

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. HISTORY AND USE OF THE ILLINOIS PATTERN INSTRUCTIONS (IPI)

I. INTRODUCTION

- § 1:1 History of Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions-Civil
- § 1:2 Trial by jury under the U.S. Constitution
- § 1:3 The “modern” jury system
- § 1:4 The growth of the Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions
- § 1:5 Formal judicial study of jury instructions
- § 1:6 The fundamental principles of jury instructions
- § 1:7 The creation of the pattern jury instructions
- § 1:8 The adoption of new pattern jury instructions
- § 1:9 Present day Supreme Court Rule 239

II. INTERPRETATION OF ILLINOIS PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS

- § 1:10 Recent case law interpretations of the Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions—Civil
- § 1:11 Shifting standard of review
- § 1:12 When a court must give an instruction
- § 1:13 Test for an instruction
- § 1:14 Deviation from the pattern jury instructions
- § 1:15 Misleading instructions and reversible error

III. THE ILLINOIS PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTION AS A PLANNING TOOL

- § 1:16 Use of this handbook and the Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions-Civil
- § 1:17 The Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions as a research tool
- § 1:18 Case evaluation and the client intake form
- § 1:19 Identify the elements within the Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions

A. DRAFTING PLEADINGS

- § 1:20 The Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions: The quintessential tool in the Illinois fact-pleading jurisdiction
- § 1:21 Pleading the elements of a cause of action under the

Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions to avoid a 735 ILCS
5/2-615 motion to dismiss

- § 1:22 Pleading the elements of a cause of action under the
Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions in response to a 735
ILCS 5/2-619 motion to dismiss
- § 1:23 A tool for drafting and responding to a motion for
summary judgment

B. TARGETING DISCOVERY THROUGH USE OF THE ILLINOIS PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS

- § 1:24 Expanding on the standard interrogatories
- § 1:25 Creating requests for production of documents
- § 1:26 The Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions as a source for
requests to admit and deposition questions

IV. THE ILLINOIS PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS AS A TRIAL PLANNING TOOL

- § 1:27 The trial notebook—A roadmap from intake to jury
deliberations
- § 1:28 The trial notebook process and components
- § 1:29 The element matrix
- § 1:30 Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions applied to case
planning, the contract dispute
- § 1:31 The trial theme

V. JURY INSTRUCTION MODIFICATIONS AND CREATING A RECORD

- § 1:32 Creating the jury instruction packet
- § 1:33 Arguing for your instructions, objecting to opposing
counsel's objections
- § 1:34 Proposing jury instruction modifications
- § 1:35 Creating the record on appeal

VI. RECENT CHANGES TO ILLINOIS PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS AS ANNOUNCED BY THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT COMMITTEE ON JURY INSTRUCTIONS: CIVIL CASES

- § 1:36 Select recent changes to the Illinois Pattern Jury
Instructions as announced by the Illinois Supreme
Court Committee on Jury Instructions: Civil Cases

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**CHAPTER 2. MOTOR VEHICLE
NEGLIGENCE**

