



**Your on the
Street Reporter**



Uyless Black

Hot McNuggets

Hot McNuggets¹

Fort Lauderdale, Florida---“A South Florida jury awarded \$800,000 in damages to a little girl who received second-degree burns when a hot Chicken McNuggets fell on her leg as her mother pulled away from the drive-thru of a McDonald’s restaurant.”

McDonald’s was cited as the culprit because it serves food that is *supposed* to be hot---*designed* to be hot---*known* to be hot---*purchased* to be hot. McDonald’s then passed this hot tamale, eh chicken, to the mom, who passed it to her child.

The hot food and its burning potential were not in the hands of the café when the meat burned some other meat. It was in the hands of the mother, but only temporarily. She passed the sizzling missile to her daughter’s...hands?...lap?

In either case, McDonald’s fulfilled its obligation to serve hot food to its customers. Even more, the hot chicken was given to the mom in a box, thus insulating the dangerous hazard’s heat.

The mother pulled the car away from the café. In doing so, she should have assumed the responsibility of keeping her child’s flesh safe from searing.

“Lawyers for McDonald’s argued...that the mother is the one who has the problem with the [resultant] scar.”

Could be. Or it could be the mother has a problem with the guilt of her carelessness and is doing what most humans do when confronted with a self-imposed mistake: Blame someone else.

Of course, the child did not eat the protective box. She pulled a McNuggets from the box then dropped it on her lap. Obviously, McDonald’s was not the culprit. The girl was. But being underaged, she was held blameless. So, in America---land of the lawsuit---the child could have sued her mother.

Meanwhile, the girl jokes about her disfigured leg, calling the scar *her nugget*. So does her mother, but to the mom, it has been a nugget of money, not the fading scar tissue.

“The mother testified that at no point did McDonald’s warn her the food might be unusually hot.” ...*Hey there, mom, we cook our food to be hot to avoid salmonella poisoning.* Which McDonald’s does, for which we nugget eaters should be thankful.

“Photos the mother took of the burn and sound clips of the child’s screams were played in the court.” *Keep on screaming, sweetie, mommy will tend to you after she tends to our sure-fire lawsuit.*

The mother testified that “she realized the nugget was lodged between [the child’s] thigh and the seat belt.” Therefore, sue the seat belt company. After all, Seat Belt Inc. should design its seat belts to be impervious to a chicken shit lawsuit about chicken.

The wrong party was sued. The mother was not cited by the court, in spite of evidence documenting the mother *recklessly* handing off hot chicken to the child, *wantonly* ignoring her screams of pain, then *willfully* filming the child before coming to her aid. A judge characterized the behavior of McDonald’s as “*willful, wanton, reckless.*”

The judge’s descriptive words were on target. Unfortunately, the wrong party was the target of the judge’s barbs.

¹ “Jury Awards Girl Burned by McNuggets \$800k,” *The Press*, July 21, 2023.