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(The following proceedings were held at 10:31 a.m.) THE COURT: Good morning.

ALL PARTIES: Good morning, Your Honor.
THE COURT: There is one juror I wanted to know if you all wanted to excuse before we begin, and that is Juror 38.

MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor, for cause for medical.
MR. LUKACS: Plaintiffs agree.
MR. NUNEZ: Agreed.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Agreed.
THE COURT: Juror 38 is excused for cause.
Bring them in please.
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: 38 is the only one that you
don't want?
THE COURT: Correct.
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Okay.
(Pause in proceedings.)
THE COURT: We're ready.
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: You're ready?
THE COURT: Yes.
(Prospective jury panel entered the courtroom at 10:35 a.m.) JURY VOIR DIRE

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. While we have other members of the jury coming in, let me just double-check and make sure you are seated where we believe you are supposed to be. When I call your name, please just raise
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your hand.
Ms. Jean Baptiste, Ms. Clayton, Mr. Romanik, Mr. Francisque, Mr. Marks and Mr. Ginoris. Mr. Lazier, Mr. Kappelman, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Smith, Ms. Shannon, Ms. Cochran and Mr. Morin.

Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Palmer, Ms. Essinger, Mr. Mumford, Ms. Aldarondo, Ms. Noche. If you two ladies could switch seats, please. Thank you. Ms. Centeno, Mr. Ulysse, Ms. Phillips, Ms. Choy.

In the back of the room, Ms. Fleite, Ms. Auguste, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Mena, Ms. Bolus, Mr. Corti, Ms. Grant, Mr. Franklin, Ms. McFarland, Mr. Perez.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: Paez.
THE COURT: Where's Ms. McFarland? And where is Mr. Perez? Oh, all right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: Paez. Paez, not Perez.
THE COURT: Paez, I'm sorry.
Mr. Barrantes. So I think, Ms. McFarland, you and Mr. Paez are seated in the incorrect positions, please. Thank you.

Belfort, Gross, Prentice, Zepeda, Reyes, Hill, Solis, Robinson, Olivo, Ramirez, Indorf, Belbusti, Deutsch, Medina, Alvarado, Nunez.

Moving on to the other side of the room, Mr. Moreno, Aleman, Karow, O'Neil, King, Moreda, Koliwala, Byrd, Diaz.

## Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA

Very good. Thank you.
Everyone, please be seated.
Ladies and gentlemen, good morning and welcome to my courtroom. My name is Cecilia Altonaga. I'm a United States District Court judge. And we have brought you here this morning in order to select the jury for a case that is about to be tried.

We began the jury selection process earlier this morning when, in the jury room, you filled out some written questionnaire forms. What has transpired from that time till now is that we have photocopied them, we have distributed them to many parties, as you can see in the courtroom, and we have all reviewed that information and taken note. And now we bring you here in the courtroom to continue with the jury selection process.

This process involves sharing information with you and gathering information from you in order to assess whether or not this is an appropriate case for you to serve as a juror on.

All of your answers to the questions we ask of you need to be given to us under oath. And I don't believe you were placed under oath in the jury pool section. So now that you are all here and seated, I would ask that you please stand and raise your right hands so that my courtroom deputy may administer your oath as perspective jurors.
(Time 10:42 a.m.)
(Prospective jury panel was sworn and testified as follows:) THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you, you may be seated. THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, let me just take a few minutes to introduce you to those who are in the courtroom. Patricia Snead is my courtroom deputy. She just placed you under oath and assisted in getting you in the courtroom in your seats. She assists with the cases that comprise my docket. She is also my main point of contact with the jury. So if you have any questions or concerns that need to reach my ears, please let Ms. Snead know, and she, in turn, will let me know. We have with us here this morning two court security officers. We have Officer Jerome Lee in the far back, and we have Officer Alan Latour to my left here in the front. The court security officers are here to see to your welfare and to assist, as well. During the jury selection process, they will be reaching you with handheld microphones when it comes time to asking you individual questions. Please wait for the court security officer to reach you and then take the microphone and use it, please. If you have any concerns, again, that need to reach my ears, you can also let the court security officers know.

Seated directly in front of me is the official court reporter Stephanie McCarn, she takes down every word that is spoken in the courtroom. Every word I speak as well as every word that you speak. So to assist her in making for a better

Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
record, I ask that you keep a few rules in mind: First, use the handheld microphone when it reaches you; second, please give us your name or juror number so that she can identify the speaker; and last, please give us audible responses, like and no instead of uh-huh and $u h-u h$ and using body language. And if you forget any of these instructions, please, don't be surprised if I interrupt, and it is to get some clarification and to assist again.

As you may have gathered from the written questionnaire form, what we begin today is a civil case, not a criminal case. It is a case of Andrea Rossi and Leonardo Corporation as Plaintiffs, who are suing Thomas Darden, John Vaughn, Industrial Heat, LLC, IPH International B.V., and Cherokee Investment Partners, LLC as Defendants.

Defendants, Industrial Heat, LLC and IPH International B.V. are, in turn, suing Andrea Rossi and Leonardo Corporation as well as JM Products Incorporated; Henry Johnson; United States Quantum Leap, LLC; Fulvio Fabiani; and James Bass.

I'm going to ask the attorneys and the parties to introduce themselves to you at this time. We'll begin with the Plaintiffs, at Plaintiffs' table.

MR. LUKACS: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning. My name is John Lukacs, and together with my colleagues
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John Annesser, Brian Chaiken, and Robert Bernstein, we represent Dr. Andrea Rossi and Leonardo Corporation.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Defendants.
MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning, everyone. My name is Chris Pace. I want to introduce to you first my clients Tom Darden, right here, and J.T. Vaughn. And assisting us during this case -- little tricky, we've got a lot of folks in here -- are Harvey Moore, Bernie Bell, Chris Lomax, and Erika Handelson. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Third-party Defendants?
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Francisco Leon De La Barra. I have the privilege of representing Mr. Henry Johnson, who is the president of my other client, JM Products, and Mr. James Bass.

MR. NUNEZ: Good morning. My name is Rudy Nunez, and I'm here representing Fulvio Fabiani, and his company United States Quantum Leap. Mr. Fabiani does not live in this country, he will be traveling here and will be here next week. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Ladies and gentlemen, let me just pause to ask some questions. Going back to the written questionnaire forms that you filled out in the jury pool section, now that you are under
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oath, is all of the information that you wrote in your form true and correct?

THE PROSPECTIVE PANEL: Yes.
THE COURT: Yes? You may hear me and/or some of the lawyers touch upon some of those areas in questioning of your fellow jurors. If any of that discussion causes you to recall something that you forgot to write down, please, don't hesitate to raise your hand and supplement what you wrote by telling us here in the courtroom.

My next question to you is, do any of you know any of us, who have been introduced to you?

THE PROSPECTIVE PANEL: No.
THE COURT: No. I know we have two teachers from
Ransom Everglades here today; is that right?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Do you know each other?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Are there any other jurors,
who know fellow jurors on this panel?
We have a hand in the far back, Officer Lee, please.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Does it count meeting the person here?

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I can't hear you. You need to wait for the microphone.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Does it count as an
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acquaintance or a friend, somebody that you just met here in the juror room?

THE COURT: No. Not someone whom you just met, and can you give us your name, please?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Olivo, Juror 44.
THE COURT: Thank you. Anyone else here have family members or friends or coworkers on the same jury?
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: At this time, I'm going to ask the attorneys to read to you the names of potential witnesses. These are people who may, during the course of this trial, come into Court to testify. What we want to know is, if you know any of them?

MR. LUKACS: Your Honor, if I may, various witnesses that may be called in this case.

THE COURT: Perhaps you could look at everyone, just give your back to me and look at everyone. That might be better for them to hear you as well, Mr . Lukacs.

MR. LUKACS: May I stand here?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. LUKACS: Thank you. Various witnesses that may be called to testify in this case are the following:

Thomas Darden; John Vaughn, Industrial Heat; John Mazzarino;
Thomas Dameron; IPH International B.V., Slocum Fogleman;
Barry West; Wendy Carter; AmpEnergo, Inc., Corporation, Craig
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Cassarino; The Boeing Company, James Childress; Dr. Andrea Rossi; James Bass; Fulvio Fabiani; John Dewey Weaver; Dr. Kau-Fui Vincent Wong; Fabio Penon; Levi Guiseppe conversely, Guiseppe Levi; Bo Hoistad; Francisco Digiovani; Cherokee Investment Partners. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Pace, any additional names?
MR. PACE: Just a few, Your Honor. And also if I can, just a little bit of additional information, Wendy Carter fairly common name, lives in North Carolina; so if you know a Wendy Carter who's down here, that's not the same person. I'm going to give you another common name, Rick Smith will be a witness. He's an engineer based in Ohio. Again, common name, but does not live anywhere nearby here. Another engineer, Joseph Murray based in North Carolina. And then if I can, just to make sure that there's no issue, you heard a reference to Thomas Dameron, he actually goes by T. Barker Dameron, but he's based in North Carolina. You heard a difficult name of Slocum Fogleman, he actually goes by Jim Fogleman, but he's also based in North Carolina. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Nunez, any additional names?
MR. NUNEZ: No, Your Honor. No additional names.
THE COURT: Mr. Leon De La Barra?
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: No, Your Honor.
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THE COURT: Thank you.
Ladies and gentlemen, do any of you recognize any of those witnesses names?
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, what we're doing here, of course, is selecting a jury for the case that is about to be tried. This is the most important part of any trial because what the lawyers, the parties, and I are doing is trying to pick the judges for the case. You see, I have the title of judge, and I preside over the trial, but I don't decide its outcome. It is that group of men and women, selected by the parties with their lawyers, who will decide its outcome. So what we're interested in doing is finding a group of fair and impartial men and women, who can try the case based solely on the testimony and evidence received here in the courtroom, who can put aside biases and prejudices you may have, and who can follow the law as I instruct and render a fair verdict at the end.

So that is the purpose for the questioning that we're about to engage in and have started already. For example, if you knew some of these witnesses, you might not be able to be a fair juror, or if you knew some of the parties, you wouldn't be able to be fair.

The only correct answer to give to the questions we ask of you is a truthful response. You are under oath. The
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only thing we ask is that you give us a truthful response. If any of the questioning makes you uncomfortable and you would prefer to discuss something privately outside the presence of your fellow jurors, please, let us know, and we will bring you in for individualized questioning. Please know we're not trying to pry into your personal lives but remember the importance of what it is we're doing.

Ladies and gentlemen, is there anyone here who has any difficulty reading, speaking, or understanding the English language?
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: Is there anyone here with any medical condition-- I'm sorry. I have a hand in the back.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONILLA: I understand, but it's difficult for me understand very well or sustain it one conversation in English.

THE COURT: Okay. Could you --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONILLA: I no write, I no write English.

