

Strategic Litigation & Claims Analysis: Pedestrian Liability, Evidence Preservation, and Damages Optimization in California Comparative Negligence Cases

1. Executive Strategic Assessment

1.1 Situation Overview and Strategic Mandate

The client presents a complex personal injury scenario situated at the intersection of Socal Avenue and Kansas Avenue in Napa, California. The incident involves a pedestrian-vehicle collision where the client, admitting to a state of intoxication but asserting right-of-way, was struck by a vehicle. Critical variables include the refusal of immediate medical transport (ambulance denial), the possession of video evidence and a police incident card, and a significant five-day latency period before the onset of potential symptoms or the realization of injury severity.

The strategic mandate is to engineer a comprehensive roadmap for litigation and claims recovery. This requires a forensic deconstruction of the incident through the lens of California's "pure" comparative negligence framework. The primary challenge lies not in establishing the collision itself—which is corroborated by video—but in overcoming the "gap in treatment" and the "intoxication defense" that insurance carriers will leverage to devalue or deny the claim. The objective is to convert the raw evidentiary assets (video, police card) into actionable intelligence, neutralize the medical delay through forensic physiological argumentation, and optimize the damages model to align with the specific inputs of insurance valuation algorithms such as Colossus.

1.2 Risk Profile and Opportunity Matrix

The case presents a bifurcated risk profile. On one hand, the "gap in treatment" and admitted intoxication constitute high-risk "value killers" in standard insurance adjusting. On the other hand, the existence of video evidence documenting the right-of-way status offers a potent "value driver" that can override subjective credibility attacks.

The "McKinsey-style" approach demands we view this not merely as a tort claim but as a multivariate negotiation involving statutory duties, algorithmic scoring, and evidentiary chain-of-custody. The immediate imperative is to transition the client from a passive victim

with a "police card" to an active litigant with a fully documented medical and legal file. The 5-day post-accident window is the critical event horizon; actions taken immediately to document "delayed discovery" of injuries will determine the viability of the claim.

1.3 The Core Strategic Thesis

The central thesis of this analysis is that the client's intoxication is a "condition," not a "cause," and the delay in medical treatment is a "physiological consequence" of trauma, not proof of health. By rigorously applying California Vehicle Code (CVC) statutes regarding pedestrian rights and leveraging digital forensics to authenticate the video evidence, the legal strategy will isolate the driver's negligence as the sole proximate cause of the collision. Simultaneously, the damages strategy will focus on "Duties Under Duress"—a specific algorithmic input—to monetize the pain experienced during the gap period, thereby turning the delay from a liability into a documented element of suffering.

2. Legal Framework: California Comparative Negligence Analysis

2.1 The Doctrine of Pure Comparative Negligence

California operates under a "pure" comparative negligence system, a judicial doctrine firmly established in the landmark decision *Li v. Yellow Cab Co.* (1975).¹ This framework fundamentally alters the risk calculus for the plaintiff. In jurisdictions utilizing contributory negligence or modified comparative negligence, a plaintiff found to be 50% or 51% at fault is often barred from any financial recovery. California's system, conversely, permits a plaintiff to recover damages regardless of their percentage of fault, provided the defendant bears some responsibility.

The mechanics of this doctrine are precise: the total damages awarded by the trier of fact are reduced by a percentage equal to the plaintiff's own negligence.² For a pedestrian admitting to intoxication, this distinction is the cornerstone of the litigation strategy. It means that even if a jury were to find the pedestrian 40% responsible for the accident due to impaired reaction time or judgment, the pedestrian retains the right to collect 60% of the total assessed damages.

This non-binary approach to liability allows for aggressive litigation even in cases with "bad facts" like intoxication. The legal battle does not hinge on proving the pedestrian was perfect, but rather on quantifying the driver's breach of duty as the *predominant* factor. Defense counsel and insurance adjusters often rely on the "intoxication defense" to intimidate claimants into abandoning their cases. However, under California law, intoxication is not a *per se* bar to recovery. The dispositive legal inquiry focuses on conduct rather than chemistry: "Did the pedestrian's intoxication contribute to the accident, and if so, to what mathematical

degree?".³

2.2 Statutory Duties and Right-of-Way Dynamics

The client asserts possession of the "right of way." In the context of the Socal Avenue and Kansas Avenue intersection, this assertion must be rigorously tested against the California Vehicle Code (CVC).

