

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
COUNTY OF LEXINGTON ) ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
Ted Wingo, ) Civil Action No. 2022-CP-32-03865  
Plaintiff, )  
vs. ) **VERDICT FORM**  
Thomas Campen M.D. & Associates, )  
LLC, Stanton Optical, Stanton Optical )  
Florida, LLC d/b/a/ Stanton Optical & )  
My Eyelab, Vision Precision )  
Holdings, LLC, and Prabhjot )  
McTague, )  
Defendants. )

Negligence

1. Do you, the jury, unanimously find that Dr. Prabhjot McTague was negligent?

☒ YES (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 2)

☐ NO (PLEASE STOP AND DELIBERATE NO FURTHER)

2. Do you, the jury, unanimously find that any such negligence of Dr. Prabhjot McTague was a proximate cause of injury to Ted Wingo?

☒ YES (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 3)

☐ NO (PLEASE STOP AND DELIBERATE NO FURTHER)

Agency

3. Do you, the jury, unanimously find that Dr. Prabhjot McTague was acting as an agent or apparent agent of Thomas Campen M.D. & Associates, LLC?

☒ YES (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 4)

☐ NO (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 4)

4. Do you, the jury, unanimously find that Dr. Prabhjot McTague was acting as an agent or apparent agent of Stanton Optical (as a trade name on behalf of all defendants)?

✓ YES (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 5)

\_\_\_\_\_ NO (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 5)

5. Do you, the jury, unanimously find that Dr. Prabhjot McTague was acting as an agent or apparent agent of Stanton Optical Florida, LLC d/b/a Stanton Optical Florida & My Eyelab?

✓ YES (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 6)

\_\_\_\_\_ NO (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 6)

6. Do you, the jury, unanimously find that Dr. Prabhjot McTague was acting as an agent or apparent agent of Vision Precision Holdings, LLC?

✓ YES (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 7)

\_\_\_\_\_ NO (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 7)

Comparative Negligence

7. Do you, the jury, unanimously find that Ted Wingo was negligent and that his negligence was a contributing proximate cause of some or all of the injuries and damages that he claims?

✓ YES (PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION 8)

\_\_\_\_\_ NO (PLEASE SKIP QUESTION 8 AND GO TO QUESTION 9)

8. Taking into account the combined negligence that proximately caused the harm to Ted Wingo, what percentage of fault is attributable to each party?

15% Ted Wingo

85% Defendants

**NOTE: YOUR PERCENTAGES MUST ADD UP TO 100%**

IF THE PERCENTAGE OF FAULT ATTRIBUTABLE TO TED WINGO IS 50% OR LESS, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 9.

IF THE PERCENTAGE OF FAULT ATTRIBUTABLE TO TED WINGO IS GREATER THAN 50%, PLEASE STOP AND DELIBERATE NO FURTHER.

Damages

9. Please state the **total** amount of damages, if any, sustained by the Plaintiff? Do not reduce any award of damages by the percentage of fault that you may have attributed to Mr. Wingo in Question 8.


\$ 2 million for economic damages  
 \$ 1 million for non-economic damages

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTION 10.

Recklessness

10. Do you, the jury, unanimously find that the plaintiff has proven by clear and convincing evidence that Dr. Prabhjot McTague's conduct in proximately causing injury or damage to Ted Wingo rose to the level of recklessness, willfulness, or wantonness?

☐ YES (PLEASE STOP AND DELIBERATE NO FURTHER)  
☒ NO (PLEASE STOP HERE AND DELIBERATE NO FURTHER)

  
 Jury Foreperson

4/25/2025  
 Date

PLEASE NOTIFY THE BAILIFF THAT YOU HAVE FINISHED YOUR DELIBERATIONS