

From The New York Times:

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1984

lowed us down through the centuries." After a meeting Thursday night with Patricia A. Glenn, a conciliator from the Justice Department's Community Relations Service in Chicago, the al-

They indicated they would not be satisfied with any investigation that did not find a violation of Mr. Perry's civil rights. They rejected an invitation to meet

series of sessions with city and community leaders, to end "rhetorical dialogues" in the news media by both sides and reopen lines of substantive talk. She met today with city officials

client confidentiality, they would never divulge anything Mr. Perry had told them. Representatives of the minister's alliance said that was part of a cover-up.

Pistol Manufacturer Found Not Liable for Injury Its Product Caused

Special to The New York Times

DALLAS, Jan. 20 — A jury of four men and eight women decided today that the manufacturer and seller of a pistol that crippled a Texas teen-ager six years ago were not liable for his injury.

The case had been closely watched by proponents and opponents of the sale of pistols because it was based on the contention that inexpensive pistols easily concealed were, by their very nature, "unreasonably dangerous" products and that their manufacturers and distributors should be liable for any injuries they cause.

The \$33 million suit, filed by Windel Turley, a Dallas lawyer, on behalf of David Clancy of Amarillo, Tex., now 21 years old, led to about 80 similar suits around the country. Mr. Clancy's case is the first to go before a jury.

Mr. Turley said he would continue to litigate the cases he has filed against about 15 gun makers.

"We learned a lot from this case and

we'll plan to pursue the others," he said. "I hope gun manufacturers don't take this as a stamp of approval for the way they do business or the 22,000 deaths and \$10 billion in damages they are responsible for."

Defendant Is Elated

But Randal Mathis, the attorney for the Zale Corporation, the prime defendant in the case, said his company was not surprised but elated by the verdict.

"We're very, very pleased by the verdict," he said. "I think it shows that a case like this is more appropriate for a legislature to consider than the courts."

The jury foreman, William E. Dishner, said he also doubted whether the case should have gone to the jury.

"I don't see a law that tells us a handgun can't be produced," he said. The jury deliberated almost 10 hours before reaching its verdict, and two jurors dissented from the verdict.

Mr. Clancy was a 15-year-old ninth-grade student when a .22-caliber pistol of the type known as a "Saturday night special," handled by 15-year-old Kenneth Hacker in a high school parking lot, accidentally discharged. The bullet lodged in Mr. Clancy's neck, leaving him paralyzed below the shoulders.

The jury ruled that the Hacker youth was the only negligent party in the accident. It said Mr. Clancy was entitled to \$2 million in damages. But Mr. Hacker, who settled a \$50,000 insurance claim with Mr. Clancy after the accident, was listed only as a third-party defendant who could have been held responsible for damages only if the seller or manufacturer were found at fault. So Mr. Clancy will receive no damages.

In closing arguments Thursday, Mr. Turley asked the jury to "send a message" to companies around the country that manufacture or sell inexpensive pistols similar to the \$19 weapon that

crippled Mr. Clancy will be held liable for the suffering such weapons cause.

"We are not a violent people," Mr. Turley said. "We despise suffering and death and we will not tolerate people who will sacrifice teen-agers for a buck."

But an attorney for the Zale Corporation, which sold the weapon through an Amarillo discount store it owned, said the company bore no liability. He said the blame for the accident rested solely with Mr. Hacker's careless handling of the weapon.

Attorneys for the Zale concern said the pistol was safe if used properly. They said Mr. Turley's suit was similar to taking action against an auto maker or auto dealership if a drunk driving one of their cars was involved in an accident that injured someone.

"If you don't use common sense and safe gun handling there's not a firearm in the world that can't cause serious injury," one of the attorneys told the jury.