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SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2008

Day 19, Verdict
(8:06 A.M)
(Outside the presence of the jury.)
THE COURT: We're on the record.

Both NDS's and EchoStar's counsel are here. The parties are present.

This is outside of the jury's presence.
And I've actually brought up the Court security officer. Why don't you remain with us. You're not going to get the jury right now.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: The Court's learned some considerable factors this morning.

Let me begin by saying the background of this issue involves jurors who were properly admonished to avoid speaking to counsel for either party and that counsel would avoid speaking to the jurors. Additionally, these jurors were admonished at the close of each session that they were not to discuss the case with anyone nor form nor express any opinion about the case.

At the close of trial on Wednesday, May 7th, 2008, the lawyers (sic) were instructed to meet on the first floor of the courthouse on Tuesday, May 13th, 2008, so the bailiff could bring them to the jury room for deliberation.

Kristee, thank you for coming in from vacation. The Court Clerk who admonished them is present if any counsel has any questions of her in that regard. But, Kristee, were they properly admonished? THE CLERK: Yes, they were. THE COURT: And state to counsel what you told them.

THE CLERK: They were instructed to all meet on the first floor in the jury assembly room, and the bailiff would bring them all up as a group. It was also explained to them that the reason being because the evidence was going to be in that room, and they cannot -- they always have to view the evidence as a group together.

THE COURT: I've represented to you, Counsel, about Kristee being present because that's been the Court's habit and custom also for the last ten years. It also was for 17 years in Superior Court. It's never varied.

And the reason for that is to stop the obvious, and that is any potentiality of a juror or jurors beginning to deliberate regardless of an instruction before a late juror might arrive.

Seven of those jurors appropriately and properly appeared in the jury room as instructed. One juror, No. 1, did not.

Now, most of the counsel before this Court are
from out of the jurisdiction. Plaintiff's counsel, I believe, are from Texas. Most of defense counsel, if I'm not mistaken, are from San Francisco. All of you or some are Los Angeles. A couple are from Los Angeles. But lead counsel, Mr. Snyder, is from San Francisco, and Mr. Eberhart -- San Francisco. Remaining counsel are from Los Angeles.

Now, yesterday, there was a statement by Mr. Snyder that somewhat concerned this Court. Mr. Snyder, yesterday you stated that this Court instructed you to be here at 1:00 o'clock. It made it appear that that was an order. Let me set the record very clear about that so that there's no equivocation at all.

I initially had called lead counsel into the hallway and had stated to you to be here at 10:00 o'clock, not 1:00 o'clock, feeling that there was no reason to have defense counsel from San Francisco flying back; they could catch an early flight that morning. And then I realized in that discussion that you're from Texas, and it didn't appear to be fair to have counsel have the morning at home if they wanted to and take a flight and that you had to, you know, fly in the night before.

So I changed that. And my statement to each of you was, "You don't have to be here until 1:00 o'clock." Your 1:00 o'clock date was a drop-dead date. You had to be
here. But you didn't have to be here before that date. Mr. Welch, I believe, told me in the hallway that you're flying in anyway. You're bringing everybody out, quote/unquote, by plane the night before.

And Mr. Snyder, my recollection is, thanked the Court. And I didn't know if you were going to appear or not. It doesn't matter to the Court as long as all parties were here by 1:00 o'clock.

Now, let me state to you that to one of my concerns last evening was, not only a trial and how it's perceived in terms of fairness and in terms of rulings, but one of the little things that happen that can have a bias or prejudice that the record never captures, but being involved in trial work so long gives one of the parties an unfair edge.

I brought the Court security officer up today, and I've also brought Kristee in, and the information that's going to be relayed to you in a few moments is that whatever this contact was with this particular juror had no effect on the other seven.

In other words, you didn't have lurking attorneys in the hallway when the group was re-brought back up. So you didn't have what I call the "stare-down" of the -- of the side of attorneys sitting in the hallway when the other eight jurors were brought down the hallway. At least that's
the information relayed to me, but I'm going to find out quickly for my record.

Even then, I doubt that that would be enough for mistrial, but I will want to know what are the perceptions taking place.

The Court has been informed of the following regarding the incident with Juror No. 1. I was told on the first day of deliberations, May 13, 2008, that the bailiff arrived in chambers at approximately 8:00 to 8:15 and informed the staff that he could not locate one or more of the jurors. The best I can piece together in this time frame is, 8:15 to 8:20 an individual indicated via the chambers intercom that one or more jurors were in the hallway and could not enter the courtroom. She was instructed that the staff would not let the jury into the jury room.

Ms. Willetts, apparently -- I'm guessing that must have been you calling into chambers. And this incident must have already taken place when you called into chambers. Kristee was not the recipient of that phone call, by the way. One of the law clerks was.

