



## THE FLORIDA SENATE

### SPECIAL MASTER ON CLAIM BILLS

**Location**

402 Senate Office Building

**Mailing Address**

404 South Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100  
(850) 487-5237

DATE	COMM	ACTION
2/1/11	SM	Unfavorable

February 1, 2011

The Honorable Mike Haridopolos  
President, The Florida Senate  
Suite 409, The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100

Re: **SB 42 (2011)** – Senator Joe Negron  
Relief of Eric Brody

### SPECIAL MASTER'S FINAL REPORT

THIS IS A CONTESTED EXCESS JUDGMENT CLAIM FOR \$30,760,670.30 OF LOCAL MONEY BASED ON A JURY AWARD AGAINST THE BROWARD COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE TO COMPENSATE CLAIMANT ERIC BRODY FOR THE PERMANENT INJURIES HE SUFFERED IN A COLLISION WITH A DEPUTY SHERIFF'S CRUISER.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

On the evening of March 3, 1998, in Sunrise, Florida, 18-year-old Eric Brody was on his way home from his part-time job. He was making a left turn from Oakland Park Boulevard into his neighborhood when his AMC Concord was struck near the passenger door by a Sheriff's Office cruiser driven by Deputy Sheriff Christopher Thieman.

Deputy Thieman was on his way to a mandatory roll call at the Sheriff's district station in Weston. One estimate of his speed was 70 MPH. Even the lowest credible estimate of his speed was in excess of the 45 MPH speed limit. It is estimated that the cruiser, after braking, struck Eric's vehicle at about 53 MPH. The impact caused Eric to be violently thrown toward the passenger door, where he struck his head. He suffered broken ribs and a skull fracture. Eric was airlifted to Broward General Hospital where he underwent an

emergency craniotomy to reduce brain swelling. However, he suffered a severe brain injury that left him with permanent disabilities.

Eric was in the hospital intensive care unit for four weeks and then was transferred to a rehabilitation center. He was later transferred to a nursing home. He remained in an induced coma for about six months. After the coma, Eric had to learn to walk and talk again. Eric is now 31 years old and lives with his parents. He has difficulty walking and usually uses a wheelchair or a walker. His balance is diminished and he will often fall. Eric has some paralysis on the left side of his body and has no control of his left hand. He must be helped to do some simple personal tasks. He tires easily. The extent of his cognitive disabilities is not clear. His processing speed and short-term memory are impaired and his mother believes his judgment has been affected.

At the time of the collision, Eric had been accepted at two universities and was interested in pursuing a career in radio broadcasting. However, his speech was substantially affected by his injuries and it is now difficult for anyone other than his mother to understand him.

One of the main issues in the trial was whether Eric was comparatively negligent. The Broward County Sheriff's Office (BCSO) contends that Eric was not wearing his seatbelt and that, if he had been wearing his seatbelt, his injuries would have been substantially reduced. Eric has no memory of the accident because of his head injury, but testified at trial that he always wore his seatbelt. The paramedics who arrived at the scene of the crash testified that Eric's seatbelt was not fastened. However, the seatbelt was spooled out and there was evidence presented that the seatbelt could have become disconnected in the crash.

The jury saw a crash re-enactment that was conducted with similar vehicles, using a belted test dummy. The results of the reenactment supported the proposition that the collision would have caused a belted driver to strike his or her head on the passenger door. The seatbelt shoulder harness has little or no effect in stopping the movement of the upper body in a side impact like the one involved in this case. The head injury that Eric sustained is consistent with injuries sustained

by belted drivers in side impact collisions. Therefore, Eric's injury is not inconsistent with the claim that he was wearing his seatbelt at the time of the collision. I conclude from the evidence presented that Eric was more likely than not wearing his seat belt.

Deputy Thieman's account of the incident was conspicuously lacking in detail. Deputy Thieman did not recall how fast he was going before the collision. He could not recall how close he was to Eric's vehicle when he first saw it. He could not recall whether Eric's turn signal was on.

A curious aspect of the incident was that Deputy Thieman had been traveling in the left lane of Oakland Park Boulevard, which has three westbound lanes, but collided with Eric's vehicle in the far right lane. If Deputy Thieman had stayed in the left lane, the collision would not have occurred. Why Deputy Thieman swerved to the right was not adequately explained. It would seem that the natural response in seeing a vehicle moving to the right would be to try to escape to the left. At trial, Deputy Thieman testified that he did not turn to the left because that was in the direction of oncoming traffic. However, there was no oncoming traffic at the time. It is concluded that the manner in which Deputy Thieman maneuvered his vehicle was unreasonable under the circumstances and that it was a contributing cause of the collision.

Deputy Thieman's was fired by the Broward County Sheriff's Office in 2006 for misconduct not related to the collision with Eric Brody.

Eric received \$10,000 from Personal Injury Protection coverage on his automobile insurance. He receives Social Security disabilities payments of approximately \$560 each month. He also received some vocational rehabilitation assistance which paid for a wheelchair ramp and some other modifications at his home.

Eric has a normal life expectancy. One life care plan developed for Eric estimated the cost of his care will be \$10,151,619. There was other evidence that his future care would cost \$5 to \$7 million.

LITIGATION HISTORY:

In 2002, a negligence lawsuit was filed in the circuit court for Broward County by Charles and Sharon Brody, as Eric's parents and guardians, against the BCSO. In December 2005, after a lengthy trial, the jury found that Deputy Thieman was negligent and that his negligence was the sole cause of Eric's damages. The jury awarded damages of \$30,609,298. The court entered a cost judgment of \$270,372.30. The sum of these two figures is \$30,879,670.30. Post-trial motions for new trial and remittitur were denied. The verdict was upheld on appeal.

