

MASTER

**KING COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF EXECUTIVE SERVICES
INQUEST PROGRAM**

**INQUEST INTO THE DEATH OF WANGSHENG LENG
INQUEST # 18IQ42509**

INTERROGATORIES TO THE INQUEST JURY

DATED 5th day of February, 2024.



Marcine Anderson
Inquest Administrator



Inquest Program
Department of Executive Services
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135
Seattle, WA 98104
206-477-6191
TTY Relay 711
Inquests@kingcounty.gov

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE
DEATH OF WANGSHENG LENG**

Interrogatory No. 1: Did the Issaquah Police Department receive a report of a verbal domestic disturbance at the Leng residence on August 5, 2018?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 2: Did the 911 caller inform the call-taker that the individuals involved in this incident might be Korean or Chinese?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 3: Were the responding officers informed that the individuals involved in this incident might be Korean?

YES ___ NO 5 UNKNOWN 1

Interrogatory No. 4: Were the responding officers told that this incident might involve non-English speakers?

YES ___ NO 6 UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 5: Did Officers Mike Lucht and Kylen Whittom respond to the Leng residence and interact with Wangsheng Leng and his wife LiPing Yang?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 6: When officers first encountered Mr. Leng and Ms. Yang, did it appear to any Officer that Mr. Leng was holding Ms. Yang's shirt from behind?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES ___ NO 4 UNKNOWN 2

Interrogatory No. 7: Was there a language barrier among the officers and Mr. Leng and Ms. Yang?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___



Inquest Program
Department of Executive Services
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135
Seattle, WA 98104
206-477-6191
TTY Relay 711
Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 8: Did a language barrier among the officers and Mr. Leng and Ms. Yang impede communications?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 9: Did the officers see the apartment door shutting?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 10: Did the officers enter the apartment?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 11: Did Mr. Leng wave his arms and loudly say something like "Da Da Da"?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 12: Did Mr. Leng move toward Officer Lucht?

YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

Interrogatory No. 13: Did the officers hold Mr. Leng and move him to the couch?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 14: Did Mr. Leng tense up while the officers were moving him?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 15: Did the officers lower Mr. Leng down so that his chest was on the couch?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 16: Was there a blue pillow between the couch and Mr. Leng?

YES 5 NO ___ UNKNOWN 1

Interrogatory No. 17: Did the officers place Mr. Leng in handcuffs?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 18: Did Mr. Leng stop tensing up and stop reacting to the officers after being handcuffed?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 19: Did an officer or officers move Mr. Leng to a chair?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 20: Did an officer or officers move Mr. Leng to a second chair?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 21: Did an officer request medical aid?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 22: At what point did the officers first learn that Mr. Leng suffered from Alzheimer's disease?

Before making physical contact? YES ___ NO 6 UNKNOWN ___

While making physical contact? YES 3 NO 2 UNKNOWN 1

After making physical contact? YES 2 NO 3 UNKNOWN 1



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 23: After the officers learned of Mr. Leng's Alzheimer's disease, did the officers determine that this was not a domestic violence incident?

YES NO UNKNOWN

Interrogatory No. 24: At what point did officers first attempt to obtain an interpreter?

Before making physical contact? YES NO UNKNOWN

While making physical contact? YES NO UNKNOWN

After making physical contact,
but before calling for medical aid? YES NO UNKNOWN

After calling for medical aid? YES NO UNKNOWN

Simultaneous with calling for
medical aid? YES NO UNKNOWN

Interrogatory No. 25: Were officers able to communicate with Mrs. Yang using an interpreter?

YES NO UNKNOWN

Interrogatory No. 26: Were officers able to communicate with Mr. Leng using an interpreter?

YES NO UNKNOWN

Interrogatory No. 27: Did medics decide to transport Mr. Leng to a hospital?

YES NO UNKNOWN

Interrogatory No. 28: While in the hospital, was Mr. Leng diagnosed with a cervical spine injury for which he underwent surgery?

YES NO UNKNOWN

Interrogatory No. 29: Did Mr. Leng have a preexisting physical condition that affected the severity of his spinal cord injury?

YES NO UNKNOWN



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 30: Were scrapes that were observed on Mr. Leng's arms, hand, leg, and foot while he was at the hospital caused during his interaction with the officers?

YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

Interrogatory No. 31: Were the scrapes on Mr. Leng determined to be superficial by medical personnel?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 32: Did Mr. Leng's Alzheimer's impede his ability to participate in rehabilitation for his spinal cord injury?