THE COURT: Can you stand, please, ma'am? Thank you.
And can you give us your juror number or name?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONILLA: My name is Bernarda
Bonilla. My juror name -- number is 40.
THE COURT: 40. Thank you very much.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BONILLA: Okay.
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THE COURT: Anyone else?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANA DIAZ: My name is an Ana Diaz. I'm not too much English.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
Is there anyone here who has -- we have a hand in the first row, Juror No. 1, Ms. Jean Baptiste. Yes, ma'am?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR JEAN BAPTISTE: So I don't understand quick -- I don't understand English, like, somewhat at a distance. So I don't speak English, like --

THE COURT: So you have some difficulty with English?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR JEAN BAPTISTE: Yes. And I have
issues to write English too.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
Anyone else? We have another hand.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORENO: 52.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORENO: Orlando Moreno.
THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Moreno?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MORENO: Sometimes I have some difficulty understanding when people talk too rapidly, and then that is the only thing.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Could I ask that gentleman to sit over here on the far right so that the officers can move freely about the back there? Thank you.
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Ladies and gentlemen, is there anyone here who has any health-related concern, health issues, difficulty sitting for extended periods of time, difficulty hearing, or any health issues that you think may prevent you from serving as a juror in this case?

We have a hand in the far back.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Olivo, No. 44.
THE COURT: Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: I just had -- I just had an
implant in one of my upper molars, and it hurts.
THE COURT: Is the pain going to get better or worse; do you think?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: I'm going to have to go back to the dentist, sometime either today or in the next week.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Judge, we have one here.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHOY: Yamile Choy.
THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHOY: I cannot be in a closed room with a closed door for such a long time. It gets me, like, not being myself, and it gets me hyper, it gets me nervous. That's all.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHOY: You're welcome.

MR. LUKACS: Juror number?
THE COURT: Juror No. 23, Yamile Choy.
Yes, sir, in the back?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR STEVEN DIAZ: Not necessarily --
Steven Diaz.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR STEVEN DIAZ: -- a medical
condition, but I have a very important procedure on July 5th at the University of Miami, and so I just wanted to give you a heads up on that.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR STEVEN DIAZ: Okay.
THE COURT: I have another hand here in the jury box.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Ronnie Mumford.
THE COURT: Yes. Juror 17.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: 17. Okay. It's not
really that serious, but I have diabetes, and occasionally I have to go to the restroom because of water.

THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: So that's basically it.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: I'm okay usually --
THE COURT: So with breaks, you're fine?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Fine.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
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Ladies and gentlemen, I've mentioned before, and you're aware that this is a civil case. It's a civil case in which we have several Plaintiffs, and we have several Defendants, and we have several third-party Defendants. So a Plaintiff is a party that files a lawsuit and is requesting some relief, in this case money damages.

So this case started out with two Plaintiffs suing for money damages. Leonardo Rossi -- I'm sorry -- Andrea Rossi and Leonardo Corporation, and so these Plaintiffs are suing several Defendants. I started naming them, Thomas Darden, J.T. Vaughn. So the Plaintiff that brings a lawsuit has the burden of proving his or its claims by what we call the greater weight of the evidence.

This is not a criminal case. In a criminal case, the Government brings criminal charges against a person and is accusing the person of committing crimes. And what the Government is generally asking for is punishment, imprisonment. So under our legal system in a criminal case, the Government must prove the crime charged beyond all reasonable doubt. A very high burden.

The law is different in civil cases such as this one, and a Plaintiff that is seeking money damages and the recovery of money from a Defendant or Defendants, must prove its claims by the greater weight of the evidence. So if you were thinking of scales of justice, in order to win, a Plaintiff has to tip
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those scales by 51 percent.
And as I've said before, we have several Plaintiffs because all of the Defendants -- I'm sorry -- two of the Defendants, Industrial Heat and IPH are also Plaintiffs because they're also suing back Andrea Rossi and Leonardo Corporation. And those Defendants have also brought in other parties, the JM Products, Henry Johnson, and so forth. And to the extent that those Defendants are also Plaintiffs, they have that burden of proof on the claims that they are bringing, to prove those claims by the greater weight of the evidence.

And then we have something else that's called affirmative defenses. So a lot of the parties in this case that are being sued have raised affirmative defenses, and they carry the burden of proof on their affirmative defenses. I will give you instructions on all of this later. That's to give you a general sense.

It is the duty of the jury selected, to listen to and weigh all the evidence and to judge credibility. The primary role of the jury is to judge the credibility of the witnesses, who come before you. You already come to court equipped with life experience. You judge credibility every day. You judge it at home. You judge it at work. When people communicate to you and tell you something, you're weighing whether they're being truthful or not and bring that common sense with you as well if you are selected as a juror.
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Ask yourself as to each witness, does he or she stand to gain something by the outcome of the case? Did the witness give a prior statement different from the statement he or she is giving you here in court, and if so, why? Did the witness seem to have a good memory and the opportunity to observe clearly and accurately those things he or she is testifying about? Does the witness's testimony differ from the testimony of another witness on the very same point, and if so, why? You are the judges of the facts, and you will judge credibility. So keep this in mind.

I want to give you a summary, an overview of how the parties in this case describe their case.

Andrea Rossi and Leonardo Corporation are asserting four claims against Tom Darden, J.T. Vaughn, Industrial Heat, IPH International, and Cherokee Investments. The Plaintiffs claim Industrial Heat and IPH breached a license agreement that the parties had. The Plaintiffs claim Industrial Heat and IPH failed to make a required 89 million dollar payment after an agreed-upon, independent third party had validated the underlying technology.

An alternative -- as an alternative to that claim, the Plaintiffs claim that Industrial Heat and IPH were unjustly enriched by benefits given to them by the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs claim Industrial Heat and IPH successfully sold 4 percent of their company in return for 50 million dollars as
a result of Dr. Rossi's efforts in continuing to provide consulting services to Industrial Heat and IPH.

Third claim, Plaintiffs allege Tom Darden, J.T. Vaughn, and Cherokee fraudulently induced the Plaintiffs to enter into that license agreement with Industrial Heat by misrepresenting Industrial Heat's ability to pay under the agreement. Plaintiffs claim the Defendants misrepresented that Industrial Heat and Cherokee had funds in excess of 100 million dollars to pay for the technology; that upon completion of a guaranteed performance test that Industrial Heat and IPH would pay the full amount of the license fee; That Industrial Heat and Cherokee are both the same company and Industrial Heat was a wholly owned intellectual property holding entity for Cherokee; and that Cherokee would guarantee payment of the license fee by its subsidiary Industrial Heat.

Last, the Plaintiffs claim that all of the Defendants misappropriated the Plaintiffs' trade secrets and unjustly benefitted.

For their part, Defendants, Industrial Heat and IPH claim that Rossi and Leonardo Corporation breached a contract. They claim the parties entered into a license agreement for technology and that it was Plaintiffs who breached it by failing to show the technology worked as promised and failing to deliver all of the know-how about the technology to Industrial Heat and IPH as required under the agreement.
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IPH also asserts a separate claim for breach of contract against the Plaintiffs and states the Plaintiffs breached the license agreement by disclosing aspects of the technology to outsiders; failing to assign patents for the technology to IPH; charging Industrial Heat and IPH for patent-related costs that the Plaintiffs were required to pay; and working on the technology with companies other than Industrial Heat and IPH.

Industrial Heat also brings a claim for fraudulent inducement against the Plaintiffs as well as Henry Johnson and JM Products. Industrial Heat claims, Rossi, Leonardo, Johnson, and JM Products convinced Industrial Heat to enter into a contract by making false statements to Industrial Heat. Industrial Heat says Rossi, Leonardo, Johnson, and JM Products convinced Industrial Heat into entering a contract called a "term sheet" by falsely saying JM Products was a real company with a production facility in Florida; that JM Products had a real commercial use for the technology; and that JM Products was affiliated with Johnson Matthey, a large company in England.

Industrial Heat and IPH also bring a claim for violation of Florida's Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act against the Plaintiffs, as well as Johnson, JM Products, James Bass, and Fulvio Fabiani. They say that those Defendants violated the Florida law by manipulating Industrial Heat and

IPH into sending a plant they own to Florida and then deceiving Industrial Heat and IPH as to what they were doing with the plant in Florida.

Finally, Industrial Heat states a claim of breach of contract against Fabiani and United States Quantum Leap. Industrial Heat entered into a technical consulting agreement with Fabiani and Quantum Leap. Industrial Heat claims Fabiani and Quantum Leap reached the agreement by not acting in the best interest of Industrial Heat and not providing Industrial Heat with accurate information.

Now, JM Products and Johnson deny Industrial Heat's of fraudulent inducement. They assert Industrial Heat negotiated the terms of the agreement and did not include any representations concerning Johnson Matthey in it. JM Products and Johnson say Industrial Heat was aware JM Products was a newly formed entity that was being set up for the purpose of conducting experiments while using steam generated by the plant. JM Products, Johnson, and Bass deny Industrial Heat and IPH's claim that they were engaged in a scheme to deceive them.

Fabiani and Quantum Leap deny they're liable to
Industrial Heat and IPH for violating Florida's Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act. They say they have no involvement in manipulating Industrial Heat and IPH into sending the plant to Florida. And while the plant was in Florida, they did not engage in any deceptive acts.
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Fabiani and Quantum Leap deny they failed to perform in accordance with the technical consulting agreement they had with Industrial Heat. They say they properly performed under the contract and turned over all or substantially all of the data collected during the plant's operation in Doral.

Ladies and gentlemen, is there anyone here who knows anything about this case, from anything you may have read, heard, or seen?
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: Is there anyone here who, now that you have truly a very general idea about what the case is about, believes that you cannot serve as a fair and impartial juror in this case?
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: Is there anyone here who has ever heard of the term "cold fusion?"
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: Is there anyone here who has watched the 60 Minutes episode called "Cold Fusion Hot Again."

MR. PACE: Your Honor, to the prior question there were three hands.

THE COURT: There were. There were indeed. Yes.
Has anyone heard of E-Cat or low-energy nuclear reactions?
(No audible response.)
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THE COURT: Is there anyone here who has any understanding of thermal engineering or thermal dynamics?

All right. If we could have the two hands in the far back, Officer Lee, if you could take the microphone to them, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Besides being a computer -THE COURT: I'm sorry. Your name and number again, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Olivo, 44. Besides being a computer engineer, I'm also an electric mechanical engineer. So thermodynamics and physics, mathematics is my field.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
The next juror?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR INDORF: Hello. My name is Jane Indorf. I'm assistant professor at the University of Miami in biology. And during my studies as a biology graduate student, I'm familiar with thermodynamics and some physics.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
We did have some hands -- oh, we have another person in the far back. Could you please stand?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: My name is Osvaldo Moreda.
When $I$ was a nursing major at Miami-Dade College, I had to take the -- I had to understand thermodynamics while I was taking physics, also.

THE COURT: Thank you. That's Juror 57?
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: 57, yes.
THE COURT: We did have, I believe, several hands when I asked a question about cold fusion. Could I see those hands again? Could I ask this juror in the jury box -- oh, here first row, Juror No. 3, Mr. Romanik?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Yes. I just have a general layman's understanding, having read some general publications about the research and development, but no technical expertise.

THE COURT: What is your general knowledge?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Well, you know, they're working on it, and fusion is -- fusion creates energy, but doesn't use as much energies.

