

No. 01-1289

---

---

IN THE  
Supreme Court of the United  
States

---

STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE  
INSURANCE COMPANY,

*Petitioner,*

*v.*

CURTIS B. CAMPBELL AND  
INEZ PREECE CAMPBELL,

*Respondents.*

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UTAH SUPREME COURT

---

---

**BRIEF OF KEITH N. HYLTON AS AMICUS  
CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

---

---

WILLIAM F. MERLIN, JR.  
LEE D. GUNN IV  
GUNN MERLIN, P.A.  
601 Bayshore Blvd.  
Suite 800  
Tampa, FL 33606  
(813) 229-1000

GARRY B. BRYANT  
*Counsel of Record*  
LAW OFFICES OF  
GARRY B. BRYANT, P.C.  
3507 N. Campbell Ave.  
Suite 111  
Tucson, AZ 85719  
(520) 322-9000

— *Additional counsel listed on the inside cover* —

---

---

— *additional counsel* —

DOUGLAS L. GROSE  
DOUGLAS L. GROSE, P.A.  
2102 W. Cleveland St.  
Tampa, FL 33606  
(813) 251-3380

JOHN GABROY  
GABROY ROLLMAN  
AND BOSSÉ, P.C.  
3507 N. Campbell Ave.  
Suite 111  
Tucson, AZ 85719  
(520) 320-1300

DALE MCGARVEY  
MCGARVEY, HEBERLING,  
SULLIVAN & MCGARVEY, P.C.  
745 South Main St.  
Kalispell, MT 59904-5399  
(406) 752-5566

### **QUESTION PRESENTED**

*Amicus curiae* will address the following question:

Whether the Utah Supreme Court misapplied deterrence theory in its approach to reviewing the \$145 million punitive damage award in this case.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTION PRESENTED ..... i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iv

INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE* ..... 1

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT ... 2

ARGUMENT ..... 4

I. DETERRENCE THEORY PROVIDES  
USEFUL GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWING  
PUNITIVE DAMAGE AWARDS ..... 5

    A. The Theory of Penalties Provides  
    the Foundation for Deterrence  
    Theory ..... 5

    B. The Theory of Penalties Implies  
    that Punitive Damage Awards  
    Should Aim to Make the Injurer  
    Pay the Full Costs of the Harm It  
    Imposes in Some Cases, and in  
    Other Cases the Punitive Damage  
    Award Should Aim to Make the In-  
    jurer Disgorge Any Gains It Re-  
    ceives as a Result of Its Harmful  
    Conduct ..... 12

    C. In Cases in Which Punitive Dam-  
    age Awards Should be Designed to  
    Strip the Injurer of Its Gains, the  
    Primary Concern Should be to  
    Avoid Setting an Award that is  
    Less Than the Minimum Necess-  
    sary to Disgorge Those Gains ..... 18











































































