

Session report

Ramirez v. Lakeline Transit · Full-day mock trial

Attorney work product. Prepared October 16, 2026. Every figure derives from stored juror responses; quotes are verbatim and attributed.

SAMPLE REPORT · FICTIONAL CASE · NO REAL JURORS OR PARTIES

Duration: 3 h 12 min Jurors: 24 of 24 joined Capture rate: 95%


Completed everything: 29%

1. Before openings · first impressions

open 6 min · 100% captured


1. From the case summary alone, who do you lean toward?

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



2. A bus company should be held to a higher safety standard than an ordinary driver.

24 of 24 joined jurors answered




Mean 5.8 of 7

2. After plaintiff's opening

open 7 min · 92% captured

1. Who is winning so far?

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



2. What one fact from the opening stuck with you?

20 of 24 joined jurors answered


- Six weeks with nothing written in the brake log. · Juror 01
- The bus had been flagged for brake fade twice that summer. · Juror 02
- She was in the intersection on a yellow, that part seems agreed. · Juror 03
- The driver said he pressed the pedal and it went to the floor. · Juror 04
- Her phone records are going to matter and we have not seen them. · Juror 05
- A city bus does not get to skip inspections. · Juror 06
- Two surgeries. She was 41. · Juror 07
- Both sides agree the light was yellow when she entered. · Juror 08
- The supervisor signed off on inspections that never happened. · Juror 09
- The maintenance log just stops in July. · Juror 11
- She accelerated into a yellow light. That is on her. · Juror 12
- The bus was doing 38 in a 35 with soft brakes. · Juror 13
- The gap in the log. Nobody has explained that yet. · Juror 14
- The fusion failed and she needed a second operation. · Juror 15
- The brake fade complaints were in the driver's own words, in writing. · Juror 16
- The first surgeon told her the fusion might not hold. · Juror 17
- Lakeline knew. The emails say they knew. · Juror 19
- We have not heard how fast she was going. · Juror 20
- She lost her job at the clinic after the second surgery. · Juror 21
- They kept the bus in service after the driver reported the brakes. · Juror 23

3. After defense opening

open 6 min · 100% captured


1. Who is winning so far?

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



2. The defense explanation of the brake inspection schedule made sense.

24 of 24 joined jurors answered




Mean 3.2 of 7

4. Liability · responsibility for the crash

open 8 min · 100% captured

1. Who bears more responsibility for the crash?

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



2. What percentage of fault, if any, belongs to Ms. Ramirez?

24 of 24 joined jurors answered

Low: 0 % Median: 17.5 % Mean: 26 % High: 75 %




Every answer, lowest to highest

5. Causation · the second surgery

open 7 min · 100% captured


1. Was the second surgery caused by the crash?

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



2. The treating surgeon was credible.

24 of 24 joined jurors answered




Mean 5.7 of 7

6. Witness credibility

open 6 min · 100% captured


1. Ms. Ramirez

24 of 24 joined jurors answered




2. The bus driver

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



3. The maintenance supervisor

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



7. After damages · in your own words

open 9 min · 92% captured

1. What is the single most important fact in this case so far?

22 of 24 joined jurors answered

- The brake log gap. If the records were fine they would have shown them to us. · Juror 01
- The driver reported the brakes twice and the bus stayed on the road. Everything else is detail. · Juror 02
- She went on a yellow and the bus could not stop. Both of those are true at the same time. · Juror 03
- The supervisor could not say who did the July inspection. That was the moment for me. · Juror 04
- She chose to go on yellow. The bus should have stopped but she started it. · Juror 05
- The two written brake complaints before the crash. · Juror 06
- \$4M felt high until I heard about the second surgery. · Juror 07
- The light was yellow. Neither side really disputes that, so it comes down to the brakes. · Juror 08
- The bus was in service with known brake complaints. That is the case. · Juror 09
- A company that cannot produce six weeks of safety records should not get the benefit of the doubt. · Juror 11
- A reasonable driver stops on yellow. The brake issue is real but she put herself there. · Juror 12
- The driver's own complaint form. He wrote 'pedal soft' and they signed it off. · Juror 13
- The gap in the maintenance log is what did it for me. Nobody explained that. · Juror 14
- The second surgery is where the money is, and I am not sure the first one failing is on the bus. · Juror 15
- The supervisor's testimony. He was guessing and it showed. · Juror 16
- The fusion failing. The surgeon said the crash forces made the first repair fragile. · Juror 17
- I keep coming back to how fast she entered the intersection. We never got that number. · Juror 18
- Lakeline's internal emails about brake fade. They knew the fleet had a problem. · Juror 19
- The phone records. If she was looking down, none of the brake stuff matters as much. · Juror 20
- She cannot stand for a full shift anymore. That is permanent. · Juror 21
- The missing log pages. In my job if the inspection log is blank the machine does not run. · Juror 23
- The second surgery. I believed the surgeon that it traces back to the crash. · Juror 24

