

## COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS.

SUPERIOR COURT  
CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 1684CV02490**LISA BUTNER,**  
Plaintiff,

V.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE POLICE ("MSP")  
Defendant.**VERDICT FORM: CLAIM 1 and CLAIM 6****(CLAIM 1): DISPARATE TREATMENT—November 2013 Internal Affairs Unit**

1. Did Plaintiff Lisa Butner prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against her on basis of her race when not hiring her for the position of November 2013 Internal Affairs position?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #2.**\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "NO," Please Go On to Question #3.*

2. Was MSP's discrimination of Lisa Butner's race a determinative cause of MSP not hiring her for November 2013 Internal Affairs position?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #3.**\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #3.*

3. Did Plaintiff Lisa Butner prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against her on basis of her gender when not hiring her for the position of November 2013 Internal Affairs position?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #3 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #4.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #3 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #5.*

4. Was MSP's discrimination of Lisa Butner's gender a determinative cause of MSP not hiring her for November 2013 Internal Affairs position?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #5.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "NO," and Your Answer To Question #1, #2, and/or #3 is "NO," you have reached your verdict as to Disparate Treatment. Please Go On To Question #5.*

#### **(CLAIM 6): DISPARATE IMPACT**

5. Has Plaintiff Lisa Butner demonstrated a specific employment practice of MSP that causes a significant discriminatory impact on MSP employees who are female?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #5 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #6.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #5 is "NO," Please Go On to Question #6.*

6. Has Plaintiff Lisa Butner demonstrated a specific employment practice of MSP that causes a significant discriminatory impact on MSP employees of color?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #7.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "NO," and Your Answer to Question #5 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #7.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "NO," and your Answer to Question #5 is "NO," you have reached a verdict as to Disparate Impact. If Your Answer To Question #2 and/or Question #4 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #9.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "NO," and your Answer to Question #5 is "NO," and ALL of your Answer to Question #1 and #3 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the form at the end of the page.*

**\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "NO," and your Answer to Question #5 is "No," and ALL of your Answers to Questions #2 and #4 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the form at the end of the page.**

7. Has MSP shown that the employment practice which causes a significant discriminatory impact is job-related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  \_\_\_\_\_

**\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #8.**

**\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "NO," you have reached a verdict as to Disparate Impact. If Your Answer To Question #2 and/or Question #4 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #9.**

**\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "NO," and ALL of your Answer to Question #1 and #3 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the form at the end of the page.**

**\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "NO," and ALL of your Answers to Questions #2 and #4 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the form at the end of the page.**

8. Has MSP refused to adopt or use an alternative practice that equally or better serves MSP's legitimate business needs which has a lesser disparate impact on employees of color and/or employees who are female?

Yes  \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #9.**

**\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "NO," you have reached a verdict as to Disparate Impact. If Your Answer To Question #2 and/or Question #4 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #9.**

**\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "NO," and ALL of your Answer to Question #1 and #3 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the form at the end of the page.**

**\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "NO," and ALL of your Answers to Questions #2 and #4 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the form at the end of the page.**

## DAMAGES

9. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there is economic damages, and if so, what is the amount of economic damages you award Plaintiff Lisa Butner against MSP?

Nine hundred thirty-nine thousand two hundred Dollars and twenty  
Amount In Words

\$ 939,220.00

Amount In Figures

10. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Lisa Butner did not reasonably mitigate her economic damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

Zero Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

11. From the total amount from Question #9, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #10.

\$939,220.00

(Total amount from Question #9)

MINUS

\$ 0.00

(Amount from Question #10)

= Nine hundred thirty-nine thousand two hundred and twenty dollars  
(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words

\$939,220.00 4

12. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there is emotional distress, and if so, what is the amount of damages in emotional distress you award Plaintiff Lisa Butner against MSP?

Eighty seven thousand five hundred  
Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 87,500.00

Amount In Figures

13. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Lisa Butner did not reasonably mitigate her emotional distress damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No ✓

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

zero

Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

14. From the total amount from Question #12, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #13.

\$ 87,500.00

(Total amount from Question #12)

MINUS

\$ 0.00

(Amount from Question #13)

= Eighty seven thousand five hundred dollars  
(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words

\$ 87,500.00

15. Please add up the total amount from Question #11 and #14:

One million twenty-six thousand seven hundred and twenty Dollars  
Amount In Words  
\$ 1,026,720.00  
Amount In Figures

#### PUNITIVE DAMAGES

16. Has Plaintiff Lisa Butner proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP's discriminatory conduct was outrageous or egregious?

