

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL BRANCH, DIVISION 7
CIVIL ACTION NO. 19-CI-001481

FILED ELECTRONICALLY

CHRISSY CRAM

PLAINTIFF

v.

TRIAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

LEE E. CORBETT, M.D.;
CORBETT COSMETIC SURGERY a/k/a
CORBETT COSMETIC AESTHETIC SURGERY AND MEDSPA; and
LOUISVILLE PLASTIC SURGERY, PLLC

DEFENDANTS

* * * * *

The parties, in person, and by counsel, appeared in open court to try the issues in this case to a jury beginning March 8, 2022. The Plaintiff was represented by Hon. Joe Buckles. The Defendants were represented by Hon. Clay A. Edwards and Hon. Morgan N. Blind. The trial began Tuesday, March 8, 2022, and continued through Thursday, March 10, 2022.

Voir dire was conducted on March 8, 2022 and thirteen jurors were duly selected and sworn. The panel was properly admonished at each daily recess. An opening statement on behalf of the Plaintiff was offered by Mr. Buckles. An opening statement on behalf of Defendants was offered by Mr. Edwards.

Plaintiff presented her proof through the testimony of Chrissy Cram, Dr. Lee Corbett, and Dr. Stephen Schantz. Plaintiff also introduced a number of documentary exhibits which were published for the jury. Following introduction of this evidence, Plaintiff announced the close of her evidence on March 9, 2022.

Motions for directed verdict on the issues of the claims for fraud, battery, and punitive damages were made by Mr. Edwards on behalf of Defendants. The court denied all motions.

Defendants presented their proof through the testimony of Dr. Lee Corbett and Dr. Steven

Schuster. Defendants also introduced a number of documentary exhibits, which were published to the jury. Following presentation of this evidence, Defendants announced the close of their evidence on March 10, 2022. Plaintiff announced no rebuttal evidence. Defendants renewed their motions for directed verdict as described on the record, which were all denied. Plaintiff made no motions.

The Court instructed the jury as to the substantive law of the case as set forth in the jury instructions filed of record after noting the Plaintiff's objections to those instructions. Closing argument on behalf of Defendants was offered by Mr. Edwards. Closing argument on behalf of Plaintiff was offered by Mr. Buckles.

One juror was randomly drawn as an alternate. The remaining twelve jurors retired to deliberate. The jury returned a unanimous response of "NO" as to the interrogatory contained in jury instruction no. 2, which was indicated by the signature of the foreperson. The jury returned a unanimous response of "NO" to jury instructions no. 3, which was indicated by the signature of the foreperson. Pursuant to these responses, no answer was required with regard to jury instructions nos. 4, 5, or 6 which pertained to damages. The parties waived polling of the jury's verdict.

Pursuant to the jury's verdict, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:

That Plaintiff's complaint, and the claims presented therein, be, and they are, hereby dismissed with prejudice. This is a final and appealable order and judgment pursuant to CR 54.02, there being no just cause for delay in its entry.

All of which is ordered this 16th day of March 2022.

FILED
JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
MAR 22 2022
DAVID L. NICHOLSON, CLERK
D.C.
BY

ENTERED IN COURT
DAVID L. NICHOLSON, CLERK
BY
MAR 23 2022
DEPUTY CLERK

Audra Jean Eckerle
HON. AUDRA JEAN ECKERLE
JUDGE, CIVIL DIVISION 7