

## LEGAL ISSUES

**I. The Trial Court erred in not applying the statute of frauds to the instant case. The Trial Court had several opportunities to do so and therefore the jury was not properly instructed and legal issues were left to their determination.**

PAM Oil<sup>1</sup> filed a Motion for Summary Judgment based on the statute of frauds. The Trial Court denied that motion. PAM Oil filed a Motion for a Directed Verdict at the close of Gallagher's evidence at trial. That Motion was denied by the Trial Court. PAM Oil requested jury instructions based on the statute of frauds. The Trial Court refused to give those instructions.

**II. The Trial Court erred in not granting PAM Oil's Motion for Summary Judgment and not finding that Gallagher was an employee at-will.**

PAM Oil filed a Motion for Summary Judgment based on the Gallagher's status as an employee at-will. The Trial Court denied that Motion.

**III. The Trial Court erred in denying PAM Oil's Motions in Limine and allowing the introduction of irrelevant and prejudicial evidence before the jury.**

PAM Oil filed Motions in Limine regarding the presentation of evidence that was irrelevant and prejudicial. The Trial Court held those issues in abeyance until they were presented at trial. PAM Oil objected to the introduction of that evidence and was overruled. As a result, the jury was allowed to hear irrelevant and prejudicial evidence.

**IV. The Trial Court erred in not giving PAM Oil's requested jury instruction on an individual's consent to the terms of a contract they have signed.**

PAM Oil offered a jury instruction which provided that an individual consents to the terms of a contract they have signed. The Trial Court refused to give that instruction.

**V. The Trial Court erred in not giving PAM Oil's requested jury instruction on the meeting of the minds.**

PAM Oil requested a jury instruction that clarified the contractual requirement of the meeting of the minds. The Trial Court refused to give that instruction.

**VI. The Trial Court erred in not giving PAM Oil's requested jury instructions on alleged oral agreements and promissory estoppel and in not granting PAM Oil's Motion for Summary Judgment on the same issues.**

PAM Oil filed a Motion for Summary Judgment regarding oral agreements and promissory estoppel. The Trial Court denied that Motion. PAM Oil requested jury instructions on oral agreements and promissory estoppel. The Trial Court refused to give those instructions.

**VII. The Trial Court erred by not giving PAM Oil's requested instruction on the substitution of a new employer.**

PAM Oil requested a jury instruction regarding the substitution of a new employer and the employee's consent to working for that new employer. The Trial Court refused to give that instruction.

**VIII. The Trial Court erred in not deducting the unemployment compensation Gallagher received from the jury's award.**

PAM Oil filed a post-trial Motion to reduce the jury's award based on unemployment compensation payments Gallagher received. The Trial Court denied that Motion.