

# Cooper Tire v. Mendez

## Question 1

The court did not order for fresh trials because there were no sufficient legal grounds to support such a decision. In the first place, the plaintiff has failed to provide reliable evidence in court thus the case did not have sufficient grounds to advance to the next stage. Judges act as gatekeepers and have the powers to analyze the facts of a case to determine there is need for retrial or judgment. However, the decisions of the judges depend on whether the plaintiff to the case meets the minimum requirements for a fresh trial (Meiners, Ringleb, & Edwards, 2012). It is the responsibility of the plaintiff to conduct a thorough due diligence before presenting any evidence in court. The fact that the plaintiff presented unreliable evidence in court is evidence that the plaintiff and his legal team failed to conduct comprehensive research on the case. Furthermore, the court was relying on scientific evidence to make the final judgment. Since the plaintiff failed to deliver credible evidence, there was no need for fresh trials (Jance, 2013).

## Question 2

Even though the judges believed the evidence presented for the plaintiffs, their judgment did not stand because the evidence was legally insufficient to support the judgment. It was important for the plaintiff to prove that the tire was defective when it left the Cooper Tire premises and that the defects had led to the plaintiff's injuries (Meiners, Ringleb, & Edwards, 2012). The plaintiff presented inadmissible expert testimonies because they lacked the relevant qualifications in the area of tire safety. Furthermore, the testimony was not based on a reliable foundation because the individuals offering the expert witness were not experts in tire safety. The mere fact that the tire failed did not prove that the product was defective. Instead, it may have proved that the tire failed to function properly as a result of a design defect (Giannelli & Imwinkelried, 2007).

## References

Giannelli, P. C., & Imwinkelried, E. J. (2007). *Scientific evidence*. Newark, NJ: LexisNexis.

Jance, J. A. (2013). *Judgment call: A Brady novel of suspense*. New York, NY: Harper.

Meiners, R. E., Ringleb, A. H., & Edwards, F. L. (2012). *The legal environment of business*. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.