Upon opening the door to the jury room, the law clerks told Ms. Hopkins, the courtroom deputy for this Court, that the jurors were in the hallway, and Ms. Hopkins entered the hallway where she saw Juror No. 1 apparently
speaking to counsel. That turns out not to be true -- there was one juror in the hallway, not the multitude. They were still downstairs.

Ms. Hopkins then called Counsel into the courtroom and asked what the juror had stated to them, and counsel for plaintiff, Mr. Hagan, stated that Juror No. 1 had stated, "Good morning and good luck" to defense counsel and that "he," referring to Mr. Hagan, had merely smiled. Counsel for plaintiff, Mr. Noll or Mr. Welch indicated that the juror had stated "Good morning and good luck" and that Mr. Noll stated "Good morning," and then Mr. Welch said nothing.

Now, besides the record that was created yesterday, the Court has the benefit of having talked to my own court clerk, and the same information that you relayed to me yesterday had previously been relayed to the Court. I simply wanted your statement on the record so I have a very clear record.

Ms. Hopkins indicated that plaintiff's counsel may be required to disclose these events, but the Judge would make that decision, and Counsel apparently were on the way from San Francisco or from -- because they weren't in the courtroom at that time and couldn't be located.

Now, that's no fault of defense counsel.

The Court was informed of these facts, and $I$ held
an informal discussion around $2: 30 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. I want to relay to you what occurred between that time.

The Court phoned in about 12:00 o'clock your time and was told that the jurors had gone to lunch, that plaintiffs' counsel were here, that defense counsel were not present but had been informed, of course, and I was reminded that they were not required to be here before 1:00 o'clock nor were plaintiffs' counsel.

And I was told that not only the Headnet (sic) Reports had been met with the consent of all of you informally, but -- strike that -- had gone back to the jury -- but also that the -- I said -- Headend Reports. Headend Reports.

But also I was told that there had been some kind of communication with one of the jurors and that Kristee knew about that and wanted to relay that to the court.

Kristee was not available. It was the lunch hour, and I had called back about 1:00 -- between 1:00 and 2:00 and talked to one of the law clerks at that time.

Kristee got on the phone and relayed to me the information she's about to relay to you.

I had a conversation with all counsel some time between 2:00 o'clock and 2:30 -- I can't remember the exact time -- but in that range someplace. You were informed in that very first conversation about the Headend Reports and
agreed to the eight copies having gone back to the jurors, which is a no-think call, by the way.

You also were informed at that time, the very first conversation with this Court, about that problem or potential problem. And, in fact, I think if my memory's correct -- and Kristee, you can disagree at any time -- that I actually put Kristee on the phone with you and had her relay the information with my law clerks present as well.

I asked what you wanted to do. We had court reporters available. At that time I think I indicated to Mr. Snyder that that was your lead call; that is, any bias or prejudice that might befall any of the parties really seemed to be something that could be damaging to the defense. So I think I made the statement to you -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -- that regardless of plaintiffs' position, $I$ thought you had the first call in that regard. In other words, I was going to take my lead, I think, quote/unquote, from what you were going to say to me.

You had absorbed that information for the first time and said you wanted until the following day to consider it. I don't think any of us anticipated, quite frankly, a verdict that first day. I think we all felt we had plenty of time, and we knew that Mr. Bender was scheduled to undergo this interview or solicitation for some contract and that the jury was leaving at 11:30 and that Wednesday was a
half day or just a morning session.
Meanwhile, sometime between 4:00 o'clock and 4:30,
to my memory, the jury reached a verdict. I now know the
exact time because, thank goodness, the jury dated it. It
was 4:02.
Kristee sealed that verdict. You were sent home,
and we decided to hash this out on today's date and bring
the jury back in one session because $I$ didn't know how long
this was going to take, whether it was going to take an hour
or hours. So it seemed wise to bring the jury back on
Thursday morning.
Now, in the meantime, I want to specifically ask
Mr. Noll and any of the counsel: When the jury was brought
back up -- just the equity of this -- were you in the court
when the jurors were brought back up en mass? Were you in
the hallway? Did you see the jurors, Mr. Noll?
MR. NOLL: No, Your Honor, I never saw the jurors.
THE COURT: Where were you after this initial
contact by Juror No. 1? In other words, when the jurors --
were you down in the cafeteria, did you leave the building,
or did you come into the courtroom?

MR. NOLL: We would have come into the courtroom and spoke with Kristee. And then, we left. I believe we went to lunch.