8. Damages · what was proven

open 7 min · 100% captured

1. Which categories of damages did the plaintiff prove?

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



2. Past and future medical expenses you would award

24 of 24 joined jurors answered

Low: \$120,000 Median: \$447,500 Mean: \$437,917 High: \$650,000



9. Damages · total award

open 8 min · 100% captured

1. Total amount you would award Ms. Ramirez, all categories combined

24 of 24 joined jurors answered

Low: \$250,000 Median: \$1,400,000 Mean: \$1,631,250 High: \$4,200,000




10. Verdict check

open 5 min · 100% captured


1. If you had to vote right now

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



2. How confident are you in that vote?

24 of 24 joined jurors answered



Mean 5.3 of 7

11. Close · what would change your mind

open 8 min · 63% captured

1. What would the other side have needed to show to change your vote?

18 of 24 joined jurors answered

Proof the July inspection actually happened. · Juror 01

Nothing short of the missing log pages. · Juror 02

Her speed entering the intersection. If she was speeding I move toward shared. · Juror 03

A credible explanation for the six-week gap. · Juror 04

Evidence the brakes alone would have caused the crash even if she had stopped on yellow. · Juror 05

Show me the inspection records. · Juror 06

If the second surgery had been for something unrelated. · Juror 07

Her phone records showing she was not distracted. · Juror 08

An inspection record from July that was not signed after the fact. · Juror 09

The log. Only the log. · Juror 11

If the bus had run the light instead of her. · Juror 12

If the driver had never reported the brakes before. · Juror 13

Nothing. The log gap is the case. · Juror 14

A supervisor who could remember who did the inspection. · Juror 16

A second surgeon saying the fusion failed for reasons other than the crash. · Juror 17

Different emails. · Juror 19

Proof she was under the limit and not on her phone. · Juror 20

Records. Real ones, dated at the time. · Juror 23

2. Anything you wanted to ask that nobody answered?

12 of 24 joined jurors answered

How fast was she going? · Juror 03

Was she on her phone? · Juror 05

Why was the bus 3 mph over? Was that the driver or the brakes? · Juror 08

Who else was on the bus and were any of them hurt? · Juror 10

Why did she not brake when the light changed? · Juror 12

Who had the July log pages last? · Juror 14

Did the first surgeon warn her the fusion could fail before she agreed to it? · Juror 15

What does the second surgery cost going forward? · Juror 17

Did the crash data recorder show her speed? · Juror 18

Had she had back problems before this? · Juror 20

What happened to the driver afterward? · Juror 22

Is there a third surgery coming? · Juror 24

Juror by juror

Columns are set.question numbers from the sections above. Long answers are shortened here and written answers are left out of the printed grid; full text appears with its question and in the CSV export.

Juror	1.1	1.2	2.1	3.1	3.2	4.1	4.2	5.1	5.2	6.1	6.2	6.3	8.1	8.2	9.1	10.1	10.2
Juror 24	Undecided	5	Too early to say	Too early to say	4	Shared equally	35 %	Yes	5	5	4	3	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$650,000	\$2,250,000	For Ms. Ramirez	5
Juror 01	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	2	Mostly the defendant	10 %	Yes	6	6	3	2	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$480,000	\$1,500,000	For Ms. Ramirez	6
Juror 02	Plaintiff	7	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	3	Mostly the defendant	0 %	Yes	7	7	2	2	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$650,000	\$2,100,000	For Ms. Ramirez	7
Juror 03	Undecided	5	Plaintiff	Too early to say	4	Shared equally	45 %	Probably	5	5	5	3	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wages	\$305,000	\$950,000	For Ms. Ramirez	4
Juror 04	Undecided	7	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	3	Mostly the defendant	15 %	Yes	7	6	3	3	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$385,000	\$1,200,000	For Ms. Ramirez	5
Juror 05	Undecided	5	Too early to say	Defense	5	Mostly the plaintiff	65 %	Unlikely	4	3	6	5	Past medical; Lost wages	\$130,000	\$400,000	For Lakeline Transit	5
Juror 06	Plaintiff	7	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	3	Mostly the defendant	10 %	Yes	7	6	3	2	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$560,000	\$1,750,000	For Ms. Ramirez	6
Juror 07	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	2	Mostly the defendant	0 %	Yes	6	7	2	1	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$650,000	\$4,200,000	For Ms. Ramirez	7
Juror 08	Undecided	5	Too early to say	Too early to say	4	Shared equally	40 %	Probably	5	5	4	4	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$350,000	\$1,100,000	For Ms. Ramirez	4
Juror 09	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Too early to say	2	Mostly the defendant	20 %	Probably	6	5	3	2	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$415,000	\$1,300,000	For Ms. Ramirez	5
Juror 10	Undecided	5	Too early to say	Too early to say	4	Shared equally	50 %	Probably	5	4	5	4	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$270,000	\$850,000	For Lakeline Transit	3
Juror 11	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	2	Mostly the defendant	5 %	Yes	6	6	2	2	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$650,000	\$2,500,000	For Ms. Ramirez	6

