AGENDA ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MODEL CIVIL JURY INSTRUCTIONS

Administrative Office of the Courts Scott M. Matheson Courthouse 450 South State Street Council Room, Suite N31

August 9, 2004 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Welcome and approval of minutes	John Young
Preliminary and General Instructions	Phil Ferguson, Ch.
Damages Instructions	Rich Humpherys, Ch
Proximate Cause	Jonathan Jemming

Meeting Schedule: Matheson Courthouse, 4:00 to 6:00, Judicial Council Room

September 13 October 18 (3rd Monday) November 8 December 13

MINUTES

Advisory Committee on Model Civil Jury Instructions June 14, 2004 4:10 p.m.

Present: John L. Young (chair), Timothy M. Shea, Honorable William W. Barrett, Jr., Juli

Blanch, Francis J. Carney, Marianna Di Paolo, Phillip S. Ferguson, Tracy H.

Fowler, L. Rich Humpherys, Colin P. King, Paul M. Simmons, Jonathan Jemming

Excused: David E. West

1. *Minutes*. On motion of Judge Barrett and Mr. Carney's second, the committee approved the minutes of the May 10, 2004, meeting.

- 2. Law Clerk. Mr. Carney introduced Jonathan Jemming, who has been hired as a law clerk to assist the committee with research.
- 3. Draft Preliminary and General Instructions. The committee continued its review of the draft instructions prepared by Mr. Ferguson's subcommittee. Mr. Ferguson reported that he had incorporated the changes discussed at the last committee meeting. His subcommittee is still working on revisions to instructions 2.13 and 2.14 regarding opinion testimony and 2.18 defining the preponderance of the evidence. The committee reviewed the following instructions:
 - a. 1.4. Evidence in the Case. At Mr. Simmons's suggestion, "or certain qualified opinions" was struck from the second sentence.
 - b. 2.15. Charts and Summaries. Mr. Carney questioned the need for the instruction. The committee suggested that the instruction be broken out into two parts-one for charts and summaries that are received into evidence, and one for those that are not received into evidence. Dr. Di Paolo suggested the last sentence be stated in the negative, as in the original MUJI 2.15.

Mr. Ferguson will revise the instruction in light of the committee's comments.

c. 2.16. Burden of Proof. Mr. Simmons suggested that the instruction did not accurately state the law in that the party with the burden of proof does not necessarily have to produce evidence to meet the burden; he can meet the burden by evidence produced by the other side. Some committee members questioned whether the jury needed to be instructed on the burden of proof (as opposed to the standard of proof). Mr. Humpherys noted that it matters who has the burden of proof, since if the party with the burden of proof does not meet his burden, he loses. Dr. Di Paolo thought the instruction was too abstract to be helpful. The committee suggested combining it with instructions on the parties' contentions or on the elements of the parties' claims and affirmative defenses. Mr. Ferguson suggested that the burden of proof could be discussed in

Minutes June 14, 2004 Page 2

connection with the special verdict form. Instruction 2.16 might not be necessary in light of instruction 2.27, "Agreement on Special Interrogatories." The committee then discussed the timing of the instruction. Mr. Shea suggested that the presumption should be to give instructions at the beginning of the trial, so that the jury will have a road map, even if they will need to be repeated at the end of the trial. Mr. Carney suggested that the jury be shown the special verdict form at the beginning of the trial, even though it may have to be revised during the course of the trial. Ms. Blanch suggested that the parties may have conflicting versions of the special verdict form, but Mr. Humpherys suggested that they could agree on a verdict form at pretrial. The committee decided to hold off on instruction 2.16. If it decides to omit the instruction, there will need to be a comment explaining the committee's reasoning.

- d. 2.17. Direct and Circumstantial Evidence. Mr. Carney questioned the need for the instruction. The committee agreed that the instruction was necessary since some people think that circumstantial evidence is not sufficient to meet one's burden of proof. The committee suggested changes to the wording of the instruction, which Mr. Ferguson will incorporate into the next draft.
- e. 2.19. Clear and Convincing Evidence. Dr. Di Paolo thought that an example would help the jury, but the committee agreed that the example used in paragraph 3 was more confusing than helpful. Mr. King suggested that the standards of proof should be explained in the preliminary instructions and that the first paragraph of the instruction should be given whatever the standard of proof is, not just in cases involving a clear-and-convincing standard. Mr. Fowler suggested that the instruction be tailored to the particular facts and issues in the case. Mr. Humpherys, Mr. King and Mr. Simmons questioned the last sentence of the instruction, which states that clear and convincing evidence must "at least have reached the point where there remains no substantial doubt." They thought the standard was too close to "beyond a reasonable doubt."

Mr. Jemming will research what "clear and convincing evidence" means under Utah law.

Mr. Humpherys was excused.

- f. 2.20. Taking of Notes. Mr. Carney suggested that the instruction Judge Iwasaki uses is better than instruction 2.20. Mr. Shea suggested that instruction 1.6 be revised for use at the end of trial and that the revised instruction replace instruction 2.20.
- 4. *Next Meeting*. There will be no committee meeting in July. The next meeting will be Monday, August 9, 2004, at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes June 14, 2004 Page 3

The meeting concluded at 6:00 p.m.

Preliminary and General Instructions

01.04. Evidence in the case.

"Evidence" is anything that tends to prove or disprove a disputed fact. It can be the testimony of a witness or documents or objects or photographs or stipulations or certain qualified opinions or any combination of these things.

