



## THE FLORIDA SENATE

### SPECIAL MASTER ON CLAIM BILLS

**Location**

302 Senate Office Building

**Mailing Address**

404 South Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100  
(850) 487-5237

DATE	COMM	ACTION
1/30/17	SM	Favorable
	JU	
	ATD	
	AP	

January 30, 2017

The Honorable Joe Negrón  
President, The Florida Senate  
Suite 409, The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100

Re: **SB 32** – Senator Audrey Gibson  
Relief of Danielle Maudsley

### SPECIAL MASTER'S FINAL REPORT

THIS IS AN UNCONTESTED EQUITABLE CLAIM FOR \$1,750,000 PAYABLE FROM THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY AND MOTOR VEHICLES, BASED ON A SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE ESTATE OF DANIELLE MAUDSLEY AND THE FLORIDA HIGHWAY PATROL AND TROOPER DANIEL COLE, WHICH RESOLVED A CIVIL ACTION THAT AROSE FROM THE ALLEGED NEGLIGENT USE OF AN ELECTRONIC CONTROL DEVICE THAT CAUSED THE DEATH OF DANIELLE MAUDSLEY.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

On September 19, 2011, Trooper Daniel Cole of the Florida Highway Patrol (FHP) arrested 20 year old Danielle Maudsley for two counts of leaving the scene of a crash with property damage and two counts of driving with no valid driver's license. The charges are all second degree misdemeanors.

The first hit-and-run crash occurred at approximately 8:47 a.m. on September 19, 2011. Trooper Cole was dispatched to the scene and while responding, a second hit-and-run crash, which occurred at approximately 9:41 a.m., was reported with tag numbers, vehicle descriptions, and driver descriptions consistent in both crashes. Trooper Cole requested a *Be on*

*the Lookout (BOLO)* for the suspect's vehicle. Both crashes occurred in Pinellas County.

A short time later, deputies from the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office (PCSO) located the suspect vehicle, which was damaged, at Ms. Maudsley's residence in Pinellas Park. Trooper Cole was notified and went to the Maudsley residence. Upon arrival Deputy Chad Earl (PCSO) informed Trooper Cole that Danielle Maudsley resisted his attempts to detain her, without violence, and he intended to charge her for that offense, and that she was already on probation for driving with no valid driver's license. After deputies informed Trooper Cole that Danielle Maudsley had made spontaneous statements to the deputies that she had been involved in the hit-and-run crashes, Trooper Cole arrested Ms. Maudsley.

Trooper Cole handcuffed Ms. Maudsley behind her back and transported her to the Pinellas Park FHP station at 7651 U.S. 19 North to complete the investigative paperwork prior to taking her to the county jail.

Trooper Cole had activated the in-car video and audio system for the transport. The video shows that Danielle Maudsley is a slightly built woman and while fidgeting in the back of the patrol car removed one of her hands from the handcuffs. Upon arrival at the FHP station at approximately 11:04 a.m., and while exiting the patrol car, Ms. Maudsley passively informed Trooper Cole that her hand was free and she was unable to reinsert it into the handcuffs. Trooper Cole re-cuffed Ms. Maudsley behind her back and they entered the side door of the FHP station near the conference room.

Trooper Cole seated Ms. Maudsley in a chair in the conference room farthest from the door. Trooper Cole seated himself at the conference room table between Ms. Maudsley and the door to complete the investigative paperwork. At approximately 11:11 a.m. Ms. Maudsley advised Trooper Cole that she was thirsty. While escorting her to get a drink of water, she complained about the handcuffs and turned so that he could see that her wrist was caught in one of the handcuffs. Trooper Cole had her adjust her wrist so that it was not caught and he checked to be sure the handcuffs were still secure.

At approximately 11:41 a.m., Trooper Cole requested another FHP officer watch Ms. Maudsley so that he could use the

restroom. According to the investigative report, Trooper Cole returned about one and a half minutes later and assumed sole control of Ms. Maudsley while he resumed the paperwork.

Throughout the period from initially entering the conference room, there was no indication of aggressive or uncooperative behavior on the part of Danielle Maudsley while in custody.