Yes ✓ No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If your answer is "YES," Please Go On To Question #17.*

*\*If your answer is "NO," Please Go On to Question #18.*

17. Do you find that there are punitive damages, and if so, what is the amount of punitive damages you award Plaintiff Lisa Butner against MSP?

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's punitive damage is below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

Two million fifty-three thousand four hundred and forty Dollars  
Amount In Words Three million and eighty thousand one hundred and sixty dollars  
\$ 2,053,440.00 \$ 3,080,160.00  
Amount In Figures (EM) 11/17/2025

#### TOTAL DAMAGES

18. Please add up the total amount from Question #15 and #17:

Three million eighty thousand and one hundred and sixty Dollars  
Amount In Words Four million one hundred and six thousand, eight hundred and eighty dollars.  
\$ 3,080,160.00 \$ 4,106,880.00  
Amount In Figures

(EM)  
11/17/2025

ten (10) twelve (12)  
The above findings represent the verdict of at least twelve (12) out of fourteen (14) of the  
members of the jury.

W. Mee

EM 11/17/2025

JURY FOREPERSON

Dated: 11/17/2025

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS.

SUPERIOR COURT  
CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 1684CV02490

**DEBORAH RYAN,**  
Plaintiff,

V.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE POLICE ("MSP")  
Defendant.

**VERDICT FORM: CLAIM 2**

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—July 2014 Narcotics Inspection Unit**

1. Did Plaintiff Deborah Ryan prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against her on basis of her gender when not hiring her for the position of July 2014 Narcotics Inspection Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #2.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #3.*

2. Was MSP's discrimination of Deborah Ryan's gender a determinative cause of MSP not hiring her for July 2014 Narcotics Inspection Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #3.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #3.*

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—Spring 2014 Concord Station Commander**

3. Did Plaintiff Deborah Ryan prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against her on basis of her gender when not hiring her for the position of Spring 2014 Concord Station Commander?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #3 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #4.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #3 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #5.*

4. Was MSP's discrimination of Deborah Ryan's gender a determinative cause of MSP not hiring her for Spring 2014 Concord Station Commander?

Yes  No

*\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #5.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #5.*

#### **DISPARATE TREATMENT—Fall 2014 Newbury Station Commander**

5. Did Plaintiff Deborah Ryan prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against her on basis of her gender when not hiring her for the position of Fall 2014 Newbury Station Commander?

Yes  No

*\*If Your Answer To Question #5 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #6.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #5 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #7.*

6. Was MSP's discrimination of Deborah Ryan's gender a determinative cause of MSP not hiring her for Fall 2014 Newbury Station Commander?

Yes  No

*\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #7.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #7.*

#### **DISPARATE TREATMENT—Winter 2014/2015 Medford Station Commander**

7. Did Plaintiff Deborah Ryan prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against her on basis of her gender when not hiring her for the position of Winter 2014/2015 Medford Station Commander?

Yes  No

*\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #8.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "NO," but you answered "YES" to one or more or all of Questions #2, #4, and/or #6, Please Go On To Question #9.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "NO," and you answered "NO" to ALL Questions #1, #3, and #5, you have reached your verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "NO," and you answered "NO" to ALL Questions #2, #4, and #6, you have reached your verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

8. Was MSP's discrimination of Deborah Ryan's gender a determinative cause of MSP not hiring her for Winter 2014/2015 Medford Station Commander?

Yes  No

*\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #9.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "NO," but you answered "YES" to one or more or all of Questions #2, #4, and/or #6, Please Go On To Question #9.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "NO," and you answered "NO" to ALL Questions #1, #3, and #5, you have reached your verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "NO," and you answered "NO" to ALL Questions #2, #4, and #6, you have reached your verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

## DAMAGES

9. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there is economic damages, and if so, what is the amount of economic damages you award Plaintiff Deborah Ryan against MSP?

ZERO Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

10. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Deborah Ryan did not reasonably mitigate her economic damages?

Yes  No

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

ZERO Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

11. From the total amount from Question #9, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #10.

ZERO

(Total amount from Question #9)

MINUS

ZERO

(Amount from Question #10)

= ZERO \$0.00

(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words

12. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there is emotional distress, and if so, what is the amount of damages in emotional distress you award Plaintiff Deborah Ryan against MSP?

One hundred and thirty-seven thousand five hundred Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 137,500.00

Amount In Figures

13. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Deborah Ryan did not reasonably mitigate her emotional distress damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No ✓

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

ZERO

Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

14. From the total amount from Question #12, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #13.

\$137,500.00

(Total amount from Question #12)

MINUS

\$0.00

(Amount from Question #13)

= One hundred thirty seven thousand five hundred dollars  
(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words \$137,500.00

15. Please add up the total amount from Question #11 and #14:

One hundred thirty seven thousand five hundred  
Amount In Words

\$137,500.00

Amount In Figures

#### PUNITIVE DAMAGES

16. Has Plaintiff Deborah Ryan proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP's discriminatory conduct was outrageous or egregious?

