INTRODUCTION

In January 2001, the Center for Justice & Democracy released a White Paper entitled Reading Between the Headlines: The Media and Jury Verdicts. The report analyzed the media’s coverage of civil jury verdicts and found this coverage to be deeply skewed, fueling common misperceptions that civil juries routinely award plaintiffs eye-popping verdicts for frivolous claims. In addition, headlines commonly emphasized large monetary awards and rarely noted the misconduct that led to the verdict, such as: “$90 Million Awarded in Car Rollover Case,” “Fen-Phen Suit Nets Pair $29.1 Million Jury Award,” “Ravenwood patient awarded $55 million,” “Jury Hands Car-Crash Victims A Record $5B,” “Jury Awards Two Brothers $105 Million.” Citing real world statistics used by legal scholars and empirical researchers, we found that news coverage of verdicts varied widely from what was actually happening in the civil courts, namely that significant numbers of juries and judges awarded plaintiffs nothing and when they did win, the awards were generally extremely modest.

The conclusions reached in Reading Between the Headlines were bolstered significantly by a book published in 2004 entitled Distorting the Law: Politics, Media and the Litigation Crisis, which quickly became the leading study documenting the media’s influence on the public’s perception of tort litigation. In Distorting the Law, authors William Haltom and Michael McCann conducted a detailed analysis of media coverage of tort litigation from 1980 – 1999, finding that (1) the media’s increased reporting on tort litigation perpetuated the
myth that the system is overrun with frivolous lawsuits and high verdicts; (2) stories of
large jury verdicts were covered out of proportion to other outcomes; and (3) the media’s
narratives echoed the myth that the civil jury system was in a state of emergency.\textsuperscript{10}

Since the publication of \textit{Reading Between the Headlines} and \textit{Distorting the Law}, the
media has undergone a significant transformation due to the explosion of the internet,
web, blogs and the emergence of social media like Facebook and Twitter.\textsuperscript{11} Given these
changes, we thought it would be useful to re-examine these issues to determine if changes
in the media are changing what the public is learning about civil jury verdicts. We found
mixed results but for the most part, coverage is still not providing an accurate picture of
the civil justice system and in fact, certain new media trends are making the situation
worse.

**HOW DO PEOPLE GET THEIR NEWS TODAY AND WHAT ARE THEY LEARNING**

According to the Pew Research Center’s State of the Media 2011 study,\textsuperscript{12} a vast majority
of all audiences still get news from one or more traditional sources, including local TV
news,\textsuperscript{13} radio\textsuperscript{14} and newspapers. However, many of these traditional news sources are
decaying. The most significant traditional news decline has been newspaper readership,
with only 26 percent of the public now reading newspapers and only 8 percent of the
public under 30 doing so. According to Pew, daily print newspaper circulation has fallen
in every 6-month period since March 2003.\textsuperscript{15} And while online editions of newspapers
appear to be gaining “unique visitors,”\textsuperscript{16} a 2010 survey found that the number of people
who reported having read either an online or print newspaper “yesterday” was just 37
percent, having declined from 43 percent in 2006.

Behind only television news, daily newspapers were the second most common way for
the public to receive their news in 2000. By 2010, daily newspapers had fallen to fourth,
behind both radio and online news.\textsuperscript{17} Pew writes,

> People are spending more time with news than ever before, according to Pew
> Research Center survey data, but when it comes to the platform of choice, the web
> is gaining ground rapidly while other sectors are losing. In 2010, digital was the
> only media sector seeing audience growth.\textsuperscript{18}

While Pew found that traditional media is not yet being replaced by new media sources, it
is supplemented by digital sources: the web, cell phones, email, social networks and
podcasts. Search engines are playing an increasing role in how people get to news
sources, with Google the primary entry point.\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, social media “is rapidly
becoming a competing driver of traffic to search aggregators” and “‘share’ tools that
appear alongside most news stories rank among the most clicked-on links.”\textsuperscript{20}

What is particularly important about the emergence of Google, Google News and other
digital news aggregators, as well as social media like Facebook and Twitter, is that they
show only a brief set of words - more often than not, just headlines. For example, writes
Anne Mangen in the Journal of Research in Reading, “This growing digital audience
corresponds with a growing audience that is reading digital headlines out of context, or at
least in a ‘shallower, less focused way.’”