You must entirely disregard any evidence as to which I sustain an objection and any evidence I that order to be struck.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and you must entirely disregard it. Do not make any investigation about the facts in this case. Do not make any personal inspections, observations or experiments. Do not view locations involved in the case, things or articles not produced in court. Do not look things up on the Internet. Do not look for information in books, dictionaries or public or private records that are not produced in court. Do not let anyone else do any of these things for you.

Do not consider anything you may have heard or read about this case in the media or by word of mouth or other out-of-court communication.

You are to consider only the evidence in the case, but you are not expected to abandon your common sense. You are permitted to interpret the evidence in light of your experience.

01.09. Credibility of witness testimony.

Testimony in this case will be given under oath. You are responsible to evaluate that testimony as to its believability. You may believe all or any part of the testimony of a witness. You may also believe one witness as against many witnesses or many as against one, in accordance with your honest convictions. In evaluating the testimony of a witness, you may want to consider the following:

Personal Interest. Do you believe the accuracy of the testimony was affected one way or the other by any personal interest the witness has in the case?

Bias. Do you believe the accuracy of the testimony was affected by any bias or prejudice?

Demeanor. Is there anything about the witness' appearance, conduct or actions that causes you to give more or less weight to the testimony given?

Consistency. How does the testimony that is given tend to support or not support other believable evidence that is offered in the case?

Knowledge. Did the witness have a good opportunity to know what he or she is testifying about? Memory. Does the witness' memory appear to be reliable? Reasonableness. Is the testimony of the witness reasonable in light of human experience? The foregoing instructions are not intended to limit how you evaluate testimony. You are the ultimate judges of how it is to be interpreted. Advisory Committee Comments. This instruction may be given again at the conclusion of the case. 02.10. Inconsistent statements. You may believe that a witness, on another occasion, made a statement inconsistent with that witness's testimony given here. That doesn't mean that you are required to disregard the testimony. It is for you to decide whether to believe the witness. 02.11. Effect of willfully false testimony. If you believe any witness has intentionally testified falsely about any important matter, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness, or you may disregard only the intentionally false testimony.

02.13. Statement of opinion.

Under limited circumstances, I will allow a witness to express an opinion. You do not have to believe an opinion, whether it comes from an expert witness or not. Consider opinion testimony as you would any other evidence, and give it the weight you think it deserves.

02.15. Charts and summaries.

Certain charts and summaries have been shown to you in order to help explain the evidence. However, such charts or summaries are not in and of themselves evidence. If such charts or summaries correctly reflect facts or figures shown by the evidence in the case, you may consider them.

02.16. Burden of proof.

When these instructions say that a party has the burden of proof, it means that the party must produce evidence that meets the following requirements:

[Here list the elements of the claim]

02.17. Direct and circumstantial evidence.

A fact may be proved by direct or circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial evidence consists of facts or circumstances that allow someone to reasonably infer the truth of the facts to be proved. For example, if the fact to be proved is whether Johnny ate the cherry pie, and a witness testifies that she saw Johnny take a bite of the cherry pie, that is direct evidence of the fact. If the witness testifies that she saw Johnny with cherries smeared on his face and an empty pie plate in his hand, that is circumstantial evidence of the fact.

02.19. Clear and convincing evidence.

There are 3 levels of proof in the law, (1) proof by a preponderance of the evidence, (2) proof by clear and convincing evidence, and (3) proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The usual level of proof used in a civil case is proof by a preponderance of the evidence, that is, proof that a fact is more likely than not. Another way of saying this is proof by the greater weight of the evidence.

This case involves [certain or some] issues that must be proven to a standard higher than the usual standard. This next level of proof is proof by clear and convincing evidence. This level of proof is not as high as the standard used in criminal cases, that is, proof beyond a reasonable doubt. However, in order for something to be proven by clear and convincing evidence, it must be more than merely probable. You must be firmly convinced of the fact at issue.

To satisfy the clear and convincing level of proof, the evidence as to the fact in issue should be compelling. It must at least have reached the point where there remains no substantial doubt as to the truth or correctness of the conclusion.

02.20. Using notes.

In the jury room you are welcome to use any notes you have taken to refresh your memory of what the witnesses said. Remember that your notes are not evidence; only the testimony of the

witnesses and the documents and other things received by the Court during the trial are the evidence. You must each reach your own decision after consultation with the other jurors, and each of you must rely on your own memory of the evidence. One juror's opinion should not be given excessive consideration just because that juror took notes. 02.21. Multiple plaintiffs. Although there are _____ plaintiffs in this action, that does not mean that they are equally entitled to recover or that any of them is entitled to recover. The defendant is entitled to a fair consideration of [his] [her] [its] defense as to each plaintiff, just as each plaintiff is entitled to a fair consideration of that plaintiff's claim against the defendant. Unless otherwise instructed, all instructions apply to each defendant and to each plaintiff. 02.22. Multiple defendants. Although there are _____ defendants in this action, that doe not mean that they are equally liable or that any of them is liable. Each defendant is entitled to a fair consideration of that defendant's own defense to each claim of the plaintiff(s). If you conclude that one defendant is liable, that does not necessarily mean that one or more of the other defendants are liable. You must evaluate the evidence fairly and separately as to each plaintiff and each defendant. 02.23. Discontinuance as to some defendants. Defendants _____ and ____ are no longer involved in this case. You should not concern yourself with the reasons why, but should consider the issues presented in accordance with the Court's instructions and the evidence in the case. 02.24. Settling defendants in multi-party cases. The plaintiff(s) and [settling defendant(s)] have reached a settlement agreement in this matter. [This settlement agreement provides that ______.] [The relevant portions of this agreement are ______.] There are many reasons why parties settle during the course of a lawsuit. Settlement does not mean that the defendant has admitted fault or that the plaintiff has a weak case. You must still determine from the evidence which party or parties, including [the settling defendant(s)]

were at fault, if any, and how much fault each party should bear. In deciding how much fault should be allocated to each party you must not consider the settlement agreement as an admission of fault by [settling defendant(s)]. Nor should you consider the settlement agreement as an indication of [settling defendant's] willingness to deal responsibly with the plaintiff.

