

VIRGINIA:

*In the Supreme Court of Virginia held at the Supreme Court Building in the
City of Richmond on* Friday *the* 12th *day of* January,
2007.

George Ingram, Appellant,

against Record No. 060739

Circuit Court No. LL-2806-4/06-609

Stephen T. Harper, et al., Appellees.

Upon an appeal from a
judgment rendered by the Circuit
Court of the City of Richmond.

Upon consideration of the record, briefs, and argument of
counsel, the Court is of opinion that there is no error
in the judgment of the trial court against Sergeant George J. Ingram
("Ingram"), a City of Richmond police officer.

Ingram's first assignment of error stated that the trial
court erred when it failed to rule as a matter of law that the
plaintiffs' evidence was insufficient to prove that the first
frangible breaching round fired by Ingram was grossly negligent.
The trial court instructed the jury without objection that the jury
"may accept or discard all or part of the testimony of a witness as
[the jury] think(s) proper." Therefore, the instruction became the
law of the case. Medical Ctr. Hosps. v. Sharpless, 229 Va. 496,
498, 331 S.E.2d 405, 406 (1985). Consequently, the jury was
permitted to accept or discard any of the witnesses' testimony
including Ingram's testimony. The plaintiffs' case was supported
by the testimony of three expert witnesses; ballistics expert Lama
S. Martin, metallurgist expert Dr. George Langford, and standard of

care expert William Kenneth Katsaris. Based on the testimony of these experts, a reasonable jury could have found that Ingram was grossly negligent in firing the first shot. Accordingly, Ingram's first assignment of error is without merit.

Ingram's second assignment of error stated:

In the absence of sufficient evidence that the first round fired was grossly negligent, the circuit court erred when it failed to rule as a matter of law that Plaintiffs' evidence of proximate cause was insufficient because the evidence revealed at most only a 50% probability that the round that caused the death of Plaintiffs' decedent resulted from Ingram's alleged gross negligence.

Assignment of error two is premised on the condition that the first assignment of error is correct. As explained herein, the first assignment of error is without merit because a reasonable jury could have concluded that Ingram was grossly negligent in firing the first shot. Therefore, the second assignment of error is also without merit.

Ingram's third assignment of error stated that the trial court erred when it failed to rule as a matter of law that the record in the case provided undisputed evidence that Ingram exercised at least a minimum measure of care for the safety of others such that none of the five rounds fired by Ingram were grossly negligent. This assignment of error is without merit because the evidence was in dispute. Therefore, the issue of gross negligence was properly before the jury for its resolution. Chapman v. City of Virginia Beach, 252 Va. 186, 190, 475 S.E.2d 798, 801 (1996) ("Whether gross

negligence has been established is usually a matter of fact to be decided by a jury.").

Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed. The appellant shall pay to the appellees damages according to law. This order shall be certified to the said circuit court.

A Copy,

Teste:

Pat L Haring

Clerk