Yes ✓ No \_\_\_\_\_

\*If your answer is "YES," Please Go On To Question #17.

\*If your answer is "NO," Please Go On to Question #18.

17. Do you find that there are punitive damages, and if so, what is the amount of punitive damages you award Plaintiff Deborah Ryan against MSP?

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's punitive damage is below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

Two hundred seventy five thousand  
Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 275,000.00

Amount In Figures

**TOTAL DAMAGES**

18. Please add up the total amount from Question #15 and #17:

Four hundred twelve thousand five hundred Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 412,500.00

Amount In Figures

ten (10)      twelve (12)

The above findings represent the verdict of at least twelve (12) out of fourteen (14) of the members of the jury.

W.Mel

EM 11/17/2025

JURY FOREPERSON

Dated: 11/17/2025

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS.

SUPERIOR COURT  
CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 1684CV02490

**LUIS MARTINEZ,**  
Plaintiff,

V.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE POLICE ("MSP")  
Defendant.

**VERDICT FORM: CLAIM 3**

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—November 2015 Hampden County District Attorney Detective's Unit**

1. Did Plaintiff Luis Martinez prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against him on basis of his race when not hiring him for the position of November 2015 Hampden County District Attorney Detective's Unit?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #2.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #3.*

2. Was MSP's discrimination of Luis Martinez's race a determinative cause of MSP not hiring him for November 2015 Hampden County District Attorney Detective's Unit?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #3.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #3.*

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—August 2017 Hampden County District Attorney Detective's Unit**

3. Did Plaintiff Luis Martinez prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against him on basis of his race when not hiring him for the position of August 2017 Hampden County District Attorney Detective's Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #3 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #4.  
\*If Your Answer To Question #3 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #5.*

4. Was MSP's discrimination of Luis Martinez's race a determinative cause of MSP not hiring him for August 2017 Hampden County District Attorney Detective's Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #5.  
\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #5.*

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—September 2017 Northwestern District Attorney Detective's Unit**

5. Did Plaintiff Luis Martinez prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against him on basis of his race when not hiring him for the position of September 2017 Northwestern District Attorney Detective's Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #5 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #6.  
\*If Your Answer To Question #5 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #7.*

6. Was MSP's discrimination of Luis Martinez's race a determinative cause of MSP not hiring him for September 2017 Northwestern District Attorney Detective's Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #7.  
\*If Your Answer To Question #6 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #7.*

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—May 2016 Canine (K-9) Unit**

7. Did Plaintiff Luis Martinez prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against him on basis of his race when not hiring him for the position of May 2016 Canine (K-9) Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #8.  
\*If Your Answer To Question #7 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #9.*

8. Was MSP's discrimination of Luis Martinez's race a determinative cause of MSP not hiring him for May 2016 Canine (K-9) Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #9.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #8 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #9.*

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—January 2018 Anti-Terrorism Unit**

9. Did Plaintiff Luis Martinez prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against him on basis of his race when not hiring him for the position of January 2018 Anti-Terrorism Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #9 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #10.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #9 is "NO," but you answered "YES" to one or more or all of Questions #2, #4, #6 and/or #8, Please Go On To Question #11.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #9 is "NO," and you answered "NO" to ALL Questions #1, #3, #5 and #7, you have reached your verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #9 is "NO," and you answered "NO" to ALL Questions #2, #4, #6, and #8, you have reached your verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

10. Was MSP's discrimination of Luis Martinez's race a determinative cause of MSP not hiring him for January 2018 Anti-Terrorism Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #10 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #11.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #10 is "NO," but you answered "YES" to one or more or all of Questions #2, #4, #6 and/or #8, Please Go On To Question #11.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #10 is "NO," and you answered "NO" to ALL Questions #1, #3, #5 and #7, you have reached your verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #10 is "NO," and you answered "NO" to ALL Questions #2, #4, #6, and #8, you have reached your verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

## DAMAGES

11. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there is economic damages, and if so, what is the amount of economic damages you award Plaintiff Luis Martinez against MSP?