YES 4 NO ___ UNKNOWN 2

Interrogatory No. 33: Did Mr. Leng develop aspiration pneumonia as a complication from his spinal cord injury?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 34: Did Mr. Leng die on September 5, 2018 in Shoreline, WA?

YES 4 NO ___ UNKNOWN 2

Interrogatory No. 35: Did force used by the officers cause or contribute to Mr. Leng's death?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 4 NO ___ UNKNOWN 2

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 4 NO ___ UNKNOWN 2

Interrogatory No. 36: Did Mr. Leng's preexisting spinal condition contribute to his death?

YES 5 NO ___ UNKNOWN 1

Interrogatory No. 37: Did Mr. Leng's Alzheimer's contribute to his death?

YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

**QUESTIONS ABOUT WHETHER THE INVOLVED OFFICERS COMPLIED WITH
ISSAQUAH POLICE DEPARTMENT POLICIES AND TRAININGS**

Handcuffing and Restraints

Interrogatory No. 38: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #306 on Handcuffing and Restraints apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 39: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #306 on Handcuffing and Restraints?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___

Interrogatory No. 40: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #306 on Handcuffing and Restraints?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Use of Force

Interrogatory No. 41: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #300.3 on Use of Force apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 42: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #300.3 on Use of Force?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 3 ~~6~~ NO ___ UNKNOWN 3 ~~6~~

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

DID NOT ANSWER ___

Interrogatory No. 43: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #300.3 on Use of Force?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

DID NOT ANSWER ___



Inquest Program
Department of Executive Services
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135
Seattle, WA 98104
206-477-6191
TTY Relay 711
Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Deadly Force Applications

Interrogatory No. 44: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #300.4 on Deadly Force Applications apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES ___ NO 6 UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES ___ NO 6 UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 45: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #300.4 on Deadly Force Applications?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES ___ NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER 6

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES ___ NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER 6

Interrogatory No. 46: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #300.4 on Deadly Force Applications?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES ___ NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER 6

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES ___ NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER 6

Duty to Intercede

Interrogatory No. 47: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #300.2.1 on the Duty to Intercede apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES ___ NO 6 UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES ___ NO 6 UNKNOWN ___



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 48: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #300.2.1 on the Duty to Intercede?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES ___ NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER 6

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES ___ NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER 6

Interrogatory No. 49: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #300.2.1 on the Duty to Intercede?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES ___ NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER 6

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES ___ NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER 6

Medical Consideration

Interrogatory No. 50: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #300.6 on Medical Consideration apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 51: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #300.6 on Medical Consideration?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 52: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #300.6 on Medical Consideration?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___

Crisis Intervention Incidents

Interrogatory No. 53: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #469 on Crisis Intervention Incidents apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 54: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #469 on Crisis Intervention Incidents?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 4 NO ___ UNKNOWN 2

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 4 NO ___ UNKNOWN 2

DID NOT ANSWER ___



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 55: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #469 on Crisis Intervention Incidents?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 4 NO ___ UNKNOWN 2

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 4 NO ___ UNKNOWN 2

DID NOT ANSWER ___

Bias-Based Policing

Interrogatory No. 56: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #402 on Bias-Based Policing apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 57: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #402 on Bias-Based Policing?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

DID NOT ANSWER ___



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 58: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #402 on Bias-Based Policing?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 3 NO ___ UNKNOWN 3

DID NOT ANSWER ___

Limited English Proficiency Services

Interrogatory No. 59: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #368 on Limited English Proficiency Services apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 60: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #368 on Limited English Proficiency Services?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 2 NO ___ UNKNOWN 4

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 2 NO ___ UNKNOWN 4

DID NOT ANSWER ___



Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

Interrogatory No. 61: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #368 on Limited English Proficiency Services?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 2 NO ___ UNKNOWN 4

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 2 NO ___ UNKNOWN 4

DID NOT ANSWER ___

Domestic Violence

Interrogatory No. 62: Did Issaquah Police Department Policy #320 on Domestic Violence apply to the actions of the involved officers during this incident?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

Interrogatory No. 63: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with Policy #320 on Domestic Violence?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES 6 NO ___ UNKNOWN ___

DID NOT ANSWER ___

Interrogatory No. 64: If the policy applied, did the involved officers comply with training they received on implementing Policy #320 on Domestic Violence?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES NO UNKNOWN

DID NOT ANSWER

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES NO UNKNOWN

DID NOT ANSWER

QUESTIONS DETERMINING WHETHER WANGSHENG LENG'S DEATH WAS OCCASIONED BY CRIMINAL MEANS

Interrogatory No. 65: Did the involved officers cause Wangsheng Leng's death by criminal means, as defined in Instruction No. 8?