At approximately 11:45 a.m., while Trooper Cole was still engaged in the paperwork, Danielle Maudsley ran past him, out of the conference room, down the short hallway, and exited the side door in which she had entered. At that time, Danielle Maudsley was no longer handcuffed behind her back. According to Trooper Cole, he was unable to discern whether she was handcuffed at all.

Trooper Cole indicated that he never heard Ms. Maudsley get up, the jingle of a handcuff, or anything. He felt a presence move behind him and when he looked up, she was even with the doorway to the conference room.

The in-car video and audio in Trooper Cole's transport vehicle were still activated and recorded the ensuing events. Off camera, Trooper Cole is heard asking, "Where are you going?" and he whistled at her. The next sound, which is almost immediately, is the squeak of the push bar on the station's exit door. Investigative reports and the video support the conclusion that the sound was from Danielle Maudsley pushing the bar to exit the building.

According to the investigative report, when Trooper Cole got to the exit door, it was swinging back in his direction. He pushed the door open with his left hand as he pulled his electronic control device (Taser) from the holster on his belt with his right hand. He weighed almost three times Danielle's weight, and according to Trooper Cole believed that [tackling] going to the ground with Danielle would certainly have resulted in her being injured.

The audio/video recording shows<sup>1</sup> Ms. Maudsley in full stride with her body posture leaning forward, within a distance of approximately one to two feet from Trooper Cole. Trooper Cole has the Taser in his right hand drawn and horizontal but

---

<sup>1</sup> At time stamp 11:45:49 a.m. on the in-car video recording.

his right elbow is still at his side. His posture is more erect. The left side of his body is not visible in the frame. Both are on the sidewalk under the eave of the building's roof.

According to the audio/video recording and still photographs from the recording, one second later, at 11:45:50 a.m., Trooper Cole's right hand with the Taser is outstretched approximately two feet from Ms. Maudsley's back. Both are still on the sidewalk beside the side door. The next still photograph with the same time stamp shows Ms. Maudsley stepping off the sidewalk in full stride, her back still to Trooper Cole, with her body posture indicating that she had received a Taser discharge into her back. She also released an audible squeal at this time. Trooper Cole had not warned the fleeing Maudsley that he was going to discharge the Taser. The distance between Trooper Cole and Ms. Maudsley had increased to approximately three to four feet by this point; however, the front of the Taser was approximately two feet away at the point of discharge.

At 11:45:51 a.m., Ms. Maudsley's body is twisting toward Trooper Cole in the parking lot. Still clearly handcuffed but in the front of her body, she falls backwards, striking the back of her head on the pavement of the parking lot.<sup>2</sup> She is whimpering and sits up. Trooper Cole instructs her to "lay down" several times, which she does. Other FHP troopers come out of the building to assist. Ms. Maudsley, while still whimpering and crying tries to sit up again and at 11:47:02 complains that she cannot not get up. This interchange continues until approximately 11:48 a.m., when she becomes quiet and still. Emergency Medical Services arrived at approximately 11:51 a.m., and transported Ms. Maudsley to Bayfront Medical Center.

At approximately 5:00 p.m., the physician attending to Ms. Maudsley advised that her condition was critical and her prognosis was not good due to the lack of activity in her brain. In addition Maudsley had tested positive for oxycodone, and cocaine in her system. Danielle Maudsley never regained consciousness, was diagnosed with a traumatic brain injury, remained in a constant vegetative state on life-support, and passed away on September 15, 2013.

---

<sup>2</sup> The FDLE Investigative Report of the incident reports a measurement between the approximate point on the concrete pad where Trooper Cole fired his Taser at Daniele Maudsley to the point on the pavement/asphalt where Ms. Maudsley fell and fractured her skull at 15.217 feet.

The FHP Supervisor's Use of Control Report, signed in October, 2011, by the district shift commander, district commander, and troop commander concluded that based on the totality of the circumstances, the force used exceeded the minimum amount of force needed to effectuate the apprehension of Danielle Maudsley. Within that report, the supervising investigator noted that Trooper Cole was in no apparent danger and because of his closeness to the suspect, the time necessary to warn Ms. Maudsley would not have prevented him from being able to use the ECD if she continued to flee. He further noted that the ECD cartridges issued by the agency have a maximum range of 25 feet.

