bike would be anywhere from about 25 to 29 feet in front of the bus.

- Q. Okay. So if -- using the video and using your computer analysis, and you use a 1.5 perception-reaction time --
 - A. Right.

- Q. -- and assuming a witness was correct that Dr. Khiabani was in the bike lane, how far in front of the bus would Dr. Khiabani have been as they approached the intersection before he starts to make the left turn -- before the bus starts to make the left turn?
- A. I think that's what we were just talking about.
- Q. I know, but just give me that number again.
- A. Okay. So, again, using a second and a half of reaction time and knowing that he's in the turn, the answer is the bike would be 25 to 29 feet in front of the bus.
- Q. Okay. Now, you're not here to talk about visibility in front of the bus, are you?
 - A. I'm not.
 - Q. That's somebody else's job; right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Let's give the benefit of the doubt.

 Let's make it a faster perception-reaction time.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Let's use a second instead of a second and a half. 2 Α. Okay. 3 Can you give us the numbers -- if the Q. 4 perception-reaction time of the bus driver was 1 second, how far in front of the bus would 5 6 Dr. Khiabani have been at the time that he started 7 to move? 8 A. The bus -- or the bike would be 9 approximately 16 to 20 feet in front of the bus 10 when the bus driver would begin to perceive and 11 react.

- Q. Now, is a perception-reaction time of 1 second extremely -- would you use the word "liberal"? I mean, it's pretty hard for a person to do that; right?
- A. It is. It is. Like I've said before, the published data out there for typical driver perception-reaction time is a second and a half to 2 1/2 seconds. So 1 second is extremely quick.
- Q. So you've given us those numbers. What I want you to do is to look at Exhibit No. 560.

That's your actual reconstruction drawing; correct?

- A. Yes, that is.
- Q. And what does that tell us?

A. Well, this was sort of after taking all of this — these pieces of the puzzle that I was talking about earlier, you've got the scene information, the vehicle information, the video analysis, all the physical evidence that was on the ground. And putting that into a scale diagram and putting all of that onto a drawing, now we can actually start to see distances involved.

For instance, the distance from the point of impact to the first gouge was 18 feet. The distance from the first gouge to the point of rest of the bike was 15 feet. I could see that the bike had been moved a total of 9 feet to its secondary point-of-rest position. I could see where the point of rest of the bus was from the cell phone footage.

So this is sort of a compilation, my reconstruction drawing. It's a scale drawing of everything put into the diagram.

- Q. Look at Exhibit No. 562. What is the video analysis likely impact No. 1? What does that mean? Explain to the jury what you're showing them there.
- A. So this is a close-up view of frame 15. Remember I was talking about the dark object that

was just behind the wheel well of the bus. So this was the close-up view of the point of impact between Dr. Khiabani and the side of the bus.

- Q. All right. Now, the next slide is 563, exhibit number. What are you showing there with the likely impact under the video analysis?
- A. This is the impact location based on the three-dimensional scene that I had created with the three-dimensional bus model, and we have the tan line represents the right travel lane, and you can see the blue line is the bike lane. And now we're showing where the bike is coming into contact with the side of the bus. And all of that taking place in that respective view of slide No. 15.
- Q. So is this your best analysis of what the impact looked like and where it occurred?
- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And that impact is in the right travel lane of the bus; correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And it is how far into the travel lane at the point of impact?
- A. This distance from the edge of the bike lane to the contact point on the bus is

approximately 6 feet.

- Q. Okay. And I want to be very clear again. Go back to frame 94, which is the first time that you see the bus. And I think all the other experts agree with you. Is that your understanding?
 - A. Yes, I think that we do agree on that.
- Q. You're not here to say where Dr. Khiabani was with respect to what the eyewitnesses saw; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. All right. With respect to if Dr. Khiabani was in the bike lane at the speeds the two were going, he would have -- how far back would he have been if you used the 2.5 reaction seconds in front of the bus?
- A. I've calculated for the 2.5. It would be further than 1.5.
 - Q. Let's don't go to 2.5. Go to 1.5.
- A. If we go to the 1.5, the bike is in front of the bus 25 to 29 feet.
- Q. And if you go to 1 second, which is very very liberal, it's how far in front?
- 24 | A. 16 to 20 feet.
 - Q. Okay. Now, look finally at 564. What

are you showing us with that slide?

A. The point of impact taking it from the bird's-eye view. Now we can see everything from the top view. We're looking at the impact between Dr. Khiabani and the side of the bus. And if you looked at that and could put a ruler down, we would understand that that point of impact occurs approximately 6 feet from the bike lane. I show that they were at that point of impact location is about 18 feet from the first gouge that was on the ground.

Q. Now, I want to switch subjects for a minute. The jury was shown a videotape that came off of YouTube of a vehicle. I think it was an oil tanker-type truck and a bicyclist that occurred in Russia.

Have you had a chance to see that video?

- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. All right. And have you analyzed that video as far as looking -- taking that video and stopping it frame by frame?
 - A. Yes, I have.