- **CVC 21950 (Right of Way in Crosswalks):** This statute imposes a mandatory duty on drivers to yield to pedestrians crossing the roadway within any marked or unmarked crosswalk at an intersection.³ The concept of the "unmarked crosswalk" is critical here. Even if no painted lines exist, the extension of the sidewalk lines across the intersection creates a legal crosswalk where the pedestrian enjoys statutory protection.
- **CVC 21950(b) (Pedestrian Duty of Care):** This subsection provides the counter-balance, stating that no pedestrian may suddenly leave a curb or other place of safety and walk or run into the path of a vehicle that is so close as to constitute an immediate hazard.³
- **CVC 21958 (Intoxicated Pedestrian):** While often cited by defense, this code primarily restricts intoxicated pedestrians from walking on roadways where they interfere with traffic. It does not automatically negate the right-of-way protections if the pedestrian is within a crosswalk and not creating an immediate hazard.

The strategic implication is that "right of way" is a rebuttable presumption that hinges on timing and visibility. The video evidence becomes the objective arbiter of these statutory elements. If the video demonstrates that the pedestrian entered the intersection when the vehicle was at a safe distance, the CVC 21950(b) defense collapses, leaving the driver wholly liable for failing to yield under CVC 21950(a).

2.3 Modeling Fault Allocation Scenarios

To proceed strategically, we must model the potential allocation of fault based on the intersection dynamics and the admitted intoxication. This McKinsey-style risk assessment creates a matrix of probable outcomes to guide settlement negotiations.

Scenario Model	Driver Conduct (Primary Variable)	Pedestrian Conduct (Secondary Variable)	Intoxication Factor	Probable Fault Allocation	Recovery Viability
A: The Statutory Ideal	Speeding, distracted (phone), or failed to	Crossing in crosswalk (marked/unmarked),	Present but non-causal (conduct was safe).	Driver: 90-100% Pedestrian:	High: Intoxication is irrelevant to

	scan intersection .	steady pace, checked traffic.		0-10%	causation.
B: The Shared Failure	Speeding or failure to yield, but had reaction time.	Crossing legally but slowly or with slight stumble due to impairment.	Contributor y (slowed exit from danger).	Driver: 60-75% Pedestrian: 25-40%	Moderate: Damages reduced but claim remains valuable.
C: The "Dart-Out"	Driving within speed limit, normal reaction time.	Stepped out suddenly or against signal; clear impairment effect.	Causal (impaired judgment of distance).	Driver: 20-30% Pedestrian: 70-80%	Low to Moderate: Recovery limited to 20-30% of total damages.
D: The "Last Clear Chance"	Driver saw pedestrian but failed to brake/steer despite opportunity .	Pedestrian negligent (jaywalking/ intoxicated) and stuck in road.	Contributin g to perilous position.	Driver: 70-90% Pedestrian: 10-30%	High: Doctrine overrides pedestrian negligence.

Strategic Takeaway: The client's video evidence is the key to positioning the case in **Scenario A** or **Scenario D**. If the video shows the driver had ample time to see and avoid the pedestrian, the "Last Clear Chance" doctrine ¹ can effectively neutralize the intoxication argument by placing the burden of avoidance on the driver.

2.4 The "Eggshell Plaintiff" Doctrine

It is anticipated that the defense will argue the client's intoxication made them more susceptible to injury—perhaps by preventing them from bracing for impact or reacting defensively. California law adheres to the "Eggshell Plaintiff" rule (civil jury instruction CACI 3928). This doctrine holds that a tortfeasor (the at-fault driver) takes the plaintiff as they find them. The driver is liable for the full extent of the injuries caused, even if a sober or more agile

person might have evaded the collision or suffered less severe trauma.¹ This legal principle prevents the defense from discounting damages simply because the victim was vulnerable or impaired at the time of the negligent act.