THE COURT: All right. Very good.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Embarrassing.
THE COURT: No, not at all, not at all. While you
have the microphone, Mr. Romanik, I did have a follow-up question for you. You served as a juror in another federal case, I believe. How long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: I bet it was ten years ago.

THE COURT: Okay. And it was also a business lawsuit. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Business lawsuit.

THE COURT: We have you on that special list of jurors who come in for civil cases. I'm kidding.
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Did you enjoy -- is there anything about that prior experience that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: I don't believe so.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Sure.
THE COURT: We had some other hands with cold fusion in the -- right in the jury box. Behind Mr. Romanik, we have --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: Kappelman.
THE COURT: Kappelman, Juror No. 8. Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: I teach physical
science. I have some basic knowledge of cold fusion.
THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: Or at least a concept of what it is.

THE COURT: All right. And you agree with Mr. Romanik in his general statement?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. That's a safe answer.
While you have the microphone, Mr. Kappelman, you did serve as a juror in a prior case. Was it a civil case or a criminal; do you recall?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: Civil, I believe.
THE COURT: And how long ago was that?
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: Five or six years ago. THE COURT: Is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to serve fairly here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Mumford?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Yes.
THE COURT: Juror No. 17.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Okay. I am basically
familiar with cold fusion, thermodynamics, basically from studying it in college this stuff. But I am not a professor in it, but I do understand it.

THE COURT: All right. I did have a question for you, Mr. Mumford. You wrote that you were retired from the medical field. What was the --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: No, retired from AT\&T.
THE COURT: AT\&T.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Yeah.
THE COURT: Okay. And you also served as a juror, I believe, two times before?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Correct.
THE COURT: Did the jury reach a decision both times?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Both times.
THE COURT: Is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to judge this case
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And you had -- you wrote about that
lawsuit against Ford Motor Company.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Correct.
THE COURT: Is there anything about that prior experience that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Okay.
THE COURT: Is there anyone here who has experience with trade secrets, patents, or copyrights?

Okay. And that's Juror 44, Mr. Olivo?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Yes, we have experience registering rights for computer programming.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Professor Indorf, do you as well, ma'am, or no?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR INDORF: No.
THE COURT: No. Okay.
We have some hands over here on the far right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: My name is Allison O'Neil,
Juror 55.
THE COURT: 55.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: I've been involved in a
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couple of writing projects and artistic projects. Ah, and I have done a very minimal amount of research into intellectual property things for those purposes, individual purposes, and have helped collaborators, um, like, send off to the Library of Congress for copyrights on -- for artistic projects.

THE COURT: Excellent. Thank you.
And while you have the microphone.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Yes.
THE COURT: You were the foreperson in a prior trial, correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Yes.
THE COURT: How long ago was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Several years ago.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: More than seven.
THE COURT: And that was a criminal case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about that prior experience that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: No.
THE COURT: And you wrote about the class action that someone close to you was involved in. Is there anything about his case that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: No.
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
And I believe your fellow juror also raised her hand.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: 54, Elizabeth Karow.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: Just my husband was filing a patent on, like, an agricultural structure that didn't end up going through. That's my only experience.

THE COURT: All right. And while you have the microphone, Ms. Karow, you wrote about being -- was it an extra juror or grand juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: No, it was -- I was an extra juror.

THE COURT: And that was in Indiana?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that experience that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: No.
THE COURT: And what type of law does your father practice?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: Corporate law.
THE COURT: Here or?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: In Indiana.
THE COURT: Indiana. Does he work in a law firm?
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: Yeah, for a law firm.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about the type of work that he does or your discussions with him about his work that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: I don't think so.
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
Ladies and gentlemen, is there anyone here who has any experience in valuation of new technology or business valuation?

Okay. We have one here in the jury box.
That's Mr. Gonzalez, Juror No. 9.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GONZALEZ: Yeah, hi. Good morning, everyone. My name is Jesse Gonzalez, Juror No. 9. I am an auditor with KPMG. So in our various audits as a public accounting firm, we are sometimes engaged to perform audits for mergers and acquisitions, business combinations. I have experience in looking at forecasted financial information, valuation of certain intangible assets, franchise rights, things of that nature.

THE COURT: Excellent. Thank you.
Anyone else?
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: Is there anyone here who has any bias against people from foreign countries? One of the parties here, Dr. Rossi, is from Italy. I believe we have witnesses
who may also be from other countries.
Anyone with a bias or prejudice?
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: Is there anyone here who has ever tried to break a contract; you had a contract with someone and you tried to get out of it or did get out of it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Would a verbal contract count?

THE COURT: Let me just go back. Wait for the microphone, please, Mr. Olivo, Juror 44.

The question is a verbal contract?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: A verbal contract, does it count?

THE COURT: Yes, it does.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Then I have a problem of that.

THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: I was deceived by a bank. They denied me a payment of $\$ 5,000$ on the work that I did in computers. And I told you that happening in this room because I left my country because of that.

THE COURT: And what country is that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Dominican Republic.
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THE COURT: Thank you very much.
Is there anyone here who has ever given testimony at trial or in a deposition? Several hands.

Why don't we start over here. Mr. Kappelman?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: Yes. I gave a deposition.

THE COURT: In what kind of a case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: If I remember correctly,
an injury. A former athlete of mine had been involved in an accident, and I was given a deposition about his abilities before he was injured.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
And in the back. All right. We have Ms. Essinger.
Yes, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESSINGER: Yes.
THE COURT: That's Juror 8 -- 16. Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESSINGER: About a month and a half ago, I was deposed because the attorneys wanted information about a child of mine who had problems from birth -- the student of mine that had problems from birth. And their parents were suing the hospital and the nurses and the doctors.

THE COURT: All right. So you were a fact witness? Right.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESSINGER: Um-hmm. I only had the child a couple months.
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THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
If could you pass the microphone to Mr. Mumford, Juror 17.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: I was deposed against the Ford Motor Company. So I was -- their lawyers, my lawyers and I think there was a third-party lawyer.

All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: So.
THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.
All right. Just two more down, if you could, I think it's Ms. Noche, Juror 19.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: I had to give a deposition on an altercation that $I$ separated with two of my students, and a lawsuit ensued. And I had to give a deposition on the -- one parent tried to attack a student, so I had to give a deposition on it.

THE COURT: All right. And while you have the microphone, Ms. Noche, you wrote about a lawsuit that was settled out of court. Were you a party to that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: I was not.
THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about the experience that that person went through in that case that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: I didn't have a very good experience with the lawyers in either party.

THE COURT: Right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: They prolonged it to the point where we just kept on giving money and money and money. I think, something that could have been settled out of court within a few months took, you know, years.

THE COURT: All right. But will you carry that displeasure with those lawyers and hold it against these lawyers whom you don't know?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: I can't say for sure. I --
THE COURT: You just don't like lawyers.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: Due to my experience, I didn't have a very good experience, I would say.

THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: Not so much.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: Okay.
THE COURT: Is there anyone else here who has that, sort of, feeling, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but that sort of not too happy with lawyers type of feeling?

I see we have a hand in the back. And that is?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: Alma Ramirez.
THE COURT: All right. Juror No. 45. Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: About ten years ago, I worked for the Post Office and for a -- a carrier ran over a child and killed it, killed the child. And I had to go to
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THE COURT: Right. Is that -- do you hold any biases or do you just dislike lawyers because of that or?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: No.
THE COURT: Oh, all right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: No, I don't.
THE COURT: Oh, I see.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: It was just something that happened, and it was very --

THE COURT: Difficult.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: -- traumatizing.
THE COURT: Yes. While you have the microphone, ma'am, you wrote about serving about eight years ago on a jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: It was a civil.
THE COURT: Correct. And is there anything about that experience that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: I hope not.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: No. 44, Olivo. I was called to talk on behalf of a fellow friend in Fort Lauderdale in a courtroom of law. It was a charge -- he was charged and convicted, and he is right now in jail for killing three people in a car accident, and he was under the influence. So I -- I was called in to talk about what I knew of him, which is good,
and it was good, and it is still good.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Other hands in the back row?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEDINA: Hello. I'm Juror No. 49.
Name's Alexis. I was called as a witness in a case of a cousin of mine and the wife in Tampa. But then the wife dismissed the case, so I wasn't --

THE COURT: So you never testified?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEDINA: I never had to testify so. THE COURT: While you have the microphone, Mr. Medina, you also wrote about a car accident or lawsuit?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEDINA: Yeah, that was when I used to work for Embassy Suites. And they actually -- okay, they actually went after the company, not after me, so.

THE COURT: All right. Not you personally? PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEDINA: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MEDINA: Yeah.
THE COURT: If you could pass the microphone down.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: No. 51.
THE COURT: Ms. Nunez. Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: I was deposed while I was
working at Florida Department of Transportation on a construction claim.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
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We had another hand up in the front row back there.
Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MENA: Eddie Mena. I think I was
27. I am not sure. I was just deposed during my divorce.

THE COURT: Yes. That is 27. And let me see here.
And, Mr. Mena, you also served as a foreperson in a criminal case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MENA: Yes.
THE COURT: Is there anything about that experience that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MENA: No, I don't believe so.
THE COURT: And as a result of being deposed in your own divorce, would that affect your ability to judge the case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MENA: No.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Yes?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: I'm Glenda Centeno. I don't know the number.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, your name again?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Glenda Centeno.
THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: I had to give a deposition
for an accident that $I$ was involved in.
THE COURT: Juror No. 20.
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: 20.
THE COURT: All right. And were you sued personally, as well, or not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: I was suing the person who.

THE COURT: Okay. And is there anything about that experience that would affect your --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: I'm not a fan of lawyers either.

THE COURT: Not a fan, but do you dislike them for any particular reason?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Just because of that experience.

THE COURT: All right. But do you like any of us here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: No.
THE COURT: I'm a lawyer too.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: No.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
Other? Yes, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR COCHRAN: My name is Britney
Cochran. I am currently in the process of a lawsuit where the other party is going after my mother and I. We were involved in a car accident. Well, I was involved in a car accident in December 2013.
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THE COURT: Right. Okay. And that's going on right now?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR COCHRAN: Yes, the trial is actually set for some time in September.

THE COURT: Okay. And you are being represented by insurance counsel?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR COCHRAN: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about that experience that you are going through now that would affect your ability to serve fairly here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR COCHRAN: Honestly, yes, it is making me a little anxious, especially since my mother is older and her having to go through the process, as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
We have another hand in the back. Oh, all right.
Let's start over there.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: Juror No. 57.
THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: Osvaldo Moreda. I had to testify against my best friend in a criminal case.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KING: Hi, No. 56.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KING: I was involved in a lengthy
divorce; it took years. And I also forgot that, I guess, my
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roofer sued me for additional moneys, went to court for that. And, recently, I had a car accident, and I guess that's still pending.