- § 2:1 Motor vehicle negligence—Apparent agency principal sued as agent—50.05—*Armato v. 5 Star Flash, Inc., et al.*
- § 2:2 —A corporation acts through its employees—50.11—*Hill-Layne v. Chicago Transit Authority*
- § 2:3 —Both principal and agent sued—No issue as to agency—50.01—*Ranson v. Chicago Transit Auth. et al.*
- § 2:4 —Duty of driver using highway—70.01—*Jones v. Herrera*
- § 2:5 — — —*Mejia v. Chavez*
- § 2:6 — — —*Bulluck v. Douglas*
- § 2:7 — — —*Burns v. Jimenez*
- § 2:8 — — —*Garon v. Kowalski*
- § 2:9 — — —*Lara v. Destani*
- § 2:10 — — —*Pawlik v. Soto*
- § 2:11 — — —*Davila v. Montanez*
- § 2:12 —Right of way—B45.01.C—*Ashcroft-Ulanski v. Garcia*
- § 2:13 — —21.02—*Patel v. Tabladillo*
- § 2:14 — — —*Dean v. Kim*
- § 2:15 —Duty of driver using highway—21.02—*Kukich v. Gonzalez*
- § 2:16 —Right of way—70.02—*Johnson v. Martinez*
- § 2:17 — — —*Gaspar v. Patel*
- § 2:18 — —10.01—*Corona v. Filhour et al.*
- § 2:19 —Pedestrians—Crossing at crosswalk—20.01—*Schonfeld v. Tortorici*
- § 2:20 — —Crossing at other than crosswalks—*Fuller v. Porter*
- § 2:21 — — —*M.D. v. Starr*
- § 2:22 — — —70.03—*Dugaduga v. Cherney*
- § 2:23 — — —*O.M. v. Vondran*
- § 2:24 — — —70.03—*Short v. Watson*
- § 2:25 — — — —*Mullis v. Trinity Services, Inc.*
- § 2:26 — —Truck—600.09—*Perez v. Larry’s Cartage Company*
- § 2:27 — —Shoulder of roadway—31.09—*Cornejo v. Alliance Shippers Inc.*
- § 2:28 —Duty of driver to guests—Emergency vehicle—*Howard v. Czerniak*
- § 2:29 — —72.05—*Seaborg v. Connie’s Pizza, Inc.*
- § 2:30 —Failure to Reduce Speed and Keep a Lookout—30.01—*Darling-Mills v. Hitz*

- § 2:31 —Passenger in private vehicle—30.01—Dawson v. Rouette
- § 2:32 —Violation of statute, ordinance, or regulation—60.01—Cici v. Kotelman
- § 2:33 — — —Tumizeh v. Chicago Transit Authority
- § 2:34 — — —60.01, 10.02—Bryant v. Guerico
- § 2:35 — — —Fiscal v. Escalante, et al.
- § 2:36 —Violation of statute, ordinance, or regulation; duty of driver using highway—60.01—Floyd v. Boyes et al.
- § 2:37 —Issues made by the pleadings—One or more defendants
- § 2:38 — — —Coley v. Richardson
- § 2:39 — — —State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Garcia-Morales
- § 2:40 —Motor vehicle striking bicyclist—60.01—Daoud v. Miller
- § 2:41 — — —Verdin v. Magiera
- § 2:42 —Failure to reduce speed and keep a lookout—20.21—Watkins v. Harris
- § 2:43 — — —Raggs v. Preston
- § 2:44 — — —Fluhler v. Keane
- § 2:45 — — —Argudo v. Anderson
- § 2:46 — — —2.02—Parral v. Murray
- § 2:47 — — —McCabe v. Chicago Transit Authority
- § 2:48 — — —Kennedy v. Fantin
- § 2:49 —Collision—Truck accident—23.01B—Kroft v. Viper Trans, Inc.
- § 2:50 — — —Bus, passenger—20.01—Griffith v. Doan
- § 2:51 — — —Intersection—20.01—Latif v. Fulton
- § 2:52 — — —Rear-end collision—20.01—Hilgendorf v. Atterberry
- § 2:53 — — —Eating while operating motor vehicle—20.01—Raskin v. Mitchell
- § 2:54 — — —Injuries to passenger—20.01—Minchuk v. Ingraffia
- § 2:55 — — —Centerline violation—20.01—Beatty v. Wells

CHAPTER 3. PROFESSIONAL NEGLIGENCE AND MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

- § 3:1 Professional negligence—Medical malpractice—105.01—Issues made by the pleadings—20.01—Estate of Cutaia v. Gottlieb Memorial Hospital et al.
- § 3:2 — — —St. Aubin v. Claridge Imperial Ltd.
- § 3:3 —Duty of a specialist—105.02—Lavine v. Glen Oaks Medical