3. Intelligence Gathering: Converting Evidentiary Assets

3.1 Deciphering the "Police Card" in Napa, CA

The client possesses a "police card" with an incident number but lacks the driver's identity. This is a common bureaucratic hurdle in post-accident procedures. In Napa, as in many jurisdictions, the card provided at the scene is an "Incident Information Card," distinct from the formal Traffic Collision Report.

3.1.1 Distinction Between Incident Number and Report

- **Incident Number (CAD Event):** This number tracks the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) log. It contains the raw data of the 911 call, unit dispatch times, and brief officer notes.⁵ It is generated immediately but contains limited public information.
- **Traffic Collision Report (CHP 555 / PD Report):** This is the formal investigatory document required by CVC 20008 for any accident involving injury.⁷ It contains the critical "Face Sheet" with insurance codes, policy numbers, and fault determination codes. The generation of this report can take 5 to 14 days depending on the caseload of the Napa Police Department.

3.1.2 Protocol for Extracting Driver Data

Since the client needs to initiate a claim immediately, waiting for the full report is strategically disadvantageous. The following protocol outlines the method for extracting driver data using the available incident number.

Table 1: Napa Police Department Record Retrieval Matrix

Document Type	Accessibility Status	Content Value	Request Method	Strategic Use
Face Sheet (Page 1)	Often releasable within 3-5 days.	Driver Name, Address, Insurance Carrier, Policy Number.	In-person at Records Bureau (1539 First St) or via LexisNexis portal.	Immediate opening of insurance claim; identifying limits.

CAD Dispatch Log	Public record; available via request.	Time of call, witness names (sometimes), license plates.	Public Records Act (PRA) Request or standard records request.	Locating witnesses; confirming timeline if report is delayed.
Full Collision Report	Delayed (10+ days); investigation pending.	Officer's fault conclusion, diagrams, witness statements.	Formal request via CHP 190 form or Napa PD Records request.	Used for settlement negotiation and litigation evidence.
Exchange of Info Card	Immediate (at scene).	Driver Name, Insurance (often incomplete).	Provided by officer.	Starting point; often illegible or missing policy details.

Actionable Steps:

- Immediate Face Sheet Request:** The client must visit the Napa Police Department Records Bureau at 1539 First Street. The goal is to request the "Face Sheet" or "Exchange of Information" page of the report associated with the incident number. This page is often technically separate from the investigative narrative and can be released earlier to "parties of interest" to facilitate insurance processing.⁸
- Online Portal Check:** Napa PD may utilize the "Citizens Online Police Reporting System" or third-party portals like LexisNexis for report distribution.¹⁰ The client should check these platforms using the incident number to see if a preliminary report has been uploaded.

3.2 The DMV SR-1 / SR-19C "Backdoor" Maneuver

If the police department is unresponsive or the report is delayed due to "ongoing investigation" status (common in DUI-related or injury incidents), the client must leverage the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) data request protocols.

3.2.1 Mandatory SR-1 Filing

California CVC 16000 mandates that every driver and involved party in an accident resulting in any injury (no matter how minor) or property damage exceeding \$1,000 must file a Report of Traffic Accident (Form SR-1) with the DMV within 10 days.¹¹

- Strategic Imperative:** The client must file this form immediately. The "injury" threshold is

met by the fact that the client was struck, even if they "felt fine" initially. Filing this form creates an official state record of the accident independent of the police report.

3.2.2 The SR-19C Discovery Tool

Once the SR-1 is on file, the client creates legal standing to request information about the other party. The client should subsequently file **Form SR-19C (Financial Responsibility Information Request)**.¹³

- **Mechanism:** This form compels the DMV to release the insurance information and driver details of the other party involved in the accident.
- **Strategic Value:** This is a powerful "backdoor" to obtain the driver's insurance policy number if they refused to provide it at the scene or if the police report is locked. It bypasses the local police bureaucracy entirely.