You may, however, consider the settlement agreement when you weigh the believability of the testimony of the witnesses. Since the plaintiff and [the settling defendant(s)] have settled, they are no longer adversary parties in the lawsuit. That means that the plaintiff now has a financial incentive to show that the non-settling defendant(s) is [entirely] [mostly] to blame for the [accident] [injuries] [damages]. Also, the [settling defendant(s)] now has/have no reason to disagree with the plaintiff(s) as to how much money, if any, you should award.

02.25. Jurors to deliberate and agree if possible.

Is it now your duty to consult with one another – to deliberate – with a view to reaching an agreement. You each must decide the case for yourself, but only after discussing the case with your fellow jurors. You should not hesitate to change an opinion when convinced that it is wrong. However, you should not surrender your honest convictions just to end the deliberations or to agree with other jurors.

02.26. Resort to chance.

Your duty as a juror is to evaluate the evidence presented by the parties and to come to a decision that is supported by the evidence. You are not to speculate, draw lots, or flip coins, for example. The law forbids you to decide any issue in this case by resorting to chance.

If you decide that a party is entitled to recover, you must then decide the amount of money to be awarded to that party. It would be unlawful for you to agree in advance to take the independent estimate of each juror, then total the estimates, draw an average from the total, and to make that average the amount of your award. On the other hand, each of you should express your own independent judgment as to what the amount should be. It is your duty to thoughtfully consider the amounts suggested, evaluate them according to these instructions and the evidence and, after due consideration, come to an agreement on the amount, if any, to be awarded.

02.27. Agreement on special interrogatories.

I am going to give you a form to fill out. This form is called the Special Verdict. Your duty is to answer the questions, based upon the evidence you have seen and heard during this trial, after discussing the evidence with one another and coming to an agreement as to what the answer to each question should be.

In answering these questions, you should bear in mind that the burden of proving any disputed fact rests upon the party claiming the fact to be true, and that the fact must be proved by [the greater weight of the evidence] [clear and convincing evidence].

Because this is a civil action, at least six jurors must agree on the answer to each question, but they need not be the same six on each question. As soon as six or more of you have agreed on the answer to each question, have the verdict signed and dated by your foreperson and tell the bailiff you have finished. The bailiff will escort you back to this courtroom; you should bring the completed Special Verdict with you.

02.28. Selection of jury foreperson and return of verdict.

When you leave the courtroom in a few moments and go to the jury room, your first responsibility is to select a foreperson. The foreperson will preside over your deliberations and sign the verdict form to which you agree.

The foreperson should not dominate the jury or the discussions. The foreperson's opinions should be given the same weight as the opinions of each of the other members of the jury.

Damages Instructions

27.01. Damages; Introductory.

4 5

If you decide that defendant's Fault Legally Caused damages to [name of plaintiff] you must award the damages, if any, that you decide will fairly and adequately compensate [name of plaintiff] for these damages. There are two kinds of damages: Special Damages and General Damages. I will now explain Special and General Damages.

Advisory Committee Comments.

This instruction should be given as a preliminary instruction to all damage instructions and may or should be modified to fit the particular situation. The case may be submitted to the jury on special verdict, general verdict, or stipulated liability. The user may want to refer specifically to the special verdict question in modifying this form. Each specific damage instruction that applies to the case should then follow.

27.02. Personal injury; Special damage; Medical care.

Special Damages include expenses for medically related care which is reasonably required and legally caused by the accident. You should award the reasonable value of the medically related care in the past and for the care that more probably than not will be reasonably required in the future. [The fact, if it be a fact, that any of the foregoing expenses were paid by some source other than the [name of plaintiff]'s own funds does not affect [name of defendant]'s responsibility to pay for such expense.]

27.03. Personal injury; Special damage; Loss of earnings.

Special Damages also include lost earnings and loss of earning capacity. You should award the reasonable value of the work [name of plaintiff] has been unable to do, and the reasonable value of his/her future earnings that more probably than not will be lost in the future. In determining this amount, you should consider evidence of: [name of plaintiff]'s earning capacity; (2) his/her actual earnings; (3) his/her work before and after the accident; and (4) what he/she would likely have earned if he/she had not been injured.

"Earning Capacity" is not the same as lost earnings. Earning capacity means the potential to earn income. It is not necessarily determined by the actual loss of earnings. To determine the reasonable value of the loss of earning capacity, you should consider whether the injury legally caused: (1) a reduction of [plaintiff's name]'s ability to earn income; and (2) a decreased ability

to weather adverse economic circumstances, such as a discharge or lay-off, or a voluntary change of employment.

References.

