

# Appendix: Resources for Researching Tort Damages and Valuation

*Last Updated: June 2026*

## **Overview**

This appendix collects commonly used resources for researching tort damages, jury verdicts, settlements, economic benchmarks, and valuation reference points relevant to Federal Tort Claims Act matters. The list is designed to be practical rather than exhaustive and is intended to help practitioners quickly locate jurisdiction-specific and injury-specific comparables when estimating damages for SF-95 presentment or litigation.

## **1. Commercial verdict and settlement research tools**

[LexisNexis Verdict and Settlement Analyzer](#). A subscription-based tool that aggregates jury verdicts and settlements with filters for jurisdiction, injury type, damages category, and defendant type. Often available through larger Lexis subscriptions or institutional access.

[Westlaw Verdicts and Settlements](#). A comprehensive verdict and settlement database accessible through Westlaw, allowing searches by venue, practice area, injury, and damages outcomes. Particularly useful when paired with KeyCite and docket research.

[VerdictSearch \(ALM\)](#). A national database of verdicts and settlements organized by injury type, location, and award size. Commonly used by plaintiffs' firms for benchmarking non-economic damages.

## **2. State and regional verdict reporters**

Many states or regions have dedicated verdict-reporting services that provide more granular local data than national databases.

Examples include:

- [California: Jury Verdict Alert \(JVA\)](#), which publishes detailed summaries of verdicts and settlements by county and injury type.
- Illinois, [Jury Verdict Reporter / Law Bulletin Media](#), Illinois-focused verdict-and-settlement reporter used by Illinois trial attorneys and judges.
- [The Louisiana Jury Verdict Reporter](#), Louisiana-specific jury-verdict reporter and subscription publication covering civil jury verdicts statewide.
- Minnesota, [Twin City Jury Verdict Reporter](#), Minnesota-specific personal-injury verdict resource covering detailed verdict information in major Minnesota counties, including Hennepin.
- [Minnesota State Law Library — Jury Awards Guide](#), Public research guide explaining how to locate Minnesota jury-award and verdict materials through private publications and law-library catalog searches.
- [New Jersey Jury Verdict Review and Analysis](#), New Jersey-specific verdict reporter/publication available through Rutgers’ legal research portal.
- [New York: Jury Verdict Review and Analysis \(JVRA\)](#), a long-standing reporter covering verdicts and settlements throughout New York.
- [Oregon Litigation & Arbitration Reports / Jury Verdicts Northwest](#), Oregon-specific monthly publication reporting verdicts, settlements, and arbitrations in personal-injury cases from Oregon Circuit Courts.

Other regions: Many states have bar-affiliated or commercial reporters (often titled “Jury Verdict Reporter,” “Trial Reporter,” or similar). Local law libraries are often the fastest way to identify what services exist in a given jurisdiction.

### **3. Public law library and court system guides**

County and state public law libraries frequently publish research guides on locating jury verdicts and settlements. These guides often identify both free and paid resources and may include local reporter titles, historical print volumes, and online databases available on-site.

State court system websites and judicial branch libraries may also maintain research pages pointing to verdict and settlement resources, particularly for civil practice.

#### **4. Federal docket and opinion research**

CourtListener and the RECAP Archive (Free Law Project). These tools provide free access to many federal dockets and filings, including complaints, motions, orders, and sometimes settlement-related documents. While verdict amounts are not always public, dockets can reveal judgment amounts, settlement approvals, and case posture that inform valuation.

Published judicial opinions. In bench-tryed FTCA cases, written opinions may discuss damages findings in detail. Searching district court opinions by tort type and agency defendant can yield useful qualitative benchmarks, even when precise comparables are limited.

#### **5. Economic benchmarks and reference data**

Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics program provides wage data by occupation, industry, and geographic area, useful for estimating lost wages or reduced earning capacity.

Medical cost benchmarks. Publicly available fee schedules and cost references can assist with estimating medical damages when full billing is unavailable. Practitioners commonly consult Medicare Physician Fee Schedule methodologies, hospital charge data, and state health cost transparency tools as estimation references.

Life expectancy and work-life tables. Actuarial tables and work-life expectancy studies are often used by economists to project future losses. While experts are typically retained later, early familiarity with these tables can inform rough estimates at the SF-95 stage.

#### **6. Using comparables responsibly in FTCA cases**

FTCA-specific considerations. Comparables drawn from state court or Section 1983 litigation may include punitive damages, jury-driven awards, or attorney-fee dynamics that are not available under the FTCA. When using these comparables, practitioners should adjust expectations to reflect the FTCA's compensatory-only framework and bench-trial posture. 28 U.S.C. §§ 2674, 2402.

Time and inflation adjustments. Older verdicts should be adjusted for inflation and contextualized within current damages norms. Many verdict research tools provide inflation-adjusted figures; where they do not, standard CPI adjustments can be applied.

Matching facts matters more than matching numbers. The most persuasive use of verdict data focuses on similarity of injury, duration, functional impact, and venue, rather than headline award size alone.

## **7. Practical workflow for damages research**

**Step 1:** Identify the governing state law for damages and any caps or special rules that may apply.

**Step 2:** Search for recent verdicts and settlements (ideally within the last five years) involving similar injuries and fact patterns in the same or comparable venues.

**Step 3:** Note both the range and the median of outcomes, along with qualitative factors (credibility issues, video evidence, severity of harm).

**Step 4:** Cross-check economic assumptions (wages, medical costs) against public benchmarks.

**Step 5:** Document sources and assumptions so that the SF-95 “sum certain” can be explained and defended as a good-faith estimate.

\* \* \*

*\*\*\*This toolkit contains informational and educational content only. It does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon as a substitute for legal advice for a specific organization or about a particular set of facts. Receipt of this information does not create an attorney-client relationship. Links to external websites are provided for informational purposes only. Democracy Forward Foundation does not endorse, control, or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of information on linked sites, and accepts no responsibility for their content.\*\*\**