On or about September 20, 2011, the FHP requested the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) investigate this incident as a Use of Force incident. On November 7, 2011, the FDLE concluded that Trooper Cole was in the legal performance of his official law enforcement duties and acted within the scope of his assignment. The investigation determined that the use of force by Trooper Cole was within the allowable parameters outlined in Chapter 776, Florida Statutes.

The Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV) Office of Inspector General's administrative investigation likewise determined that Trooper Cole acted in accordance with Florida law and FHP policy.

Florida Statutes, FHP policies and procedures, and officer/trooper training programs provide structure, parameters, and guidance for the use of force to prevent escape, including the use of electronic control devices (ECD). Although not a complete recitation of these documents, the following considerations demonstrate the complexity of the issues presented in the facts of this claim bill:

- A law enforcement officer or other person who has an arrested person in his or her custody is justified in the use of any force which he or she reasonably believes to be necessary to prevent the escape of the arrested person from custody. Section 776.07, F.S.
- Members of the FHP shall in every instance seek to employ the minimum amount of control required to successfully overcome physical resistance, prevent escapes, and effect arrests. Members' actions must be objectively reasonable in light of the facts and

circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. FHP Procedures 10.01.07 and Policy 10.05.02 specific to ECD.

- In accordance with s. 943.1717(1), F.S., a member's decision to deploy the ECD shall involve an arrest or custodial situation during which the person who is the subject of the arrest or custody escalates resistance to the member from passive physical resistance to active physical resistance, and the person (a) has the apparent ability to physically threaten the member or others; or, (b) is preparing or attempting to flee or escape. (Note: Fleeing cannot be the sole reason for deployment of the ECD.) FHP Policy Manual 10.05.04 C.
- There may be incidents in which the use of an ECD conflicts with [a list of 6 situations a member shall not use the device unless exigent circumstances exist, including use on a handcuffed prisoner]. In those cases, the use of the ECD must be based on justifiable facts and are subject to "Use of Control" supervisory review. FHP Policy Manual specific to ECD – Deployment 10.05.04 C 1.
- As in all uses of control, certain individuals may be more susceptible to injury. Members should be aware of the greater potential for injury when using an ECD against ... persons of small build regardless of age. FHP Policy Manual specific to ECD – Deployment 10.05.04 C 2.
- When reasonable, members preparing to fire the device should announce a verbal warning such as "Stop Resisting, Taser!, Taser!, Taser!" to warn the violator ... FHP Policy Manual specific to ECD – Deployment 10.05.04 C 4.

On November 2, 2012, Danielle Maudsley was determined to be incapacitated, and Julie Goddard was appointed her Guardian by the Circuit Court of the Ninth District in and for Orange County. Ms. Maudsley was residing in a nursing facility in Orange County at the time. When Ms. Maudsley died, Ms. Goddard became the Personal Representative of the Estate of Danielle Maudsley.

Litigation originated on May 23, 2013, in state court against Trooper Cole and the FHP in the Sixth Circuit of Pinellas County while Ms. Maudsley was still alive. The complaint alleged that Trooper Cole acted in a manner exhibiting wanton and willful disregard of human rights and safety, by among other ways:

- Failing to use his Taser in a proper, safe and appropriate manner;
- Deploying his Taser on a handcuffed and running Danielle Maudsley when he knew or should have known that the use of the Taser under the circumstances would likely result in severe injuries to her;
- Failing to use other available, safer means to stop Danielle Maudsley, such as reaching out with his hands and grabbing her;
- Failing to provide a verbal warning in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth by the Florida Highway Patrol; and
- Failing to follow other accepted policies and procedures set forth by the FHP.

The complaint also alleged that the FHP was negligent in its training and instruction of Trooper Cole in the proper, safe, and appropriate use of his Taser.

On July 7, 2014, after Danielle Maudsley's death, an amended complaint was filed that also alleged excessive force and Fourth Amendment constitutional violation claims. The case was removed to the United States District Court, Middle District of Florida.

On August 10, 2015, the parties settled all claims for \$1,950,000 to avoid the cost of protracted and expensive litigation. The settlement agreement refers to the allegations of negligence against the FHP and Trooper Cole that are contained in the Complaint. While maintaining no admission of liability or responsibility, the FHP and Trooper Cole acknowledge that if this case went to trial, a federal jury could reasonably award damages to the Plaintiff in the amount of \$1,950,000 based on the facts of the case.