Dalebout v. Union Pacific R. Co., 980 P.2d 1194, 1200 (Ut. App. 1999) Corbett v. Seamons dba Big O Tire, 904 P.2d 232, N.2 (Ut. App. 1995)

27.04. Personal injury; Special damage; Loss of household services.

Special Damages also include loss of household services. To recover damages for this loss, [name of plaintiff] must prove the reasonable value of the household services that [name of plaintiff] has been unable to do, and the reasonable value of the household services that, more probably than not, he/she will be unable to do in the future.

27.05. General damages.

In awarding general damages, you may consider the nature and extent of injuries sustained by [name of plaintiff], the degree and character of the disfigurement, the pain and suffering occasioned by the injuries, both mental and physical, their probable duration and severity, the extent to which [name of plaintiff] has been prevented from pursuing his/her ordinary affairs of life and the extent he/she has been limited in the enjoyment of life. You may consider whether the consequences of these injuries will, with reasonable probability, continue in the future and if so, you should award such damages as will fairly and justly compensate him/her throughout his/her life expectancy.

Pain, suffering, disfigurement and other such general damages are not capable of being exactly and accurately determined and there is no fixed rule, standard or formula in determining these general damages. Nevertheless, it is your duty to make this determination. The law does not require the opinion of any witness to establish the amount of general damages. The argument of counsel as to the amount of damages is not evidence of reasonable compensation. In making an award for general damages, you should exercise your authority with calm and reasonable judgment and the damages you fix shall be just and reasonable in light of the evidence.

 You are not precluded from awarding damages because of the difficulty in computing the damages. While you may not award damages based upon mere speculation, the law requires only that the evidence provide a reasonable basis for assessing the damages and does not require a mathematical certainty.

27.06. Personal injury; Damage; Susceptible to injury.

A person who may be more susceptible to injury than someone else is still entitled to recover the full amount of damages that were Legally Caused by [name of defendant]'s Fault. In other words, the amount of damages should not be reduced merely because [name of plaintiff] is more susceptible to injury than someone else may be.

27.07. Personal injury damages; Aggravation of preexisting conditions. (Alternate A)

An injured person who has a condition or disability before the time of an injury is not entitled to recover damages for that condition or disability. However, the injured person is entitled to recover damages for any aggravation of the preexisting condition or disability caused from the injury, even if the person's preexisting condition or disability made the injured person more susceptible to problems than a healthy person would have been, and even if a healthy person may not have suffered the additional problems. However, the damages you may award are limited to the additional damages caused by [defendant's name]'s Fault.

Advisory Committee Comments.

Alternate Instruction A reflects the holding of the Utah Supreme Court in Brunson v. Strong, (cited below). The Court did not specifically address the issue of dormant and asymptomatic conditions. Alternate Instruction B reflects the holding of the Utah Court of Appeals in Biswsell v. Duncan (cited below,) where the plaintiff claimed that the preexisting condition was dormant or asymptomatic. Modification of the instruction may be necessary based upon the evidence in any given case.

References.

Biswell v. Duncan, 742 P.2d 80 (Utah 19087)

Brunson v. Strong, 17 Utah 2d 364, 412 P.2d 451 (1966)

BAJI No. 14.65 (Supp. 1992). Reprinted with permission; copyright 1986 West Publishing Company

27.08. Personal injury damages; Aggravation of preexisting conditions.

(Alternate B)

References.

A person who has a preexisting condition which doesn't cause the person any problems, may recover the full amount of damages legally caused by an aggravation of that condition. In other words, when a preexisting condition does not cause pain or disability, but that condition plus the injury brings on pain, disability or other problems, then it is the injury, not the preexisting condition, that is the legal cause of the pain or other problems.

Biswell v. Duncan, 742 P.2d 80 (Utah 1987)

27.09. Personal injury; Damages; Apportionment for preexisting condition

When a pre-existing condition exists which makes the injuries from an accident greater than they would have been in the absence of such a pre-existing condition, it is your duty, if possible, to apportion the amount of disability, impairment, pain, suffering, and other damages, between those caused by the pre-existing condition and those caused by the accident. But if you find that the evidence does not permit such an apportionment, then you must determine that the entire disability, impairment, pain, suffering, and other damages, are legally caused by [name of defendant]'s fault.

Reference.

Robinson v. All-Star Delivery, Inc., 992 P.2d 969 (Utah 1999) Tingey v. Christensen, 987 P.2d 588, 591-92 (Utah 1999)

27.10. Personal injury; Damages; Duty to mitigate.

A person who has been injured is supposed to use reasonable diligence in caring for the injuries and in acting in a way that avoids a worse situation.

When an injured person does not use reasonable diligence to care for the injuries, and as a result the injuries are aggravated, the defendant is not responsible to pay damages for this aggravation. If [name of plaintiff] made reasonable efforts to avoid an aggravation of his/her

situation, then your award should include the reasonable amounts he/she incurred for this purpose.