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 3:4 —Medical malpractice—105.01—Estate of Protho v. Keele, M.D.
- § 3:5 —Duty of a specialist—105.02—First National Bank of La Grange v. Glen Oaks Hospital
- § 3:6 — —105.01—Perros v. Kalamaris
- § 3:7 — —105.02—Solner v. Palos Hospital
- § 3:8 Medical Malpractice—Wrongful death—105.01—Estate of Giorno v. Advocate Health and Hosp. Corp.
- § 3:9 — —105.01, 31.04—Estate of Nogan v. Ghaly, et al.
- § 3:10 Professional negligence—Duty of a specialist—105.01—Estate of Plewa v. Midwest Ctr. for Women’s Healthcare Ltd., et al.
- § 3:11 — — —Ford v. Vander Velde, M.D.; Midwest Radiological Associates P.C.
- § 3:12 — — —S.S., Pro Ami, Smith v. Tolentino, M.D.
- § 3:13 —Duty of specialist—105.01—DeAngelo v. Advocate Health Partners, et al.
- § 3:14 — — —Cohen v. ACSN
- § 3:15 Medical and professional malpractice—Informed consent—105.07.01—Chmeilewski v. Stohle
- § 3:16 — —105.01—Acker v. Maquiling
- § 3:17 — —105.07.01—Stephney v. Grossman
- § 3:18 — — —Allsup v. Wyers
- § 3:19 — — —Flores v. Alva, M.D.; Medicor Partners S.C.
- § 3:20 —Ordinary care—105.08—Campbell v. Nielsen
- § 3:21 — —105.07.02—Mitchell v. Caro
- § 3:22 —Res ipsa loquitur—105.09—DeJesus v. Tam, M.D., et al.
- § 3:23 — —105.02—Gamboa v. Advocate Health Care
- § 3:24 —Issues made by the pleadings—Informed consent—One plaintiff and one defendant—105.07.01—Nieder Korn v. Weil, et al.
- § 3:25 —Apparent agency—105.11—Caruso v. Advocate Sherman Hosp., et al.
- § 3:26 — —105.11 (refused)—Koralewicz v. Saint Mary Nalareth Hasgrial Yario
- § 3:27 Professional negligence—Financial services—105.01—Hannic Freight Forwarders v. GCG Financial v. Benefits Consulting Group
- § 3:28 —Medical malpractice—105.01—Cloud v. Hill, M.D., et al.
- § 3:29 —Violation of statute, ordinance, or administrative regulation/legal malpractice—60.01—Brannen, et. al. v. Joerg Siefert et. al.
- § 3:30 —Legal services—105.01—Carey v. Powers
- § 3:31 —Nursing home—190.02—Groh v. Glenview Terrace Property

- § 3:32 —Law enforcement—Wrongful Death—31.12—Taylor v. City of Chicago
- § 3:33 Professional negligence and medical malpractice—105.01—Romano v. Franciscan Alliance
- § 3:34 — —Maldonado v. Butt, et al.
- § 3:35 — —20.01—Afridi v. Northshore Univ. Health Sys.
- § 3:36 —Violation of statute, ordinance, or administrative regulation/legal malpractice—Otto v. Rozenstrauch