Juror	1.1	1.2	2.1	3.1	3.2	4.1	4.2	5.1	5.2	6.1	6.2	6.3	8.1	8.2	9.1	10.1	10.2
Juror 12	Defendant	4	Defense	Defense	6	Mostly the plaintiff	75 %	No	4	2	6	6	Past medical	\$120,000	\$250,000	For Lakeline Transit	6
Juror 13	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	2	Mostly the defendant	10 %	Yes	6	6	3	3	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$510,000	\$1,600,000	For Ms. Ramirez	6
Juror 14	Plaintiff	7	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	3	Mostly the defendant	0 %	Yes	7	6	2	1	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$650,000	\$3,200,000	For Ms. Ramirez	7
Juror 15	Undecided	5	Plaintiff	Too early to say	4	Shared equally	40 %	Probably	5	5	4	3	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wages	\$320,000	\$1,000,000	For Ms. Ramirez	4
Juror 16	Undecided	7	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	3	Mostly the defendant	10 %	Yes	7	6	3	2	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$610,000	\$1,900,000	For Ms. Ramirez	6
Juror 17	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Too early to say	2	Mostly the defendant	15 %	Probably	6	6	4	3	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$465,000	\$1,450,000	For Ms. Ramirez	5
Juror 18	Undecided	5	Too early to say	Too early to say	4	Shared equally	50 %	Unlikely	5	4	4	4	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$240,000	\$750,000	For Lakeline Transit	3
Juror 19	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	2	Mostly the defendant	5 %	Yes	6	7	2	2	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$650,000	\$2,800,000	For Ms. Ramirez	7
Juror 20	Undecided	5	Too early to say	Defense	5	Mostly the plaintiff	60 %	Unlikely	4	3	5	5	Past medical; Lost wages	\$160,000	\$500,000	For Lakeline Transit	4
Juror 21	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Too early to say	2	Mostly the defendant	20 %	Probably	6	5	3	3	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$430,000	\$1,350,000	For Ms. Ramirez	5
Juror 22	Undecided	5	Too early to say	Too early to say	4	Shared equally	45 %	Probably	5	4	5	4	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$210,000	\$650,000	For Ms. Ramirez	3
Juror 23	Plaintiff	6	Plaintiff	Plaintiff	2	Mostly the defendant	0 %	Yes	6	7	1	1	Past medical; Future medical; Lost wage...	\$650,000	\$3,600,000	For Ms. Ramirez	7

Observations

Recorded during or after the session by staff or an agent. Each one cites the answers it rests on; nothing here is unsourced.

OUTLIER · JURYTAP HOST

Juror 12 is the only juror who answered No on whether the crash caused the second surgery, put the panel's highest fault share (75%) on Ms. Ramirez, and gave the lowest total award (\$250,000).

Cites: Juror 12 on "Was the second surgery caused by the crash?"; Juror 12 on "What percentage of fault, if any, belongs to Ms. Ramirez?"; Juror 12 on "Total amount you would award Ms. Ramirez, all categories combined"

PATTERN · JURYTAP HOST

Every juror who named the maintenance log gap as the single most important fact (Jurors 02, 07, 11, 14, 19, 23) landed above the panel median on the total award.

Cites: Juror 02 on "What is the single most important fact in this case so far?"; Juror 07 on "What is the single most important fact in this case so far?"; Juror 11 on "What is the single most important fact in this case so far?"; Juror 14 on "What is the single most important fact in this case so far?"; Juror 19 on "What is the single most important fact in this case so far?"; Juror 23 on "What is the single most important fact in this case so far?"

Panel

Jurors who joined. Ages are shown as bands.

Juror	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Occupation	County
Juror 24	45-54	Male	More than one race	Accountant	Bastrop
Juror 01	25-34	Female	White	Dental hygienist	Travis
Juror 02	45-54	Male	Hispanic or Latino	Warehouse supervisor	Travis
Juror 03	25-34	Female	Black or African American	Software tester	Williamson
Juror 04	55-64	Male	White	Retired teacher	Hays
Juror 05	45-54	Female	Hispanic or Latino	HVAC technician	Travis
Juror 06	35-44	Male	Asian	Bank teller	Bastrop
Juror 07	65+	Female	White	Retired postal carrier	Travis
Juror 08	35-44	Male	More than one race	Paralegal	Travis
Juror 09	18-24	Female	White	Barista	Williamson
Juror 10	55-64	Male	Hispanic or Latino	School bus driver	Hays
Juror 11	45-54	Female	Black or African American	Insurance adjuster	Travis
Juror 12	25-34	Male	White	Graphic designer	Bastrop
Juror 13	65+	Female	Hispanic or Latino	Retired machinist	Travis
Juror 14	25-34	Male	Asian	Nursing student	Travis
Juror 15	55-64	Female	White	Office manager	Williamson
Juror 16	35-44	Male	More than one race	Electrician	Hays
Juror 17	35-44	Female	White	Pharmacy technician	Travis
Juror 18	55-64	Male	Hispanic or Latino	Church administrator	Bastrop
Juror 19	45-54	Female	Black or African American	Real estate agent	Travis
Juror 20	25-34	Male	White	Line cook	Travis
Juror 21	35-44	Female	Hispanic or Latino	Physical therapist	Williamson
Juror 22	55-64	Male	Asian	Truck dispatcher	Hays
Juror 23	35-44	Female	White	Veterinary technician	Travis