Fifty six thousand three hundred and sixty-eight Dollars  
Amount In Words

\$ 56,368.00

Amount In Figures

12. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Luis Martinez did not reasonably mitigate his economic damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

ZERO Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

13. From the total amount from Question #11, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #12.

\$ 56,368.00

(Total amount from Question #11)

MINUS

ZERO \$ 0.00

(Amount from Question #12)

= Fifty six thousand three hundred and sixty-eight dollars

(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words

\$ 56,368.00

14. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there is emotional distress, and if so, what is the amount of damages in emotional distress you award Plaintiff Luis Martinez against MSP?

Sixty-two thousand five hundred Dollars  
Amount In Words

\$ 62,500.00

Amount In Figures

15. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Luis Martinez did not reasonably mitigate his emotional distress damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No ✓

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

Zero Dollars  
Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

16. From the total amount from Question #14, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #15.

\$ 62,500.00

(Total amount from Question #14)

MINUS

Zero \$0.00

(Amount from Question #15)

-Sixty-two thousand five hundred dollars

(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words

\$ 62,500.00

17. Please add up the total amount from Question #13 and #16:

One hundred and eighteen thousand eight hundred and  
Dollars sixty-eight

Amount In Words

\$ 118,868.00

Amount In Figures

#### **PUNITIVE DAMAGES**

18. Has Plaintiff Luis Martinez proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP's discriminatory conduct was outrageous or egregious?

Yes ✓ No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If your answer is "YES," Please Go On To Question #19.*

*\*If your answer is "NO," Please Go On to Question #20.*

19. Do you find that there are punitive damages, and if so, what is the amount of punitive damages you award Plaintiff Luis Martinez against MSP?

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's punitive damage is below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

Two hundred and thirty-seven thousand seven hundred  
Dollars and thirty-six

Amount In Words

\$ 237,736.00

Amount In Figures

#### **TOTAL DAMAGES**

20. Please add up the total amount from Question #17 and #19:

Three hundred fifty-six thousand six hundred and four  
Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 356,604.00

Amount In Figures

ten (10)      twelve (12)

The above findings represent the verdict of at least ~~twelve (12)~~ out of fourteen (14) of the members of the jury.

EM 11/17/2005

Jury Foreperson

Dated: 11/17/2005

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS.

SUPERIOR COURT  
CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 1684CV02490

**DANA OLIVER,**  
Plaintiff,

v.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE POLICE ("MSP")  
Defendant.

**VERDICT FORM: CLAIM 4**

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—2017 Armorer Unit**

1. Did Plaintiff Dana Oliver prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against him on basis of his race when not hiring him for the position of 2017 Armorer Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #2.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #3.*

2. Was MSP's discrimination of Dana Oliver's race a determinative cause of MSP not hiring him for 2017 Armorer Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #3.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "NO," Please Go On To Question #3.*

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—2018 Anti-Terrorism Unit**

3. Did Plaintiff Dana Oliver prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against him on basis of his race when not hiring him for the position of 2018 Anti-Terrorism Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #3 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #4.*

**\*If Your Answer To Question #3 is "NO," and your Answer to Question #1 and/or Question #2 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end.**

4. Was MSP's discrimination of Dana Oliver's race a determinative cause of MSP not hiring him for 2018 Anti-Terrorism Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

**\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #5.**

**\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "NO," but your Answer to Question #1 and Question #2 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #5.**

**\*If Your Answer To Question #4 is "NO," and your Answer to Question #1 and/or Question #2 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end.**

### **DAMAGES**

5. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there are economic damages, and if so, what is the amount of economic damages you award Plaintiff Dana Oliver against MSP?

One hundred thirty thousand three hundred and Dollars thirty-eight  
Amount In Words

\$ 130,338.00

Amount In Figures

6. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Dana Oliver did not reasonably mitigate his economic damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

240 Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

7. From the total amount from Question #5, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #6.

\$130,338.00

(Total amount from Question #5)

MINUS

\$0.00

(Amount from Question #6)

= One Hundred thirty thousand three hundred and  
(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words      thirty eight dollars  
\$130,338.00

8. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there is emotional distress, and if so, what is the amount of damages in emotional distress you award Plaintiff Dana Oliver against MSP?

One hundred thousand      Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 100,000.00

Amount In Figures

9. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Dana Oliver did not reasonably mitigate his emotional distress damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No ✓

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

ZERO      Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 0.00

Amount In Figures

10. From the total amount from Question #8, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #9.

\$100,000.00

(Total amount from Question #8)

MINUS

\$0.00

(Amount from Question #9)

= One hundred thousand \$100,000.00

(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words

11. Please add up the total amount from Question #7 and #10:

Two hundred thirty thousand three hundred and thirty eight  
Amount In Words

\$230,338.00

Amount In Figures

#### PUNITIVE DAMAGES

12. Has Plaintiff Dana Oliver proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP's discriminatory conduct was outrageous or egregious?

