23

24

25

The Honorable Elisabeth Tutsch Trial Date: December 5, 2022

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR YAKIMA COUNTY

DAWNE HYDE,

Plaintiff,

VS.

THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Defendant.

Case No.: 16-2-00595-39

JUDGMENT ON JURY VERDICT AGAINST THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

JUDGMENT SUMMARY

Judgment Creditor:

Dawne Hyde

Judgment Creditor's Attorney:

The Sheridan Law Firm, P.S.

Judgment Debtor:

The State of Washington

Judgment Amount:

Prejudgment Interest:

1921,943 To be determined at a later date, if applicable and appropriate.

Attorney Fees and Costs:

To be determined upon the filing of a fee petition on a date which will be set by the Court order. The ten-day time limit for filing an attorney fee petition under CR

54(d)(2) shall not apply to this case.

[Proposed] JUDGMENT ON JURY VERDICT AGAINST THE STATE OF WASHINGTON - 1

SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S. Hoge Building, Suite 1200 705 Second Avenue Seattle, WA 98104 Tel: 206-381-5949 Fax: 206-385-9038

[Proposed] JUDGMENT ON JURY VERDICT AGAINST THE STATE OF WASHINGTON - 2

SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S. Hoge Building, Suite 1200 705 Second Avenue Seattle, WA 98104 Tel: 206-381-5949 Fax: 206-385-9038 AS M AS M

ORIGINAL

1	HONORABLE ELISABETH TUTSCH
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	STATE OF WASHINGTON
8	YAKIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
9	DAWNE HYDE, NO. 16-2-00595-39
10	Plaintiff, SPECIAL VERDICT FORM
11	VS.
12	STATE OF WASHINGTON,
13	Defendant.
14	
15	We, the jury, make the following answers to the questions submitted by the court:
16	Question No. 1: Has Ms. Hyde proved by a preponderance of the evidence that she
17	was a "whistleblower" under the Washington State Employee Whistleblower Protection Act?
18	ANSWER: YesNo
19	Question No. 2: Has Ms. Hyde proved by a preponderance of the evidence that
20	DSHS subjected Ms. Hyde to one or more workplace reprisals or retaliatory actions under the
21	Washington State Employee Whistleblower Protection Act?
22	ANSWER: YesNo
23	
24	INSTRUCTION: If you answered "No" to Question Nos. 1 or 2, skip the remaining questions, sign and date this Special Verdict Form, and notify the bailiff
25	that you have reached a verdict. If you answered "Yes" to Questions Nos. 1 and 2, proceed to Question No. 3.
26	



1	Question No. 3: Has DSHS proved by a preponderance of the evidence that there
2	have been a series of documented personnel problems or a single, egregious event, or that the
3	DSHS's action or actions were justified by reasons unrelated to Ms. Hyde's status as a
4	whistleblower and that improper motive was not a substantial factor?
5	ANSWER: Yes X No
6	
7	INSTRUCTION: If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 3, skip the remaining questions, sign and date this Special Verdict Form, and notify the bailiff that you have reached a verdict.
8	have reached a verdict. If you answered "No" to Question No. 3, proceed to Question No. 4.
9	
10	Question No. 4: Has Ms. Hyde proved by a preponderance of the evidence that
11	DSHS's actions proximately caused her damages?
12	ANSWER: YesNo
13	
14	INSTRUCTION: If you answered "No" to Question No. 4, skip Question No. 5, sign and date this Special Verdict Form, and notify the bailiff that you have
15	reached a verdict. If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 4, proceed to Question No. 5.
16	
17	Question No. 5: What do you find to be the amount of Ms. Hyde's damages?
18	A. Economic Loss:
19	1. Back Pay: \$101,260
20	2. Lost Pension: \$ 580,683
21	B. Emotional Harm: \$ 1,240,000
22	
23	
24	DATE: 12/20/2022 XAVAINA Latille
25	PRESIDINGTOR
26	