4. Evidence Preservation: Digital Forensics of Video

4.1 The "Golden Ticket" Vulnerability

The smartphone video mentioned by the client is potentially the most valuable asset in the case, serving as the objective rebuttal to the "intoxicated pedestrian" narrative. However, digital evidence is fragile. A common error is for claimants to simply "text" the video to themselves or their attorney, which compresses the file and often strips critical metadata.¹⁵ In a litigation context, the admissibility of this video hinges on proving it has not been altered and confirming the exact time and location of its creation.

4.2 Metadata and Chain of Custody Protocol

To ensure the video withstands judicial scrutiny and authenticates the "right of way" claim, a strict preservation protocol must be followed.

Table 2: Digital Evidence Preservation Checklist

Step	Action Required	Technical Method	Legal/Strategic Purpose
1. Export Original	Transfer the raw file from the recording device to secure storage.	Use USB cable or AirDrop (Apple). Do not email or SMS (compression destroys metadata).	Preserves EXIF data (GPS, Time, Date) essential for timeline reconstruction.

2. Hash Generation	Create a digital fingerprint of the file immediately upon export.	Run shasum -a 256 [filename] (Mac/Linux) or certutil -hashfile [filename] SHA256 (Windows). ¹⁶	Proves in court that the file has not been altered since the date of hashing (Data Integrity).
3. Metadata Report	Extract and save a report of the file's internal metadata.	Use tools like ExifTool or specialized forensic software. ¹⁸	Validates the exact second of recording, proving lighting conditions and sequence.
4. Cloud Backup	Create a redundant copy in a secure, non-synced location.	Upload to Google Drive/Dropbox/iCloud Drive (distinct from Photos stream).	Protects against device loss or accidental deletion.
5. Chain of Custody	Document the life of the file.	Log who recorded it, who transferred it, and where it is stored. ¹⁹	Prevents defense challenges regarding file manipulation or provenance.

4.3 Scene Reconstruction and Environmental Analysis

The client must return to the intersection of Socal Ave and Kansas Ave to document the physical environment. Google Street View is insufficient as it may be outdated. The reconstruction should focus on:

- **Sightlines:** Documenting what the driver could see from 100, 200, and 300 feet away.
- **Lighting:** If the accident was at night, are the streetlights functional? (Napa Public Works records can confirm maintenance schedules).
- **Signage:** Are there "Yield to Pedestrian" signs or crosswalk markings that are faded?
- **Video Synchronization:** Attempt to match the video perspective with physical landmarks to calculate vehicle speed (Speed = Distance / Time). If the video shows the car passing two light poles in 1 second, and the poles are 50 feet apart (measured physically), the speed can be calculated scientifically.

5. Medical Forensics: Managing the "Gap in

Treatment"

5.1 The "Gap" as a Defense Weapon

The client's statement "feel fine 5 days later" and the refusal of an ambulance create a significant "Gap in Treatment." In the insurance industry, specifically with software like Colossus, a gap greater than 72 hours triggers a "severity point deduction." The algorithm interprets this gap as an indicator that:

1. No injury occurred at the accident scene.
2. Any subsequent injury is unrelated (intervening cause).
3. The claimant is fabricating symptoms for financial gain.²⁰

5.2 The Physiological Defense: Adrenaline and Latency

To defeat the "gap" defense, the strategy must pivot from "I felt fine" to "My injuries were masked." This requires a forensic medical explanation of the body's response to trauma.

- **Adrenaline Masking:** The "fight or flight" response releases adrenaline and endorphins, which are potent analgesics capable of masking severe pain, including fractures and soft tissue tears, for 24 to 72 hours.²³ The client's intoxication may have further dulled pain perception, acting as an additional chemical mask.
- **The Inflammatory Cascade:** Soft tissue injuries (whiplash, connective tissue damage) are not immediately painful. They rely on the inflammatory cascade—the release of cytokines and prostaglandins—to generate pain signals. This biological process takes time to peak. It is medically consistent for a patient to feel asymptomatic on Day 1 and debilitated on Day 5.²⁴

5.3 Immediate Medical Activation Protocol

The "wait and see" period must end immediately. The client is at a critical cliff; waiting beyond 5-7 days shifts the claim from "difficult" to "presumptively invalid."