“Jprof,” a web site that “teaches journalism,” instructs, “Because headlines appear in lists as links rather than with the body of the story, they are the reader's … [only] introduction to a story. If they do not sell the reader immediately, the reader is unlikely to click on the link to go to the story.” And apparently, our brains are adapting. Writing for the Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard, Maryanne Wolf of the Center for Reading and Language Research writes, “The omnipresence of multiple distractions for attention — and the brain’s own natural attraction to novelty — contribute to a mindset toward reading that seeks to reduce information to its lowest conceptual denominator. Sound bites, text bites, and mind bites are a reflection of a culture that has forgotten or become too distracted by and too drawn to the next piece of new information to allow itself time to think.” In other words, as influential as headlines were when we first wrote Reading Between the Headlines in 2001, their significance is even larger today.

The other corresponding trend for purposes of this discussion is what is happening in newsrooms around the country, since “news organizations — old and new — still produce most of the content audiences consume.” No matter how someone gets their news, whether from a local TV anchor reading today’s headlines, seeing the news scrawl at the bottom of the screen, an online newspaper or blog, listening to National Public Radio in a car, searching Google News or reading a Twitter feed, the initial stories are still being written by journalists and editors at news organizations. However, economic pressures facing newsroom are influencing what journalists and editors produce.

Even a decade ago, in Distorting the Law, Haltom and McCann wrote, “Reporting in depth, critical analysis, and extended reflection are luxuries that reporters and editors cannot afford in an era in which the commercial bottom line is ever more important.” Because of limited time, depleting resources and the public’s perception of “newsworthiness,” news reports are often “[s]tandardized, stereotypical, simplified and succinct.” According to Pew, this trend is even more pronounced today. Newspaper newsrooms are 30 percent smaller than in 2000. As Pew put it, “Traditional newsrooms…. are smaller, their aspirations have narrowed and their journalists are stretched thinner.” That suggests they cover more beats. So whereas a decade ago, a news organization may have had a legal reporter whose exclusive focus was the civil courts or allowing for the development of knowledge and expertise, that is rarely true today.

These changes clearly do not correlate with better reporting on civil litigation. Because of the economic crisis striking newsrooms across the nation, combined with the fact that online and 24-hour television news sources are accelerating the speed at which news must be produced, reporters have been forced, more than ever, to concentrate on reporting that is speedy and profitable.

In sum, all of these various influences make it more likely today that the public is being exposed to brief, sensationalized and often incomplete coverage of civil jury verdicts.
OUR METHODOLOGY

On July 20, 2011, we conducted a Google News and blog search (the Top 25 blogs at Technorati blog) for civil jury verdicts and settlements between May 1, 2011 and July 20, 2011—a brief snapshot in time. From this search, we selected articles that reported on civil jury verdicts and settlements in cases that involved physical injuries. If a case was reported in two media outlets, we included the first story that appeared in the results (always the newest article). We then examined several aspects of each article to document (a) the amount of the verdict or settlement, if any; (b) whether the headline focused on the monetary amount of the award; (c) the outcome of the case; (d) whether the article was in a wire story or local original news source.

GENERAL FINDINGS

A. Median award

The median plaintiff award in the articles studied was $4,600,000 (plaintiff trial verdicts only). By contrast, according to the most recent U.S. Department of Justice analysis, the median jury award for winning plaintiffs is about $24,000, an amount statistically similar to the median award in bench trials—$21,000. In other word, the median verdict reported in our media data set was nearly 192 times higher than the typical plaintiff verdict.

Because so many cases settle before trial, we added articles about settlements to our set of articles about plaintiff awards. Even with the inclusion of settlement amounts, the median for winning plaintiffs was $1,800,000, still 75 times higher than the typical plaintiff verdict.

In 39 percent of the articles of plaintiff wins that we analyzed, the article’s headline mentioned only the monetary amount and the type of case, but nothing about the defendant’s misconduct. Another 14.5 percent mentioned only the monetary award, excluding any information about the type of case or injury. The following are a few examples:


The full article reveals that the woman suffered a horrific injury due to appalling negligence, illustrating how jackpot-sounding headlines like this do such a poor job informing readers:

   A Mill Valley woman who suffered severe chemical burns after a Lake Tahoe casino mistakenly served her a caustic cleaning solution in a water bottle has been awarded $3.25 million in damages by a San Francisco Superior Court jury, according to her attorney.