SERGEANT LUCHT: YES NO UNKNOWN

OFFICER WHITTOM: YES NO UNKNOWN


DATED this 1 day of February, 2024.



Panel Foreperson



Panel Member




Panel Member



Panel Member



Panel Member



Panel Member



King County

Inquest Program

Department of Executive Services

401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 135

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-6191

TTY Relay 711

Inquests@kingcounty.gov

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>4</u> :	<p>Sergeant Lucht stated that he heard dispatcher say "something about Asian people." Also, that he did not know there was a language barrier.</p> <p>Officer Whittam stated that he heard from dispatcher say "3 to 4 possible people, bad cases, speaking Korean" both officers were not told the incident might involve non-English speaker.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>6</u> :	<p>Sergeant Lucht stated that Mr. Long was holding Mr. Yang from behind.</p> <p>Officer Whittam was behind Sergeant Lucht and did not mention anything about seeing Mr. Long holding on to Mr. Yang's shirt.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>12</u> :	<p>Both Sergeant Lucht and Officer Whittam say that Mr. Long lunged toward them.</p> <p>It is unclear if Mr. Long moved toward Officer Lucht because he was behind Mr. Yang and there was not much space between closing door, Mr. Yang, and officers in single door doorway.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>22</u> :	<p>Mr. Yang was screaming and landed Alexander's and the officers while they were detaining Mr. Long in handcuffs, so while they were making physical contact.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>32</u> :	<p>Detective Nellis said that Mr. Long's death occurred 7 months and 7 days before which would have been Sept. 10, 2010 in a care facility in Vero Beach, VA.</p> <p>Dr. Carey said that Mr. Long died on September 5, 2016.</p>

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

<p>Interrogatory No. <u>30</u>:</p>	<p>Mr. Lang stated that the officers were very violent with handling Mr. Lang. Officer Whitaker said that Mr. Lang could have hit or rubbed up against officer Whitaker's uniform</p> <p>scratches and lacerations are consistent with each other being on one side of Mr. Lang and forcing Mr. Lang to kneel down</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>32</u>:</p>	<p>It is unknown if Mr. Lang's Atelers or if his spinal cord injury impeded his ability to participate in restraints. We don't know if his inability to stand up due to the orthostatic hypotension played a role.</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>35</u>:</p>	<p>Before the handcuffing, officers testified that Mr. Lang could raise his arms and gesturing them to "go away" after the handcuffing Mr. Lang was no longer cooperating. Dr. Bitmonais, who conducted the autopsy, concluded that the incident with the officers led to the blunt force on neck which led to the cervical spine injury.</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>42</u>:</p>	<p>It is unknown if the officers complied with use of force and whether a reasonable amount of force was used at the time when detaining and handcuffing Mr. Lang on his knees bent over the car. Officers testified to just restraining Mr. Lang with his arms, but Mr. Lang stated that he observed an officer place their hand on Mr. Lang's head to control him.</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u> </u>:</p>	<p>Other factors included officer/subject age, size factors.</p>

over car.

participate

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

<p>Interrogatory No. <u>54</u>:</p>	<p>unknown if officers complied with Policy #4609 on crisis Intervention incidents. Based upon the call being classified as a domestic violence call, sergeant Walt made the decision decision to enter the apartment to keep law from closing. There was a language barrier. no attempt to communicate caused by the officers handcuffed and detained Mr. Leng. There was no de-escalation,</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u> </u>:</p>	<p>just handcuffing Mr. Leng which resulted in his cervical spine injury.</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>57</u>:</p>	<p>Based on both of the officers' testimony, it appeared that there may have been an inappropriate reliance that because Mr. Leng and Ms. Yang were Asian and did not speak English or limited English that no attempt to communicate was made on behalf of the officers to Ms. Yang or Mr. Leng. After handcuffing Mr. Leng, the officers requested medical aid only after that requested a language line interpreter.</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u> </u>:</p>	<p> </p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>60</u></p>	<p>Unknown if the officers complied with LEAD policy because upon entry to the apartment they did not provide a language card or prioritize calling for interpreter. During officer's testimony, both still did not know the language that Ms. Yang and Mr. Leng spoke (Mandarin). If the officers showed to regard for the language in 2024, how more sensible there were they in 2010?</p>