THE COURT: And, Ms. King, is there anything about those prior experiences that would affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KING: No, I don't believe so.
THE COURT: Thank you.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: We have one here, Judge.
THE COURT: Ms. O'Neil.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Yes. I was deposed regarding an injury that a friend of mine sustained in a car accident, and I testified as to his condition and what I observed. Also, I believe I have an association with Mr . Kappelman. As he was speaking, my --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. You turned off the microphone. PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: I did?

THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Okay. My brother was a student at Ransom Everglades. Joseph Romey (phonetic). And I believe was -- coached along with him very closely and spoke of him often. So I don't know him personally, but he knows my brother very well.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Okay.
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THE COURT: Someone over here.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Yes.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHOY: Hi. Yamile Choy. I went one time to court because one boss from one company that I worked for, he sued his partner, and they took me just to testify to see what I knew about their partnership one for the other, but then the case was closed.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHOY: Okay.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BOLUS: I was in a car accident --
THE COURT: I'm sorry. Name or number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BOLUS: Rosette Bolus.
THE COURT: Juror No. 28. Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BOLUS: I was in a car accident a
long time ago, but we did not go to court or anything. They fixed my expenses out of court and everything.

THE COURT: Thank you.
All right. Thank you.
Ladies and gentlemen, I have some follow-up questions for some of you, and then the attorneys may have some additional questions.

I will begin over here in the front, Officer Latour, with Juror No. 2.
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Ma'am, could you tell us what type of work you have done in past?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CLAYTON: Worked for AT\&T.
THE COURT: AT\&T. All right. And you said you were on call for two weeks with the Federal Courts and Dade County Court for a day. Were you ever selected as part of the jury?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CLAYTON: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CLAYTON: You're welcome.
THE COURT: Juror No. 5, Mr. Marks.
And, Mr. Marks, you are attending the university now?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MARKS: No, I graduated.
THE COURT: Okay. And what did you study?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MARKS: It was anthropology.
THE COURT: Okay. And I see that you are applying for the Air Force.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MARKS: Yes.
THE COURT: And in the meantime, what do you do with your time?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MARKS: I take care of my grandmother.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
Juror No. 7, Mr. Lazier. So, Mr. Lazier, you were the foreperson on another jury; is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LAZIER: Civil case, yes.
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THE COURT: Civil case. Did the jury reach a verdict?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR LAZIER: Yes, we did.
THE COURT: And how long ago was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR LAZIER: About 10 years ago.
THE COURT: And is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to serve fairly once more?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR LAZIER: No, it wouldn't.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
Juror 14, Mr. Ruiz. Mr. Ruiz, you have been involved in some civil suits from car accidents?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RUIZ: That is correct.
THE COURT: Is there anything about those experiences that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RUIZ: In no way at all.
THE COURT: Thank you. Juror No. 18, Ms. Aldarondo.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALDARONDO: Yes.
THE COURT: And, Ms. Aldarondo, can you tell us what type of work you have done in the past?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALDARONDO: I am unemployed, but I used to babysit my sister's child.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALDARONDO: And I used to take care of their dogs.

THE COURT: Okay.
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALDARONDO: My sister has set up an interview in Tallahassee this July for me.

THE COURT: Okay. And what type of work are you looking for or would you like to do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALDARONDO: Well, I like drawing, so something with animation.

THE COURT: Okay. Excellent. Thank you.
And Juror 25, Ms. Auguste.
Ms. Auguste, could you stand? I'm sorry. I can't see. Oh, very good.

Ma'am, you work as an administrator for what company?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR AUGUSTE: Ross University School of Medicine.

THE COURT: All right. And before that, you worked as a legal assistant?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR AUGUSTE: Yes.
THE COURT: With a law firm?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR AUGUSTE: Yes, he was a solo practitioner, I guess.

THE COURT: Okay. And what type of law practice was it, plaintiffs' work, defendants, criminal?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR AUGUSTE: Well, he mainly did probate, and then he would do other things such as traffic or personal injury.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
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Juror 29, Mr. Corti. If you could stand please,
Mr. Corti, it is just easier for us see you.
Mr. Corti, your wife is a paralegal?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CORTI: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: And do you know what type of law office she works in?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CORTI: She works for a solo practitioner, civil.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And do you know if that solo practitioner handles mostly plaintiffs' work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CORTI: Defense.
THE COURT: Defense.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CORTI: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Juror 32, Ms. McFarland. And, Ms. McFarland, you
served as a juror once before in Baltimore?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR McFARLAND: Yes.
THE COURT: How long ago was that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR McFARLAND: 20 years ago.
THE COURT: And was it a civil case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR McFARLAND: It was a medical malpractice.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR McFARLAND: No.
THE COURT: Thank you.
And, Mr. Paez, Juror 33.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: Good morning.
THE COURT: Mr. Paez, you served back in '93 in
Federal Court. Here in Miami?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: Correct.
THE COURT: Is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to judge this case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: No.
THE COURT: And you also wrote about something that occurred in 2016, and the case settled just a few months ago.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: Recently, yes, settled.
THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: California.
THE COURT: Correct. Is there anything about that experience that would affect your ability to judge the case fairly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: Absolutely not.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Juror 35, Belfort. And, Mr. Belfort, you served as a juror in a medical malpractice case as well and were the foreperson. Is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to judge the case fairly?
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR BELFORT: Not at all.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Ms. Gross, Juror 36. Ms. Gross, I know you didn't remember when you were filling out the written questionnaire form, but do you have any better recollection now?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GROSS: Maybe about six years ago, medical malpractice.

THE COURT: Okay. Did the jury reach a verdict?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GROSS: Yes, guilty.
THE COURT: And were you the foreperson?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GROSS: No, ma'am.
THE COURT: Anything about that prior experience that would affect your ability to judge fairly once more?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GROSS: No.
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
Juror 37, Prentice, Mr. Prentice.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PRENTICE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And, Mr. Prentice, you were also in Federal Court as a juror one time before. Do you recall how long ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PRENTICE: Basically, like two years ago.

THE COURT: Oh, recently.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PRENTICE: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Is there anything about that prior
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experience that would affect your ability to judge fairly once more?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PRENTICE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. Juror 39, Ms. Zepeda.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ZEPEDA: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And, Ms. Zepeda, you were also a member of a jury in a state case. How long ago was that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ZEPEDA: About a year or two ago.
THE COURT: Was that a criminal case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ZEPEDA: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to judge fairly once more?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ZEPEDA: No.
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
Juror 47, Ms. Belbusti. And, Ms. Belbusti, you were also a member of a jury where the jury did reach a verdict. Is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to judge fairly once more?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BELBUSTI: Honestly, it extended a couple nights, and right back then I wasn't a mom. Now I am. I have to leave at $5: 00$, so it would affect my input in deliberations and --

THE COURT: Right. But I don't keep my jurors past 5:00.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BELBUSTI: Okay. Then it works
fine.
THE COURT: I never have.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BELBUSTI: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Okay. Juror 53, Ms. Aleman. Ms. Aleman, you have been working with interpreters in the area of human resources?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: I work for a company that has interpreters and translators. I started out 18 years ago as an interpreter, and then I progressed to being supervisor, examiner, recruiter. I have done every position. Trainer. Right now, I am an examiner. I test people's language skills and interpretation skills.

THE COURT: Did you ever work as an interpreter in court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: Not in court, but over the phone, yes, for court.

THE COURT: Okay. And does your company do that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: Yes.
THE COURT: And you were on a jury once before. How long ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: That was probably a little over a year ago.

THE COURT: Was it a criminal case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: No, civil.
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THE COURT: Is there anything about that prior jury experience that would affect your ability to judge fairly once more?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much.
Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to turn the questioning over to the attorneys. I am giving them a little bit of time each.

We'll begin with the Plaintiff.
MR. LUKACS: May it please the Court, Counsel, ladies and gentlemen, good morning again.

Let me follow up with respect to litigation experience, itself. Is it Ms. -- Juror No. 20, is it Ms. Centeno.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Centeno.
MR. LUKACS: Centeno?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Centeno.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. And you were involved in a lawsuit, as well.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Correct.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. And did your experience in that lawsuit influence you -- or will it influence your decision-making at all in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: No.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. Good. You also indicated you were
employed over at FIU, as well as your husband.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Correct.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. In what capacity is your husband working with -- at FIU?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Can you repeat the question? I'm sorry.

MR. LUKACS: In what capacity is your husband working?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: He's the assistant registrar there.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. Thank you very much.
Juror No. 11, Ms. Shannon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHANNON: Good morning.
MR. LUKACS: Good morning. You indicated you worked for the Department of Corrections.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHANNON: Yes.
MR. LUKACS: At some point you worked in corporate
America. Tell me about that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHANNON: Well, when I first graduated college, I worked for IBM, but that was years ago. So I have been working for the Department of Corrections for 14 years, now, as a counselor.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. Thank you so much.
Now, I know that Mr. Martinez and Mr. Gonzalez, Juror Nos. 38 and No. 9 have a business background, particularly with auditing and finance and management and the like. And this is
a question for all of us. Is there anybody here, other than you gentlemen, who have taken any courses in business ethics finance, management and the like?

Yes, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: I've worked for eleven years --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. One second. Please wait for the microphone.

MR. LUKACS: May I have your juror number, please? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: Yes. Madeline Aleman, 53.

MR. LUKACS: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: The microphone is not on.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: I worked eleven years for a Canadian bank. And I did different positions, including -THE COURT: I'm sorry. It turned off. The acoustics are really bad here, so we can't hear you without a microphone. COURT SECURITY OFFICER: They are both out.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: I worked 11 years for a Canadian bank, and in that Canadian bank, I did many different positions, including accounting, I was in finance. I was in all those departments, the controllers department and human resources.

I also -- back then, I started the first affirmative action program for the bank. And the bank that -- the branch that I was in was in San Juan, Puerto Rico.
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MR. LUKACS: Okay. In the -- in your experience with the bank, were you involved at all with investment banking?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: Not with investment banking, no.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. Has anybody -- and this is again a group question. Is there anybody here who has ever publicly marketed any type of new business venture or any new technology in the hopes of soliciting investors? Anybody?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: I didn't, but my husband works for Bank of America, and he's been there for over 30 years, and he's got experience in all of those fields. He's a audit manager, vice president in Bank of America.

MR. LUKACS: Is -- is Mr. Aleman currently employed at Bank of America?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: Yes.
MR. LUKACS: Great. Thank you very much.
Now, for those of you who have actually been --
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: We have one more.
MR. LUKACS: Oh, excuse me. Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHANNON: Juror No. 11. My
undergrad is in business administration.
MR. LUKACS: That's right. And you would have taken a number of courses in that --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHANNON: Yes.
MR. LUKACS: -- curriculum, correct?
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHANNON: Yes.
MR. LUKACS: Great. Thank you so much.
Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: Juror 33. I'm a human
resource manager. I've taken management courses in college and stuff, so I have had numerous positions throughout my years in human resources.

MR. LUKACS: Have you ever had any occasion to work with investment bankers?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: No.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. Thank you, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR STEVEN DIAZ: Steve Diaz. I'm not. Not familiar with my juror number. But just generally, in college, I did take some management courses, and some of them involved business ethics. And you asked a question about that, so --

MR. LUKACS: Yes, I did. So thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR STEVEN DIAZ: So I did, I'm not an expert on it, but I took a course in college.