   Julia Ellis received the award for medical bills and pain and suffering in a
civil verdict delivered June 13, attorney Christopher B. Dolan said in a statement.

Ellis was staying at Harvey’s Lake Tahoe on Dec. 2, 2007, when she asked a bartender for a bottle of water. Ellis was given a Harrah’s-branded bottle of water, took a large drink, and immediately began screaming in pain, Dolan said. She was taken to the hospital, where it was determined that the bottle contained a caustic cleaning solution.

It was later determined that an employee had poured the solution from its larger storage container into an empty, unmarked water bottle and left it in the kitchen, where it was then inadvertently served to Ellis, Dolan said.


This wire story article begins: “The Idaho Supreme Court has rejected an appeal by a former state representative who contested a lower court's ruling that he must pay $1.4 million to a couple after one of them was injured on a broken stairway.”

Characterizing the cause of action as “Injured on a broken stairway” seems to trivialize this case. Not until later does the reader learn that the plaintiff suffered permanent injuries as a result of falling through the stairway and that the defendant had been warned the steps were dangerous and failed to fix them.

Headline: Hospital, ex-doctor settle $5.25 million suit Woman wins malpractice settlement [Connecticut News Times, July 7, 2011]

While the facts of this case are egregious, resulting in the amputation of Eileen Kelleher leg, one would have no idea from the headline. In fact, her attorney noted later in the article, “Eileen Kelleher is one of the most heinously injured clients that we have ever had ... It’s amazing she survived.”

As stated above, headlines today may have more of an impact than they did when we released Reading Between the Headlines, because of their prevalence in digital news aggregators and in social media. If a reader fails to click on the article link, the only impression he or she will have of the civil justice system is from a sensationalized headline.

B. PLAINTIFF VS. DEFENSE VERDICTS

Our analysis shows that for every media story reporting a defense “win” (i.e., no money awarded a plaintiff), there were six stories about a plaintiff “win” – whether through a jury verdict or a settlement, adding to the perception that plaintiff wins come easily and dominate the system. Even when we removed settlements from our database and considered only trial verdicts themselves, there were still more than two plaintiff wins for every defense win. However, in reality plaintiffs prevail in only 51.3 percent of tort cases.
before juries, and 56.2 percent of the time before judges – in other words, a little more than half the time.

C. FAILURE TO MENTION CAPS

As we pointed out in Reading Between the Headlines: The Media and Jury Verdicts,32

\[E\]xtremely large awards are rarely upheld by the trial judge or on appeal. According to a recent study of 100 jury verdicts of $1 million or more decided in 1994, 32 verdicts were set aside or reversed and 33 were reduced.”33 Contrary to popular belief, the data also found that plaintiffs often see little if any portion of an award. In at least 10 of the 100 cases studied, the defendant’s assets or insurance coverage was insufficient relative to the amount of money owed; in 6 cases, defendants ultimately paid nothing.34

Journalists clearly should be making more effort to ensure that readers understand these realities.

Additionally, in recent years in many states, corporate special interests and medical lobbies have fought to limit the power and authority of juries in civil cases. As a result, many states now cap damages regardless of what a jury awards. This is particularly true in the area of punitive damages, awarded for horrendous misconduct, and for “non-economic” damages, for injuries like disfigurement, trauma or pain and suffering.

Clearly, regardless of the total amount of a verdict, a verdict subject to a cap is something about which readers should be told. Yet from our analysis, this is not being done, or at least not being done clearly and responsibly. We found that while there may sometimes be mention of a cap, it often occurs far down in the article so that many readers will not be aware of it especially if they are reading only the eye-popping headline. In other articles, the cap is not mentioned at all.

The following two examples illustrate this problem.

Maine Medical Malpractice case

The following headline appeared a June 15, 2011 Associated Press story that appeared on the website of the Beaumont Enterprise:

Headline: Maine jury awards $6.7 million in malpractice case

The first line of this story reads: “A Maine jury has awarded $6.7 million to a woman whose husband died at Eastern Maine Medical Center following an all-terrain vehicle accident.”