MR. BARGER: All right. Your Honor,
Attachment 3, which would be Exhibit No. 567, is
only offered for demonstrative purposes. It's not

Q.

1 being offered as an exhibit to go into evidence, 2 but we're going to show that. And I've discussed 3 that with Mr. Kemp. 4 I have no objection, Your MR. KEMP: 5 Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. 7 BY MR. BARGER: 8 So what we're going to do -- now, you've Q. 9 seen this video, obviously? 10 I have. A. 11 And you had done some -- well, what did Q. 12 you do to the video, by the way? 13 Well, first, I went out and found a more Α. 14 complete copy of it. It turned out that there was 15 a longer piece of footage rather than the short 16 video that I was initially provided. So we wanted 17 to first gather that up. 18 And then secondly was to understand just 19 where this took place. It happens in Russia. 20 And then have an understanding of what this 21 roadway looked like so that we could better 22 understand what we're seeing in the video. 23 And so that's what was my analysis as 24 sort of a step-by-step process.

So do you have the video that we can

1 show?

A. I do.

Q. Okay. Can you play it.

(Video played.)

THE WITNESS: Okay. We're going to play this, just letting it run. What you'll see is a more complete piece of footage.

BY MR. BARGER:

- Q. This takes place in Russia?
- A. It does. This does take place in Russia, outside of St. Petersburg.
 - Q. What's that right there? Stop it for a second. What is that going to the right? What's happening there?
 - A. So what's happening right here in this lane -- let me get my pointer out. Here.

So this intersection, it's like a cloverleaf. I don't know if any of you all know what a cloverleaf is, but it's got --

- Q. They live in Las Vegas. They know.
- A. So it's got lanes that are circling back around as they're coming in and coming out into the main highway. So what's happening here is this is one of those lanes that's going to sort of peel off and go on to the cloverleaf section.

So what's happening here, this is sort of the end of the far right lane. And what you're going to see is going to be this 18-wheeler that's going to come up and drive on the portion of the roadway that is -- that's not the travel lane.

- Q. Okay. So let's continue with the video.

 Okay. Let's go to the next part of the attachment. So what are you showing here?
- A. All right. So what we're showing here is what is it that the bike rider is doing in this video? The bike rider is moving to the right, and there was some information that had been provided to me that said that he was being pulled to the right and that all he was doing was just driving straight down the road.

So Mr. Barger had asked me to look at what is the actual movement of this bike rider in this video?

So one of the things that we did is we looked at on a frame-by-frame basis. And I put a green arrow right here on the white stripe that is closest to the bike rider, this blue arrow right here is in line with his back tire, and this yellow line here.

What you're going to see is a yellow

line starts out like this and then it starts to get narrow, narrow, narrow; and then, all of a sudden, the yellow line switches over to the other side.

And what that indicates is that the bike rider in this video is actually slowly moving over to the right side of that white stripe long before the 18-wheeler goes by him.

- Q. Now, I don't want you to speculate what that rider is doing with his right hand, but is his right arm off the bike, extended?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Down to the right?
- 14 A. Yes, it is.
 - Q. Are you a bicycle rider?
 - A. I am.
- Q. Well, I don't even need to go there.

Is that a signal of some sort? I don't want you to speculate what he's doing, but if somebody was signaling they were turning right, would that be the appropriate type of signal?

- A. That's typically what you do.
- Q. Let's continue quickly and finish this.
- A. I'm going to just sort of step through this. This is the frame-by-frame analysis. But

now what you're looking at, whenever we can see that white stripe, you'll start -- now you start to see the white stripe comes into view, and now you'll see that the yellow line is over on the other side, meaning that the bicyclist has moved over to the right. That's what he's intending to do, and then along comes the large truck. All the while, he has gotten further over to the right.

- Q. Okay. I think we can -- that's good.
- MR. BARGER: You can take that down. Do you need to show that, that last slide? Okay.

 BY MR. BARGER:
- Q. Now, I want you to answer a question, but I don't want you to answer it. Just I want you to pause first. Okay?

Do you have opinion, based on reasonable engineering probability, of what caused the collision -- not that, but the collision with Dr. Khiabani and the bus? Don't answer that yet. But do you have an opinion, based upon reasonable engineering probability, of what caused the collision? Is the answer yes or no?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Now, pause before you answer this. What is that opinion?

Q.

another car before we see the bus.

1	A. Dr. Khiabani turned his bike in front of
2	the bus, began his turn in front of the bus and
3	then ultimately ran into the side of the bus.
4	Q. Thank you.
5	Now, one last do we have the video?
6	I want to show the video of the Red Rock video.
7	(Video played.)
8	BY MR. BARGER:
9	Q. Now, when it gets to the motor coach
10	into the frame, what would be 4, I believe, I want
11	you to stop it.
12	Okay. Now, what I want you to do is
13	back it up until we get to the first car going
14	south in the right-hand lane.
15	That's a car. Okay. And there's
16	another car. And there's another car. And
17	there's a school bus. Now stop it after that last
18	car. And can you go are you able to go frame
19	by frame? Okay.
20	Is there a time on that that you can
21	read?
22	A. Yes. Yes. There's a timer. The timer
23	is right here, and it says 10:34:04 right there.