Juror No. 1

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>65</u> :	<p>Criminal means defined by instruction 8: the gross acts (1) were a proximate cause of death, AND (2) were not lawful.</p> <p>I believed the gross acts were a proximate cause of death for Mr. Long because, I believe that the officers' detainer of Mr. Long was lawful.</p>
Interrogatory No. __:	<p>Because I could not find both parts (1) and (2) occurred, occurred I cannot say that Mr Long's death was caused by "criminal means".</p>
Interrogatory No. __:	
Interrogatory No. __:	
Interrogatory No. __:	

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>35</u> :	unknown - Although there is enough evidence for me to conclude that officers' actions contributed to Mr. Leng's death as a collective, I don't believe there is enough evidence to determine which officer's use of force or if both officers' actions contributed to Mr. Leng's death.
Interrogatory No. <u> </u> :	This takes into consideration of Dr. Bilimoria's autopsy that concluded (by medical terminology) that another party's actions contributed to Mr. Leng's death.
Interrogatory No. <u>34</u> :	unknown as I received conflicting testimonies from witnesses. Dr. Lacy stated the date of death as September 5th, 2018 while Detective Mellis stated the date of death as September 6th, 2018.
Interrogatory No. <u>44</u> :	No, because there was no intention by either officer to cause serious bodily harm or death, which is consistent with Policy #300.4 and Chief Paula Schwan's testimony.
Interrogatory No. <u> </u> :	

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>52</u> :	Yes, as this became a medical situation upon officers' realization of Mr. Leng's Alzheimer's diagnosis. Also clarifying that Policy 469 did not apply until officers learned of Mr. Leng's Alzheimer's diagnosis, which occurred after officers handcuffed him.
Interrogatory No. <u>57</u> :	Yes, as a language barrier was not listed as any of the inappropriate reliances on race or ethnicity, officers did not assume a language barrier upon learning of Mr. Leng and Ms. Vang's race and ethnicities. From my interpretation, language barriers barriers does not fall under the race and ethnicity umbrella.
Interrogatory No. <u>60</u> :	Unknown, as whether language assistance was provided in a timely manner is uncertain. This because language line was called after Mr. Leng was detained. However, officers were adhering to securing the scene before calling the language line. Officers did not testify on whether they provided language options.
Interrogatory No. <u> </u> :	
Interrogatory No. <u> </u> :	

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>65</u>	No, the involved officers did not cause Wangsheng Leng's death by criminal means. From the definition of "criminal means" given in Juror Instruction No. 8, my interpretation is that both officers' act(s) or/and failure to do so must be both a proximate cause of death and
Interrogatory No. __:	simultaneously be unlawful as determined in the instructions. Although I concluded there to be substantial amount of evidence to prove that officers' acts were a proximate cause of death, their detaining of Mr. Leng was indeed lawful. In order for me to answer "yes," both must be true; which in this case, is not.
Interrogatory No. __:	
Interrogatory No. __:	
Interrogatory No. __:	

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>1</u> :	<p>Officers were informed of possible ethnicities of the subjects involved but information about the languages they spoke would not have been available to the extent that informing the officers of a language barrier would have been an assumption possibly in violation of policy.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>12</u> :	<p>Without specific testimony from Mrs. Yang to the contrary I felt it was most appropriate to answer in the affirmative.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>42</u> :	<p>I do not believe that there was any intent or expectation from either Officer of injury to Mr. Leng. I answered as "Unknown" because I feel that there is a large grey area with the amount of force used to detain Mr. Leng. According to Drs. Lacy and Balimoria, very little force was required, but Dr. Arden stated substantial force was required to cause injury. I cannot confidently say one way or the other that the force used was reasonable as a result.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>47</u> :	<p>I do not believe that either Officer Whitton nor Sergeant Lucht observed a use of force that was clearly unreasonable, even if that forced cause Mr. Leng's injury, and therefore I don't feel this policy applied.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>57</u> :	<p>After the language barrier and Alzheimers card were observed, it felt to me as though non-verbal attempts to communicate were not attempted, and therefore I cannot confidently say policy was followed.</p>

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>50</u> :	If Mrs. Yang's testimony is to be believed, ample time was available to seek help through the language line, because the door did not close and did not require entry by Sgt. Lucht, which began physical confrontation. In contrast according to officers, ample time did not exist because the door was closing. Due to the inconsistencies in testimony, I cannot confidently say either way if the officers complied with policy.
Interrogatory No. <u>55</u> :	I believe that Mr. Leng's interactions with the involved officers was a proximate cause of his death. However, I cannot say that the amount of force used to detain him was inappropriate to the point of being criminal, and therefore I cannot say that Mr. Leng's death was caused by criminal means.
Interrogatory No. <u> </u> :	
Interrogatory No. <u> </u> :	
Interrogatory No. <u> </u> :	