In fact, Maine law caps certain noneconomic damages against a carrier of a health plan to $400,000. But this is not explained, and not even mentioned until practically the end of the story when the reporter writes, “Attorneys said the award will likely be reduced because damages for conscious suffering and loss of companionship and emotional distress have been capped by the Legislature.”
Clearly, anyone reading just this headline would have no idea that state law caps medical malpractice awards in Maine.

**Mississippi Asbestos case**

On May 6, 2011, Charlotte Graham, the county reporter for the local Mississippi paper *Laurel Leader Call*, wrote the following (full articles are reprinted for illustration purposes):

**Headline:** Smith County jury awards $322M verdict; Largest asbestos verdict in U.S. history

RALEIGH — A Smith County jury has awarded a 48-year-old Brookhaven man the single largest plaintiff's asbestos verdict in United States history.

In a case against Chevron Phillips Chemical (CP Chem.) and Union Carbide Corporation, Thomas “Tony” Brown Jr., was awarded $322 million dollars for future medical expenses, pain and suffering, and punitive damages.

Brown, who worked in the oil fields of Mississippi from 1979 to the mid 80’s, was diagnosed with asbestosis and is currently on oxygen 24-hours a day. Asbestosis is a debilitating lung disease caused by asbestos exposure and induces lung scarring and shortness of breath, which progresses over time. Exposure to asbestos can cause cancer and death.

Brown, who worked as a roughneck mixing drilling mud on drilling rigs in Mississippi and offshore in the Gulf of Mexico, was represented by Allen Horsley, Dawn Smith, and Ray Turcotte of the Hossley Embry law firm in Dallas, along with Gene Tullos and Gary King of Tullos & Tullos of Raleigh.

“Brown inhaled asbestos dust while mixing drilling mud sold by CP Chem and manufactured by Union Carbide,” said Allen Hossley. “Although the asbestos was known to cause cancer and lung disease, CP Chem and Union Carbide continued to market these almost 100 percent pure asbestos products long after they knew the dangers.”

The jury found that CP Chem and Union Carbide were liable to Brown for defectively designing their product and failure to provide an adequate warning.

Hossley went on to say that many industrial companies like CP Chem and Union Carbide put innocent workers at an extreme health risk just to insure greater profits.
“It’s my commitment to make sure that these irresponsible companies are held accountable to the lives and families that they have destroyed,” he said. “Despite stronger regulations, many people are still suffering the lasting effects from asbestos exposure.”

Brown was unable to read and write when he started working in oil fields as a floor hand at age 16 and defendants argued that because Brown couldn’t read, he didn’t deserve protection under Mississippi’s statute requiring defendants to warn the oil-field workers about the known dangers of their asbestos drilling products.

“The jury’s verdict made it clear that the people of Mississippi think that everyone, including the young men entering the work force that can’t read, deserve equal protection under Mississippi law,” said Dawn Smith.

Attempts to reach the defendant’s attorney’s were unsuccessful Thursday.

Representing Defendant CP Chem was Alex Cosculluela of Adams and Reese of Houston, Texas; Jeffrey Trotter of Adams and Reese of Jackson; Robert Johnson of Natchez and David Garner of Raleigh.

Representing Defendant Union Carbide was Michael Terry of Hartline, Dacus Barger Dreyer, LLP of Corpus Christi and Marcy Croft of Forman Perry Watkins Krutz & Tardy of Jackson.

The Associated Press out of Jackson, Mississippi wrote a similar story, which was picked up widely:

Headline: Miss. jury awards man $322M in asbestos lawsuit

JACKSON, Miss. (AP) - A jury has awarded $322 million to a Mississippi man who claimed he inhaled asbestos dust while mixing drilling mud sold and manufactured by Chevron Phillips Chemical Co. and Union Carbide Corp.

Allen Hossley, a Dallas attorney who represented Thomas C. Brown, said Friday he believes the verdict is the largest awarded in a single plaintiff’s asbestos case.

The jury awarded $300 million in punitive damages and $22 million in actual damages. The verdict was handed down Wednesday after more than two weeks of testimony.

Hossley said the jury found the companies liable for defectively designing their product and failing to provide an adequate warning to workers.