References. C.S. v. Nielsen, 767 P.2d 504 (Utah 1988) Thompson v. Jacobsen, 23 Utah 2d 359, 463, P.2d 801 (1970) Morrison v. Perry, 104 Utah 151, 140 P.2d 772 (1943) BAJI No. 14.67 (Supp. 1992). Reprinted with permission; copyright © 1986 West publishing Company 27.11. Personal injury; Damages; Life expectancy. According to the mortality tables, [name of plaintiff] is expected to live ____ more years. You may consider this fact in arriving at the amount of future damages. A life expectancy is merely an estimate of the probable average remaining life of all persons in our country of a given age, with average health and exposure to danger. Some people live longer and others die sooner. You may consider all other evidence bearing on the expected life of the [name of plaintiff], including his/her occupation, health, habits, life style, and other activities. References. JIFU No. 90.36 (1957) BAJI No. 14.69 (Supp. 1992). Reprinted with permission; copyright © 1986 West publishing Company 27.12. Personal injury; Damages; Wrongful death; Adult. In determining damages for the death of [decedent], you will award an amount that will be just compensation for the loss that [name of plaintiff] has suffered from the death of [decedent]. You shall determine the loss based upon the circumstances that existed at the time of the decedent's death, including the following past and future items: 1) The loss of financial support or the right to receive financial support, if any, that [name of plaintiff] would have received from the decedent. In this regard, you should consider the

2) The loss of love, companionship, society, comfort, care, protection and affection which [name of plaintiff] has lost.

disposition of the decedent to financially support [name of plaintiff] and the earning capacity of

the decedent.

3) The age and health of the decedent and [name of plaintiff] immediately prior to the death. 4) Whether the deceased was kind, affectionate or otherwise. 5) The expenses for medical care incident to the death. 6) The reasonable expenses that were incurred for the funeral and burial. 7) The life expectancy of the decedent and [name of plaintiff]. [Name of plaintiff] could have only received benefits from the decedent as long as both were alive. 8) Any other evidence indicating the benefits that [name of plaintiff] might have reasonably received had the decedent lived. [In determining this award, you are not to consider any pain or suffering of the decedent; any grief or sorrow of the plaintiff; or the poverty or wealth of the plaintiff] [You may also consider the pain, anguish and mental suffering of the decedent before his/her death]? References. Utah Code Ann. §§ 78-11-7 – 12 (1992) In re Behm's Estate, 117 Utah 151, 213 657 (1950) Allen v. United States, 588 F. Supp. 247 (D. Utah 1984) Platis v. United States, 288 F. Supp. 254 (D. Utah 1968), aff'd, 409 F.2d 1009 (10th Cir. 1969) BAJI No. 14.50 (Supp. 1992). Reprinted with permission; copyright © 1986 West Publishing Company. 27.13. Personal injury; Damages; Wrongful death; Adult (Alternate A)

In determining damages for the death of [decedent], you should award an amount that will be just compensation for the loss that [name of plaintiff] has suffered from the death of [decedent]. You shall determine the loss based upon the circumstances that existed at the time of the decedent's death, including the following:

1) The past and future loss of financial support or the right to receive financial support, if any, that [name of plaintiff] would have received from the decedent. In this regard, you should consider the earning capacity of the decedent and the disposition of the decedent to financially support [name of plaintiff].

- 2) The past and future loss of love, companionship, society, comfort, care, protection and affection from the decedent which [name of plaintiff] has lost.
 - 3) The age and health of the decedent and [name of plaintiff] immediately prior to the death.
 - 4) Whether the decedent was kind, affectionate or otherwise.
 - 5) The reasonable expenses for medically related care incident to the death.
 - 6) The reasonable expenses that were incurred for the funeral and burial.
- 7) The life expectancy of the decedent and [name of plaintiff] [Name of plain
- 7) The life expectancy of the decedent and [name of plaintiff]. [Name of plaintiff] could have only received benefits from the decedent as long as both were alive.
- 8) Any other evidence indicating the benefits that [name of plaintiff] might have reasonably received had the decedent lived.

In determining this award, you are not to consider any pain or suffering of the decedent; any grief or sorrow of the plaintiff; or the poverty or wealth of the plaintiff.

[If the case involves the wrongful death of a minor, the following paragraphs should be added at the end of subparagraph (1) above: "This amount should be reduced by the value of the costs that [name of plaintiff] would likely have incurred to support [decedent] had the child survived, until the child reached the age of eighteen."]

Advisory Committee Comments.

This instruction applies to claims for wrongful death brought under U.C.A. § 78-11-7. If the cause of action also includes claims under U.C.A. § 78-11-12, Alternate B should be used.

References.

Utah Code Ann. §§ 78-11-7 – 12 (1992)

In re Behm's Estate, 117 Utah 151, 213 657 (1950)

Allen v. United States, 588 F. Supp. 247 (D. Utah 1984)

Platis v. United States, 288 F. Supp. 254 (D. Utah 1968), aff'd, 409 F.2d 1009 (10th Cir. 1969)

BAJI No. 14.50 (Supp. 1992). Reprinted with permission; copyright © 1986 West Publishing Company.

27.14. Personal injury; Damages; Wrongful death; Adult.

(Alternate B)

In determining damages for the death of [decedent], you should make two separate awards:

- (1) An amount that will be just compensation for the loss that [name of plaintiff(s)] has [have] suffered from the death of [decedent]; and
- (2) The amount of special and general damages legally caused by [defendant]'s fault which [decedent] suffered before his/her death.