CHAPTER 4. PREMISES LIABILITY

- § 4:1 Introduction to premises liability
- § 4:2 Premises liability—Issues Made By The Pleadings—Negligence—One or More Defendants—20.01—Blackman v. A&P Hospitality of Illinois LLC
- § 4:3 — — —One Or More Defendants—20.01—Randazzo v. Lukaba Productions
- § 4:4 —Duty to an adult lawfully on the property—120.02—Hess v. City of Chicago
- § 4:5 — — —Grandberry v. City of Chicago
- § 4:6 — — —Nausedas v. City of Chicago
- § 4:7 — —120.08—Robinson v. City of Chicago
- § 4:8 — —120.09—Fonder v. McKindra
- § 4:9 — —128.02—Andrews v. City of Chicago
- § 4:10 — —120.02—Martin v. City of Chicago
- § 4:11 — — —Sutton v. City of Chicago
- § 4:12 — — —Valdes Jr. v. City of Chicago
- § 4:13 —Duty to use ordinary care—10.04—Synoga v. Little Company of Mary Hosp. Found
- § 4:14 —Willful and wanton conduct—14.01—Bruno v. Fat Jack’s
- § 4:15 —Duty to use ordinary care—10.02—Cozen, et al. v. RDK Ventures LLC
- § 4:16 — — —Galvan v. City of Chicago
- § 4:17 — —B10.03—Najera-Martinez v. Valle
- § 4:18 — —10.04—Mathias v. Accor
- § 4:19 —Duty of landowner—125.01—Ahern v. Willows of Elmhurst
- § 4:20 — —120.09—Maxwell v. White
- § 4:21 — —125.01, 125.04—Robbins v. Lowe’s Home Centers
- § 4:22 —Falls on ice or snow—Negligence—15.02, 128.02—Rompala v. Baci Italian Restaurant
- § 4:23 — — —30.01—Marvin Wren v. Jewel Food Stores Inc.
- § 4:24 —Duty to use ordinary care—B10.03—Harris v. Malone
- § 4:25 —Contributory and comparative negligence—B10.03—Janeczko v. Ferrin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 4:26 — — —Knych v. Richter
- § 4:27 — — —Russo v. Morrice
- § 4:28 — — —Stiles v. Shadid D/B/A GF Properties; GF 5014
Westend L.L.C.
- § 4:29 — — —Jones v. West Cook Young Men’s Christian
Association
- § 4:30 —Corporation acts through its employees—50.11—
Estate of Madison v. University of Chicago Med. Ctr.,
et al.
- § 4:31 —Trespasser—Definition—Harwell v. Kipling
Development Corporation
- § 4:32 —Negligent repair/maintenance negligence—120.02—
Sherman v. Coromandel Umbrella Association, et al.
- § 4:33 — —Residential property—34.04—Holloman v.
Holloman
- § 4:34 — — —60.01—Ramirez v. Acevedo
- § 4:35 — — —B21.02—Brito v. Trapani Builders
- § 4:36 — —Commercial property—12.04—Musser v.
Southwest Airlines Co.

CHAPTER 5. PRODUCTS LIABILITY

- § 5:1 Products liability/breach of warranty—Strict product
liability—400.01—Backes v. Bombardier, Inc.
- § 5:2 — —B400.03—O’Brien v. Yamaha
- § 5:3 — —400.01, 400.01.01—Strum v. Depuy Orthopaedics,
Inc.
- § 5:4 — —400.01—Vandenberg v. Brunswick Corporation
- § 5:5 — — —Valadez v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC, et al.
- § 5:6 — —400.04—Maxwell v. Castle Sales Company Inc.;
Motorcycle Riding School Inc.; HJC America Inc.
- § 5:7 — —400.07—Shadley v. Pflow Industries Inc.
- § 5:8 — —400.06—Kaczorowski v. Synthes USA Sales LLC
- § 5:9 — — —Ocampo v. Paper Converting Machine Co.
- § 5:10 —Complaint and claims for contribution tried
concurrently—600.02—Hock v. Brenzewski
- § 5:11 —Strict Product Liability—15.01—Wagner,
Individually and as Executor of Wagner, Estate of v.
Eaton Corporation
- § 5:12 — —Wood v. Navistar Inc.
- § 5:13 — —41.03—Two or More Defendants—Ravizza v.
Paccar Inc.; District Rebuilders Inc.

CHAPTER 6. CONSTRUCTION ACCIDENTS

- § 6:1 Construction accidents—Construction negligence—
55.01—Work entrusted to another—Polino v. Toro
Const. Corp., et al.