Brown, 48, has asbestosis and requires oxygen 24 hours a day, Hossley said.
"At the age of 16, he went into the oil field and for a period from 1979 to the mid-80s mixed asbestos drilling additive, and then 30 years later had this diagnosis," Hossley said.

Hossley said the drilling mud was sold by Chevron Phillips Chemical and manufactured by Union Carbide.

"Although the asbestos was known to cause cancer and lung disease, CP Chem and Union Carbide continued to market these almost 100-percent-pure asbestos products long after they knew the dangers," he said.

Attorney Alex Cosculluela said Chevron Phillips Chemical will appeal.

"We believe the verdict is not supported by either the facts in evidence or the testimony introduced at trial or the law in Mississippi," Cosculluela said.

Marcy Croft, who represented Union Carbide, didn't immediately return calls seeking comment, but the company issued a statement criticizing the verdict as outrageous.

"The credible medical evidence introduced at trial clearly demonstrates that, while Mr. Brown suffers from shortness of breath, such condition is not attributable to asbestos exposure," the statement said.

Court documents showed the packaging of the drilling mud additives included a federally-mandated warning that it contained asbestos fibers and breathing the fibers could cause serious injury.

However, Brown couldn't read or write when he started working in the fields. Defendants had tried to use that fact to shoot down one of his claims. They said because Brown couldn't read, he couldn't demonstrate the reliance on the package warning would have made a difference, according to court documents.

Writing for the Wall Street Journal blog and citing the Lauren Leader Call story, Ashby Jones wrote on May 6, 2011:36

Headline: Mississippi Jury Returns Largest Asbestos Verdict in U.S. History

Asbestos litigation.

Ho-hum, right? After all, it’s about as current as Ivan Lend, as hip as Vanilla Ice, as played out as Gary Hart.

Uh, yeah, time for you to give asbestos litigation another look.

The news: A jury in Mississippi on Thursday has awarded a 48-year-old man the largest plaintiffs’ asbestos verdict in U.S. history.
In a case against Chevron Phillips Chemical and Union Carbide Corporation, Thomas Brown Jr., was awarded $322 million dollars for future medical expenses, pain and suffering, and punitive damages. Click here for the article, from the Laurel Leader-Call.

According to the story:

Brown, who worked in the oil fields of Mississippi from 1979 to the mid 80’s, was diagnosed with asbestosis and is currently on oxygen 24-hours a day. He worked as a roughneck mixing drilling mud on drilling rigs in Mississippi and offshore in the Gulf of Mexico, and inhaled asbestos dust while on the job.

“Brown inhaled asbestos dust while mixing drilling mud sold by CP Chem and manufactured by Union Carbide,” said Allen Hossley, a lawyer for the plaintiff. “Although the asbestos was known to cause cancer and lung disease, CP Chem and Union Carbide continued to market these almost 100 percent pure asbestos products long after they knew the dangers.”

The jury found that CP Chem and Union Carbide were liable to Brown for defectively designing their product and failure to provide an adequate warning.

A Union Carbide spokesman told the LB:

This verdict is outrageous and completely unsupported by the facts or applicable law. . . . There were numerous judicial errors as to both the substantive law and the conduct of the trial that prejudiced Union Carbide’s defense and provide strong grounds for appeal. Union Carbide has confidence in the Mississippi appellate courts and believes . . . that this verdict will be completely set aside by post-trial motions or through the appellate process.

A CP Chem spokeswoman sent along the following message to the LB:

The verdict is wholly unsupported by both the facts presented at trial and the law. Further, the punitive damages award is prohibited by applicable law and a clear violation of constitutional due process. . . . Chevron Phillips Chemical is confident the verdict will be set aside either as a result of post-trial motions, or by the Mississippi appellate courts, should an appeal become necessary.

Nowhere in any of these stories is mention of the fact that state law automatically and severely caps both non-economic and punitive damages in Mississippi. The highest any punitive damages award can be in Mississippi - for companies worth more than $1 billion - is $20 million. And non-economic damages are capped at $1 million.
Comments on the WSJ blog reflect these terrible journalistic failures which perpetuate the same kind of myths about the frequency of high jury awards that led to legislative caps in the first place. For example, at 7:31 pm May 6, 2011, “tell it your way” wrote this comment:

Tort Reform! That is what is needed here. Too much money awarded to the too few. The award should have been a good wage for all of the years of suffering, times two for pain and suffering, and payable to his wife until she dies as well. Any dependant adults should also be included until they die. This would be like a mentally handicapped child, or something of that nature. Other than that, No. They don’t want to talk about all the auto and truck mechanics who used to blow out brakes, with an air hose, and breathe the dust. They would have a lot more claims on their hands then.