Okay. Now, run the video until we see

_	
1	Stop. That's the bus. Okay.
2	Somehow I want to go back to the last
3	car.
4	Is that the last car? Okay. You got
5	that frame right there at 10:34; right? Right
6	there.
7	A. That's the last car right there.
8	Q. I'm sorry. Let's back that up again.
9	MR. BARGER: I apologize, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: It's okay.
11	BY MR. BARGER:
12	Q. Just back that up. When that car goes
13	at the stop line. That car right there. Okay.
14	What is that time?
15	A. That says 10:34:04.
16	Q. Now, stop it when we get to the first
17	frame you see the bus, please.
18	Stop. So what is that time?
19	A. It's 10:34:17.
20	Q. So how many seconds elapsed from when
21	the last car went into the intersection from when
22	the bus came to the intersection? How many
23	seconds?
24	A. Approximately 13 seconds.
25	Q. Okay. Now, I want to do the same thing

A.

on the other side of the median with the lane 1 2 headed north towards Charleston. 3 So I think that we passed the last car. 4 You need to go back until we see the very last car 5 enter -- that car. Is that it? 6 No. I think there's one more. 7 Stop. Was that it? Q. 8 A. I think that's it. 9 MR. BARGER: Can you back that up? 10 That's the car. Can you back that up. I know 11 it's -- okay. Back it, if you will, Brian, as far 12 back to the south when you first can. If you can't do it because it's too fast, let me know. 13 14 Stop right there. Let's just use that. BY MR. BARGER: 15 16 What is that time? Q. 17 A. 10:33:57. 18 Now what I want you to do is run the Q. 19 tape until you see the bus. 20 Are there any cars going north? 21 Α. No. 22 You saw the bus. And what is the time Q. between, basically, the last car headed north into 23 24 the intersection and when the bus first appears?

Approximately 20 seconds.

1	Q. Okay.					
2	MR. BARGER: That's fine. You can take					
3	your seat, Doctor.					
4	Judge, may I have one minute to talk to					
5	counsel?					
6	THE COURT: Sure.					
7	(Discussion off the record.)					
8	MR. BARGER: At this time, Your Honor,					
9	that's all the questions I have.					
10	And I've talked to Mr. Kemp. Can we					
11	approach the bench?					
12	(A discussion was held at the bench,					
13	not reported.)					
14	THE COURT: Okay, ladies and gentlemen,					
15	we're going to wrap up for the evening. And					
16	tomorrow I have a calendar in the morning, so					
17	we'll start at 12:30. Please have something to					
18	eat before you come. Okay? I'm going to admonish					
19	you for the evening.					
20	You're instructed not to talk with each					
21	other or with anyone else about any subject or					
22	issue connected with this trial. You're not to					
23	read, watch, or listen to any report of or					
24	commentary on the trial by any person connected					

with this case or by any medium of information,

including, without limitation, newspapers,
television, the internet, or radio.

You're not to conduct any research on your own relating to this case, such as consulting dictionaries, using the internet, or using any reference materials. You're not to conduct any investigation, test any theory of the case, re-create any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case on your own.

You're not to talk with others, text others, tweet others, message others, google issues, or conduct any other kind of book or computer research with regard to any issue, party, witness, or attorney involved in this case.

You are not to form or express any opinion on any subject connected with this trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

See you tomorrow at 12:30. Thank you. THE MARSHAL: All rise.

(The following proceedings were held outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Sir, you can step down.

Mr. Pepperman, do you have a report?

MR. PEPPERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. In

terms of the payments today, Ms. Lesani wrote that the issue is with what his department entered into the system. Their payroll team was working on reconciling the issue, but I cannot guarantee when they will have an answer for me. So they weren't able to correct the problem, their internal problem, by today.

So, as I said before, this was at 3:30 or I believe 3:00. So, unfortunately, as I mentioned before, it was a mixup in The Venetian's system with the payroll, and that's what happened and why one juror was paid because they correctly entered it and why one wasn't.

I have his paycheck stubs, but, again,
The Venetian will pay him and everything will be
covered in terms of what comes out, what goes in.
The sole purpose of the cashier's check is so that
he gets it today as opposed to another time.

THE COURT: Understood.

THE COURT: Marshal Ragsdale, he needs to get paid today; correct?