MR. LUKACS: Great. Thank you so much.
Juror No. 44, Mr. Olivo, you had your hand up? Yes, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Yes. In my line of work, I'm a computer project leader, and I deal with inventories, accounting. So I'm familiar with bookkeeping and general
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ledgers and general balance sheets, also the P\&L and everything that has to do with general accounting, that's exactly what I do. I work for a company that has an ERP program that serves that --

MR. LUKACS: Okay. But you've not had any specific experience in actually soliciting new technology or new projects for purpose of enticing either companies or individuals and making those investments, have you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: No, I have not, sir.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. Thank you, sir.
UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You were asking earlier about business, business ethics, and at work we're required every year to take online a half-hour brief course on business ethics.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. Great. Thank you so much.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: We have two here.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GINORIS: Number 6. I currently -I currently manage a service department for an HVAC company in South Florida.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. Which company is that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GINORIS: Kendale Air Conditioning.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. Great. And how long have you been there?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GINORIS: Twenty years.
MR. LUKACS: Excellent.
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Yes, sir. Mr. Romanik?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Number 3.
MR. LUKACS: Number 3.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: As a technical writer, I run across ethics and the explanation of ethics and reading and researching ethics and put together some slide programs for ethics for nonprofits.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. How long have you been involved in that -- that type operation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Technical --
MR. LUKACS: Technical writing.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: -- writing?
MR. LUKACS: Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Well, before I retired, I did that about the last -- on and off the last seven years of my life.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. Great. Thank you, sir.
Is there anybody else?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: 51. I have a master's in business administration and --

MR. LUKACS: I'm sorry. Can you speak louder?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: Master's in business
administration, and I take ethics courses every year required by my employer.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. You also have an engineering
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: I do.
MR. LUKACS: And you mentioned, I think, working with Florida Department of Transportation?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: Correct.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. And how long have you been with DOT?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: I was -- I was with DOT for 23 years. I'm currently working at Jackson.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. In your civil engineering experience with the DOT, were your -- were you focused more on the transportation and traffic analysis component of civil engineering?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: It was really in construction.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. Great. Thank you.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: We have two up here.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: So in reference to your -No. 20, Glenda Centeno. In reference to your question about the courses, I did my bachelor's in management information systems, so I took various business courses.

MR. LUKACS: And that too would have involved taking courses in business management, ethics and the like?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Correct.
MR. LUKACS: Great. Thank you so much.
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: You're welcome.
MR. LUKACS: Mr. Mumford. Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MUMFORD: Yes. My minor in college was business administration and major in computer science. And I worked for AT\&T, and yearly, several times a year, we had to take courses in business ethics. So I'm familiar with that.

MR. LUKACS: Okay. Great. Thank you.
For those of you who have purchased a home, as opposed to renting a condominium or leasing, is there anybody here that doesn't understand the distinction between having the right to use and ownership? Anybody here that doesn't understand the distinction between the two?
(No audible response.)
MR. LUKACS: Okay. For those of you who have actually purchased a home or purchased a car or made another type of investment, is there anybody here that doesn't think that getting an appraisal or doing the necessary due diligence prior to engaging in that purchase or lease or investment is the right thing to do?
(No audible response.)
MR. LUKACS: Now, Your Honor asked about whether or not anybody spoke Italian. Let me ask you here, does anybody understand Italian?

Yes, ma'am.
UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Some.
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MR. LUKACS: Okay. Have you ever had the opportunity to work by and through an interpreter as it relates to the Italian language?

UNIDENTIFIED PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. LUKACS: Is there anybody here that has any experience with the Italian culture?

Yes, sir. Your juror number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: 33.
MR. LUKACS: Mr. Paez?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: Yes.
MR. LUKACS: Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PAEZ: I was a flight attendant prior to my HR experience. I used to fly to -- out of Kennedy to Switzerland, and I used to go a lot to Northern Italy.

MR. LUKACS: Great. Thank you for that.
Your Honor, how much time do I have remaining? Couple minutes?

THE COURT: Four minutes.
MR. LUKACS: Okay. Thank you. Let me take my notes and try to wrap this up.

THE COURT: That's not working. You'll need to use the other microphone.

MR. LUKACS: You've already heard a brief description of this case. And you've heard that, in this case, Dr. Andrea Rossi and Leonardo Corporation are going to ask for
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a jury verdict in the amount of $\$ 89$ million arising from a breach of contract and other conduct on the part of the Defendants.

Is there anybody here that has any beliefs or any feelings that would make it uncomfortable or difficult for you to compensate Dr. Rossi and his company with money damages in a substantial amount, if the evidence justified it?
(No audible response.)
MR. LUKACS: We've spoken quite a bit, and Mr. Pace is going to have an opportunity to ask you some questions as well. But let me ask you if you can think of any beliefs, any experiences, any feelings at all -- I apologize for my back -that might affect the way you look at the evidence in this case?
(No audible response.)
MR. LUKACS: Does everybody here realize that in this case, you're going to hear evidence that is going to consist of both documents, that is the written word, and then, of course, oral testimony, that's when you're spoken to by witnesses themselves?
(No audible response.)
MR. LUKACS: Is there anything you would like to share before I conclude and let me know something about yourself that might in some way affect your ability to render a fair and impartial verdict in this matter?
(No audible response.)
MR. LUKACS: I thank you very much.
Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Pace.
MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor. And almost good afternoon, but still good morning to everybody.

I, just as with Mr. Lukacs, I apologize if I'm ever turning my back to one group or another. I'm trying not to.

I do have a number of questions. I think one that I really need to start off with, though, is that this is going to be a several-week-long trial and --

THE COURT: I will be addressing the length of the trial.

MR. PACE: I apologize, Your Honor.
THE COURT: That's all right.
MR. PACE: Then I will skip that entirely.
Has anyone -- I want to see if anyone here who's ever bought a product that they've returned because it didn't work? Can I -- can I ask for a second about that? I'm probably not going to go through everybody, but can we pass the microphone just for a second?

And -- I'm sorry -- let me start off just by with your juror name and number, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: 20, Glenda Centeno.
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MR. PACE: And what type of product was it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: A steamer.
MR. PACE: I'm sorry?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: A clothing steamer.
MR. PACE: A clothing steamer. And were you able to get -- and you returned it because it failed to work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Correct.
MR. PACE: Did you get a replacement for it, or did you get your money back?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Money back.
MR. PACE: Did you want -- I'm sorry.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: I did not want a replacement. I don't know if that was your question.

MR. PACE: That's perfect. I appreciate that.
Can we hand the microphone -- do you mind -- do you mind just passing it down this way?

Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR RUIZ: Juror No. 14. I had purchased a drone. The drone did not function properly. I returned it, and I got my money back.

MR. PACE: And was it just that model of the drone, or was it a -- was it a broken model, or did the drone type did not work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR RUIZ: The drone tech did not work.
MR. PACE: Thank you.
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I -- I know we saw some hands back here, if we can. Yes, right here in the corner, if I can?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SOLIS: My number is 42,
Gisell Solis, and I returned a steamer too.
MR. PACE: Ah, there's problems with steamers in Miami. Was -- did you get a replacement, or did you just simply get your money back?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SOLIS: I just got my money back.
MR. PACE: Okay. And right back here in the corner, if we can? Thank you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I bought a queen-sized mattress, one of those memory mattresses, and it didn't inflate like it was supposed to, so the company told me I had to take pictures and send it to them, and they would replace it, and they did.

MR. PACE: So it was a replacement as opposed to getting your money back?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I would presume that if it didn't -- they brought me the next one, and it didn't work, they would probably give me my money back.

MR. PACE: But the next one did?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. PACE: Excellent.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: Juror No. 57,
Osvaldo Moreda. I brought a firearm once that malfunctioned really bad. It almost blew my hand off. I gave it back to the
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company, and they serviced it, and I got it fixed, so yeah.
MR. PACE: Serviced it, got it fixed, and now it's okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: Yeah, it's fine, it's fine. It works. I don't shoot it as much anymore though because I'm very scared of it, but, yeah.

MR. PACE: Can I ask while we have the microphone over here, only because I don't believe, Ms. Aleman, I heard what -what language you translate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: Spanish?
MR. PACE: Or when you were translating.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: I was interpreting Spanish. Spanish and English.

MR. PACE: I appreciate that. I'm sorry. You may have said that, too, and I just might have missed it.

I think this was touched on a little bit, but I want to make sure I ask about it again. I have just a handful of very specific questions. This is king of my last general one.

Has anyone here been involved in a contract dispute, contract where you entered a contract with somebody, maybe even a close family member of yours entered a contract with somebody, had a disagreement, and had to find a way of resolving it? Does that experience -- is it about a steamer?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: No.
MR. PACE: If you are talking about the steamer. I
hope you don't feel I'm picking on you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: No, no, it's okay.
Okay. So currently I work at FIU, and we're having issues with a company, who said that we had a contract that was out of renewing. And we didn't, because the way the university works, when we go under contract, we have to go through our contract process, and we did initially have a contract with them, maybe in 2011, but contracts in the State university cannot last for more than three years. They definitely can't just auto-renew. We're now in 2017. At a certain point during that time, we had -- or back, I guess maybe in 2012, we had told the company, um, to use the purchase order terms and agreement to be able to -- to get the service from them. So we technically haven't been under contract with them because the PO terms is something that every year they would invoice us, and then we would go ahead and use the terms as an agreement, and then just for one year, next year, but the company is saying that because of a contract that they're talking about that was years ago that we're auto-renewing.

So we're having issues with that. The general counsel is involved. So we still -- we're still working on -- on that issue.

MR. PACE: So it's still ongoing, and it's not in court?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: It is not in court yet.
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MR. PACE: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Yet.
MR. PACE: Your -- your dislike for lawyers might grow.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: I'm sorry?
MR. PACE: I said you're dislike -- your general dislike for lawyers might grow if that goes into court as well.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: I hope not.
MR. PACE: I hope not too.
I think I saw some other hands. Did I or am I kidding myself? Over here? Please, it doesn't involve your hand, does it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: No, no.
MR. PACE: Okay, good. Fantastic.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: I had a bit of a dispute with LA Fitness because I kept trying to terminate my contract with them to switch to another gym. And they just wouldn't break the contract no matter how many fees I paid to break the contract.

MR. PACE: Now, in connection with that, did you have a -- do you have a copy of the contract?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: Yes, I do at home.
MR. PACE: All right. And then in trying to resolve the matter, did you rely on what was said in that contract to try to talk to the other side to --
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: Yes, I did. I ended up just calling the corporation and speaking to, like, you know, the top person, and we were able to resolve it over the phone with no problem.

MR. PACE: Oh, fantastic.
And then I thought I saw a hand over here -- oh, I'm sorry. I saw a hand right in front.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I forgot, the last question you asked, had I exchanged anything?

MR. PACE: Uh-huh.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've done it successfully. Gone through the company, yes, I have. It was a Weed Eater leaf blower.