5.3.1 Step 1: Urgent Care / Physician Evaluation

The client must seek evaluation by an M.D. or D.O. immediately. Chiropractic care as a *first* contact after a gap is often viewed with skepticism by insurers.

- **The Narrative:** The client must explicitly articulate the latency to the provider: "I was struck by a vehicle 5 days ago. I experienced immediate shock and adrenaline. As the shock has subsided, I have developed progressive stiffness/pain in [body parts]."
- **Documentation:** Ensure the physician documents "Patient reports delayed onset of pain following MVA." This establishes the causal link in the medical record.²¹

5.3.2 Step 2: Neurological Screening for TBI

The client's "feeling fine" may be a symptom of "anosognosia" (lack of insight) associated with

Mild Traumatic Brain Injury (mTBI). The impact of a vehicle often causes a "coup-contrecoup" injury to the brain.

- **Symptoms to Screen:** Sleep disturbance, irritability, light sensitivity, "brain fog," or nausea.²⁶
- **Testing:** Request a neurological screen (pupil response, balance, cognitive check). A normal Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) of 15 does not rule out mTBI. Specific scanning (like DTI-MRI) may be needed if symptoms persist, but an initial clinical diagnosis of "Post-concussion syndrome" (ICD-10 F07.81) is a critical value driver.²⁷

5.3.3 Step 3: Retrospective Pain Journaling

To fill the evidentiary void of the past 5 days, the client must construct a "Retrospective Pain Journal".²⁹

- **Method:** Document the days *between* the accident and the doctor visit.
 - Day 1: "Adrenaline high, felt shaken but no pain."
 - Day 2: "Woke up with stiff neck, assumed it was from sleeping wrong."
 - Day 3: "Took ibuprofen for headache, noticed bruising on thigh."
 - Day 4: "Difficulty turning head while driving."
- **Strategic Value:** This document transforms the "gap" from a period of "health" into a period of "emerging pathology," providing the insurance adjuster with a timeline that explains the delay as stoicism or confusion rather than lack of injury.

6. Algorithmic Claims Engineering: The McKinsey "Value Driver" Approach

6.1 Understanding Insurance Algorithms (Colossus)

Major insurance carriers (State Farm, Allstate, Farmers) utilize software programs like Colossus or Liability Navigator to determine settlement offers. These programs are input-driven algorithms that calculate "general damages" (pain and suffering) based on specific data points extracted from medical records and demand letters.³¹ The strategy is not to argue with the adjuster but to feed the algorithm the precise data it requires to generate a higher value range.

6.2 Value Driver 1: "Duties Under Duress"

Colossus distinguishes between "Disability" (inability to perform a task) and "Duties Under Duress" (performance of a task accompanied by pain). "Duties Under Duress" is a significant value driver often overlooked by claimants.³³

- **Strategic Action:** The client must compile a list of Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) performed *with pain* during the gap period and ongoing.
- **The Checklist:**

- *Work*: "Performed data entry while experiencing 6/10 cervical pain."
- *Domestic*: "Prepared meals for family despite inability to stand for >10 minutes."
- *Personal*: "Dressed self with difficulty due to shoulder restriction."
- **Execution:** This list must be provided to the treating physician so it appears in the *medical chart notes*. If it is not in the doctor's records, the algorithm treats it as non-existent.³⁵

6.3 Value Driver 2: Loss of Enjoyment of Life

This factor serves as a multiplier for permanent or semi-permanent lifestyle impairment.³⁶

- **Strategic Action:** Identify specific hobbies, sports, or routines disrupted by the injury. "Unable to jog," "Cannot lift grandchildren," "Stopped playing guitar due to hand numbness."
- **Nuance:** Even temporary loss of enjoyment adds value if documented correctly.

