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## Quantifying All Possible Outcomes Drives Settlement

I identified that the numerical fact pattern in this case allowed quantification of all of the possible outcomes. This helped counsel drive this case to a favourable settlement.

The dispute involved the amount due at the end of a contract. Both the Plaintiff and the Defendant claimed that they were owed money. The Plaintiff claimed it was owed $\$ 1.24$ million. I prepared a report for the Defendant showing that it was owed $\$ 1.19$ million; a spread of $\$ 2.43$ million.

Working through the numbers, I showed Defendant's counsel that:

1. there were five key issues that drove the amounts claimed;
2. each issue had two possible outcomes: the Plaintiff's and the Defendant's;
3. therefore, mathematically there were 32 possible outcomes.

I then prepared a second report for the Defendant quantifying all 32 possible outcomes. Some issues affected other calculations, so it wasn't as simple as Issue $1=\$ x$, and Issue $2=\$ y$. This report showed that in two-thirds of the outcomes, the Defendant was owed money by the Plaintiff.

Counsel used this information to convince the Plaintiff to settle on terms very favourable to the Defendant.

The table on the back of this page shows the results of the quantification.

To get my help with your case involving damages, please contact me.

Quantification of the 32 Combinations
In Order of Amount Claimed
Showing Who Wins Each Issue

| \# | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{0} \\ & \stackrel{N}{م} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\bar{n}} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{0} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\Pi} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{0} \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \end{aligned}$ | Amount Claimed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Def | Def | Def | Pla | Def | \$1,466,000 | * |
| 2 | Def | Def | Pla | Pla | Def | 1,383,000 | Amount Claimea |
| 3 | Def | Def | Def | Def | Def | 1,197,000 | Amount Claimed by |
| 4 | Def | Def | Def | Def | Pla | 1,197,000 | the Defendant |
| 5 | Def | Def | Def | Pla | Pla | 1,197,000 |  |
| 6 | Def | Def | Pla | Def | Def | 1,128,000 |  |
| 7 | Def | Def | Pla | Def | Pla | 1,128,000 |  |
| 8 | Def | Def | Pla | Pla | Pla | 1,114,000 |  |
| 9 | Pla | Def | Def | Def | Def | 600,000 |  |
| 10 | Pla | Def | Def | Def | Pla | 600,000 |  |
| 11 | Def | Pla | Def | Def | Def | 548,000 |  |
| 12 | Def | Pla | Def | Def | Pla | 548,000 |  |
| 13 | Pla | Def | Pla | Def | Def | 531,000 |  |
| 14 | Pla | Def | Pla | Def | Pla | 531,000 |  |
| 15 | Def | Pla | Pla | Def | Def | 387,000 |  |
| 16 | Def | Pla | Pla | Def | Pla | 387,000 |  |
| 17 | Pla | Def | Def | Pla | Def | 345,000 |  |
| 18 | Def | Pla | Def | Pla | Def | 337,000 |  |
| 19 | Pla | Def | Pla | Pla | Def | 262,000 |  |
| 20 | Def | Pla | Pla | Pla | Def | 145,000 |  |
| 21 | Pla | Def | Def | Pla | Pla | 77,000 |  |
| 22 | Def | Pla | Def | Pla | Pla | 68,000 |  |
| 23 | Pla | Def | Pla | Pla | Pla | -7,000 |  |
| 24 | Pla | Pla | Def | Def | Def | -50,000 |  |
| 25 | Pla | Pla | Def | Def | Pla | -50,000 |  |
| 26 | Def | Pla | Pla | Pla | Pla | -124,000 |  |
| 27 | Pla | Pla | Pla | Def | Def | -210,000 |  |
| 28 | Pla | Pla | Pla | Def | Pla | -210,000 |  |
| 29 | Pla | Pla | Def | Pla | Def | -784,000 |  |
| 30 | Pla | Pla | Pla | Pla | Def | -976,000 |  |
| 31 | Pla | Pla | Def | Pla | Pla | -1,053,000 |  |
| 32 | Pla | Pla | Pla | Pla | Pla | -1,245,000 | Amount Claimed by |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | the Plaintiff |

[^0]
[^0]:    * Interestingly, there are 2 combinations where the Defendant is owed more than it claimed