THE MARSHAL: I'll double-check. He did relay that to me earlier, that he didn't know what was going on, didn't know if he was going to get paid or was concerned about getting paid. But if

```
he could wait another day, I can ask.
 1
 2
              THE COURT:
                         Do we know when they're
 3
    going to have this?
 4
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
                               They know the issue.
 5
    They want to pay him through The Venetian.
 6
    They're trying to figure out the payroll problem.
 7
    I would assume that another day they would be able
 8
    to do it, but I can't speak for them.
                                            I can just
 9
    let her know -- if he's okay with going another
10
    day, I'm sure they could do it. But I'd have to
11
    confirm.
12
              THE MARSHAL: He just wants some
13
    information for sure.
14
              THE COURT:
                         Marshal Ragsdale, let him
15
    know that he can't be paid -- I'd rather you
16
    stipulate to what we're going to say because I
17
    don't want it to come from the Court.
                                            It's more
18
    like there's the ability to pay him today if he
19
    needs to be paid today.
20
                               You can tell him that
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
21
    The Venetian advised that there was an error in
22
    the department payroll system. They're working to
23
    get it fixed. If he can wait another day, we
24
    would hopefully have it resolved by tomorrow.
```

If he absolutely cannot, then we can

make arrangements that he receives the pay today,				
if that's okay with the Court.				
THE MARSHAL: Okay. I will.				
THE COURT: That's fine.				
Okay. Do we have other housekeeping				
matters in the meantime?				
MR. BARGER: While we're waiting, maybe				
we can discuss well, obviously, Mr. Rucoba will				
be back tomorrow at 12:30. Mr. Kemp indicated he				
wouldn't have him past three.				
MR. KEMP: I think I would go about an				
hour, just guessing.				
MR. BARGER: So we have the bus.				
Mr. Freeman, Eric Freeman, has made arrangements				
to have the bus here by 3:00. I guess the real				
question we need to know is where here.				
THE COURT: That's something we need to				
discuss with Marshal Ragsdale.				
MR. BARGER: My suggestion would be as				
soon as Will finishes the witness, the witness is				
finished, then we just do the jury view.				
Howard Russell sent around kind of a				
proposed				
MR. KEMP: Right. Your Honor, our				
objection to the proposal is their proposal				
objection to the proposal is their proposal				

```
1
    contemplates -- are we on the record?
 2
              THE COURT:
                           You need to be on the
 3
    record.
             I'm sorry.
 4
              MR. BARGER:
                            Let me start again.
                                                 Maybe
 5
    we can work it out.
 6
              THE COURT: We're back on the record.
 7
                            The issue that they -- I
              MR. BARGER:
 8
    can't speak for Mr. Kemp.
 9
              THE COURT: Mr. Kemp, would you like to
10
    speak?
11
                          Yeah.
                                 Your Honor, my
              MR. KEMP:
12
    issue --
13
              THE COURT:
                          What are we talking about?
14
    What is the topic now?
15
                          This is what we're talking
              MR. KEMP:
16
    about, the bus inspection.
17
              Mr. Russell sent a proposal either last
18
    night or this morning, and seeing the bus from the
19
    outside, I have no problem with. Okay. But in
    his proposal, it contemplated each one of the
20
21
    jurors sitting in the driver's seat and do their
22
    own little right-side visibility experiment. And
23
    I don't think that's appropriate for a million
24
    reasons. Number one, it's a jury experiment,
25
    which is not allowed.
```

THE COURT: No, it's --

MR. KEMP: Number two, if they had wanted to bring in a right-sided visibility study, like we had Mr. Cohen do, they should have brought it in.

Number three, this thing has adjusting seats. So if juror A is, say, 6-foot tall and juror B is 5 foot 2, they're going to have different viewpoints of the right-side blind spot.

Number four, the viewpoint that is relevant in this case is that of the driver. So what they -- if they really wanted to do this right, they should have had the driver sit there and got his point of view and done a 3-D visualization like Mr. Cohen did.

So that is my observation just to the jurors' experiment. I have no objection of them seeing the outside of the bus and walking around it and hitting it, whatever they want to do on the outside.

I think if they start measuring distances between certain points, I think that's a problem. I don't think they'll do that, but, you know, they might have a tendency to doing that to try to confirm where the mark is and the distance

between the wheels. I can see a juror doing that, and that, I would call juror experiment. But to just visually walk around the bus and look at it, I have no problem.

MR. BARGER: Here is our proposal.

Basically -- and it's filed so the Court will have it -- our proposal was to have the Court and the lawyers to be downstairs, subject, of course, to the Court's agreement. The bailiff would simply bring the jurors down to the location. Nobody would say a word. Nobody -- the lawyers wouldn't talk. There's no witnesses to testify. The jurors could not talk to each other.

But they be allowed to enter the bus for some period of time and not take measurements and not do experiments, but allowed to enter and sit in the seat of Pears and Plantz and sit in the driver's seat. That was our proposal.

I understand that they're objecting to that. I think the Court would probably have to make a decision one way or the other. I don't think we have to decide tonight as long as we agree that we'll have the bus here at 3:00 tomorrow, and the Court can think about what you're going to do.

```
MR. KEMP: Judge, actually, we started a bench brief on juror experiments, and that's exactly what this would be, a juror experiment, because they'd go in there and they'd experiment on the line-of-sight views themselves. I just don't think that's appropriate. I agree we can decide this tomorrow morning.
```

THE COURT: I will tell you that I'll do some research, but -- I can't remember the case right now, but the reason why I have to read this long, long thing is because -- well, it wasn't done in a controlled -- this admonishment is so long. As you all know, it wasn't done in a controlled environment, but there were some jurors on a break that started measuring. I read this a while ago.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: They were throwing rocks on coconuts -- it was a murder case -- to see seeing what damage a rock would allegedly cause. And it's no different -- I mean, your admonishment specifically precludes them from doing exactly what the defense proposes they do.