THE COURT: Mr. Hagan, did you see this mass of
jurors? In other words, were you the lurking counsel out in
the hallway?
MR. HAGAN: No, sir.
THE COURT: Where were you?
MR. HAGAN: After we came into the courtroom,
Kristee told us that we could use the courtroom if we
wanted; we could use the attorney conference room --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. HAGAN: I think we left and went to Starbucks.
By the time we came back, they had already been in the room
for a while.
THE COURT: Seems to be all counsel's favorite
haunt these days in this trial.
Mr. Welch.
MR. WELCH: Your Honor, I do not recall being
outside. I believe I was inside.
THE COURT: Inside the courtroom?
MR. WELCH: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Ms. Willetts, did you see any of the
jurors coming down? I don't mean any -- Juror No. 1 -- I'm
trying to find out if I've got the situation, and I think
Mr. Snyder would like to know also if I've got the situation
with this mass of jurors coming down the hallway with one
side sitting out in the hallway basically eyeballing them.
MS. WILLETTS: I did not see any jurors.

THE COURT: Kristee, what's your recollection? I want to get clear through this.

THE CLERK: I believe all the attorneys or some of the attorneys were inside, 'cause we were discussing what happened and what actions to take. So by the time the jurors came up --

THE COURT: CSO, coming down the hallway?

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: I vaguely remember some suits on the right side over by 9B.

THE COURT: By Judge Carney's court?

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: I didn't pay attention what attorneys they were. We walked down this way. There was no contact.

THE COURT: So I'm fairly satisfied, then, that I don't what might be perceived to be an inequitable position.

What the Court can basically piece together was apparently that as Juror No. 1 approached the courtroom and the jury room, she passed defense counsel Mr. Noll and Mr. Welch who were standing near the windows, near the elevator. Mr. Noll stated he was facing the window, could not see her peripherally, did not recognize her when she neared Mr. Noll and Mr. Welch, said "Good morning," to which Mr. Noll replied, "Good morning," as he turned to see who was approaching. Mr. Welch did not say anything to the jury -- or to the juror. The juror then said, "Good luck"
and continued down the hallway toward the courtroom and the jury room.

Is that correct, Mr. Noll?

MR. NOLL: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Repeating what I heard yesterday, from my notes, she then reached the jury room entrance which was locked, attempted unsuccessfully to open the door. She attempted to open the door to courtroom D also unsuccessfully as it was also locked. And there's a good reason, and that is because it was supposed to be locked. She was supposed to be downstairs in the jury room as the other seven jurors were and apparently just misunderstood.

It's my understanding that she then asked Mr. Lenoir and plaintiffs' other representative why the door was locked and whether Ms. Hopkins was around and how she could get into the jury room. And they indicated that she should go downstairs where there was a sign directing the jury.

Mr. Lenoir, is that correct?
MR. LENOIR: That's correct. I also mentioned
that the marshal was up here a few minutes before that.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Anything else said to her?
MR. LENOIR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: In the interim period -- apparently
from what $I$ could piece together last night and this morning -- Ms. Willetts, apparently you used the chambers intercom to inform the Court that there was a juror in the hallway. One of my law clerks responded to that. After speaking to them, I figured out that that must have been you.

Is that correct?

MS. WILLETTS: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Are you the one who placed the intercom call?

MS. WILLETTS: That's correct.

THE COURT: When Ms. Hopkins entered the hallway, she told the juror to go downstairs, which the juror did, and then the entire group was brought back up.

First of all, I'm persuaded that there's no what $I$ call "prejudice" in terms of one of the parties being absent and one of the parties being present in the hallway with the mass of the jurors. It's this one juror that seems to be the issue.

So I don't have any imbalance, even equitably, from the Court's perception, unless this juror relates something, and we'll find that out in a few moments.

Now, the present hearing is going to be held to determine whether any inappropriate communications took place between plaintiffs' counsel and Juror No. 1.

I've asked the further questions once again of Mr. Noll and Mr. Welch today. Regardless of your testimony, I wanted to hear that statement again, and $I$ wanted to summarize what I thought I'd heard yesterday.

I've asked Ms. Hopkins to come in off of vacation. My apologies, but thank you. You're an absolute saint, Kristee. I've also asked the same CSO to come up who brought the majority of jurors up. So we have all the people here at one time.

Mr. Snyder, I want to listen to you one more time about why I should take the verdict first, you know, and then delay questioning of this juror.

I've thought through last evening that perhaps the Court is ill-advised to do that, but from everything I see, the Court is apparently -- well, first of all, the decision to grant a new trial for misconduct, or by relating to jurors, is within the trial Court's discretion. The Court cites Moleski v. MJ Cable, Ninth Circuit, and also Washington Times v. Bonner, DC Circuit case.

And really, whether a mistrial is to be declared or a new trial granted because of alleged misconduct of or interference with a juror is a matter within the discretion of the trial Court.