Yes ✓ No \_\_\_\_\_

\*If your answer is "YES," Please Go On To Question #13.

\*If your answer is "NO," Please Go On to Question #14.

13. Do you find that there are punitive damages, and if so, what is the amount of punitive damages you award Plaintiff Dana Oliver against MSP?

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's punitive damage is below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

Four hundred sixty thousand six hundred seventy-six Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 460,676.00

Amount In Figures

### TOTAL DAMAGES

14. Please add up the total amount from Question #11 and #13:

Six hundred and ninety-one thousand and fourteen Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 691,014.00

Amount In Figures

ten (10)      twelve (12)

The above findings represent the verdict of at least twelve (12) out of fourteen (14) of the members of the jury.

W. Mee

FEM 11/17/2025

JURY FOREPERSON

Dated: 11/17/2025

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS.

SUPERIOR COURT  
CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 1684CV02490

**MARION FLETCHER,**  
Plaintiff,

V.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE POLICE ("MSP")  
Defendant.

**VERDICT FORM: CLAIM 5**

**DISPARATE TREATMENT—July 2014 Middlesex District Attorney Special Detective's Unit**

1. Did Plaintiff Marion Fletcher prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP discriminated against her on basis of her gender when not hiring her for the position of July 2014 Middlesex District Attorney Special Detective's Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #2.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #1 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

2. Was MSP's discrimination of Marion Fletcher's gender a determinative cause of MSP not hiring her for July 2014 Middlesex District Attorney Special Detective's Unit?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "YES," Please Go On To Question #3.*

*\*If Your Answer To Question #2 is "NO," you have reached a verdict. Please STOP HERE and sign the verdict form at the end of the page.*

## DAMAGES

3. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there are economic damages, and if so, what is the amount of economic damages you award Plaintiff Marion Fletcher against MSP?

Three hundred seven thousand, one hundred and nineteen Dollars

Amount In Words

\$ 307,119.00

Amount In Figures

4. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Marion Fletcher did not reasonably mitigate her economic damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Dollars  
Amount In Words

\$

Amount In Figures

5. From the total amount from Question #3, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #4.

\$307,119.00

(Total amount from Question #3)

MINUS

\$0.00

(Amount from Question #4)

$= \$307,119.00 = \text{Three hundred seven thousand one hundred and nineteen dollars.}$

(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words

6. Has Plaintiff proven by a preponderance of evidence that there is emotional distress, and if so, what is the amount of damages in emotional distress you award Plaintiff Marion Fletcher against MSP?

One hundred twenty five thousand Dollars  
Amount In Words

\$ 125,000.00

Amount In Figures

7. Did MSP prove by a preponderance of evidence that Plaintiff Marion Fletcher did not reasonably mitigate her emotional distress damages?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's damages should have been mitigated below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

Amount In Words \_\_\_\_\_ Dollars

\$

Amount In Figures \_\_\_\_\_

8. From the total amount from Question #6, subtract that total amount from the amount from Question #7.

\$125,000.00

(Total amount from Question #6)

MINUS

\$ 0

(Amount from Question #7)

= One hundred twenty five thousand dollars  
(Calculated Answer), Amount in Figures and Words \$125,000.00

9. Please add up the total amount from Question #5 and #8:

Four hundred and thirty-two thousand one hundred and nineteen  
Amount In Words

\$ 432,119.00

Amount In Figures

### **PUNITIVE DAMAGES**

10. Has Plaintiff Marion Fletcher proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MSP's discriminatory conduct was outrageous or egregious?

Yes ✓ No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If your answer is "YES," Please Go On To Question #11.*

*\*If your answer is "NO," Please Go On to Question #12.*

11. Do you find that there are punitive damages, and if so, what is the amount of punitive damages you award Plaintiff Marion Fletcher against MSP?

*If your answer is "YES," please enter the amount by which Plaintiff's punitive damage is below.*

*If your answer is "NO," you can indicate 0 (zero) in the amount below.*

Eight hundred sixty-four thousand two hundred and thirty-eight  
Amount In Words

\$ 864,238.00

Amount In Figures

### **TOTAL DAMAGES**

12. Please add up the total amount from Question #9 and #11:

One million two hundred ninety-six thousand three hundred and fifty-seven  
Amount In Words

\$ 1,296,357

Amount In Figures

FEM 11/17/2025  
ten (10) twelve (12)

The above findings represent the verdict of at least twelve (12) out of fourteen (14) of the members of the jury.

Elaine

JURY FOREPERSON

Dated: 11/17/2025