Case 1:99-cv-06443-LJO-SMS Document 696 Filed 11/26/08 Page 1 of 10

FILED

NOV 262008

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Ž,

DEPUTY CLEAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 MARTHA RIVERA, MAO HER, ALICIA ALVAREZ, EVA ARRIOLA, PEUANG BOUNNHONG, CHHOM CHAN, BEE LEE, PAULA MARTINEZ, MARIA MEDINA, MAI MEEMUOA, MARGARITA MENDOZA, 10 BAO NHIA MOUA, ISIDRA MURILLO, MARIA NAVARRO, VATH RATTANATAY, 11 OFELIA RIVERA, SARA RIVERA, 12 MARIA RODRIGUEZ, MARIA RUIZ, MARIA VALDIVIA, SY VANG, YOUA

Plaintiffs,

v.

NIBCO, INC., an Indiana corporation,

XIONG, and SEE YANG,

Defendant.

1:99-cv-6443 OWW SMS

SPECIAL VERDICTS OF TRIAL JURY

We the jury in the above-entitled cause find the following answers to the questions submitted to us.

1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

14 15

13

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

Question 1: On Plaintiffs' Title VII claim, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Nibco's Z test had a disproportionate adverse effect in causing the lay off of Hispanic and Asian employees?

5

1

2

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27 28

NO PLAINTIFF YES Alicia Alvarez Eva Arriola Peuang Bounnhong Chhom Chan Mao Her Bee Lee Paula Martinez Maria Medina Mai Meemoua Margarita Mendoza Bao Nhia Moua Isidra Murillo Maria Navarro Vath Rattanatay Martha Rivera Ofelia Rivera Sara Rivera Maria Rodriguez Maria Ruiz Maria Valdivia Sy Vang Youa Xiong See Yang

If you answered "yes" as to any plaintiff, answer Question

2. If you answered "no" as to all plaintiffs, answer Question 5.

Case 1:99-cv-06443-LJO-SMS Document 696 Filed 11/26/08 Page 3 of 10

ı	Question 2: Has Nibco proved by a preponderance of the
2	evidence that the Z tests were job related to and consistent with
3	business necessity?
4	
5	YesNo
6	
7	
8	
9	
TO	
11	
12	
1.3	
1.4	
15	
1.6	
17	
1.8	
19 20	If you answered Question 2 "yes," answer Question 3. If you
20 21	answered Question 2 "no," answer Question 5.
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Case 1:99-cv-06443-LJO-SMS Document 696 Filed 11/26/08 Page 4 of 10

1	Question 3: Have Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of
2	the evidence that:
3	(a) a less discriminatory alternative selection method as
4	defined in Jury Instruction No. 21, was available?
5	
6	Yes No
7	
8	
9	(b) Nibco refused to adopt the alternative selection
10	method?
11	Yes No
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	If you answered yes as to any of the Questions in Question
21	3, answer Question 4. If you answered no to any of the
22	subsections to Question 3, answer Question 5.
23	
24	
25	
26	·
27	
28	
	A

Case 1:99-cv-06443-LJO-SMS Document 696 Filed 11/26/08 Page 5 of 10

1	Question 4: Was any disp	roportionat	e adverse e	ffect of th	ıe
2	administration of the Z test by	y Nibco a c	ause of the	lay off of	# *
3	any plaintiff?				
4					
5	PLAINTIFF	YES	NO		
6	Alicia Alvarez		***************************************		
7	Eva Arriola Peuang Bounnhong				
8	Chhom Chan Mao Her		······································		
9	Bee Lee Paula Martinez		30000C 1000000W		
10	Maria Medina Mai Meemoua		490-90-90-90000		
11	Margarita Mendoza Bao Nhia Moua		*****		
12	Isidra Murillo Maria Navarro		••••		
12	Vath Rattanatay		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
13	Martha Rivera				
	Ofelia Rivera		***************************************		
14	Sara Rivera				
1 =	Maria Rodriguez				
15	Maria Ruiz Maria Valdivia		William States		
16	Sy Vang				
-*	Youa Xiong		••••		
17	See Yang				
18					
19					
20	Answer Question 5.				
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
	i				

Case 1:99-cv-06443-LJO-SMS Document 696 Filed 11/26/08 Page 6 of 10

Question 5: As to plaintiffs' FEHA claims, did Nibco's administration of its Z test cause disproportionate adverse effect in causing the lay off of any plaintiff by reason of any plaintiffs' national origin?

PLAINTIFF	YES	NO
Alicia Alvarez Eva Arriola		X
Peuang Bounnhong		\
Chhom Chan Mao Her		$\frac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}$
Bee Lee		X
Paula Martinez		<u> </u>
Maria Medina Mai Meemoua		-
Margarita Mendoza		
Bao Nhia Moua		$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{x}}$
Isidra Murillo		$\overline{}$
Maria Navarro Vath Rattanatay		-
Martha Rivera		$-\frac{\Delta}{\lambda}$
Ofelia Rivera		
Sara Rivera		<u>_X</u> _
Maria Rodriguez Maria Ruiz		->
Maria Valdivia		$\overline{\mathbf{x}}$
Sy Vang		<u> </u>
Youa Xiong See Yang		-\$ -
DCC 14.19		<u> </u>

If you answered Question 6 "yes," as to any employee, answer Question 7. If you answered Question 7 "no" as to all plaintiffs, sign and return this verdict.

Case 1:99-cv-06443-LJO-SMS Document 696 Filed 11/26/08 Page 7 of 10

Question 6: Has Nibco established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Z test was job related and necessary to its business?

Yes _______ No_____

If you answered "yes," answer Question 7. If you answered "no," and answered Question 5 "yes," answer Question 8.

	1
1	Question 7: If you found that Nibco's Z test was job
2	related and necessary to its business, have plaintiffs proved
3	that:
4	(a) There was an alternative employment practice that would
5	have accomplished the business purpose equally well?
6	
7	Yes NoX_
8	
9	(b) Would this alternative employment practice have had
10	less adverse impact on Hispanic and Asian employees?
11	
12	Yes No
13	
14	
15	,
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	If you answered Question 7 yes, answer Question 8. If you
21	answered Question 7 no, sign and return this verdict.
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	o

Question 8: Was Nibco's Z test a substantial factor in causing the lay off of any Plaintiff?

PLAINTIFF	YES	NO
Alicia Alvarez		
Eva Arriola		
Peuang Bounnhong		
Chhom Chan		
Mao Her		
Bee Lee		
Paula Martinez		
Maria Medina		
Mai Meemoua		
Margarita Mendoza		
Bao Nhia Moua		
Isidra Murillo		
Maria Navarro		
Vath Rattanatay	-	
Martha Rivera		
Ofelia Rivera		
Sara Rivera		
Maria Rodriguez		
Maria Ruiz		
Maria Valdivia		
Sy Vang		
Youa Xiong		
See Yang		

Sign, date and return this verdict.

Case 1:99-cv-06443-LJO-SMS Document 696 Filed 11/26/08 Page 10 of 10

We the jury in the above-entitled case have unanimously found the foregoing answers to the questions submitted to us in this verdict form. So say we all.

DATED: November 26, 2008.

albert Vels