Juror No. 4

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>53</u> :	<p>The "yes" applies only when officers were aware that Mr. Beng had alzheimeres</p>
Interrogatory No. __:	
Interrogatory No. __:	
Interrogatory No. __:	
Interrogatory No. __:	

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>22</u> :	<p>"while making physical contact" I am considering only restraining & handcuffings, not any contact moving from chairs, etc.</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>30</u> :	<p>Probably, but not definitive. He had had an altercation outside with his wife previous to call. If she was trying to grab his arm to bring him back could have caused s</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>34</u>	<p>Multiple people involved in the fall on 2/20/12 not necessary to state date of injury found correct date in my note</p>
Interrogatory No. <u>35</u> :	<p>I felt I needed more info ^{to conclusively determine injury caused by police.} - no suspicion of injury was given by officers or apparently none by the EMTs. Mr. Leng was involved in incident w/ Mrs. Yang before officers arrived and Mrs. Leng later testified that he fell in the ER as she was trying to bring him home. She also testified after an incident he often was listless and slept. One of the Drs testified it ^{injury} could be caused by a fall. Although as Drs testified, the injury could have been caused by any force police officers used, I felt there were other things which could have just as likely caused it, specifically the fall in ER. I felt that if it was severe enough to cause such an injury he might have cried out in pain or given some indication he had been injured. He could have quite struggling because of shock. He was able to have enough muscle control to continue sitting in a chair by himself. I believed the injury could probably be caused by a phys. interaction w/ police, but I also felt it could have been caused by an over-...</p>
Interrogatory No. X :	

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

<p>Interrogatory No. <u>57</u>:</p>	<p>Because I cannot definitively say that the officers complied or did not comply with the policy, I am saying unknown. I believe that officers stopped trying to communicate, - Unknown</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>60</u> <u>61</u></p>	<p>Officers responded by putting priority on other things and policy states that officers could have used a "language identification card" as a possible means of determining the language. Officers, in their own testimony stated that they "stopped trying" to communicate. "It is important that members (officers) are able to effectively communicate the reason for contact." stated in 368.4 LEP services along with "meaningful and timely assistance." My doubts come from the fact that at the time of the incident and STILL at the time of testimony, neither officer could tell us that the people involved in the incident spoke Mandarin. ^{60-Lucht - unknown 60-Whittom - unknown 61-Lucht - unknown 61-Whittom - unknown}</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>61</u></p>	<p>Interrogatory No. <u>61</u></p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>65</u>:</p>	<p>This question asks if Mr. Leng's death by CRIMINAL MEANS as defined in instruction #8. Instruction 8 indicates that it must be defined as the #1 proximate cause of death AND #2 were not lawful. In my opinion this IS the cause of death, backed up by the findings of Dr. Bilimoria's testimony. He described it as a chain of events, that this was the starting point of his healthcare decline. He described it starting w/ blunt force to the neck → trauma → spinal injury → aspiration → pneumonia → death, a death which he defined by medical but not legal terminology that the cause of death was certified as a homicide "due to the actions of others. Lucht - No Whittom - unknown</p>
<p>Interrogatory No. <u>65</u></p>	<p>Interrogatory No. <u>65</u></p>
<p>The actions were not criminal.</p>	

Juror No. 2

JUROR EXPLANATION FORM

If desired, you may provide a written explanation of any of your answers to the interrogatories. You need only provide a written explanation when you believe that a written explanation of your answer would provide information helpful in explaining or interpreting your answer.

Interrogatory No. <u>3</u> :	Sgt Lucht was notified of Asian people involved by dispatch. Officer Whittom testified that he was told that the people at the scene may have been speaking Korean, but that is not a given that those involved were in fact Korean. -No
Interrogatory No. <u>12</u> :	When considering all testimony, between all parties testimony differed as to whether Mr. Long moved towards the officers or was just gesturing. - Unknown
Interrogatory No. <u>22</u> :	I am defining "Physical Contact" as the handcuffing vs. the entire incident prior to medical arriving. -No -No -Yes
Interrogatory No. 12	Handwritten text is completely obscured by heavy blue scribbles.
Interrogatory No. <u>42</u> :	The credibility of Sgt. Lucht is in question. I do not believe the detainment was as gentle as Lucht testified to, but it was nowhere near as rough as testified to by Mrs. Yang. I was also taking into account the fact that it was multiple large & tall officers vs. an elderly 5'8" ≈ 130 pounds. Lucht - Unknown Whittom - Unknown