The limit of the State's sovereign immunity in the amount of \$200,000 has been paid by the Division of Risk Management pursuant to s. 768.28, F.S. The remaining \$1,750,000 is the subject of the claim bill and will be paid from General Revenue appropriated to the DHSMV if the claim bill becomes law. The FHP and Trooper Cole have agreed not to oppose a claim bill in this amount.

In the settlement agreement, the Plaintiff agrees to voluntarily dismiss the lawsuit, with prejudice, upon court approval. The Final Judgment has not been issued by the United States

District Court for the Middle District of Florida in this matter. However, Senate Rule 4.81(6) provides that the hearing and consideration of a claim that is still within the judicial or administrative systems may proceed where the parties have executed a written settlement agreement.

A Medicaid lien of approximately \$400,521 and \$119 Pinellas County EMS outstanding medical bills exist.<sup>3</sup> The net proceeds to the estate from this claim bill for \$1,750,000, after medical liens and attorney fees is expected to be approximately \$911,860. The probate court may award estate and personal representative fees, estimated at approximately \$114,030, in accordance with Florida law from all net proceeds<sup>4</sup> to the estate.

Counsel for the Plaintiff represents it is his understanding from discussion with the attorney for the personal representative of the estate, that the proposed distribution of any claim bill will be made in accordance with Florida Statute, in that both parents will receive damages equally, [after liens, costs, and expenses have been paid]. However, Cheryl Maudsley, mother and primary caregiver of Danielle, both during her life and while she was hospitalized, will be petitioning the probate court for a greater apportionment of those damages. Danielle Maudsley's father is currently incarcerated. According to Counsel, Cheryl Maudsley also intends to establish a trust for her 8 year old daughter, Danielle's sister, with a majority of her portion of the funds.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

A common law duty of care is owed to a person in custody. Kaiser v. Kolb, 543 So. 2d 732 (Fla 1989) Accordingly, Trooper Cole had a duty to reasonably carry out his operational responsibilities of maintaining custody of Danielle Maudsley and apprehending her when she attempted to flee. Under the doctrine of respondeat superior, the FHP, a Division of the DHSMV, is vicariously liable for the negligent acts of its employees, when such acts are within the course and scope of employment. See Mallory v. O'Neil, 69 So.2d 313 (Fla.1954), and s. 768.28, F.S.

---

<sup>3</sup> If this claim bill is not enacted, a negotiated amount of \$87,000 will be paid from the \$200,000 recovery under the waiver of sovereign immunity to satisfy the Medicaid lien. According to counsel, the \$200,000 has not been disbursed yet to the estate.

<sup>4</sup> Estimated net proceeds is \$1,950,000 - \$487,500 (25% attorney and lobbying fees) - \$400,640 (Medicaid and medical bills) - \$14,636 (legal office expenses) = \$1,047,224.



Whether Trooper Cole implemented his responsibilities negligently or in accordance with statutory and departmental policy was an appropriate question for the jury. This hearing officer concludes that Trooper Cole negligently performed his duties in the firing of his Taser at the point in time that he discharged it, without first issuing a warning to allow her the opportunity to stop, without ascertaining to the best of his ability whether Ms. Maudsley was still handcuffed and to reassess the situation in that light, and without at least attempting to stop or overtake her in a manner that did not include a full body tackle. He had a 25 foot discharge range within which these actions could have been employed prior to a Taser discharge. Discharging the Taser was the proximate cause of Danielle Maudsley injuries and subsequent demise. The parties agreed to execute the settlement agreement to resolve this question as well as all allegations in the Amended Complaint. The settlement agreement is reasonable given the unfortunate outcome of this incident.

ATTORNEYS FEES:

Section 768.28(8), F.S., states that no attorney may charge, demand, receive, or collect for services rendered, fees in excess of 25 percent of any judgment or settlement. Claimant's counsel, Ralph M. Guito, III, Esq., has submitted an affidavit that the attorney fees, including lobbying fees, will not exceed 25 percent of the total amount awarded under the claim bill.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based upon the foregoing, I recommend that SB 32 be reported FAVORABLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra R. Stovall  
Senate Special Master

cc: Secretary of the Senate