At 9:04 pm May 7, 2011, “colaman” wrote:

Another example of the U.S. becoming less competitive with these outlandish awards….no doubt support for pain and suffering but not wholesale thievery

Some commentors actually tried to correct what journalists failed to do. For example, at 6:00 pm May 6, 2011, SpeedRacer wrote:

MS has statutory caps on general and punitive damages that will require the Judge in this case to significantly remit this jury verdict. At the end of the day, the dollar value will be well less than $5 million.

But clearly as these examples show, it is the hyped-up and misleading headline that circulates and the damage is done.
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## Appendix: Online Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Wire*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Neumeister, 'Lawyer: Deal reached to care for paralyzed gymnast', <em>Huffington Post</em>, July 12, 2011 (<a href="http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huff-wires/20110712/us-paralyzed-gymnast/">http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huff-wires/20110712/us-paralyzed-gymnast/</a>)</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield man gets $5.7 million for oilfield accident', <em>KBAK</em> [Bakersfield, CA], May 20, 2011, (<a href="http://www.bakersfieldnow.com/news/local/122358474.html">http://www.bakersfieldnow.com/news/local/122358474.html</a>)</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Wire*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US judge awards payout for botched circumcision', <em>Google News</em>, July 18, 2011, (<a href="http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hWUCGBeULvSegRxbENDYZozXFg?docId=CNG.bdac60bc01523cb81732d8109017db35.7b1">http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hWUCGBeULvSegRxbENDYZozXFg?docId=CNG.bdac60bc01523cb81732d8109017db35.7b1</a>)</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>AFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Wire*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Sullivan, 'Family of Seattle bicyclist killed in crash settles lawsuit for $1.5M', <em>The Seattle Times</em>, May 31, 2011, (<a href="http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/localnews/2015197596_bikesuit01m.html">http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/localnews/2015197596_bikesuit01m.html</a>)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare Co to pay $1.5M for deputy fatal shooting', <em>The Stamford Advocate</em>, May 22, 2011, (<a href="http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/news/article/Tulare-Co-to-pay-1-5M-for-deputy-fatal-shooting-1389089.php#ixzz1SkvALh8w">http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/news/article/Tulare-Co-to-pay-1-5M-for-deputy-fatal-shooting-1389089.php#ixzz1SkvALh8w</a>)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Pelham, 'Settlement 'vindicates' blamed driver', <em>Daily Telegram</em> [Adrian, MI], May 11, 2011, (<a href="http://www.lenconnect.com/news/courts/x401376998/Settlement-vindicates-blamed-driver">http://www.lenconnect.com/news/courts/x401376998/Settlement-vindicates-blamed-driver</a>)</td>
<td>$895,000</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Chacon, 'Memorial pays $700,000 settlement to injured child of undocumented immigrant', <em>The Gazette</em> [Colorado Springs, CO], July 6, 2011, (<a href="http://www.gazette.com/articles/memorial-121048-undocumented-immigrant.html#ixzz1SetOfgrV">http://www.gazette.com/articles/memorial-121048-undocumented-immigrant.html#ixzz1SetOfgrV</a>)</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Wire*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mello and Sally French, 'Pothole costs city of La Habra $95,000', <em>Orange County Register</em>, May 19, 2011, (<a href="http://articles.ocregister.com/2011-05-19/news/29566389_1_pothole-medical-costs-claim">http://articles.ocregister.com/2011-05-19/news/29566389_1_pothole-medical-costs-claim</a>)</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelia Byrd, 'Miss. jury awards man $322M in asbestos lawsuit', <em>Ventura County Star</em>, May 9, 2011, (<a href="http://www.vcstar.com/news/2011/may/09/miss-jury-awards-man-322m-in-asbestos-02/#ixzz1SI1CH1jc">http://www.vcstar.com/news/2011/may/09/miss-jury-awards-man-322m-in-asbestos-02/#ixzz1SI1CH1jc</a>)</td>