I will now explain how you should determine each of these two awards. First, to determine for [name of plaintiff(s)]the loss should be determined based upon all the circumstances that existed at the time of decedent's death. You should consider the following:

- (a) The past and future loss of financial support or the right to receive financial support, if any, that [name of plaintiff] would have received from the decedent. In this regard, you should consider the earning capacity of the decedent and the disposition of the decedent to financially support [name of plaintiff].
- (b) The past and future loss of love, companionship, society, comfort, care, protection and affection from the decedent which [name of plaintiff] has lost.
 - (c) The age and health of the decedent and [name of plaintiff] immediately prior to the death.
 - (d) Whether the decedent was kind, affectionate or otherwise.
 - (e) The reasonable expenses for medically related care incident to the death.
 - (f) The reasonable expenses that were incurred for the funeral and burial.
- (g) The life expectancy of the decedent and [name of plaintiff]. [Name of plaintiff] could have only received benefits from the decedent as long as both were alive.
- (h) Any other evidence indicating the benefits that [name of plaintiff] might have reasonably received had the decedent lived.
- (i) In determining this award, you are not to consider any pain or suffering of the decedent; any grief or sorrow of the plaintiff; or the poverty or wealth of the plaintiff.

Second, regarding the special and general damages suffered by [decedent] you should determine the award based upon the following:

(A) Special Damages:

- (1) The expenses for medically related care which was reasonably required to treat the injuries legally caused by [defendant]'s fault [the fact, if it be a fact, that any of the foregoing expenses were paid by some source other than the [name of plaintiff]'s own funds does not affect [name of defendant]'s responsibility to pay for such expenses.
 - (2) The reasonable value of the lost work [decedent] was unable to do;
- (3) The reasonable value of the loss of household services that [decedent] was unable to perform; and
 - (4) Any other reasonable expenses [decedent] incurred.
 - (B) General Damages:

 In awarding general damages you may consider the nature and extent of the injuries sustained by [decedent], the degree and character of pain and suffering, both mental and physical and the extent to which [decedent] was prevented from pursuing his/her ordinary affairs of life. Pain, suffering, and other such general damages are not capable of being exactly and accurately determined and there is no fixed rule, standard or formula in determining these general damages. Nevertheless, it your duty to make this determination. The law does not require the opinion of any witness to establish the amount of general damages. The argument of counsel is not evidence of reasonable compensation. The award shall be just and reasonable in light of the evidence.

Advisory Committee Comments.

This instruction applies to claims for wrongful death brought under both U.C.A. §§ 78-11-7 and 78-11-12. This instruction assumes that the decedent survived the accident but later died as a result of the injuries sustained in the accident. If the cause of decedent's death is contested, alternate Instruction C should also be given.

References.

Utah Code Ann. §§ 78-11-7 – 12 (1992)

In re Behm's Estate, 117 Utah 151, 213 657 (1950)

Allen v. United States, 588 F. Supp. 247 (D. Utah 1984)

Platis v. United States, 288 F. Supp. 254 (D. Utah 1968), aff'd, 409 F.2d 1009 (10th Cir. 1969)

BAJI No. 14.50 (Supp. 1992). Reprinted with permission; copyright © 1986 West Publishing Company.

27.15. Personal injury; Damages; Wrongful death; Adult.

(Alternate C)

You may not award general damages suffered by [decedent] if [decedent]'s death resulted from a cause other than the injury legally caused by [name of defendant]'s fault. If you decide that his/her death resulted from some other cause, you may award only those special damages, as explained above.

Advisory Committee Comments.

This instruction applies only to a claim made under U.C.A. § 78-11-12, where it is contested whether the death resulted from a cause other than the injury legally caused by the defendant's fault.

27.16. Wrongful death; Minor.

In determining the damages for the death of [decedent] you will award an amount that will be just compensation for the loss that [name of plaintiff] has suffered from the death of [decedent].

You shall determine the award based upon the circumstances that existed at the time of the decedent's death, including the following past and future items:

1. The loss of financial support or the right to receive financial support, if any, that [name of plaintiff] would have received from the decedent. This amount should be reduced by the value of the costs that [name of plaintiff] would likely have incurred to support the decedent had the child survived, until the child reached the age of eighteen.

2. The loss of love, companionship, society, comfort, care, protection and affection which [name of plaintiff] has lost.

3. The age and health of the decedent and [name of plaintiff].

4. The expenses for medical care incident to the death.

5. The reasonable expenses that were incurred for the funeral and burial.

6. The life expectancy of the decedent and [name of plaintiff]. [Name of plaintiff] could have only received benefits from the decedent as long as both were alive.

7. Any other evidence indicating the benefits that [name of plaintiff] might have reasonably received had the decedent lived.

8. [In determining this award you are not to consider any pain or suffering of the decedent; any grief or sorrow of [name of plaintiff]; or the poverty or wealth of [name of plaintiff.]] [You may also consider the pain, anguish and mental suffering of the decedent before his/her death.]

Advisory Committee Comments.

The Committee disagreed on whether the jury may consider the pain, anguish, sorrow and mental suffering of the plaintiff arising from the wrongful death of a minor.

References.

Utah Code Ann. § 78-11-6, -12 (1992) Jones v. Carvell, 641 P.2d 105 (Utah 1982)

27.17. Mitigation of damages; Property damage.

If you decide [name of defendant] is responsible for the damage to [name of plaintiff]'s property, [name of plaintiff] is not entitled to recovery damages to his/her property that [name of defendant] proves [name of plaintiff] could have been avoided with reasonable efforts or expenditures.

You should consider the reasonableness of [name of plaintiff]'s efforts in light of the circumstances facing him/her at the time, including his/her ability to make the efforts or expenditures without undue risk or hardship.

If [name of plaintiff] made reasonable efforts to avoid harm, then your award should include reasonable amounts that he/she spent for this purpose.

27.18. Punitive damages.

You must not include in your award any damages to punish or make an example of [name of defendant]. Such damages would be punitive damages, and they cannot be a part of your verdict. You must award only the damages that fairly compensate [name of plaintiff] for [his/her/its] loss.