THE COURT: I know. But I will read what you've filed.

MR. BARGER: Right. We can file

something and they can file something and you can decide.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and we can file something. But I think, based on my understanding of the cases, it's independent, unsupervised experiments that are improper versus, sitting in the driver's seat, I would equate to sending the S-1 Gard back with the jury and having them pick it up.

I mean, jurors are allowed to pick up, manipulate, and examine the evidence. The bus is piece of evidence. And they should be able to sit in the seat and walk around the inside and do what they want as long as it's a supervised environment and they're not directly performing an independent experiment without supervision.

MR. BARGER: I think the best thing tonight, let them file theirs, we'll file ours, and the Court can decide tomorrow.

THE COURT: Very good.

MR. BARGER: But I kind of need to know from the marshal where they're going to have to put it.

THE COURT: We'll let you know in the morning.

```
1
              MR. BARGER:
                            In the morning, sure.
 2
               THE MARSHAL:
                             You'll enter on Clark.
 3
    I'll walk down there with you now if you want.
 4
               MR. CHRISTIANSEN:
                                  It's in that loading
 5
    dock; right, Marshal?
 6
               THE MARSHAL: Yes, exactly, on the south
 7
    side of the building entering from Clark.
 8
               MR. PEPPERMAN:
                               I think that's been
 9
    arranged because it's in the stipulation where it
10
    would be.
11
               MR. BARGER:
                            It's Howard doing it so --
12
               THE COURT:
                           It's in the stipulation, but
13
    getting it cleared is very --
14
              MR. BARGER:
                            I would like to walk down
15
    with you and look at it, if that's all right.
16
               THE MARSHAL: All right. No problem.
17
                           So we have okay for the
               THE COURT:
18
    loading dock, because at first that was
19
    complicated?
20
               THE MARSHAL:
                             Yes.
21
               He said it's okay for tomorrow, if we
22
    can get things done.
23
              MR. BARGER:
                            You're talking about the
24
    juror, Mr. Lennon?
25
               THE COURT: Oh, Mr. Lennon.
                                             Let's
```

```
1
    finish the topic of the bus. The topic we're on
 2
    is the bus. 3 o'clock is okay for it to be in the
 3
    loading dock?
 4
              THE MARSHAL: Yes, Your Honor.
 5
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. Very good.
 6
              Now, let's go to Mr. Lennon. He said?
 7
              THE MARSHAL: It will be fine.
 8
              THE COURT:
                           Tomorrow?.
 9
              THE MARSHAL: Yes.
10
                               I'll email her and let
              MR. PEPPERMAN:
11
    her know that tomorrow is good and --
12
              THE COURT: Yeah, tomorrow is the day.
13
              MR. PEPPERMAN: Hopefully, they can fix
14
    the problem.
15
              THE COURT: Very good.
16
              Is there anything else we need to
17
    discuss?
18
              MR. ROBERTS:
                           There is something, Your
19
    Honor, and I'm having trouble following what it
20
    is.
21
              THE COURT:
                           That's fine.
                                         That's fine.
22
    I can wait.
23
              MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honor.
24
              Maybe we could come early tomorrow to
25
    address this, Your Honor, address it right at
```

12:30 with Mr. Russell. There's apparently a disagreement between Mr. Russell and Ms. Works and Mr. Christiansen regarding the rulings that the Court has already made on the Pears deposition.

MR. KEMP: No, no, no, there's no disagreement on the rulings; the disagreement is who is going to offer it. So if you agree that you're offering all the testimony, there's no disagreement. Okay?

And the reason for that, of course, is because the motion in limine says if you offer the Pears testimony, it opens the door. So we don't want to have anything on the record that suggests we offered it so you can argue that you can wiggle out of the motion in limine.

That's the disagreement. So the disagreement is not asking the Court to cut it up again.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you talking about trying to get in the private investigator?

MR. KEMP: Right, right. Well, I'm talking about the limine. The limine ruling says that if you offer or allude to the testimony, that you're opening the door. That's what the Court's words were.