MR. PACE: And -- and -- and was it -- did you get your money back, or did they give you a new one?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They sent me a second one.
MR. PACE: Second one that works?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They sent me a replacement.
MR. PACE: I'm about to finish up. I did -- and -I'm sorry. I probably did not, but did I see somebody else raise their hand about involvement in a contract dispute, or am I wrong about that? Ah, here we are. Two folks here.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: I did before ask -- No. 44, Olivo -- if a verbal contract counts. And the Judge says it did, so I do have a bitter memory of somebody breaking a
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contract to me, verbally. No -- no lawyer saying it.
MR. PACE: No lawyer. Is this what you had with the bank --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Yes. I already mentioned that.

MR. PACE: It was an oral contract?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Yes.
MR. PACE: And then it led you to actually moving to the United States --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: Yes, sir. You work for the best.

MR. PACE: Ah.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: It did.
MR. PACE: And then we have one here in the front, I believe.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOLIWALA: Maria Koliwala, Juror No. 58. I don't know if this applies, so I'm just going to mention it. I do have a friend who has been in a contract dispute regarding business. Um, it's nothing related to me, but it's just information that's come through me regarding the contract between him and -- and the party that he has a contract with.

He had a dispute -- um, it hasn't gone to litigation or anything like that because, um, it's regarding, um, a business and its property that he had purchased. And it's an
agreement between him and the -- the owners of the property, and that he is using the property as -- as like a partnership, and it's regarding moneys that -- that he agreed to -- would be paid to the first party. And there was like a dispute as to the amount that he was due to pay them, uh, based on the earnings of the business.

As far as $I$ know, it's -- I haven't heard much more of it, but the -- you know, the business is still ongoing as to the agreements of whatever, if he's, you know, completed that or not. I'm not aware.

MR. PACE: Well, it sounds to me like whoever has this dispute, they -- they view you as a counselor, as someone who's helpful to them. You know a lot of great details about this matter. Is it something you've helped talk him through how to resolve the dispute?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOLIWALA: No. It's -- it's friends of ours, and he's been talking to my husband about it, and I've just been hearing about it. And I know how he functions, and -- and he's not very thorough in reading contracts.

MR. PACE: Ah.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOLIWALA: So my husband is trying to advise him as well as other, you know, close friends. You shouldn't sign something if you haven't, you know, gone through it completely, and if you don't understand it, you know, you shouldn't -- he's been advised not to go through this, but he
went ahead anyway. So now he's having a little bit of issues, so --

MR. PACE: Your husband's advice is you should read a contract before you sign the contract?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOLIWALA: He shouldn't even have gone -- involved into this business or even signed the contract.

MR. PACE: I -- I do appreciate that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOLIWALA: Okay.
MR. PACE: I am actually almost done, if I can have just one second, Your Honor.
(Pause in proceedings.)
MR. PACE: Ms. Nunez, can I just ask, from an engineering perspective, what do -- what do you do -- oh, I'm sorry, Ms. Nunez, I was looking at you, and I apologize. What kind of work do you do for Jackson now in terms of engineering work?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: I manage the -- the facility's design and construction department.

MR. PACE: Ah, okay.
THE COURT: Three minutes.
MR. PACE: Your Honor, I -- Your Honor, I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Third-party Defendants.
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MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Thank you, Your Honor. It is officially, good afternoon.

I just have a couple questions. Mr. Francisque, I believe you raised your hand with respect to knowledge about thermodynamics?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FRANCISQUE: Yes.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Can you briefly discuss your general knowledge --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FRANCISQUE: Yes, that's correct.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: What is your knowledge of thermodynamics?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FRANCISQUE: Sorry about that.
Repeat the question, please.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: What is your knowledge of -- or understanding of thermodynamics?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FRANCISQUE: From my understanding,
after -- I had to take the course because my bachelor's is -it's in mechanical engineering.

MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Okay. And I believe you listed a hobby as auto engine building. Is there a specific engine that you like to build, a V6, V8?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR FRANCISQUE: Usually,
first-generation General Motors.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Okay. You do that for -- you have your own cars?
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR FRANCISQUE: Yes.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: I'm a car head too, that's why I asked.

Generally, by a show of hands, how many of you have in your careers a boss? A boss. Sorry. Someone you -- a supervisor. Okay. And by a show of hands, how many of you have ever been reprimanded by a third party for something you did -- something that your boss told you to do?

By a show of hands, who here has been reprimanded by a third party for something that you did that was in the scope of your employment, something that your employer or your boss asked you or told you to do?

We have one in the back, two in the back.
Juror No. 44, I believe?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: 44. It happens every day.
In my regular line of business, we serve people, and we write programs to resolve daily issues in their businesses. And it's common behavior, human behavior, not to be satisfied and call the boss. And the boss get to you, and you know what happened after that. Never been fired for that, though.

MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Thank you for that.
Was there another hand over here?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GRANT: Hi. Ellen Grant. Sure, it -- as the gentleman said, it happens all the time. You're asked by a department chair, for example, to follow up on
something, and follow up on something. And then higher-ups say, Why did you that? And that wasn't your prerogative. And I was simply following instruction.

MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Okay. And would you -- would you expect to be sued over that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GRANT: No.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Thank you.
Is there one more?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: In the interpretation world, we have to serve as invisible -- we have to relay everything that is said, and so we're invisible. It's two people talking to each other, and I serve as the interpreter. And on one occasion, $I$ was interpreting everything that the Spanish speaker was saying, and she got mad at me and started yelling at me and cursing. Don't repeat everything I say, etc., etc. And she didn't understand my role. I don't discriminate, you know, what I should interpret or shouldn't interpret, I interpret everything I hear. So that was a third party that was telling me what not to do.

MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Okay. And how did that make you feel?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: I felt that there -- there is not enough education out there as far as how interpreters work. And so I just -- I was okay with it because I know that not everybody knows how to work with an interpreter.
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MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Thank you very much. That's all the questions.

MR. NUNEZ: No additional questions, Your Honor.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Sorry, one more.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Hi. Alison O'Neil,
Juror 55.
I'm a Dade County public school teacher, so I have a lot of bosses. I served as department chair for -- or I have served in the capacity as department chair for gifted students, which is -- falls under the umbrella of exceptional student education. And we're required to do a lot of documentation regarding that and have additional training to make sure that all that documentation is done correctly and according to the law and according to making sure that students are receiving appropriate services in the appropriate manner.

And there's a lot of paperwork that goes along with that. And so we are trained by specialists in that area in order to carry out that purpose and that directive that comes from State law. And sometimes other people, such as perhaps administrators, want things to be handled differently or aren't as familiar with the specifics of that area as we are and don't necessarily want to -- we're getting it from different sides and are not -- are really obligated to follow one set of rules and are being asked to follow another set of rules.

MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Got it.
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Sometimes.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Thank you for that.
That's all the questions I have, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Ladies and -- you had no questions.
MR. NUNEZ: No additional questions.
THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, let me discuss the length of the trial, and with that discussion, we'll just close this portion of the voir dire, this is voir dire examination of a -- of a panel of jurors, and give you a lunch break.

You may have gathered that the case is -- involves many parties, many claims, many defenses, and will take some time to try. The jury summons that you were kind enough to observe and come here in response to only asks you to be available for two weeks, I believe. Not all trials take two weeks. This one will not. This trial we anticipate will conclude the week of July 24. Next week we don't meet on Monday or Tuesday either because of July 4 th weekend. The court is closed on Monday as well as on Tuesday.

I know we're in the summer. And I know some of you may have vacation plans. So I would ask Officer Latour to start over here in the front of the room and let me just direct my question to this portion of the room and ask, is there anyone in this portion of the room who cannot serve for the duration of the trial as we anticipate it?
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In the first row, Juror No. 3, Mr. Romanik?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROMANIK: Yes. Self-employed, and my wife is my boss, and I do her backup and back office work for her. And for two weeks, she would be very unhappy. And it would probably -- it would make very tough on her, and she might miss some opportunities that she might not -- that she otherwise could have taken advantage of if I was there to do a lot of the grunt work and back work, computer research for her.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Romanik.
Anyone else in this first row? All right. Please pass the microphone down.

Mr. Marks.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MARKS: Aaron Marks, Juror 5. I'm going through enlistment with the Air Force, and as it stands right now, $I$ kind of have a scheduled date for a physical.

THE COURT: What date is that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MARKS: It is -- I believe it's the 15th of July.

And also due to my grandmother moving in with me and my mom, and my mom working most of the time, I kind of have to look after her at some points. I can only get someone to kind of look after her at certain days.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Ginoris.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GINORIS: Yes, um, being in my line
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of work, this is our busy season right now where we are swamped, and I do run the managing department, and I can be out for at least --

THE COURT: And what company do you work for?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GINORIS: Air conditioning.
THE COURT: I'm sorry?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GINORIS: Air conditioning.
THE COURT: What is the company, though?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GINORIS: Kendale Air Conditioning.
THE COURT: Kendale Air Conditioning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GINORIS: Yeah.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Second row.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAPPELMAN: Juror 8, Kappelman.
July 21st to the 28th, I'm taking a group of runners to North Carolina for a running camp.

THE COURT: Thank you.
All right. Mr. Lazier.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR LAZIER: Yes, I need one day, and that's July the 13th, I have a doctor's appointment.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Gonzalez.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GONZALEZ: Yes. Hi. Good morning.
I work for PP\&G, so we're a public accounting firm.
One of my main clients is a Fortune 200 client. July is a very
busy month for us. We have a lot of deadlines coming up, and the week of July 24 th, I'll be in Detroit for an audit committee meeting. So I'm traveling with our partner, I'm the lead engagement manager on the job and going to be traveling that week. And several deadlines the weeks before, so next week is already going to start to ramp up for us. And the first week of August, after I come back from the audit committee presentation, our main client files their quarterly filing. I am going to Siesta Key for vacation with my family. THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Smith.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SMITH: Juror No. 10. I am currently a adult education administrator. I work 12 months. We are in the process right now of master scheduling. I do have other colleagues that can take over my building in the evening, but one of my colleagues, her mother has colon cancer, so the duration of this trial is going to affect my job performance, unfortunately.

THE COURT: And who is your employer?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SMITH: Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SMITH: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHANNON: Good afternoon, Juror
No. 11, Babette Shannon. I'm currently the senior counselor
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with the Department of corrections, and my unit right now, we're already short-staffed, so we're in the process of going through various audits. We have another audit coming up on July 10th. The audits, as you know, can -- would assume, we have to pass those for our units to stay open. So it's just a really critical time right now.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHANNON: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR COCHRAN: Juror No. 12. On the week of July 21st, I am scheduled to move out of my apartment along with my elderly mother, so that's a bit much. And then also the following week, I'm scheduled to go out of town to Alabama. THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Okay. So next week I am --

THE COURT: Juror name or number.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CENTENO: Oh, sorry. 20,
Glenda Centeno. I'm supposed to go on vacation because it will be my five-year wedding anniversary. But what concerns me a lot, too, is the -- beginning the week of July 12th, my youngest child is going to be starting school, and I would -I'm going to be the one that's going to be taking him during those times.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Ms. Noche -- oh, I'm sorry. Yes.
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: I have --
THE COURT: I can't hear you. Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: I have a medical condition that I would like to discuss in private, if possible.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Once we excuse the rest of the jury.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ulysse.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ULYSSE: Juror 21. My wife just have a newborn. And then during the day, I stay with the kids, and I work night also. I work eight to four in the morning.

THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ULYSSE: And then on the July 20th, I'm traveling overseas, I already plan with ticket.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Ms. Aldarondo.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALDARONDO: Yes. My father had got in a days off prior to me getting the notice, and we had -we're going to Tallahassee because my sister had set up an interview after July 8 for -- for Party City where she used to work at, see if I can get a job there.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Ms. Essinger.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESSINGER: Yes, I was just hired for ES White student school year for special education. And it
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runs -- it starts Wednesday. The work days were yesterday and today. It begins on Wednesday, and it ends on August 1st. THE COURT: That's for the -- that's the school board? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESSINGER: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ESSINGER: Dade County Public Schools. And half of the program -- it's not at my school; however, half of the program and many of the children are my former students, and we collaborate together and work together in order to accommodate and modify what we need to help our kids, so.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
I believe there were other hands here.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Right here, Judge.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHOY: Hi. Yamile Choy, 23.
THE COURT: Yes. 23.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHOY: I work for a small company, which I am the one in charge of the whole office. I am the receptionist, I'm the secretary, I'm bookkeeping. I have to deal with all the agents of the office in a daily basic. And they don't have nobody to replace me. One of my boss, she's on jury duty as we speak. And my other boss, which is her husband, he is out of town for two weeks. So I don't have nobody can replace me. They practically -- nobody can handle
the matters in the office, and I have like 40 agents in my office --

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR CHOY: -- that I have to deal with on a daily basic.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Yes. Ms. Phillips.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR PHILLIPS: Yes. Juror No. 22. I work at Bascom Palmer in the medical records department, and we're already short-staffed. So the month of July, we have various people taking off vacation time, so I need to be there.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
All right. In the back of the room, that section, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBINSON: Barbara Robinson, 43. THE COURT: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBINSON: I am retired. I have doctors' appointments. I have made travel plans. And I cannot sit for extended lengths of time. So that would be a lot on me.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR OLIVO: No. 44. Besides my toothache that I already mentioned, I'm leading a two years go-live right now. And I have a letter here from my boss just in case you need to substantiate this claim, but being here
will hurt the company that I work for, Gormitak (phonetic) Associates, because it is right now at this point that this customer went live with the programs, and they cannot put in invoices, and you know what that means.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR RAMIREZ: Alma Ramirez. I have airfare, I'm leaving on the 20th of July out of the country. THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR GROSS: Yes, Janis Gross, No. 36.
Miami-Dade County public employee, 12-month employee. No one's in the office. Summer school is getting ready to start. I'm the only one in the office that registers the children, and I need to be there because I do payroll and registration, and it's nobody there.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GROSS: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR INDORF: Juror 46, Jane Indorf. I'm a single mother of a 20-month-year-old, who is in day care. Day care doesn't start until 8:30. He needs to be picked up between 5:00 and 5:30. I could make arrangements for the father to be there to pick him up, but it would be a hardship.

Also, I'm scheduled to be at a professional conference from the 9 th to the 16 th, up in Massachusetts. These plans have been made for months, and it's integral to my career and my professional development.
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THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DEUTSCH: Mary Deutsch, Juror
No. 48. I run the office for a private school. I'm the only one in the office. I do registration, report cards, closing up the school year, and registration for the upcoming school year.

THE COURT: What school is it, please?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DEUTSCH: It's called the Mechina South Florida of Miami Beach.

THE COURT: Can you spell that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DEUTSCH: M-E-C-H-I-N-A.
THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DEUTSCH: It's the junior high and high school.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR AUGUSTE: Juror 25. I have a planned trip from July 8th to the 12 th. And when I return, it's peak season at my job.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR STEVEN DIAZ: Steven Diaz. I have a schedule, been approved vacation time starting July 4th, going through the weekend, so I believe it's the 9 th or something like that.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR STEVEN DIAZ: Okay. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NUNEZ: 51. I have a -- I'm
scheduled to do a quarterly update to the board of -- to the public health trust board now at the end of July, but I'm -it's quarterly update for the whole capital program.

I also have a long weekend planned between the -- one of the two weekends between the 9 th and the 29 th to New York. My daughter will be up in a precollege, so I was going to fly up there and take her to college tours.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GRANT: I'm Ellen Grant.
THE COURT: I can't hear you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GRANT: Hello.
THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GRANT: Hi, I'm Ellen Grant. Yes, I have travel plans beginning on the 13th and --

THE COURT: Juror 30 . I'm sorry. Go ahead.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GRANT: Thought that I would be done by that time. Following that, I've got to check in on my parents -- we rotate siblings -- up in New Hampshire.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR GRANT: And that all falls in July.
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALVARADO: Hi. My name is Glenda.
I'm a dietician in a health center. I have admissions every day. I am in charge of the fifth floor, so I don't have anybody to cover for me.

Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA

THE COURT: That's Juror 50. And who is your
employer, ma'am?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALVARADO: Riviera Health Resort.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MENA: Eddie Mena. My sales -- my job is in sales, so 80 percent of my income is sales-related, so three weeks would severely impact that kind of income.

THE COURT: Juror 27. Thank you.
And on that side of the room.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR O'NEIL: Allison O'Neil, Juror 55.
I have a root canal on Monday. And I have two follow-up appointments, I believe, which are July 12th and 14th, which perhaps could be somewhat rescheduled. And then the following week, I have travel plans, flight for the following week.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR KAROW: Hi. Elizabeth Karow, 54. I'm a nurse practitioner for a pediatric office, and I have patients scheduled, you know, the next few weeks to see me, three to four days a week. And now is our very busy time of year. All the kids need their physicals and their forms to go back to school. In addition, I have travel plans to Colorado the 12 th through the 16 th to be in my friend's wedding. And I also have travel plans on July 26th.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR ALEMAN: Madeline Aleman, No. 53. I am a lung cancer patient. And I have appointments coming up, which I can reschedule; I wouldn't mind.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BYRD: I'm Juror 59. I have mandatory work scheduled for July 9th through 11th.

THE COURT: And who is your employer?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BYRD: Levy Restaurants.
THE COURT: I'm sorry?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR BYRD: Levy Restaurants.
THE COURT: And what do you mean by mandatory work schedule?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BYRD: We have an event coming up that I have been scheduled for, for those days.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
All right. We will ask Ms. Noche to stay with us, Juror 19. The rest will now take a break.

During this break, please do not -- oh, there's one more person?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: Osvaldo Moreda, Juror No. 57.

THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MOREDA: My grandmother has terminal
cancer, and she's nearing her time.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
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During this lunch break, please do not discuss this case with anyone. Please avoid contact with the parties and the lawyers. They cannot have contact with you. Please don't do any reading or research about the case. And please return and be gathered outside the courtroom doors by 1:30. Please come back by 1:30.

Have a good lunch.
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Prospective jury panel exited the courtroom at 12:28 p.m.)
THE COURT: Ms. Noche, if you would just stay here with us, please, ma'am.
(Pause in proceedings.)
(Prospective Juror No. 19 present.)
THE COURT: Everyone, please be seated.
Ms. Noche, you can just take a seat there, ma'am.
There was something you wanted to discuss with us privately.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: Thank you. It is nothing drastic, but it's a little bit embarrassing. I suffer from irritable bowel syndrome, diarrhea. I get bouts, they can be five, seven bouts a day or none a day. So it's very unpredictable.

THE COURT: I understand. Thank you, ma'am.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR NOCHE: You're welcome.
(Prospective Juror No. 19 not present.)
THE COURT: I know you all need a break as well, but
we are going to plow right ahead and address these cause challenges, and then you are going to take your break. All right?

MR. PACE: Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: If anyone needs to use the restroom, you can come behind me. But we are moving forward while you have other Counsel here.

All right. All right. Do $I$ hear a cause challenge on Juror No. 1?

MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. LUKACS: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on Juror 3?
MR. LUKACS: No.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. LUKACS: I'm sorry. A cause challenge, yes.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. LUKACS: Forgive me.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Do I hear cause a challenge on Juror 5?
MR. PACE: Yes.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. LUKACS: No. No objection.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on Juror 6?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
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THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: No.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on Juror 7?
MR. PACE: Yes.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. LUKACS: No.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 8,
Kappelman?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
MR. PACE: Yes, I know. Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on Juror 9?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
MR. PACE: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on Juror 12?
MR. LUKACS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. PACE: Oh, no, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on Juror 18?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
MR. PACE: Oh.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. PACE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 19?
MR. PACE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 20?
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MR. LUKACS: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on Juror --
MR. PACE: Your Honor, can I ask, you went past
Juror 16. Didn't she say she has the school board?
THE COURT: She works for the Dade County Public Schools.

MR. PACE: But -- okay.
Cause challenge on Juror 21 ?
MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. LUKACS: No.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on Juror 23?
MR. LUKACS: If I may just look at my notes for a moment, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Can't be in a closed room. Works for a small company.

MR. PACE: Oh, yes.
MR. LUKACS: Oh, yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 25?
MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 26?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 27?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
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THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 30?
MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken.
Cause challenge on 40 ?
MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 43?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 44?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 45?
MR. PACE: Yes.
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 46?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
MR. PACE: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 51?
MR. NUNEZ: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 52?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 53?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken.
MR. PACE: Your Honor, did she say she could
reschedule? I thought she said she could reschedule the vacation.
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THE COURT: She is the lung-cancer patient with appointments.

MR. PACE: Oh, jeez, my apologies.
THE COURT: That's all right. Cause challenge on 54?
MR. LUKACS: Yes.

MR. PACE: All right. Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 55?
MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. LUKACS: Yes.

THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 59?
MR. NUNEZ: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken. Let me go back to Moreda 57.

Cause challenge on 57?
MR. NUNEZ: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. LUKACS: Yes.

THE COURT: Stricken. Cause challenge on 60?
MR. PACE: Yes.
THE COURT: Stricken. Any others?
MR. PACE: Give me just one second, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes.
(Pause in proceedings.)
MR. LUKACS: Your Honor, with regard to Juror No. 48, she is the administrator of the school over in Miami Beach that indicated a hardship as a result of planning, and these are the months in which -- that's when they do their planning for the
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following year. I know it could be extreme.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. NUNEZ: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Stricken.
Any others?
MR. NUNEZ: Your Honor, number -- I thought Nos. 10
and 11.
THE COURT: One works for the school board, the other one works for Department of Corrections.

MR. PACE: Your Honor, my only other one would be Juror No. 15, Christopher Palmer. I noticed on the form the repeated spelling errors. I am not sure that the handling of a case with a lot of documents, so we would --

THE COURT: That might disqualify a lot of lawyers from the process of law. And on that happy note, gentlemen, why don't we take our lunch break.