- § 6:2 — —55.01, 55.02, 55.04—Rizner v. The Weitz Co.
- § 6:3 — —55.02—McGillivray v. Skender Const. LLC
- § 6:4 — —55.03—Schlemer v. Fru-Con
- § 6:5 — — —Cooper v. Carlson Bros.
- § 6:6 — — —Urvieta v. Cresthill
- § 6:7 — —55.04—More than one person having control—
Startz v. University of Chicago
- § 6:8 — —Wrongful death—31.09—Feltes v. Enger Vavra,
Inc.
- § 6:9 — —Contributory negligence—11.01—Jarrett v.
Triodyne Wangler
- § 6:10 — —20.01—Issues made by the pleadings—Dent v.
Pheasant Run Apartments

CHAPTER 7. INTENTIONAL TORTS

- § 7:1 Intentional torts—Contributory willful and wanton
conduct—14.02—Balon v. McDonnell
- § 7:2 Intentional Torts—Contributory willful and wanton
conduct—20.01.01—Lorts v. Robin
- § 7:3 Intentional torts—Wrongful death—31.09—Brawner v.
Chicago
- § 7:4 — — —Lyons, administrator of the estate of Fabian,
deceased, v. Fabian
- § 7:5 — —Fraud and deceit—800.01—Navarrete Pontiac v.
Protz
- § 7:6 — —800.09A—Tummillo v. Gallagher
- § 7:7 — —800.05—Falbo v. Ed Napletons Elmhurst Acura
- § 7:8 — —Punitive/exemplary damages—Willful and wanton
conduct—35.01—Gemkis v. Home Depot USA Inc.
- § 7:9 — —Willful and wanton conduct—20.01.01—Wheatley v.
Chicago
- § 7:10 — —Medlin v. Am. Audio Visual
- § 7:11 — —Geraci v. DiBuono
- § 7:12 — —30.01—Cox v. Mau
- § 7:13 Intentional Torts—Assault and Battery—20.01—Ryan
v. Advocate Health & Hosp.
- § 7:14 — —150.02—Ozimek v. The Old Time Tap
- § 7:15 — —Sexual Assault—21.02—Doe v. Podvisevski

CHAPTER 8. CONTRACTS

- § 8:1 Introduction to contracts
- § 8:2 Contracts—Breach of contract—700.01—Terms not in
dispute—Tolliver v. Allstate Ins. Co.
- § 8:3 — — — —Village of Deer Park v. Sirirattumrong
- § 8:4 — — — —Mogilevsky v. Rubicon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 8:5 — — — —Lee v. USAA Cas. Ins. Co.
- § 8:6 — —700.02—Kustok v. Commander Packaging Corporation
- § 8:7 — —Verdict A—Radiant Partners v. Reinberg
- § 8:8 —Violation of statute, ordinance, or administrative regulation—60.01—Computer Business Systems v. Londos
- § 8:9 —Questions for verdict form—700.17V—Markey v. American Benefit Consul
- § 8:10 —Anticipatory breach by repudiation—700.08—G.F. Mann Agency v. David Agency Insurance
- § 8:11 —Proof and performance of contract—700.03, 700.07—Poper v. Ridenour
- § 8:12 —Breach of contract—Agency—Board of Education of Calumet City School District No. 155 v. Liu Architects, P.C., et al.
- § 8:13 —Case law interpretation

CHAPTER 9. REAL PROPERTY

- § 9:1 Real property—Measure of damages—30.01—Chicago Import v. Commonwealth Edison
- § 9:2 —Negligence—10.01—Hirse Korn v. Behnke
- § 9:3 —Repairable damage to real property—30.17—Ferraro v. Illinois Farmers Insurance Co.
- § 9:4 —Breach of contract—700.02—Maguire v. Holt
- § 9:5 —Fraud and deceit—800.02A—McCarrin v. Gorenz
- § 9:6 —Duty to use ordinary care—10.04—Yezeguelian v. Cardelli
- § 9:7 — —B10.03—Aberdeen Family v. Wayne, Inc.
- § 9:8 —700.17—Zechman v. City of Highland Park
- § 9:9 —Trespass/Nuisance—20.01—Kwilas v. L.K. Precision Tuckpointing