1	MR. ROBERTS: To the testimony or to the					
2	statement that was taken by the investigator?					
3	MR. KEMP: Well, you can't take the					
4	fruit from the poison tree and say, "Well, we					
5	didn't offer the statement, but we offered the					
6	words that were in the statement."					
7	But, anyway, that's the only issue. The					
8	issue is that you agreed that you are the					
9	proponent of all the testimony, not just the parts					
10	that you designated initially a week ago. Do you					
11	see what I'm saying?					
12	MR. ROBERTS: You're asking us to offer					
13	the part you cross-designated.					
14	MR. KEMP: No. We are not designating					
15	anything because we don't want to be in this					
16	little trap where you say to the judge later,					
17	"Well, they offered it. I didn't offer it."					
18	That's the reason.					
19	But it's not asking the Court to go					
20	through it again.					
21	Does that make sense?					
22	MR. BARGER: I think what I heard you					
23	say is that if we attempt to offer anything,					
24	you're going to say you can then go into all the					
25	investigators?					

```
1
              MR. KEMP:
                          Yes.
 2
              MR. BARGER:
                            That's exactly what you're
 3
    saying?
 4
              MR. ROBERTS:
                             Okay.
 5
              The other thing, Your Honor, is Plantz.
 6
    We've got designations. We've got plaintiff
 7
    cross-designations. We've never received any
 8
    objections to --
 9
              MS. WORKS: We haven't cross-designated
10
    yet.
11
              MR. ROBERTS:
                             Okay. We wanted to play
12
    this on Wednesday. That's when we've got blocked
13
    for it.
             So I guess they're coming; we just don't
14
    have them?
15
              MS. WORKS: Correct.
16
              MR. ROBERTS: Would the Court like this
17
    to start reviewing, or do you want to wait until
18
    you have a complete set?
19
                           I'll take it.
              THE COURT:
                                          I'll take it
    now so I can start. And let's not forget that the
20
21
    jury instructions are due tomorrow at 5:00.
22
              MR. KEMP:
                          That's correct, Your Honor.
23
    We've already worked on --
24
              MR. ROBERTS: We exchanged some over the
25
    weekend, yes.
```

```
1
               MR. KEMP: And the verdict form too,
 2
    Your Honor.
3
                          Thank you. All right.
               THE COURT:
    Thank you, Mr. Roberts.
 4
               Everyone have a nice evening.
 5
               THE MARSHAL: Court is now adjourned.
 6
 7
                 (Thereupon, the proceedings
 8
 9
                  concluded at 5:12 p.m.)
10
11
                            -000-
12
    ATTEST: FULL, TRUE, AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF
13
    PROCEEDINGS.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Electronically Filed 3/12/2018 10:18 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

JU	1	9	9	4

3 Facsimile: (702) 949-8398 10 11 12

1

Daniel F. Polsenberg Nevada Bar No. 2376 dpolsenberg@lrrc.com JOEL D. HENRIOD |Nevada Bar No. 8492 ihenriod@lrrc.com ABRAHAM G. SMITH asmith@lrrc.com Nevada Bar No. 13,250 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER LLP |3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone: (702) 949-8200

Attorneys for Defendant Motor Coach Industries, Inc. D. LEE ROBERTS. Nevada Bar No. 8877 lroberts@wwhgd.com HOWARD J. RUSSELL Nevada Bar No. 8879 hrussell@wwhgd.com DAVID A. DIAL, ESQ. Admitted Pro Hac Vice ddial@wwhgd.com Marisa Rodriguez Nevada Bar No. 13234 mrodriguez@wwhgd.com WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAL, LLC 6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118 Telephone: (702) 938-3838 Facsimile: (702) 938-3864

Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Block

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

13

14

KEON KHIABANI and ARIA KHIABANI, minors by and through their Guardian, MARIE-ČLAUDE RĬGAUD; SIAMAK BARIN, as Executor of the Estate of

15 Kayvan Khiabani, M.D. (Decedent); the 16 Estate of Kayvan Khiabani, M.D. (Decedent); SIAMAK BARIN, as Executor

17 of the Estate of Katayoun Barin, DDS (Decedent); and the Estate of Katayoun Barin, DDS (Decedent); 18

Plaintiffs,

20

19

21

22

23

MOTOR COACH INDUSTRIES, INC., a Delaware corporation; MICHELANGELO LEASING INC. d/b/a RYAN'S EXPRESS, an Arizona corporation; EDWARD HUBBARD, a Nevada resident; BELL SPORTS, INC. d/b/a GIRO SPORT DESIGN, a Delaware corporation; SEVENPLUS BICYCLES, INC. d/v/a

24PRO CYCLERY, a Nevada corporation,

25 DOES 1 through 20; and ROE CORPORATIONS 1 through 20, 26

Defendants.

27

28

_ewis Roca

Case No.: A-17-755977-C Dept. No.: XIV

MOTOR COACH INDUSTRIES, INC.'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ORAL MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW (NRCP 50(a))

Because the evidence at trial confirms that there is no basis to award punitive damages against Motor Coach Industries, either directly or through the acts of an employee, MCI seeks judgment as a matter of law on plaintiffs' claim for punitive damages. NRCP 50(a).

ARGUMENT

To award punitive damages, a jury must find—by clear and convincing evidence—not just that MCI was reckless or irresponsible, but that it engaged in despicable conduct that it knew would likely cause injury. The evidence plaintiffs presented at trial cannot sustain such a finding.