27.19. Arguments of counsel not evidence of damages.

The arguments of the attorneys are not evidence of damages. Your award must be based on the testimony of the witnesses and the other evidence that has been admitted during trial.

27.20. Proof of damages.

Before you may award damages, [name of plaintiff] must prove two points.

First, he/she must prove that damages occurred. The evidence must do more than raise speculation that damages actually occurred; there must be a reasonable probability that [name of plaintiff] suffered damages from the Fault of [defendant].

Second, [name of plaintiff] must prove the amount of damages. The level of evidence required to establish that damages actually occurred is generally higher than that required to establish the amount of damage.

It is the wrongdoer, rather than the injured party, who should bear the burden of some uncertainty in the amount of damages. While the standard for determining the amount of damages is not so exacting as the standard for proving that damages actually occurred, there still must be evidence that rises above speculation and provides a reasonable, even though not necessarily precise, estimate of the amount of damages.

If damages actually occurred, the amount of damages may be based upon reasonable approximations, assumptions or projections.

Reference.

Atkin Wright & Miles v. Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., et al., 709 P.2d (Utah 1985)

27.21. Present cash value.

If you decide that [name of plaintiff]'s damages includes future special damages, then the amount of those future damages must be reduced to their present cash value. This is necessary because money received now will, through investment, grow to a larger amount in the future.

To find present cash value, you must determine the amount of money that, if reasonably and frugally invested today, will provide [name of plaintiff] with the amount of [his/her/its] future damages.

[You may consider expert testimony in determining the present cash value of future economic damages.]

27.22. Loss of consortium; Non-economic damage.

[Name of plaintiff] claims that [he/she] has been harmed by the injury to [his/her] [husband/wife]. If you decide that [name of injured spouse] has proved the Fault of [name of defendant], you also must decide how much money, if any, will reasonably compensate [name of plaintiff] for loss of [his/her] [husband/wife]'s companionship and services, including:

1. The loss of love, companionship, comfort care, assistance, protection, affection, society, moral support; and

2. The loss of the enjoyment of sexual relations [or the ability to have children].

[Name of plaintiff] may recover for harm [he/she] proves [he/she] has suffered and for harm [he/she] is reasonably likely to suffer in the future. No fixed standard exists for deciding the amount of these damages. You must use your judgment to decide a reasonable amount based on the evidence and your common sense.

27.23. Settlement deduction.

You have heard evidence that [name of plaintiff] has settled [his/her/its] claim against [name of settled party]. Your award of damages to [name of plaintiff] should be made without considering any amount that [he/she/it] may have received under this settlement. After you have returned your verdict, I will make any appropriate adjustment to your award of damages.

27.24. Introduction to tort damages; Liability contested.

If you decide that [defendant] is at Fault, you also must decide how much money will reasonably compensate [defendant] for the harm. This compensation is called "damages."

The amount of damages must include an award for each item of harm that was caused by [plaintiff]'s Fault.

[The damages claimed by [name of plaintiff] for the harm caused by [name of defendant] fall into two categories called economic damages and non-economic damages. You will be asked on the verdict form to state these damages. 27.25. Introduction to tort damages; Liability established. [Name of defendant]'s responsibility for [name of plaintiff]'s claimed harm is not an issue for you to decide. You must only decide how much money will reasonably compensate [name of plaintiff] for the harm. This compensation is called "damages." The amount of damages must include an award for each item of harm that was caused by [name of defendant]'s Fault. [The damages claimed by [name of plaintiff] for the harm caused by [name of defendant] fall into two categories called economic damages and non-economic damages. You will be asked on the verdict form to state these damages. 27.26. Items of economic damage. The following are the specific items of economic damages claimed by [name of plaintiff]: [Insert applicable instructions on items of economic damage.] 27.27. loss of ability to provide household services; Economic damage. The loss of [name of plaintiff]'s ability to provide household services. To recover damages for the loss of the ability to provide household services, [name of plaintiff] must prove the reasonable value of the services [he/she] would have been reasonably certain to provide to [his/her] household if the injury had not occurred. 27.28. Loss of use of real property; Special damage. The loss of use of [name of plaintiff]'s [insert identification of real property].

To recover damages for the loss of use, [name of plaintiff] must prove the reasonable cost to rent similar property for the reasonable time when [he/she] could not use [his/her/its] own

property.

27.29. Loss of use of personal property; Special damage.

 27.31. Loss or destruction of personal property; Special damage.

The [loss/destruction] of [name of plaintiff]'s [item of personal property].

The loss of use of [name of plaintiff]'s [item of personal property].

To recover damages for loss of use, [name of plaintiff] must prove the reasonable cost to rent a similar [item of personal property] for the amount of time reasonably necessary to repair or replace the [item of personal property].

27.30. Damage to personal property; Special damage.

The damage to [name of plaintiff]'s [item of personal property].

To recover damages for damage to personal property, [name of plaintiff] must prove the reduction in the [item of personal property]'s value or the reasonable cost of repairing it, whichever is less.

To determine the reduction in value, you must decide the fair market value of the [item of personal property] before the harm occurred and then subtract the fair market value of the [item of personal property] immediately after the harm occurred.

"Fair market value" is the highest price that a willing buyer would have paid to a willing seller, assuming:

- 1. That there is no pressure on either one to buy or sell; and
- 2. That the buyer and seller are fully informed of the condition and quality of the [item of personal property].