6.4 Value Driver 3: Dominant Limb Involvement

Injuries to the dominant hand, arm, or leg receive higher severity scores in Colossus.³⁷

- **Strategic Action:** Ensure the medical report explicitly states "Patient is right-hand dominant and presents with right shoulder/wrist injury." This simple data point can trigger a specific multiplier in the software.

7. Procedural Roadmap & Litigation Economics

7.1 The Settlement Demand Strategy

Once the investigative and medical phases are initiated, the client prepares for the pre-litigation demand.

- **Timing:** Do not send a demand until the full extent of injuries is known (Maximum Medical Improvement). However, the notice of claim should be sent immediately to the driver's insurance once identified.
- **The Demand Letter Architecture:**
 - Liability Statement:** Assert 100% right-of-way based on CVC 21950 and video evidence. Reject comparative negligence.
 - Medical Narrative:** Frame the "gap" as "delayed onset due to traumatic shock." Reference specific ICD-10 codes.
 - Algorithmic Inputs:** Explicitly list "Duties Under Duress" and "Loss of Enjoyment" factors to force the adjuster to input them into Colossus.
 - Monetary Demand:** A calculated figure (e.g., Medical Bills x 3-5 multiplier) grounded in the severity of the inputs.

7.2 Small Claims vs. Limited Civil Jurisdiction

Given the initial "minor" nature of the injury, the case economics may favor Small Claims Court.

- **Small Claims Limit (2024/2025):** In California, an individual can sue for up to **\$12,500.**³⁸
 - Pros: Low cost, speed (2-3 months), no attorneys allowed (leveling the playing field against insurance defense), and judges often favor tangible evidence (video) over technical legal arguments.
 - Cons: Limited discovery (harder to subpoena driver's phone records).
- **Limited Civil (\$25,000 Limit):** If medical bills exceed \$5,000 or injuries are persistent, this venue allows for attorney representation and full discovery but carries higher costs and longer timelines.

Strategic Recommendation: If the total medical bills and estimated pain/suffering fall under \$12,500, Small Claims is the most efficient vehicle. The video evidence acts as a "force multiplier" in this setting, allowing the client to visually demonstrate the driver's negligence to a judge who is empowered to apply equitable principles.

7.3 Statute of Limitations and Deadlines

The client must adhere to strict procedural deadlines to preserve the claim.³⁹

Table 3: Critical Deadlines in California Personal Injury

Deadline Type	Timeframe	Trigger Event	Strategic Implication
DMV SR-1 Filing	10 Days	Date of Accident	Mandatory to avoid license issues and enable SR-19C discovery.
Medical Evaluation	Immediate	ASAP (Gap Closure)	Critical for credibility; bridging the "gap" defense.
Govt. Tort Claim	6 Months	Date of Accident	CRITICAL: If the driver was a public employee (e.g., city worker, bus driver), a claim must be filed with the agency within 6

			months.
Statute of Limitations (PI)	2 Years	Date of Accident	Deadline to file a lawsuit for bodily injury (CCP 335.1).
Statute of Limitations (PD)	3 Years	Date of Accident	Deadline to file for property damage (phone, clothes).

8. Conclusion and Tactical Checklist

The client stands at a strategic crossroads. The admission of intoxication and the 5-day treatment gap constitute significant, but surmountable, liabilities. The possession of video evidence documenting the right-of-way is the "fulcrum" upon which the case can pivot from a denial to a recovery. By shifting the narrative from "drunk pedestrian" to "negligent driver failing to yield," and by forensically documenting the medical latency to explain the treatment gap, the client can build a viable claim.