In addition, to hold MCI vicariously liable for its employees' alleged wrongful conduct, the jury must find that someone with the authority to set company policy directly engaged in despicable conduct that injured plaintiff, or that such a policymaker had full knowledge of the conduct and its outrageous nature and nonetheless ratified it. Such a finding, again by clear and convincing evidence, is unsustainable.

I.

WITHOUT EVIDENCE THAT MCI DISREGARDED A KNOWN, PROBABLE HARM, PUNITIVE DAMAGES ARE INAPPROPRIATE

A. The Requisite State of Mind for Punitive Damages

An award of punitive damages requires a state of mind far greater than mere negligence or even recklessness. See Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. v. Thitchener, 192 P.3d 243, 255 (2008). Historically, punitive damages have always been improper unless the evidence shows either a willful wrong or damages as an intended consequence. American Excess Ins. Co. v. MGM Grand Hotels, Inc., 102 Nev. 601, 606, 729 P.2d 1352, 1355 (1986). Under the current punitive-damages statute, too, a plaintiff may recover punitive damages only where it is proven by "clear and convincing evidence" that the defendant has been guilty of either oppression or malice. NRS 42.005(1).



 $\mathbf{2}$

Lewis Roca ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE "Oppression' means despicable conduct that subjects a person to cruel and unjust hardship with conscious disregard of the rights of the person." NRS 42.001(4) (emphasis added). "Malice, express or implied' means conduct which is intended to injure a person or despicable conduct which is engaged in with a conscious disregard of the rights or safety of others." NRS 42.001(3) (emphasis added). Implied malice is a discrete basis for awarding punitive damages where conscious disregard is present. See NRS 42.001(3); see also Countrywide, 192 P.3d at 254-55. "Conscious disregard," in turn, is defined as [1] "the knowledge of the probable harmful consequences of a wrongful act and [2] a willful and deliberate failure to act to avoid those consequences." NRS 42.001(1) (emphasis added). Such an actual consciousness that harm would probably result is equivalent to intent to cause that harm.

B. An Award of Punitive Damages Requires Conscious Disregard for a Known, Probable Harm

1. Conscious Disregard Means Actual Knowledge of the Likely Harm

To prove conscious disregard under Nevada law, the defendant must first have actual knowledge of a probable harm. Countrywide, 192 P.3d at 255. Countrywide clarified that actual knowledge can include—at its lowest threshold—a willful and deliberate refusal to avoid probable harmful consequences where the defendant egregiously and intentionally ignores the obvious. Id.

In *Countrywide*, the defendant mortgage company foreclosed on the wrong condominium while the owners were away on military assignment and threw away all of the owners' possessions. *Id.* at 246. The company simply ignored numerous clear indications that it was seizing the wrong home and "continued to proceed with the foreclosure despite knowing of the probable harmful consequences of doing so." *Id.* at 255. Not only did the company's document file indicate an address mix-up, but it was also obvious the owners

had not "abandoned" the unit as the power was still on, and the unit contained the owners' family picture albums, military service medals, clothing and unopened mail. *Id.* at 247, 255.¹ The mortgage company intentionally ignored these obvious indications that it was foreclosing on the wrong home and proceeded anyway.

Just two months after deciding Countrywide, the Supreme Court found punitive damages could not be imposed where, although the facts were only slightly different, there was no evidence the defendant actually knew of a probable harm or intentionally ignored the obvious. See Winchell v. Schiff, 193 P.3d 946 (Nev. 2008). In Winchell, a lessor of a cold-storage unit decided to inspect it after she incorrectly concluded that the lessee may have abandoned the unit. Id. at 948-49. The electricity was still on and the unit was full of the plaintiff's inventory of fish. *Id.* The lessor nevertheless had the locks changed, took the keys, and did not turn the alarm back on after disabling it. *Id.* Upon returning and finding a substantial part of his inventory stolen, the lessee sued for the demise of his business and sought punitive damages. *Id.* The court found, however, that the facts did not support a finding of conscious disregard. *Id.* While the court's reasoning was not explicit, no reasonable jury could have found on these facts that the lessor either had actual knowledge her actions would probably cause someone to break in, or that she intentionally ignored the obvious risk. *Id.* at 953.

As Winchell illustrates, Countrywide did not lessen the definition of

¹ Other indicators of an obvious potential mix-up included the fact that the homeowner's association fees were up-to-date; the plaintiffs' names appeared as owners in several documents in the file for the property that should have been foreclosed upon; the defendant's asset manager saw some of these documents and understood that plaintiffs actually owned the property, but did not consider this problematic; and the asset manager ignored other documents in the defaulting owner's file that would have confirmed the plaintiffs owned the property. *Id.* at 247, 255.



 $\mathbf{2}$

Lewis Roca

conscious disregard. *Countrywide* merely clarified that conscious disregard may include willfully refusing to become "conscious" of probable harm by deliberately closing one's eyes to the obvious.

2. The Legislative History to NRS 42.001 Shows that Even Unconscionably Irresponsible Conduct Does Not Justify Punitive Damages