Now, any unauthorized communication between a juror and a witness or interested party is presumptively
prejudicial. But the parties seeking to avoid a new trial may overcome that presumption by making a strong contrary showing, and the Court cites Caliendo v. Warden of California Men's Colony and also Maddox v. The United States, 146 U.S. 140, 142, 1892 case. That overturned a murder conviction based on the bailiff's comment to the jury. However, quote, "If an unauthorized communication with a juror is de minimis, the parties seeking a new trial must show that the communication could have influenced the verdict before the burden of proof shifts to the party opposing a mistrial."

The Maddox presumption of prejudice applies when an unauthorized communication crosses the low threshold to create a potential for prejudice. The Court cites The United States v. Day, 10th circuit 1987 case. There the Government agent asked the juror in the men's room, "How you holding up?" And the Court found it does not trigger a presumption of prejudice.

The Court from Smith -- or the quote from Smith v. Phillips is quite strong. United States Supreme Court case. Indeed, the Courts recognize that, quote, "It is virtually impossible to shield jurors from every contact or influence that might theoretically influence their vote. Accordingly, we must distinguish between deliberate and intentional conduct and mere inadvertent or accidental contact involving
only an exchange of greeting in order to avoid an appearance of discourtesy." Cite: U.S. v Harry Barfield Company, 359 F.2d, Fifth Circuit, 1966 case as well.

Under the Maddox framework, the statements will
only be grounds for new trial if they are not or non-de minimis and create a risk.

I think the wise course is to find out right at the very beginning of this because, first, the jury's already rendered a verdict. That verdict's been in a sealed condition. The jury has it in their presence.

That verdict also -- the Court's taken extraordinary caution along with counsel of having each juror sign that verdict. Normally, the foreperson signs the verdict, the verdict's brought in, and then the jury's polled. Well, here, there's signature lines for each of the jurors. So it defies imagination that there's going to be a change, although I'll certainly conduct polling for either the defense or the plaintiff in this matter.

Mr. Snyder, let me turn to you one more time as a courtesy.

I'm fairly concerned that any misgivings you might have had or I might have felt also in terms of the entire jury being exposed to one party in the hallway, that uncomfortable feeling that I'm not there, is set aside; that it's one juror potentially, once again, that we're dealing
with.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I appreciate the additional information that you provided this morning.

My point yesterday -- and it remains our position today -- is that under the actual prejudice standard, that can only be determined after the verdict is read. And so while $I$ understand the Court's point about inquiring of the people involved now for purposes of making a record, whether or not that prejudiced, the verdict, can only be determined after the verdict was read. And that was why I suggested that the inquiry need not be made until after the verdict.

THE COURT: Is your feeling still the same?
MR. SNYDER: Yes. I still believe that the standard could only be determined after the verdict's read.

THE COURT: All right. Now, if I bow to that wisdom, you're taking away a potential remedy. In other words, the Court is best able to act if it has information. And the difficulty with that position is that if, in fact, I had determined that there was some type of prejudice after I spoke to the jury before the verdict came in, I could determine two things that $I$ wouldn't be able to do following your advice:

First, I'd be able to find out if whatever that prejudice was, was conveyed to the other seven jury members.

In other words, if it wasn't, then your position would be, well, there's prejudice anyway because that juror participated in the proceedings.

But my response might be reinstructing this jury to go back and begin their deliberations again if $I$ found prejudice in this matter and to start their deliberations anew as if this juror hadn't participated.

So by taking that position, if I subscribe to this position, it may weaken your position later on in a motion for new trial, because I really would be following your direction. And my initial thought is that this should take place before the jury comes into court, that $I$ should have all the information at my disposal, that I'm better off as a trial judge having that information in making decisions. But if you think that that's prejudicial, then $I$ want you to state why it's prejudicial, especially in light of a signed verdict form with eight signatures on it.

MR. SNYDER: I guess if I could ask for clarification of the Court's question.

Are you asking whether it's our position that the inquiry would be prejudicial or the --

THE COURT: That the inquiry prior to the verdict would be prejudicial.

MR. SNYDER: No, Your Honor. My point is not that I believe that the inquiry would be prejudicial. My point
is that the inquiry, the determination of whether the actual prejudice test is met or has been met, can't be determined until after the verdict is read. So it's not -- it is not NDS's position or my position that the inquiry is itself prejudicial.

THE COURT: All right. My preference is for the inquiry now. I think that's the wisest course of action.

But let me pay the same courtesy to plaintiffs' counsel.

MR. HAGAN: Your Honor, our position is that we agree with the Court. Initially, we don't think that there was any improper contact whatsoever, but $I$ think that the proper time to determine that is now, before the verdict is read, because if there was a determination that it's safer to assume that there was improper contact, you have additional remedies that you will not have after the verdict has been read and received by the Court.

