She can tell you also that following the accident, Mr. Ervin asked her if she had seen the truck cut him off and she said no, she hadn't. She'll tell you the same thing. She didn't see what happened between Mr. Ervin and the truck. All she can tell you is that she was driving along when suddenly he came into her lane.

At the appropriate time I'll have a chance to talk with you again and at that time ask you to find that my client, Ms. Young, was not responsible.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Stephenson>

MR. STEPHENSON: May I please the Court, Your Honor.

OPENING STATEMENTS

BY MR. STEPHENSON:

Good morning ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

My name is Andrew Stephenson. I indicated earlier I

represent one of the Defendant's in this lawsuit,

Baltimore Tank Lines.

And I'd first like to thank you all for being here today and for doing your service; your civic duty as jurors. It's a very important role and my clients certainly appreciate it. I know it's inconvenient in this modern age to have to give up a whole day to be a juror but rest assure we're grateful for it and -- and

it's probably gonna be just a one day trial so hopefully it won't be too much of an impact.

And -- there's really only three witnesses' in this case. You're gonna hear from my -- client's driver, Mr. Ran -- Danny Quade and you're gonna hear from Ms.

Cindy Young and you're gonna hear from the Plaintiff.

No expert witnesses, no other witnesses to hear from. There's a few exhibits you'll have the opportunity to review and that's pretty much going to be it.

And you -- you're the try or fact in this case.

The Judge determines the law but you guys have to

determine what the facts are; what happened in this case.

And I trust that you'll reserve your judgment until

you've heard all the evidence.

The Plaintiff in this case has the burden of proof. That means they've got to make, they've got to prove to you that it was more likely so than not that their version of events is true. We don't have that burden.

So you're gonna hear, the Plaintiff's gonna put on their case first. Then the Defendant's will have the opportunity to put on their cases thereafter. And we trust that you'll keep an open mind throughout the entire process and reserve your judgment until you've heard all the evidence.

And that you'll treat all of the parties as individual parties. I'm -- I'm the only one that represents a company in this case. The other two parties are individuals.

Not only do I represent a company but I represent a tractor trailer company. In fact, that's what I do for a living; I just represent tractor trailer companies.

In my experience sometimes I find that folks don't like tractor trailers so I just like to be honest about it. Folks don't like tractor trailers. They don't like driving next to them. Not a -- not a popular type of client to have. But I trust that you guys will put any of those types of feelings aside and you'll just weigh the evidence as you receive it.

Now, in this case -- Plaintiff's Counsel showed you two exhibits. These are going to actually be -- these are blow-ups of exhibits that are gonna be admitted into evidence in his case.

After all of the testimony was taken in this case in Deposition I retained an engineer to go out and measure the scene where this accident occurred and we -- this -- this -- this is what was produced from those measurements and those diagrams was the exhibits that will be admit -- admitted into evidence.

Now, this is -- this is what our engineer has run up and there's a bunch more exhibits and this -- this is another one. But this depiction here where the Plaintiff has put his version of what happened, where he's placed the vehicles on that, that's what they have done with one of our -- exhibits. Where we're not agreeing that that's how the accident happened. In fact we have a very different version of how it happened.

It's important that you note that this exhibit where the Plaintiff has indicated this is where the accident happened, that's Slide C. Let's put that down for a second.

So in terms of the larger blow-up -- the Plaintiff is indicating Slide C that the in -- the accident happened in and around this area here, okay. It's important that you understand that that's what they're saying here today.

But through the course of the trial you're gonna hear testimony. Just so you know that's about 760 feet away from Leonardtown Road and you've got a scale here and you can calculate that and work it out when you get the exhibits later on. But I've done the math and it's about 760 feet away from Leonardtown Road.

Today during the trial you'll hear that -- we had Depositions taken in the Discovery process. That's

the sworn statement under oath where we created written transcripts in this case.

And at the Deposition the Plaintiff was asked, where did this accident occur? How far from Leonardtown Road did this accident occur? And he was very specific and very infactic; it was 80 yards. 80 yards is 240 feet. He likened it in his Deposition to "about a football field"; "About a football field's distance from Leonardtown Road." I've done the math and you can do it again. You'll have the exhibits. They'll have scales and you can work it out but 240 feet, right about there; right about 500 feet away from where they're saying the accident happened, here today.

That's the type of thing you're gonna have to consider in terms of weighing credibility and weighing evidence in this case.

You're gonna hear from my client's driver, Mr. Quade. He lives in Clements, Maryland here in Charles County; been a professional truck driver for over 25 years; married 20 years; got four kids.

He owned the tractor involved this case. He's what they call an owner/operator. He leases his tractor to Baltimore Tank Lines.

You're gonna hear, similar to the Plaintiff,
Mr. Quade drives down Mattawoman Beantown Road and makes

a left turn onto Leonardtown Road every single day.

That's how he gets home. He lives in Clements and he drives down that road then takes Leonardtown south to home.