Immediate Tactical Checklist:

1. **Medical:** Proceed to Urgent Care/MD immediately. Report "delayed onset pain" and ensure it is charted.
2. **Evidence:** Hash and archive the original video file. Execute the Chain of Custody log.
3. **Intelligence:** Visit Napa PD for the Face Sheet. File DMV Form SR-1.
4. **Documentation:** Construct the "Retrospective Pain Journal" and "Duties Under Duress" list.
5. **Assessment:** Monitor injury progression for 30 days. If soft tissue only, target a Small Claims (\$12,500) strategy. If MRI reveals structural damage, retain counsel for Limited Civil litigation.

This comprehensive approach leverages the specific mechanics of California law and insurance claim valuation to optimize the client's position despite the initial adverse facts.

Works cited

1. California Pedestrian Accidents: Driver Negligence Versus Pedestrian Comparative Negligence | Maison Law - JDSupra, accessed December 9, 2025, <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/california-pedestrian-accidents-driver-5417522/>
2. Los Angeles Pedestrian Accident Lawyers - Dordick Law, accessed December 9, 2025,

- <https://www.dordicklaw.com/los-angeles-personal-injury/pedestrian-accidents/>
- 3. A Car Hits a Pedestrian — Who Is at Fault Under California's Pedestrian Accident Law?, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://losangelespersonalinjury.attorney/blog/determining-fault-in-pedestrian-accidents>
 - 4. Pedestrian Accidents | Los Angeles Car Injury Lawyers Sharifi Firm, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.attor neypersonalinjurylaw.com/practice-areas/personal-injury/pedestrian-accidents/>
 - 5. CAD FAQ | Craig Police Department - CRIMEWATCH, accessed December 9, 2025, <https://crimewatch.net/us/co/moffat/craig-pd/160618/content/cad-faq>
 - 6. How CAD Systems Aid Law Enforcement Case Management in 2024, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://10-8systems.com/how-law-enforcement-cad-systems-help-with-case-management-in-2022/>
 - 7. Do I Need a Police Report After a Car Accident in California?, accessed December 9, 2025, <https://cyclistlaw.com/police-report-after-a-car-accident-in-california/>
 - 8. How To Get Ahold Of Another Driver's Insurance Information - CaseyGerry Trial Lawyers, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://caseygerry.com/blog/how-to-get-ahold-of-another-drivers-insurance-information/>
 - 9. Records and Property Bureau | Napa, CA, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.cityofnapa.org/706/Records-and-Property-Divisions>
 - 10. Filing an Online Report | Napa, CA, accessed December 9, 2025,
<http://www.cityofnapa.org/497/Filing-an-Online-Report>
 - 11. California Accident Reporting Rules: When, How & Penalties - Visionary Law Group Experts, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://visionarylawgroup.com/do-you-have-to-report-accident-california/>
 - 12. When And Why You Should Report A Car Accident To The DMV in Santa Ana, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.hn-lawyers.com/blog/when-and-why-you-should-report-a-car-accident-to-the-dmv-in-santa-ana/>
 - 13. How to Get Someones Insurance Info After an Accident: Essential Steps - 1800thelaw2, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.1800thelaw2.com/resources/vehicle-accident/how-to-get-someones-insurance-info/>
 - 14. How to Obtain Another Driver's Insurance Information in California | Leslie Law Firm Blog, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://leslieinjurylaw.com/blog/if-another-driver-hit-you-heres-how-to-get-their-insurance-information/>
 - 15. 3.10 Preserving Video Recordings as Digital Evidence - Tech Safety Canada, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://techsafety.ca/resources/toolkits/preserving-video-recordings-as-digital-evidence>
 - 16. How to Get Hash of a File for SHA256 and/or MD5 - Broadcom support portal,

- accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://knowledge.broadcom.com/external/article/286808/how-to-get-hash-of-a-file-for-sha256-and.html>
17. Generating an SHA-256 Hash From the Command Line | Baeldung on Linux, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.baeldung.com/linux/sha-256-from-command-line>
18. Cell Phone Metadata Evidence, Mobile Forensics, Remote Collection - Howe Law Firm, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.howelawfirm.com/e-discovery-and-forensics/mobile-phone-evidence/phone-metadata/>
19. Best Practices for Maintaining Chain of Custody for Digital Evidence - VIDIZMO, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://vidizmo.ai/blog/chain-of-custody-for-digital-evidence>
20. Gaps in Treatment in California Personal Injury Cases - Maison Law, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://maisonlaw.com/personal-injury/california-personal-injury-faq/gaps-in-treatment-in-california-personal-injury-cases/>
21. Why You Should Avoid Taking Gaps in Treatment - Van Law Firm Injury & Accident Attorneys, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://vanlawfirm.com/blog/why-you-should-avoid-taking-gaps-in-treatment/>
22. How the Colossus Computer Program Estimates Accident Settlement Values - Nolo, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/how-the-colossus-computer-program-estimates-accident-settlement-values.html>
23. Delayed Injury Symptoms You Can't Ignore After An Accident - Georgia Spine & Orthopaedics, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.gaspineortho.com/delayed-injury-symptoms-car-accident/>
24. Why Pain Sustained During Auto Accidents is Often Delayed - Memorial Springs ER, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.memorialspringser.com/post/why-pain-sustained-during-auto-accidents-is-often-delayed>
25. When Is It Too Late to Go to the Doctor After a Car Accident in California?, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.wccbc.com/when-is-it-too-late-to-go-to-the-doctor-after-a-car-accident-california/>
26. Common Delayed Symptoms After a Car Accident (and Why They Matter Legally), accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://twdinjurylaw.com/blog/common-delayed-symptoms-after-a-car-accident/>
27. Traumatic brain injury - Diagnosis & treatment - Mayo Clinic, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/traumatic-brain-injury/diagnosis-treatment/drc-20378561>
28. TBI (Traumatic Brain Injury): What It Is, Symptoms & Treatment - Cleveland Clinic, accessed December 9, 2025,

<https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/diseases/8874-traumatic-brain-injury>

29. How to Create a Personal Injury Pain Journal After an Accident | Brandon J Broderick, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.brandonjbroderick.com/how-to-create-a-personal-injury-pain-journal-after-an-accident>
30. How a Daily Pain Journal Can Strengthen Your Personal Injury Claim in Union City, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.karnsandkarns.com/how-a-daily-pain-journal-can-strengthen-your-personal-injury-claim-in-union-city/>
31. Colossus and Xactimate: How Computer Algorithms Determine Your Injury Settlement Offer, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://866attylaw.com/colossus-xactimate-how-computer-algorithms-determine-your-injury-settlement-offer/>
32. Colossus Personal Injury Settlement Calculator - How It Works - Miller & Zois, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.millerandzois.com/car-accidents/insurance-claims-settlements/colossus/>
33. How Colossus Values an Injury's Impact on Daily Life - AutoAccident.com, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://autoaccident.com/how-colossus-values-an-injury-s-impact-on-daily-life/>
34. Colossus Claims Adjusting Software - Houston Personal Injury Lawyers, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.simmonsandfletcher.com/car-accident-lawyer/auto-insurance-claims/colossus/>
35. How Do Duties Under Duress Impact Settlement Value ..., accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://settlementintelligence.com/blogs/news/what-are-duties-under-duress>
36. Colossus Insurance Software: Guide for Kentucky Drivers - The Schafer Law Office, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://mikeschaferlaw.com/blog/colossus-the-myth-explained/>
37. Colossus and Medical Management: Part 2 - Shaw Chiropractic Group, accessed December 9, 2025,
<http://shawchiropractic.legalsolutions.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/WEB%20-108%20-%20Colossus%20and%20medical%20Management%20Part%202.pdf>
38. Before you start a small claims case | California Courts | Self Help Guide, accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/small-claims/before-you-start>
39. Deadlines to sue someone | California Courts | Self Help Guide, accessed December 9, 2025, <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/civil-lawsuit/statute-limitations>
40. California Personal Injury Statute of Limitations [2025 Updated], accessed December 9, 2025,
<https://www.barrandmudford.com/news/california-personal-injury-statute-of-limitations/>