THE COURT: I agree. And I think I'd already
determined that regardless of your respective positions that
that was the Court's feeling as well.

Counsel, I'm going to begin in this way: I'm going to make the statement generally to the juror as follows to somewhat set her at ease and let her do the talking initially before questions are asked.

First, I'm going to tell her that the Court needs
to inquire into some communication or communications that you may have had with one or more plaintiffs' counsel on Tuesday morning, May 13th, before the deliberations and explain to her that at any time a juror has contact with people involved in the case, we have to ask those questions to make sure nothing inappropriate occurred.
"I'm asking you these questions for my own record, and the parties have not requested that I ask them of you. I think that's an important statement by the court so that it doesn't appear that there's a disagreement between you or that this is at your impetus. This should be from the Court.
"Now, we understand that the jury has reached a verdict, and the verdict will be read shortly, but for now I do not want you to tell us what decision this jury's reached." In other words, I don't want her blurting out any indication. We're all very anxious, of course, to know, but we don't even want a hint before the whole jury is present.
"I'm going to ask you a few questions about what occurred in the hallway outside the courtroom before you began your deliberations.
"First, initially before we start, we'd like to know whether you took part in the jury's deliberations and reached a verdict, without telling us a verdict on Tuesday May 13th."

I think that's answer's obvious: Yes.

And second, "Could you describe for us generally what happened when you first arrived at the courthouse on Tuesday morning for deliberations and any communications you may have had with anyone associated with the case?"

In other words, instead of me segmenting by questions, I'd like to hear the first overall statement by her.

I remember when $I$ was practicing law, whenever a witness was questioned, even if they were telling the truth, they remembered about 70 to 80 percent of it. The second time through, they remembered 90 percent, and the third time through, a little bit more. And I was always surprised at trial that they remembered something else. And that was with a truthful witness.

The third would be, "If you remember, who initiated these communications?" In other words, after I hear her general statement, that may be obvious. She may say, "I talked to counsel." But I want to specifically ask: Who initiated this?

Fourth, "When you had these communications, had you already reached a decision in your mind about this case? If so, was anything said that might have suggested to counsel what the decision you believed -- suggested to counsel what decision you made?"

In other words, my feeling still is, after they're properly instructed, that the attorneys have a right -- or the witnesses at that point -- strike that -- the jurors at that point have a right to form an opinion. They've been properly instructed, et cetera. If they come into court with a preconceived idea at that time, that may be grounds for a motion for new trial. We'll take that up at that time. But let's find out right now because that's going to be one of the primary questions you're going to want to know.
"When you returned to the first floor and met with the other jurors or at any time, did you tell the jurors what had happened up in the hallway?"

Okay. "And did you tell them that you had seen or communicated with counsel or anyone associated with the case?"

The sixth question: "Did the events of Tuesday morning have any impact on your decision in this matter or the decision of any of the other jurors -- in other words, the brief discussion you had in the hallway?"

Finally, "Have you or any of the other jurors, to the best of your knowledge, had contact with any person associated with this case outside this trial." In other words, what $I$ want to find out is, this is the one juror who apparently wandered up to court. All the other seven jurors
knew to go downstairs. I just want to make certain that there's no other contact with this particular juror.

Now, I may have other questions, but that's as far as I'm going to get right now until I have this juror speak to us.

Would you please summon Juror No. 1, please.

Do you know her name?

THE CLERK: Susan Harris.

THE COURT: Good morning.
JUROR NO. 1: Good morning.

THE COURT: Ms. Harris, I need to inquire into some communications that you may have had with plaintiffs' counsel Tuesday morning, May 13th, before the deliberations.

Anytime a juror has contact with people involved in the case, we have to ask questions to make sure that nothing inappropriate occurred. And I'm asking these questions for my own record. The parties have not requested that I ask these of you.

Now, we understand that the jury's reached a verdict, and the verdict is going to be read very shortly, and I do not want to know at any time during this conversation what you decided.

JUROR NO. 1: Okay.

THE COURT: We are all very anxious, of course, to know, but we don't even want a hint during my conversation
with you.
So we'll go quickly in these questions, but you'll be out of here briefly.

I'm going to ask you just a few questions about what occurred in the hallway outside the courtroom before you began deliberations. And initially before we start, I'd like to know whether you took part in the jury's deliberations and you reached a verdict, without telling us the verdict, on Tuesday, May 13th.

JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Could you describe to us generally what happened when you first arrived at the courthouse on Tuesday morning for deliberations and any communications, including greetings, you might have had with anyone associated with this case.

