IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <i>Plaintiff</i> ,	
and	
LOUISE HAMBURG, Intervenor-Plaintiff,	CIVIL ACTION NO. 20-1396
v.	
THE DORCHESTER OWNERS'	
ASSOCIATION,	
Defendant.	

JURY VERDICT FORM

QUESTION #1:

 Do you find the United States of America and Louise Hamburg ("Plaintiffs") proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Louise Hamburg had a mental impairment that substantially limited one or more of her major life activities?

YES: _____ NO: _____

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO QUESTION #1, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #1a. IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" TO QUESTION #1, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #2.

QUESTION #1a:

a. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Dorchester Owners' Association ("DOA") knew, was informed of, or reasonably should have known Louise Hamburg had a disability and needed an ESA because of her disability?

YES:

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO QUESTION #1a, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #1b.

IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" TO QUESTION #1a, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #2.

QUESTION #1b:

b. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Louise Hamburg needed an ESA in order to have an opportunity to use and enjoy her dwelling in The Dorchester equal to the opportunity that non-disabled people have to use and enjoy their dwellings in The Dorchester?

YES:

NO:

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO QUESTION #1b, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #1c and Question #1d.

IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" TO QUESTION #1b, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #2.

QUESTION #1c:

c. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA refused to provide a reasonable accommodation to Louise Hamburg in the form of a permission for Ms. Hamburg to live in The Dorchester with an ESA?

YES:

NO: _____

QUESTION #1d:

d. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA unreasonably delayed responding to **Louise Hamburg's** request for a reasonable accommodation in the form of a permission for **Ms. Hamburg** to live in The Dorchester with an ESA?

YES: _____ NO: _____

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO EITHER QUESTION #1c OR #1d, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #1e.

IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" TO BOTH QUESTIONS #1c and #1d, PLEASE PROCEED TO OUESTION #2.

QUESTION #1e:

e. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Louise Hamburg was injured by DOA's conduct?

YES:

NO:

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO QUESTION #1e, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION 1f. IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" TO QUESTION #1e, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #2.

QUESTION #1f:

f. If you answered "YES" to Question Nos. 1a, 1b, 1c or 1d, 1e, and 1f, please write the amount of monetary damages you believe fairly compensates Louise Hamburg for the injury DOA's conduct caused her:

\$_____

3

QUESTION #2:

2. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Bernard and/or Cynthia Halpern had a mental impairment that substantially limited one or more of Bernard and/or Cynthia Halpern's major life activities?

YES: _____ NO: _____

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" QUESTION #2, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #2a. IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" TO QUESTION #2, PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION #3.

QUESTION #2a:

a. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA made Bernard and/or Cynthia Halpern's dwelling in The Dorchester unavailable to them because of Bernard and/or Cynthia Halpern's disability?

YES:

NO: _____

QUESTION #2b:

b. Do you find Plaintiff proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA imposed terms and conditions on Bernard and/or Cynthia Halpern that were not imposed on other, non-disabled people living in the Dorchester, because of Bernard and/or Cynthia Halpern's disability?

YES:

NO: _____

QUESTION #2c:

c. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA unreasonably delayed responding to Bernard and/or Cynthia Halpern's request for a reasonable accommodation, in the form of a permission for Bernard and/or Cynthia Halpern to live in The Dorchester with an ESA?

YES: V NO:

QUESTION #3:

3. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA unreasonably delayed responding to **Anna Minkovich's** request for a reasonable accommodation, in the form of a permission for **Anna Minkovich** to live in The Dorchester with an ESA?

YES:

NO: _____

QUESTION #4:

4. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA made dwellings in The Dorchester unavailable to people with disabilities who needed ESAs because of their

disabilities?

NO: _____

QUESTION #5:

5. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA imposed different terms, conditions, or privileges, on people with disabilities who needed ESAs from those that

were imposed on other, non-disabled people who resided in, owned property in, or rented a dwelling in The Dorchester?

QUESTION #6:

6. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA failed to provide reasonable accommodations to people with disabilities who needed ESAs to have an opportunity to use and enjoy dwellings in The Dorchester that was equal to the opportunity non-disabled people had to use and enjoy dwellings in The Dorchester?

YES: _____ NO: _____

QUESTION #7:

7. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to permit people with disabilities who needed ESAs because of their disabilities to fully enjoy the rights granted to them by the Fair Housing Act?

 $_{\rm YES:}$

NO: _____

QUESTION #8:

8. Do you find Plaintiffs proved by a preponderance of the evidence that DOA denied a group of people the rights that are granted to them by the Fair Housing Act?

YES: _____

NO: _____

QUESTION #9:

9. If you answered "YES" to Question Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, do you find the Unites States is entitled to monetary damages for the DOA's discriminatory conduct?

YES:

NO:

: mille

JUBY FOREPERSON

DATE

O:\Alessandra.2021\DORCHESTER\JURY VERDICT SHEET--FINAL.docx

3:10 pm