1 2 3 4 5 6 7 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR KING COUNTY 8 9 PHI TRINH AND MATTIE BAILEY. Case No. 04-2-26460-0 SEA 10 Trial Date: January 16, 2007 Plaintiffs, 11 Hon. Sharon Armstrong 12 VS. MATTIE BAILEY JUDGMENT ON JURY VERDICT [3 SEATTLE CITY LIGHT, a department of the CITY OF SEATTLE, a municipality, (Clerks Action Reguirol 14 DANA BACKIEL, individually 15 Defendants. 16 17 JUDGMENT SUMMARY 18 Judgment Creditor: Mattie Bailey 19 Judgment Creditor's Attorney: The Sheridan Law Firm, P.S. 20 Judgment Debtor: The City of Seattle, Seattle City Light 21 Judgment Amount: \$ 503, 195,00 22 Prejudgment Interest: To be determined at a later date 23 Attorney Fees: To be determined at a later date 24 25 BAILEY JUDGMENT ON JURY VERDICT - I THE SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S.

**ORIGINAL** 

THE SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S. HOGE BUILDING, SUITE 1200 705 SECOND AVENUE SEATTLE, WA 98104 TEL: 206-381-5949 FAX: 206-447-9206

This matter was tried by a jury of twelve from January 22, 2007 to February 20, 2007. 1 2 with the Honorable Sharon Armstrong presiding. Plaintiff Mattie Bailey appeared personally 3 and through her attorney of record, John P. Sheridan, The Sheridan Law Firm, P.S. Defendant 4 appeared through its designated corporate representative and through Philip Thompson and 5 Russell Perisho, Perkins Coie, LLP. 6 The parties presented evidence and testimony to the jury and on February 24, 2007, 7 the jury returned a verdict in favor of plaintiff on her claim as follows: 8 9 Back Pay: \$ 70 ...

Front Pay: \$ 2, 434

Emotional Harm: \$ 462,000 10 11 12 13 14 A copy of the jury's verdict is attached. 15 This judgment is presented in open court following the jury's verdict while opposing 16 counsel is present pursuant to CR 54(f)(2)(C). 17 Consistent with the jury's verdict in this action, the Court enters judgment as follows: 18 Monetary Relief: \$503, 195,00 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

BAILEY JUDGMENT ON JURY VERDICT - 2

THE SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S. HOGE BUILDING, SUITE 1200 705 SECOND AVENUE SEATTLE, WA 98104 TEL: 206-381-5949 FAX: 206-447-9206

1	Dated this 26 Th. day of Febr	
2	Dated this day of Febr	ruary, 2007.
3		A. A. A. S.
4		Hon. Sharon Armstrong
6		Hom. Sharon Annistrong
7	Presented By:	Approved as to Form:
8	THE SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S.	PERKINS COIÉ, LLP
9	NP DQ 6	$\rightarrow \partial_1 \wedge \neg$
10	By: John Sheridan, WSBA # 21473	By: WSBA # 12857
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	Philip A. Thompson, WSBA # 12857 Russell L. Perisho, WSBA # 8538 Attorneys for Defendants
12		recomeys for Defendants
13		,
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		,
23		
24		
25		

BAILEY JUDGMENT ON JURY VERDICT - 3

THE SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S. HOGE BUILDING, SUITE 1200 705 SECOND AVENUE SEATTLE, WA 98104 TEL: 206-381-5949 FAX: 206-447-9206

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR KING COUNTY

PHI IRINH AND MATTIE BAILEY,	Case No. 04-2-26460-0 SEA Trial Date: January 16, 2007
Plaintiffs,	Hon. Sharon Armstrong
V\$.	VERDICT FORM—Mattie Bailey
SEATTLE CITY LIGHT, a department of the CITY OF SEATTLE, a municipality, DANA BACKIEL, individually	
Defendants.	
We, the jury, answer the following que	estions submitted by the court:
QUESTION NO. 1: Has Plaintiff Me	attie Bailey proved her claim of disparate
treatment by a preponderance of the evidence	?
ANSWER: YesN	0
QUESTION NO. 2: Has Mattie Bail	ey proved by a preponderance of the evident that
Seattle City Light unlawfully subjected her to	a hostile work environment because of her race?
ANSWER: YesN	0
ADIC	<del>IA/A/</del>
CAIGI	<b>-</b> -
	COPY

	QUES'	TION NO. 3: Has Mattie Bailey proved by a preponderan	ce of the evidence				
that Sea	attle Çi	ty Light unlawfully retaliated against plaintiff for opposing	discrimination?				
	ANSW	/ER: Yes No					
	Answer Question No. 4 only if you answered "yes" to one or more of Questions,						
No. 1, 2 and/or 3, above.							
QUESTION NO. 4: If you award damages to the plaintiff on her claim(s) against							
Seattle City Light, what amount, if any, do you award for							
	(a)	Lost wages and benefits through the time of trial	s 38,761,-				
	(b)	Future lost wages and benefits	s_Z,434,-				
	(c)	Emotional Harm	\$ 462,000,-				
Answer Question No. 5 only if you answered Question No. 2 "Yes" and awarded							
emotional harm damages in Question No. 4, above.							
QUESTION NO. 5: What percentage of emotional harm, if any, do you attribute to							
harassn	nent th	rough creation of a hostile work environment occurring befo	ore August 5, 2001?				
Answer:%							
Answer: 25 %  Dated this 25 day of February 2007.							
		Presiding Juror					