JUROR NO. 1: Well, unfortunately, I was the only one who forgot that you told us to go downstairs, so I came up here.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR NO. 1: Tried to go in the room, and it was locked. And I think I asked them -- I think I asked 'em, "Can you go ask Kristee to open the door," 'cause I kept knocking on it, knocking on it, knocking on it, knocking on it, and they said, "The courtroom is locked." And then eventually Bob came and got me.

THE COURT: Do you remember who initiated the first conversation? Did you initiate it with the attorney, or did the attorney initiate it with you?

JUROR NO. 1: I did it with them. I'm sure everybody saw me. I kept knocking, knocking, knocking, knocking, you know, for a few minutes. I felt like everybody was waiting for me. I was knocking on our door. I wasn't knocking on the courtroom door.

THE COURT: Okay.
JUROR NO. 1: And I knew I couldn't come in the courtroom, so I asked them, "Could you please go ask Kristee to open the door for me?"

THE COURT: When you had these communications, had you already reached a decision in your own mind about this case? In other words, the jury hadn't started deliberating yet, but had you already decided what this case should be in your own mind?

I don't want to know which side.

JUROR NO. 1: Well, by the end you kind of have a -- you might be tipped one way or the other, but you're ready to discuss it with the others.

THE COURT: Was there anything said by the attorneys in response to you asking about the courtroom that indicated or might have influenced your decision in this matter?

JUROR NO. 1: No, they just said that the courtroom was locked.

THE COURT: Okay. When you returned to the first floor and met with the other jurors, or at any time, did you tell the jurors about any communication you had with the attorneys up here on this floor?

JUROR NO. 1: I -- I might have just told them I was upstairs knocking on the door, and I saw the attorneys up in the hallway.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you indicate which side -like the plaintiffs' attorneys or the defense attorneys -or did you just say "the attorneys"?

JUROR NO. 1: I probably said I saw EchoStar people up there.

THE COURT: And did you tell them -- or did the events of Tuesday morning when you had this contact, this brief contact with the attorneys and asked 'em about getting into the Court -- did that have any impact on your decision in this matter as you had deliberated with the other jurors?

JUROR NO. 1: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Have you or any of the other jurors, to the best of your knowledge, had contact with any person associated with this case outside the trial; in other words, other than this conversation in the hallway?

JUROR NO. 1: Me -- do I know about me or any of
the other jurors?
THE COURT: Just you.
JUROR NO. 1: I haven't.

THE COURT: Okay. Finally, do you recall saying to any of the attorneys, "Good morning and good luck""? JUROR NO. 1: I may have.

THE COURT: Okay. And if you did say that, what were you conveying?

JUROR NO. 1: I was -- probably nothing. Just like, saw -- walked by 'em coming to the door and just said "Good morning, good luck," I guess.

THE COURT: Okay. I want to thank you very much. JUROR NO. 1: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you not to relay any of our conversation back to the other jurors.

JUROR NO. 1: Okay.

THE COURT: And we'll see you in just a few moments.

Thank you for your courtesy.

JUROR NO. 1: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, under the Maddox framework, it's unlikely that these communications -- it's unlikely that Juror No. 1 's communications with counsel were initiated by this juror, from all that $I$ can gather -weren't initiated by counsel. These were initiated by the
juror, obviously, and from what $I$ can discern at this point, I'm going to find that these are mere pleasantries and a brief discussion of where to meet for deliberations. They do not rise to the level of potential prejudice and trigger the Maddox issues and -- of actual prejudice here.

Now, Counsel, of course, that can be developed. You're not foreclosed.

That's an initial ruling before $I$ bring the jury out. There may be other inquiry if the verdict's adverse to NDS. This does not foreclose, of course, a request by you for new trial.

But by the same token, I think that the Court's made an adequate inquiry at this time, at least both on equitable grounds that there's not an imbalance of perception in the hallway, which you never see on the record, but in trial work there's a lot of things that occur in the Court that the Circuit would never see, but trial judges understand very well any imbalance.

And second, I'm absolutely convinced, quite frankly, at least at this juncture with the information in front of the Court, that Counsel, you did not initiate the contact. You conducted yourselves appropriately. I can't find any prejudice here. In appears to be a "good morning" greeting.

And I think her statements, when, in fact -- I
think at the end of the case, the slowing down of the case probably gave this jury, after they looked at these exhibits four, five, and six times and the excellent presentation by both sides in this matter, quite frankly, a pretty clear indication for all the jurors, and that's reflected in a one-day verdict, which is not strange as people may think in a five-week trial, because many of these issues involved these documents being repeatedly shown to the jury by plaintiff and defense counsel.

Having made that record, Counsel, of course I want to be courteous. I want to turn to the plaintiff and then to the defendant for additional comments.