[If you find that [name of plaintiff]'s [item of personal property] cannot be completely repaired, the damages are the difference between its fair market value before the harm and its fair market value after the repairs have been made, plus the reasonable cost of making the repairs. The total amount awarded must not exceed the [item of personal property]'s fair market value before the harm occurred.]

To recover damages for the [loss/destruction], [name of plaintiff] must prove the fair market value of the [item of personal property] just before the harm occurred.

"Fair market value" is the highest price that a willing buyer would have paid to a willing seller, assuming,:

- 1. That there is no pressure on either one to buy or sell; and
- 2. That the buyer and seller are fully informed of the condition and quality of the [item of personal property].
 - 27.32. Lost profits; Special damage.

To recover damages for lost profits, [name of plaintiff] must prove it is reasonably certain [he/she] would have earned profits but for [name of defendant]'s Fault.

To determine lost profits, you must decide the gross amount [name of plaintiff] would have received were it not for [name of defendant]'s Fault and then subtract from that amount the expenses [including the value of the [specify categories of evidence, such as labor/materials/rents/all expenses/interest of the capital employed]] [name of plaintiff] would have had if [name of defendant]'s Fault had not occurred.

The amount of the lost profits need not be calculated with mathematical precision, but there must be a reasonable basis for computing the loss.

27.33. Present cash value.

If you decide that [name of plaintiff]'s damages includes future special damages, then the amount of those future damages must be reduced to their present cash value. This is necessary because money received now will, through investment, grow to a larger amount in the future.

To find present cash value, you must determine the amount of money that, if reasonably and frugally invested today, will provide [name of plaintiff] with the amount of [his/her/its] future damages.

[You may consider expert testimony in determining the present cash value of future economic damages.]

27.34. Items of non-economic damage.

The following are the specific items of non-economic damages claimed by [name of plaintiff]:

[Insert applicable instructions on items of noneconomic damage.]

27.35. Loss of consortium; Non-economic damage.

 [Name of plaintiff] claims that [he/she] has been harmed by the injury to [his/her] [husband/wife]. If you decide that [name of injured spouse] has proved the Fault of [name of defendant], you also must decide how much money, if any, will reasonably compensate [name of plaintiff] for loss of [his/her] [husband/wife]'s companionship and services, including:

1. The loss of love, companionship, comfort care, assistance, protection, affection, society, moral support; and

2. The loss of the enjoyment of sexual relations [or the ability to have children].

[Name of plaintiff] may recover for harm [he/she] proves [he/she] has suffered and for harm [he/she] is reasonably likely to suffer in the future. No fixed standard exists for deciding the amount of these damages. You must use your judgment to decide a reasonable amount based on the evidence and your common sense.

27.36. Collateral source payments.

 You shall award damages in an amount that fully compensates plaintiff for damages as I have instructed you. You shall not speculate or consider any other possible sources of benefit the plaintiff may have received. [Do not consider whether or not [name of plaintiff] received workers' compensation benefits for [his/her] injuries.] After you have returned your verdict the court will make whatever adjustments may be appropriate.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Frank Carney

FROM: Jonathan G. Jemming

SUBJECT: Utah Law of Proximate Cause, etc.

I. Proximate Cause in Utah

- "Proximate cause is 'that cause which in the natural and continuous sequence [] (unbroken by an efficient intervening cause), produces the injury and without which the result would not have occurred. It is the efficient cause—the one that necessarily sets in operation the factors that accomplish the injury." *Mahmood v. Ross*, 990 P.2d 933, 938 (Utah 1999)(quoting *Harline v. Barker*, 912 P.2d 433, 439 (Utah 1996)(citations omitted)).
- See also *Bansanine v. Bodell*, 927 P.2d 675, 676 (Utah App. 1996).

A. Foreseeability

- "What is necessary to meet the test of negligence and proximate cause is that it be reasonably foreseeable, not that the particular accident would occur, but only that there is a likelihood of an occurrence of the same general nature." *Rees v. Albertson's, Inc.*, 587 P.2d 130, 133 (Utah 1978).
- See also *Steffensen v. Smith's*, 862 P.2d 1342, 1346 (Utah 1993).
- In context of the foreseeability of product misuse, see *Allen v. Minnstar*, *Inc.*, 97 F.3d 1365, 1369 (10th Cir. 1996)(using *Harline* to determine how Utah law would fall in products liability context.).

B. Intervening, Superseding and Concurrent Causes

- "Utah courts have consistently recognized that 'a more recent negligent [or criminal/intentional] act may . . . relieve the liability of a prior negligent actor under the proper circumstances." Bansanine v. Bodell, 927 P.2d 675, 677 (Utah App. 1996)(quoting Steffensen v. Smith's, 820 P.2d 482, 488 (Utah App. 1991), aff'd, 862 P.2d 1342 (Utah 1993). These circumstances arise when the more recent negligent or criminal act was unforeseeable to the first negligent actor. Id. (emphasis added).
- Under law of superseding causation, a person's negligence is not superseded by negligence of another if subsequent negligence of another is foreseeable to original actor. *McCorvey v. Utah State Dept. of Transp.*, 868 P.2d 41 (Utah 1993).
- If the subsequent criminal or negligent act was "foreseeable to the prior actor, both acts are *concurring causes* and the prior actor is not absolved of liability." *Id.*; see also *Mitchell v. Pearson Enters*, 697 P.2d 240, 246 (Utah 1985).