CHAPTER 10. AGENCY AND EMPLOYMENT

- § 10:1 Introduction to agency and employment
- § 10:2 Agency and employment—Both principal and agent sued—Agency denied—Principal sued under respondeat superior only—50.03—Indiana Harbor Belt R.R. v. Henkels & McCoy
- § 10:3 —Principal sued, but not agent—50.04—Mayfield v. Total Facility Maintenance, Inc.
- § 10:4 —Inference of agency—50.08—Krebasch, et al. v. Patel, et al.
- § 10:5 —Agent or independent contractor—50.10—Qualtier v. HH Installations

- § 10:6 —A corporation acts through its employees—Her v. City of Chicago
- § 10:7 — —50.11—S.M. v. Lobes, et al.
- § 10:8 —Partner—Liability of—No issue as to partnership, agency, or scope of authority—50.12—Fakhouri v. Duric
- § 10:9 —Claims based on apparent agency—Both principal and agent sued—Principal sued under respondeat superior only—Medical malpractice actions—Reliance on principal alleged—105.10—Ciaramitaro v. Galina Cab Corp., et al.
- § 10:10 —Wrongful death—31.09—Estate of Maestas v. Union Pac. R.R. Co., et al.
- § 10:11 —Mitigation of damages—33.01—Addis v. Exelon
- § 10:12 —Violation of statute, ordinance, or administrative regulation—60.01—Colella v. JMS Trucking
- § 10:13 — — —Fisher v. Union Pacific R.R.
- § 10:14 — — —Bell v. Quality Cartage, Inc.
- § 10:15 Agency and Employment—Statutory provisions (Federal Employers’ Liability Act)—160.01—Workplace injury—Johnson v. Northeast Illinois Reg’l Commuter Railroad Corp.
- § 10:16 Agency and employment—Professional negligence—105.01—Reiff v. Much Shelist
- § 10:17 —Trespass—120.01—Lewis v. Bickhaus
- § 10:18 —Retaliatory discharge—250.02—Housley v. Chicago Transit Authority
- § 10:19 —Insurance bad faith—710.03—O’Neill v. Gallant
- § 10:20 —Excessive force—Federal jury instruction 7.08—Sallenger v. City of Springfield
- § 10:21 —Retaliatory discharge—Title VII—Mendez v. Perla Dental

CHAPTER 11. ILLINOIS PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS ON DAMAGES: THE BEGINNING AND END OF THE LITIGATION PLAN

- § 11:1 Introduction
- § 11:2 Historical treatment of damages
- § 11:3 Historical policy considerations that developed current damages theory
- § 11:4 Historical views of damages affecting 20th century case law
- § 11:5 Pattern damages instructions verses modified instructions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 11:6 Difficulties with deviation from the pattern instructions on damages
- § 11:7 Three tenets of drafting modified instructions: simplicity, brevity, and clarity
- § 11:8 Consequential damages instructions
- § 11:9 Punitive damage instructions in Illinois
- § 11:10 Illinois pattern instruction on punitive damages
- § 11:11 Damage instructions considerations for trial planning
- § 11:12 Reviewing elements of damages to be presented to the jury
- § 11:13 Conclusion

**CHAPTER 12. FORMS OF VERDICTS—
RESULTS BASED CASE PLANNING**

- § 12:1 Introduction
- § 12:2 History of forms of verdicts
- § 12:3 Historical policy considerations that developed current forms of verdicts
- § 12:4 Historical views of forms of verdicts affecting modern case law
- § 12:5 Form of verdicts as a litigation tool
- § 12:6 Construction of the form of the verdict
- § 12:7 Use of verdict forms at trial
- § 12:8 Use of the verdict form during closing arguments
- § 12:9 Conclusion

Table of Laws and Rules

Table of Cases