On behalf of the plaintiff.
MR. HAGAN: Your Honor, I think the answers given by Mrs. Harris are consistent with the information provided by plaintiffs and plaintiffs' counsel and the Court clerk, and it demonstrates that there was absolutely no improper contact or attempt to influence the jury in any way whatsoever, and it was simply morning pleasantries.

THE COURT: Let me turn to Mr. Snyder.

MR. SNYDER: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Preserve your record in this regard in case there's -- obviously, if it's a defense verdict, the issue is moot. If there's a plaintiffs' verdict, you're not
foreclosed from coming back to the Court on a motion for new trial.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor. That's our understanding.

THE COURT: All right.

Then, Counsel, is there anything further before I summon the jury?

MR. WELCH: No, sir, Your Honor.
MR. SNYDER: No.

THE COURT: All right. Would you be kind enough to summon the jury.
(In the presence of the jury.)
THE COURT: Good morning. First of all, we're back in session.

All counsel are present from EchoStar and NDS and the parties.

And, first of all, before $I$ inquire into the verdict, I want to thank all of you. Some of you literally volunteered vacation time, not getting paid, so many of you -- very busy in your respective businesses, new job -we're all very well aware of that, and I think all counsel, regardless of your verdict -- of course, one side will be excited; the other will be disappointed; that's trial work -- but $I$ think Mr. Snyder on behalf of NDS is thanking you along with all of his counsel. Mr. Hagan Mr. Welch on
behalf of EchoStar, they're thanking you also.
Now, later on, one of them may not be thanking you -- I'm just kidding -- but, you know, I think we take the jurors for granted, and $I$ hope we used your time productively. I hope that we didn't have a lot of sidebars and a lot of wasted time 'cause you really did donate your time.

Let me say one thing else also to you.
It's really important we did it that way. Otherwise, if we just ask for the volunteers, we get one type of juror sometime. Maybe they're all in public service or they're all retired or they're all unemployed. And that's not the American system of justice. We're unique in terms of the jury system. Your wisdom really prevails.

Well, say you one, say you all: Has the jury in this matter reached a verdict? If so, would you indicate by saying "yes."

THE JURY: Yes.

THE COURT: Your foreperson is Mr. Bender.
Mr. Bender, you have an envelope, please. Would you be kind enough to hand it to the bailiff.

JUROR FOREPERSON: (Complies.)
THE COURT: We had this placed in a sealed condition and signed by Mr. Bender.

I'll read the verdict.

## VERDICT

THE COURT: Claim No. 1: Digital Millennium

Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. Section $1201(a)(1)(A)$-- Liability.

Question No. 1: Have Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NDS violated the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. Section $1201(\mathrm{a}) 1(\mathrm{~A}) ?$

No.

Claim No. 2: Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. Section $1201(a)(2)$-- Liability.

Question No. 2: Have Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NDS violated the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. Section $1201(a)(2) ?$

No.

Claim No. 3: Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. Section $605(a)$-- Liability.

Question No. 3: Have Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NDS violated the Communications Act, 17 U.S.C. Section $605(a) ?$

Yes.

If you answered YES on Question No. 3, please calculate actual damages (taking into account any reduction you may find based on any failure to mitigate damages by Plaintiffs) and statutory damages. Statutory damages are
based on the number of violations and amount per violation, which are for you to determine. Plaintiffs must elect either (a) actual damages or (b) statutory damages if you return a verdict for Plaintiffs.

If you answered NO on Question No. 3, go to Question No. 4.

Actual damages: EchoStar's actual damages: You've listed 45.69; is that correct?

JURY FOREPERSON: That's right.

THE COURT: I'll come back and inquire about that in just one moment.

NagraStar's actual damages: You've listed 0.00; is that correct? That's an affirmance by all of the jurors?

JURY FOREPERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Statutory damages: Total number of Defendants' violations against Plaintiffs: You've listed one.

Amount per violation) (within range of $\$ 1,000$ to \$10,000): You've listed $\$ 1,000$ and you've totaled that for total statutory damages of $\$ 1,000$.

If that's correct, would you nod your head once again.

THE JURY: (Nods.)

THE COURT: The verdict in that indicates a yes by all of the jurors.

Claim No. 4: Have Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NDS violated California Penal Code Section 593d(a)?

You've answered Yes.

If you answered YES on Question No. 4, please calculate actual damages (taking into account any reduction you may find based on any failure to mitigate damages by Plaintiffs) and go to Question No. 5 after calculating actual damages.

Actual Damages: EchoStar's actual damages: You listed 45.69.

NagraStar's actual damages: You listed 0.00 .
Question No. 5: If you answered YES on Question No. 4, do you find that Defendants acted with oppression, fraud, or malice?

You've answered No.

