

Plaintiff's View

Claim—Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

Text: "Defendant Dr. Joe Smith D.D.S. is ...
Prayer: "Plaintiff respectfully asks the court...
Prayer-Amount: \$100,000

Private

Element-Authority: Prosser

Element1: Defendant Act,

Extreme/Outrageous

Evidence Supporting: letter 3/12/93

Evidence Supporting: p testimony

Evidence Supporting: p wife testimony

Authority: Figueiredo-Torres v. Nickel

Element2: Intent

Public View

Claim—Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

Text: "Defendant Dr. Joe Smith D.D.S.committed the tort of intentional infliction of emotion distress by initiating an affair with plaintiff's wife while plaintiff was a patient."

Prayer: "Plaintiff respectfully asks the Court for \$100,000 in compensatory damages plus reasonable attorney's fees and costs and whatever additional damages the Court deems appropriate."

Prayer-Amount: \$100,000

Authority: NIL

Responses: Denied by D

Figure 2: The plaintiff's view of his breach of his intentional infliction of emotional distress claim is very different from the public's at this early stage in litigation. American civil procedure requires a plaintiff only to state a claim by name and hence that is all that shows up in the public view: "intentional infliction of emotional distress." Note that in the Plaintiff's private view, his attorney has sketched in some notes about what the elements of this claim are according to a legal authority and what pieces of evidence exist to support those elements.

KTa's distributed object database keeps private information on the plaintiff's private machine until it becomes public on the plaintiff's initiative. Thus, the letter of 3/12/93 that supports the element of an outrageous defendant act, is available as a hypertext link (note the underlining) but will be supplied from the local disk. The Figueiredo case (in which a psychiatrist had an affair with a patient's wife) is also available as a link, to be supplied either from a local cache, the World Wide Web, or a commercial service such as Lexis.

Note that in the public view of the case, no authorities have been cited by either side to support or attack the fit of the facts of this case to the claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress. That is presumably because no motions for summary judgment have been filed. In any case, the defendant apparently denied the claim, the full text of the denial would be available with a mouse click