The BCSO paid the \$200,000 sovereign immunity limit under s. 768.28, Florida Statutes. The payment was placed in a trust account and none of it has been disbursed. Attorney's fees and costs have not been deducted. Eric Brody has received nothing to date.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The claim bill hearing was a *de novo* proceeding to determine, based on the evidence presented to the Special Master, whether the BCSO is liable in negligence for the damages suffered by Eric Brody and, if so, whether the amount of the claim is reasonable.

Deputy Thieman had a duty to operate his vehicle in conformance with the posted speed limit and with reasonable care for the safety of other drivers. His speeding and failure to operate his vehicle with reasonable care caused the collision and the injuries that Eric Brody sustained. The BCSO is liable as Deputy Thieman's employer.

Although Eric Brody was required to yield before turning left, the evidence does not show that a failure to yield was a contributing cause of the collision. Eric reasonably judged that he could safely make the left turn. He was well past the lane in which Deputy Thieman was traveling. The collision appears to have been caused solely by Deputy Thieman's unreasonable actions in speeding and swerving to the right. I believe the jury acted reasonably in assigning no fault to Eric.

At the claim bill hearing, Claimant's counsel urged the Special Master to determine that the liability insurer for the BCSO acted in bad faith by failing to timely tender its \$3 million coverage in this matter and, therefore, the insurer is

liable for the entire judgment against the BCSO. However, because the insurer was not a party to the Senate claim bill proceeding, and because the bad faith claim is not a proper subject for determination in a claim bill hearing under the rules of the Senate, I did not take evidence nor make a determination regarding the bad faith claim.

The BCSO objected to the provision of the 2010 claim bill that provided for the BCSO's assignment of its bad faith claim against its insurer to Eric Brody as prohibited by the Florida Constitution and beyond the statutory authority of the Senate. It may be unconstitutional for a local claim bill to require the assignment of a legal claim, because Article III, Section 11(a)(7) of the Florida Constitution prohibits special laws or general laws of local application pertaining to "conditions precedent to bringing any civil or criminal proceedings." However, Senate Bill 42 does not require the assignment of the BCSO's legal claim. The bill requires the BCSO to pay the \$30 million claim, but states that, in lieu of payment, the BCSO "may" assign its legal claim against the insurer to Eric Brody and, if it assigns its claim, the BCSO is not required to pay the \$30 million. In this form, I do not believe that Senate Bill 42 violates the constitutional restriction on special laws or exceeds the Senate's authority.

ATTORNEYS FEES:

In compliance with s. 768.28(8), Florida Statutes, the Claimant's attorneys will limit their fees to 25 percent of any amount awarded by the Legislature.

SPECIAL ISSUES:

Senate Bill 42 incorrectly states that the jury awarded damages of \$30,690,000. The correct amount is \$30,609,298. The total excess judgment claim is incorrectly stated as \$30,760,372.30. The correct amount is \$30,679,670.30.

The positions of the parties regarding this claim bill are uncertain. It is not clear why Broward County opposes the opportunity to avoid a \$30 million claim bill by assigning its legal claim against its insurer to the Claimant. It is also unclear why the Claimant would refuse the Legislature's award and the settlement offers made by the County, which would allow Eric Brody to begin to receive the care he needs, and choose instead to accept the risk and further delay associated with commencing a bad faith claim against the County's insurer.

The Senate should also consider the unusual size of this claim bill. Sovereign immunity from liability in tort effectively prevents the State and local governments from being bankrupted by damage awards. Claim bills in excess of \$10 million are unusual. Claims bills in excess of \$20 million are rare. This claim bill for over \$30 million is the largest ever claim bill to my knowledge. In the past, the largest claim bills have usually called for installment payments or other mechanisms to make the fiscal impact manageable. The BCSO contends that it cannot pay this claim without drastic reductions in governmental services. It asserts that the claim is equivalent to 300 law enforcement officers or five fire/rescue stations. Eric Brody deserves to be compensated for his injuries caused by the negligence of Deputy Thieman, but it would be unreasonable to waive sovereign immunity if the result is to cause severe reductions in government services to the citizens of Broward County.

The fiscal burden that would be associated with the Legislature's regular passage of \$10, \$20, and \$30 million claim bills, especially for claims that will be paid by local governments beyond their insurance coverage, indicates that a balance must be struck between the principle of sovereign immunity and the principle of fair compensation.

The payment of a claim bill is a matter of legislative grace and the Senate is free to deviate from a jury award. When very large claim bills are filed, it is reasonable for the Senate to consider, among other factors, whether the amount of a claim deviates substantially above or below the median jury verdict for similar injuries. At the request of the Special Master, the parties submitted jury verdict data for cases involving permanent brain injuries. The information was inadequate to allow a median award to be stated with confidence, but it is under \$20 million. As stated above, the life care plans for Eric Brody ranged from \$5 to \$10 million.

If the Senate wishes to pay the claim, I believe the option to assign the claim should be preserved in the bill, but the award should be reduced to \$15 million and Broward County should be allowed to pay the award in several installments.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

For the reasons set forth above, I recommend that Senate Bill 42 (2011) be reported UNFAVORABLY.

SPECIAL MASTER'S FINAL REPORT – SB 42 (2011)

February 1, 2011

Page 7

Respectfully submitted,



Bram D. E. Canter

Senate Special Master

cc: Senator Joe Negron  
R. Philip Twogood, Secretary of the Senate  
Counsel of Record