Question No. 6: Have Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NDS violated California Penal Code Section 593e(b)?

Your answer is Yes.

If you answered YES on Question No. 6, please calculate actual damages (taking into account any reduction you may find based on any failure to mitigate damages by Plaintiffs) and statutory damages, and go to Question No. 7 after calculating damages. Statutory damages are based on
the number of violations and amount per violation, which are for you to determine. Plaintiffs must elect either (a) actual damages or (b) statutory damages if you return a verdict for Plaintiffs.

Actual Damages: EchoStar's actual damages:
You've listed 0.00.

NagraStar's actual damages: The jury has listed 0.00 .

Statutory Damages: Total number of Defendants' violations against Plaintiffs: You've listed one.

Amount per violation (within range of $\$ 500$ to \$10,000): The jury has written 500.00.

Total statutory damages: 500.00.
I take it that indicates, obviously, \$500; is that correct?

JURY FOREPERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: That's an affirmative answer by all
jurors nodding their heads.

Question No. 7: If you answered YES on Question

No. 6, do you find that Defendants acted with oppression, fraud, or malice?

The jury's responded No.

Question No. 8: If you answered YES on

Question No. 6, do you find that Defendants engaged in a conspiracy to violate California Penal Code Section 593e(b)?

The jury has answered No.

Question No. 9: If you answered YES on
Question No. 6, do you find that Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar have proven by clear and convincing evidence that NDS's conduct was sufficiently malicious, oppressive, or in reckless disregard of Plaintiffs EchoStar's and NagraStar's rights to warrant an award of punitive damages to Plaintiffs?

The jury has answered No.
Question No. 10, involving Claim No. 6, the RICO violation under 18 U.S.C. Section $1962(c)$-- Lability.

Question No. 10 reads: Have Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NDS committed Criminal Copyright Infringement in violation of 17 USC Section 506?

The jury has answered No.

Question No. 11: Have Plaintiffs EchoStar and NagraStar proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NDS committed misconduct in connection with an Access Device in violation of 47 U.S.C. Section 1029?

The jury has answered, No.

Question No. 12 only requires a response if the jury answered Question No. 10 or 11 with a YES. They have not. Therefore, 10 -- strike that.

Question No. 12 and Question No. -- Question

No. 12 is blank.

Question concerning Counterclaim 1.

California Civil Code Section 3426 -- Liability.

Question No. 13: Has NDS proven by a
preponderance of the evidence that EchoStar violated the California Uniform Trade Secrets Act, California Civil Code Section 3426?

The jury has answered No.
Question No. 14: Has NDS proven by a preponderance of the evidence that NagraStar violated the California Uniform Trade Secrets Act, California Civil Code Section 3426?

The jury has answered No.
This has not only been signed and dated by the foreperson, but the Court has asked for the signatures of each of the other seven jurors which are also affixed to this document.

Now, this Court has asked the jury previously if these are the decisions by the jury. The jury has responded Yes.

I'll turn to each of the parties and see if you would like the jury polled as to any one or more of the claims.

```
Let me turn to EchoStar first.
```

MR. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: NDS.

MR. EBERHART: No.

MR. SNYDER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything further before the Court orders that the clerk of the Court record this verdict on behalf of EchoStar?

MR. HAGAN: Your Honor, it was a little unclear to us what the 45.69 --

THE COURT: Let me come back to 45.69.

Is that dollars, or is that thousands of dollars
or --

JURY FOREPERSON: \$45.69.
THE COURT: Forty-five dollars and sixty-nine cents.

Is there anything further on behalf of EchoStar?

MR. HAGAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything on behalf of NDS?

MR. SNYDER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm going to order the honorable clerk
of this court to record the verdict at this time. The
findings of the eight jurors are unanimous. The verdict is now recorded.

Now, Counsel, I would like a few minutes with the jury to personally thank them for their service. I told you I'd give you a brief tour. I know you're anxious to get out
of here, but we're also a criminal court, and we don't let
you go very quickly. I'm just kidding you.

So why don't you come back in chambers and visit
with me for a moment. I feel I've gotten to know you so
well in some ways, just seeing you every day.
I'm just going to give you kind of a
behind-the-scenes tour, and then we'll get you on your way
quickly.
If you'd like to leave, you're free to talk to any
counsel at any time. By the same token, you don't need to
speak to any counsel. That's entirely up to you.
So if you would like to come back in chambers, you
have to speak with me for a moment, though.
Counsel, if you would like to remain, you're more
than welcome to. If not, you're more than welcome to go on
your way.
Thank you very much.
Oh, we'll set date with Kristee any motions for
new trial that can be done outside of my presence.
Counsel, see Kristee.
MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor.
(At 8:59 a.m., proceedings were adjourned.)
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