You're gonna hear he was very familiar with his tractor. He owned it. It's the same tractor he drove every single day.

But here's where our version of events differ.

Unlike how the Plaintiff showed the accident happening,

Mr. Quade is gonna tell you he drives down Mattawoman

Beantown Road -- when there's two through lanes he always

stays in the left of the two through lanes.

He's gotta make his left hand turn also from the -- the right of the two left turn lanes because he's driving a 60-foot tractor trailer and he can't make that turn from the left of the left turn lane because it's too sharp of a turn. He has to make it from this lane here.

And every day he drives down here he does the same thing. He comes down this lane here and merges straight across, straight across into the left lane.

This isn't the type of inter -- this is exactly why I went out and had engineers prepare these detailed diagrams. Because I don't want you to misunderstand that this is the type of road where -- where you got two through lanes here and then it widens off to the left for

the left turn lanes. That's not what happens here. This is a merge situation. There's no lane change involved. He drives straight into the lane he needs to go into.

And he'll testify he just has to keep his steering wheel straight.

In fact, if he wanted to stay in one of the through lanes, as he'll testify, he would actually near - need to steer to the right to remain in that lane.

There's no lane change.

Now, according to the Plaintiff you got Mr.

Quade coming down the through lanes, going off into the right through lane, coming back over. He's got -- he's got my client coming over here, making a lane change here. In other words, he's suggesting that Mr. Quade would have ignored the merge, ignored the merge, come all the way around totally (unintelligible, 2 words), and then made a lane change.

Mr. Quade will say he never does that. That's absolutely inconsistent with his regular routine practice.

Now, there's salient facts in his case. And here is the first one. This is probably the most important fact in this case. The Plaintiff has admitted, and I assume he's gonna testify consistent today with his Deposition transcript, that he was driving behind the

tractor trailer. All the way down from 301 he's following behind, behind, behind.

He admits he was directly behind the tractor trailer all the way. Tried to get ahead of him back at the turn, whatever, but he was behind him for at least a mile prior to this occurring.

So if he's behind the tractor trailer how is it then that he gets into this scenario that they have described here where he's getting ahead of the tractor trailer. The only explanation I think that you can reach in terms of the evidence that will be presented today is that Mr. Ervin tried to speed around and overtake the tractor trailer on the inside as he was merging; left himself with no room and then cut out in front of Ms. Young. And apparently applied his brakes too at that point. He didn't accelerate on when he moved into this left of the left turn lanes because he was rear-ended by Ms. Young who was, by her own testimony which is undisputed, going about 35 miles per hour.

That's the first most salient point; that he admits he was driving to the rear of the tractor trailer all the way down.

The second most salient point in this case
you're gonna hear, I think you've already heard it from
Mr. Ford. Ms. Young's gonna testify that despite this

close scenario here that the Plaintiff's alleged that happened at -- understand that "D" there is for Dodge.

That's Ms. Young's vehicle, the Dodge. "H" is for Honda.

That's the Honda Accord that Mr. Ervin was driving.

Despite this situation here where a tractor trailer is -- by -- by Mr. Ervin's testimony, cutting across down on top of the Honda forcing him into the lane. Ms. Young's gonna testify, never saw it, never saw it happen; absolutely inconsistent with normal human experience and perception. You'll ask yourselves that; 60-foot shiny tanker trailer with a silver tank coming down on top of you and she didn't see it. She would have been five -- let -- five or ten feet away from this tractor trailer during this entire scenario and she didn't see it.

Now, Mr. Quade is gonna testify he has no knowledge of an accident. We admit that we looked at the record and yeah, Mr. Quade, he lives in Clements. He was — he was the most likely person to be — this lawsuit and claim is our first notice that we're allegedly involved in the accident.

He has no recollection of seeing an accident and certainly it is undisputed there was never any contact between the Baltimore Tank Lines tractor trailer and any of the other vehicles. That is not even in

dispute. He's gonna testify he has no recollection of an accident having ever occurred.

so that is the evidence you're gonna hear today and I think that you will find in weighing that, that it's more likely so than not or you can't make a decision if the scales of justice are evenly balanced in your mind that he hasn't met the burden of proof and tipped them in his favor. It's more likely so than not that the tractor trailer did the obvious, easiest thing by just merging straight into the right of the two left turn lanes which is what he did everyday and what he needed to do in order to get home.

And that if the Plaintiff, by his own testimony, was driving behind the tractor trailer there is no possible way that this accident scenario that they've concocted in this exhibit could have occurred.

With that I thank you again and -- look forward to closing this trial up today.

THE COURT: Please call your first witness.

MR. BRATT: Your Honor, I'd like to move that - the witnesses be sequestered. I think there's one nonparty witness, Mr. Quade.

THE COURT: We'll approach on that.

(Counsel approaches the bench.)

THE COURT: Is Mr. Quade the corporate