Leading up to the enactment of NRS 42.001, the Court was split over whether there could be "implied malice" in the sense of conduct that deliberately disregarded a probability of harm even without a specific intent to cause, or whether "implied malice" simply referred to a method of proving a defendant's actual intent to cause harm by circumstantial evidence. *Craigo v. Circus-Circus Enterprises, Inc.*, 106 Nev. 1, 21, 786 P.2d 22, 35 (1990). There was no dispute, however, that an "implied malice" standard would at least require an actual awareness of the harm that would result by acting or failing to act. By any measure, an unconscionable but unconscious disregard for the plaintiff's safety would not subject a defendant to punitive damages. *See, e.g.*, *First Interstate Bank of Nevada v. Jafbros Auto Body, Inc.*, 106 Nev. 54, 57, 787 P.2d 765, 767 (1990).

a. Cases leading up to the enactment of NRS 42.005 required actual awareness of the risk of harm

Thus, for example, in *Granite Construction Company v. Rhyne*, 107 Nev. 651, 817 P.2d 711 (1991), the defendant "consciously and deliberately" chose not to erect a protective fence, despite having contractually agreed to do so. *Id.* at 653, 817 P.2d at 714. The defendant was conscious of the harm that could result, because it knew *both* that the purpose of the fence was to protect motorists from cattle wandering onto the roadway *and* that there was a bull on the field that was to be segregated from the thoroughfare. *Id.* at 653, 817 P.2d at 713.

By contrast, in First Interstate Bank of Nevada v. Jafbros Auto Body, Inc.,

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

the Supreme Court reversed a punitive damages award where a defendant bank, as a result of its own errors and despite having them called to its attention by the customer, dishonored the customer's checks, causing damage to the customer's business. 106 Nev. at 55-56, 787 P.2d at 766. Even then, the bank failed to correct its records for three months, despite being aware of them. See id. The court concluded that the bank had exhibited, at most, "unconscionable irresponsibility," which did not amount to conscious disregard and, thus, would not support punitive damages. *Id.* at 57, 787 P.2d at 767.

b. THE LEGISLATURE CODIFIED THE REQUIREMENT AS "CONSCIOUS DISREGARD"

Although Countrywide suggested that the Legislature in enacting the NRS 42.001 definitions had rejected the idea that "unconscionable irresponsibility" was immune from punitive damages, the legislative history refutes Countrywide's analysis. Countrywide read NRS 42.001 to supersede Justice Springer's concurrence in Craigo v. Circus-Circus Enterprises, Inc., that a manager's "unconscionable irresponsibility" was not an adequate basis for punitive damages. Countrywide, 124 Nev. at 741–42, 192 P.3d at 254 (citing Craigo, 106 Nev. 1, 21, 786 P.2d 22, 35 (1990) (Springer, J., concurring)). But the sponsors of the new NRS 42.001 definitions were clear that "[b]y adopting the California statutory standards, the bill effectively adopts the standards advocated in both the plurality and concurring opinions in Craigo." (Leg. Hist., at 64; see also id. at 51 ("The bill adopts the standard which is closely analogous to the Craigo standard which was adopted by our Supreme Court some years ago." (statement of Senator Mark A. James)).) The statute explicitly intended that "[b]ad judgment, even unconscionably irresponsible conduct . . . does not reflect the evil mind or motive" necessary for an award of punitive damages. (Leg. Hist., at 65.) And that is in fact how NRS 42.001 was interpreted after its enactment. See Maduike v. Agency Rent-A-Car, 114 Nev.

 $\mathbf{2}$

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

ewis Roca.

1, 953 P.2d 24 (1998).

In Maduike v. Agency Rent-A-Car, for example, the Nevada Supreme Court found punitive damages inapplicable despite repeated misbehavior by the defendant. 114 Nev. 1, 5-6, 953 P.2d 24, 26-27 (1998). In that case, the plaintiff family rented a car from the defendant. When they experienced problems with the car on a drive from Reno to Las Vegas, they called to complain to the defendant, who instructed them to continue driving to its Las Vegas office. On the way, the car caused an accident when the brakes failed. Id. at 3, 953 P.2d at 25. The defendant's Las Vegas office refused to repair or replace the vehicle, however, and the plaintiffs had to drive the car back to Reno. On the way, the car malfunctioned, injuring three family members. *Id.* Despite the breadth of the defendant's inattention and callousness, the Nevada Supreme Court agreed that there was no evidence either of defendant's intent to cause hardship or of its conscious disregard for the plaintiffs' rights. Id. at 5-6, 953 P.2d at 26-27. Quoting its earlier Jafbros decision, the court noted again that "even unconscionable irresponsibility will not support a punitive damages award." Id. at 5, 953 P.2d at 26. See also Village Dev. Co. v. Filice, 90 Nev. 305, 315, 526 P.2d 83, 89 (1974) (reversing an award of punitive damages where there was evidence of "unconscionable irresponsibility" in a land sales deal, but not enough evidence to show oppression, fraud, or malice in fact). This standard controls the result in this case.

3. A Claim for Punitive Damages in a Products Liability Case Requires the Same Demonstration of Conscious Disregard

In keeping with Countrywide, punitive damages are not recoverable in a products liability case unless the plaintiff demonstrates that the defendant actually knew the product had a dangerous defect when it left the defendant's possession or control. Sutherland v. Elpower Corp., 923 F.2d 1285, 1290-91 (8th