<td>$322,000,000</td>
<td>Plaintiff</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Wire*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk Jury Awards $7.5 Million to Hit-and-Run Crash Victim', <em>The Ledger</em> [Lakeland, FL], May 28, 2011, (<a href="http://www.theledger.com/article/20110528/NEWS/110529443/1002/SPORTS7Title=Polk-Jury-Awards-7-5-Million-to-Hit-and-Run-Crash-Victim-">http://www.theledger.com/article/20110528/NEWS/110529443/1002/SPORTS7Title=Polk-Jury-Awards-7-5-Million-to-Hit-and-Run-Crash-Victim-</a>)</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>Plaintiff</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Ellis, '$6.5 million verdict awarded in inmate's slaying', <em>The Oklahoman</em>, June 24, 2011, (<a href="http://newsok.com/6.5-million-verdict-awarded-in-inmates-slaying/article/3579891">http://newsok.com/6.5-million-verdict-awarded-in-inmates-slaying/article/3579891</a>)</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>Plaintiff</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Boyd, 'Jury finds bar that served driver partially responsible for wreck that killed 4 teens', <em>Star-Telegram</em> [Fort Worth, TX], June 15, 2011, (<a href="http://www.star-telegram.com/2011/06/14/3152661/jury-finds-bar-that-served-driver.html#ixzz1SfrHzY7T">http://www.star-telegram.com/2011/06/14/3152661/jury-finds-bar-that-served-driver.html#ixzz1SfrHzY7T</a>)</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>Plaintiff</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Wire*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Gaspar, 'Bakersfield to pay $2.1 million in wrongful death lawsuit', <em>KBAK</em> [Bakersfield, CA], May 20, 2011, <em>(<a href="http://www.bakersfieldnow.com/news/local/122372269.html">http://www.bakersfieldnow.com/news/local/122372269.html</a>)</em></td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>Plaintiff</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Dickson, 'Family of Burleson man killed in DWI crash gets $1 million from country club', <em>Star-Ledger</em> [Fort Worth, TX], July 9, 2011, <em>(<a href="http://www.star-telegram.com/2011/07/08/3209835/family-of-burleson-man-killed.html#ixzz1Sei9boiN">http://www.star-telegram.com/2011/07/08/3209835/family-of-burleson-man-killed.html#ixzz1Sei9boiN</a>)</em></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Plaintiff</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroger found liable in 2nd assault', <em>The Clarion-Ledger</em> [Jackson, MS], June 17, 2011, *(<a href="http://www.clarionledger.com/article/20110618/NEWS/106180336/Kroger-found">http://www.clarionledger.com/article/20110618/NEWS/106180336/Kroger-found</a> LIABLE-2nd-assault?odyssey=mod</td>
<td>newswell</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Passal, 'Jury Clears United Taconite in Wrongful Death', <em>WDIO</em> [Duluth, MN], July 8, 2011, <em>(<a href="http://www.wdio.com/article/stories/S2191353.shtml?cat=10349">http://www.wdio.com/article/stories/S2191353.shtml?cat=10349</a>)</em></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Indem</td>
<td>Orig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal jury in civil case finds no wrongdoing by Raleigh County deputies in fatal shooting', <em>Daily Reporter</em> [Greenfield, IN], July 19, 2011, <em>(<a href="http://www.greenfieldreporter.com/view/story/a4dcb5c3e2004895832c8a9fc7ae1cf4/WV--Deputy-Shooting/">http://www.greenfieldreporter.com/view/story/a4dcb5c3e2004895832c8a9fc7ae1cf4/WV--Deputy-Shooting/</a>)</em></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix: Online Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Wire*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4M award upheld in motel suit', <em>Picayune Item</em>, July 6, 2011, (<a href="http://picayuneitem.com/statenews/x925653617/-4M-awardupheld-in-motel-suit)">http://picayuneitem.com/statenews/x925653617/-4M-awardupheld-in-motel-suit)</a></td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix: Online Coverage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Wire*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Wire Story Categories:*
- Orig: Original Source
- AP: Associated Press
- AFP: Agence France-Presse
- Reu: Reuters
- LP: Originating in Local Paper