MR. PACE: Okay.
MR. LUKACS: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(A lunch recess was taken at 12:37 p.m.)
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A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

THE COURT: Let's begin, please.
All right, Plaintiffs. Juror No. 2, Clayton?
MR. LUKACS: Fine.
THE COURT: Defense?
MR. PACE: I'm sorry, Your Honor. For Clayton, accept.

THE COURT: Third Parties?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Defense, Juror 4, Francisque?
MR. PACE: Accept.
THE COURT: Third Parties?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Strike, peremptory.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants, Juror No. 10,
Smith?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept, Your Honor.
That was Juror No. 10, correct, Your Honor?
THE COURT: 10.
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MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, Juror 11?
MR. LUKACS: I believe Juror 11, Your Honor, expressed
a hardship. She is the Department of Corrections officer.
THE COURT: I didn't find it sufficed for that.
MR. LUKACS: Okay.
THE COURT: Do Plaintiffs accept?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept.
THE COURT: Third-parties?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants, Juror 13?
MR. PACE: We would exercise a peremptory as to
Juror 13.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants, Juror 14 ?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Peremptory, strike.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, Juror 15?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Strike.
THE COURT: Defendants, Juror 16?
MR. PACE: Accept.
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THE COURT: Third-party Defendants?
MR. NUNEZ: Strike.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants, Juror 17?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, Juror 22?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: I'm sorry, Judge. No. 22, strike.
THE COURT: Defendants, Juror 24?
MR. PACE: Accept.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants, Juror 28?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Strike, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, Juror 29?
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MR. LUKACS: Strike.
THE COURT: Defendants, Juror 31?
MR. PACE: Strike, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants, Juror 32?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept.
THE COURT: That gives us six. I'll go over them.
Juror No. 2, Clayton; 10, Smith; 11, Shannon; 17, Mumford; 24, Fleite; 32, McFarland.

MR. LUKACS: Your Honor, where are we on the strikes at this time?

THE COURT: Plaintiffs have used four. Defendants have used five.

MR. LUKACS: Thank you.
THE COURT: And I say four for you because the third-party Defendants used one.

MR. LUKACS: Yes, Your Honor. Are we going to seek a
panel of ten as we did yesterday?
THE COURT: I am going try for more.
MR. LUKACS: Okay.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, Juror No. 33, Paez?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.

THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept.
THE COURT: Third parties?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants, Juror 34, Barrantes?
MR. PACE: Accept.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Strike.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, Juror 35, Belfort?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants, Juror 36, Gross?
MR. PACE: Accept, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Third parties?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants, Juror 37,
Prentice?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.

THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, Juror 38, Martinez -- I'm sorry. Juror 39, Zepeda?

MR. LUKACS: Strike.
THE COURT: Defendants, Juror 41, Hill?
MR. PACE: We'll strike Ms. Hill.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants, Juror 42, Solis?
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs, Juror 47, Belbusti.
MR. LUKACS: I recall this being a hardship as well,
Your Honor, if I'm not mistaken. Peremptory.
MR. NUNEZ: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I also had her as travel.

MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: She had to travel July 6th to July 16th.

THE COURT: Belbusti?
MR. NUNEZ: That's what $I$ have in my notes.
MR. PACE: You might have had it for 46. You might
have written over. I don't have any travel in my notes for 47.
THE COURT: Neither do I.
MR. LUKACS: I have, actually -- oh, for 47?
THE COURT: Correct. We are on 47, Jennifer Belbusti.
She is the database administrator at FedEx.
MR. LUKACS: Peremptory, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Defendants, Juror 49, Medina?
MR. PACE: Accept, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. I skipped over Deutsch,
48?
MR. PACE: I think that Deutsch is out.
THE COURT: I'm sorry. She is out.
So the Defendants accepted Medina? Third-party
defendants? Accept?
MR. NUNEZ: I'm sorry, that's 49?
THE COURT: 49.
MR. NUNEZ: Yes, Your Honor, accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: Strike.
THE COURT: That's it for you on strikes.
MR. LUKACS: Okay.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants, Juror 50,
Alvarado.
MR. NUNEZ: Accept.
THE COURT: Plaintiffs?
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MR. LUKACS: Oh, excuse me, Your Honor, accept.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Accept, Your Honor. That gives us 12?
THE COURT: That gives us 12.
And let's move on to Juror 56, King. Plaintiffs?
MR. LUKACS: No, I don't have any more strikes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Your Honor, I believe we also are also out of strikes, and I don't have a basis for cause.

THE COURT: Third-party Defendants?
MR. NUNEZ: Same response, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. So let's go over the list of jurors.

MR. PACE: Do we have one -- if Your Honor wants, I think 58 is also still -- was still technically on the list. I don't know if you wanted to stop at 13 or just cover 58 as well.

THE COURT: Do you want to try this round with 13 jurors, Mr. Pace?

MR. PACE: Well, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, you could.
MR. PACE: I'm sorry. I only raised it because that was the only one you didn't cover, so I don't -- you know, I don't know if when you bring them back, somebody is going to

```
remember a --
```

THE COURT: Another vacation.
MR. PACE: Right.
THE COURT: All right. So let's move on.
MR. PACE: I mean, I have no cause for 58. I don't know if anyone else does.

THE COURT: Do all parties accept Juror 58?
MR. LUKACS: Let me just check one last location.
I have no basis for cause.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. NUNEZ: Same response, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Very good.
So let's go over the jurors again. Clayton, No. 2;
Smith, 10; Shannon, 11; Mumford, 17; Fleite, 24; McFarland, 32;
Paez, 33; Belfort 35; Gross 36; Prentice, 37; Solis, 42;
Alvarado, 50; King, 56; and Koliwala, 58.
Do the Plaintiffs accept the jury?
MR. LUKACS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Defendants?
MR. PACE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Third-party Defendants?
MR. NUNEZ: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And the understanding is that there will be eight jurors deliberating at the end, correct? Unless the parties wish to have all of the ones who are here through the
duration of this very long trial deliberate?
MR. PACE: Um --
THE COURT: I will let you all discuss that with your clients and give me your position at some point so we all know.

MR. PACE: I appreciate that, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Let's bring the jury in, please.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Please rise for the jury panel.
(Prospective jury panel entered the courtroom at 1:40 p.m.) THE COURT: Everyone, please be seated.

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to thank you once more, first of all, for coming in today in response to the jury summons; second, for answering our questions with honesty and candor; and, third, for being so patient with us. I know it's been a long day for you.

At this time, I am going to call out the juror numbers and names of those who have been selected. If your name is called, it means you are a juror in this case. At the conclusion of my reading of the list, I will excuse the rest of your members who were not picked. You will all go back to the jury pool section to receive further instruction.

If your name is called and you should leave with your fellow jurors outside my courtroom doors, we'll lock the courthouse down and get you back here. So please don't leave
if your name is called, because we continue with the trial after the rest of the jurors are excused.

These are the jurors selected in this case: Juror No. 2, Cheryl Clayton; Juror No. 10, Lewanda Smith; Juror No. 11, Babette Shannon; Juror 17, Ronnie Mumford; Juror 24, Brenda Fleite; Juror 32, Wendy McFarland; Juror 33, Gabriel Paez; Juror 35, Hideyuki Belfort; Juror 36, Janis Gross; Juror 37, LeRoy Prentice; Juror 42, Gisell Solis; Juror 50, Glenda Alvarado; Juror 56, Kathy King; and Juror 58, Maria Koliwala.

To the rest of you, thank you very much. Kindly return to the jury pool section. And you all have a good day.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(Prospective jury panel exited the courtroom at 1:48 p.m.)
THE COURT: Ms. Clayton, I am going to ask you, ma'am, to go into the jury box. You can just -- there is an opening over there and sit in the very first seat.

Ms. Smith, if you would move down the row next to Ms. Clayton. And, Ms. Shannon, and if you would move down as well. Mr. Mumford, if you would please join your fellow jurors in the first row.

Ms. Fleite, please come forward, ma'am. Ms. McFarland. Ms. Clayton, I did not mean you. I need you to stay in the jury box. I'm sorry.

Ms. Fleite, ma'am, if you would please move into the jury box with this seat. Ms. McFarland, if you would follow.

And, Mr. Paez, just move all the way down, please.
Mr. Paez, Gabriel Paez. Okay. Very good. Thank you.
Mr. Belfort. Mr. Belfort, if you would move into the second row, all the way down.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: This way, sir.
THE COURT: Ms. Gross, Mr. Prentice, Ms. Solis, Ms. Alvarado, Ms. King and Ms. Koliwala.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to ask that you please stand and raise your right hands. At this time, my courtroom deputy will administer your oath as jurors in this case.
(Time 1:46 p.m.)
(The selected jury panel was sworn.)
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you. You may be seated. COURT'S PRELIMINARY JURY INSTRUCTIONS

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, first of all, let me indicate that if any of you will need letters for your employers, my courtroom deputy can get those to you. And you will you be meeting with her in the jury room because I'm sure many of you would want to let your employers know. Particularly for public employers, they are very well and familiar with the rules of this court. And our jury pool section will work with you at guaranteeing that your employers receive communications so that you don't receive any pressure from that end with regard to your jury service here.

Members of the jury, now that you have been sworn, I need to explain some basic principles about a civil trial and your duty as jurors. These are preliminary instructions. I will give you more detailed instructions at the end of the trial.

It is your duty to listen to the evidence, decide what happened, and apply the law to the facts. It is my job to provide you with the law that you must apply, and you must follow the law even if you disagree with it.

You must decide the case on only the evidence presented in the courtroom. Evidence comes in many forms. It can be testimony about what someone saw, heard or smelled. It can be an exhibit or a photograph. It can be someone's opinion.

Some evidence may prove a fact indirectly. For example, if a witness saw wet grass outside and people walking into the courthouse carrying wet umbrellas, this may be indirect evidence that it rained, even though the witness did not personally see it rain. Indirect evidence like this is also called circumstantial evidence, simply a chain of circumstances that likely proves a fact.

As far as the law is concerned, it makes no difference whether evidence is direct or indirect. You may choose to believe or disbelieve either kind. Your job is to give each piece of evidence whatever weight you think it deserves.
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During the trial, you will hear certain things that are not evidence, and you must not consider them. First, lawyer statements and arguments are not evidence. In their opening statements and closing arguments, the lawyers will discuss the case. Their remarks may help you follow each side's arguments and presentation of evidence. But the remarks, themselves, are not evidence and should not play a role in your deliberations.

Second, the lawyer's questions and objections are not evidence. Only the witness's answers are evidence. Do not decide something is true just because a lawyer's question suggests that it is. For example, a lawyer may ask a witness, you saw Mr. Jones hit his sister, didn't you? Well, that question is not evidence of what the witness saw or what Mr . Jones did unless the witness agrees with it.

There are rules of evidence that control what the Court can receive into evidence. When a lawyer asks a witness a question or presents an exhibit, the opposing lawyer may object if he thinks the rules of evidence do not permit it. If I overrule the objection, then the witness may answer the question or the Court may receive the exhibit. When I sustain an objection, the witness cannot answer the question, and the Court will not receive the exhibit.

When I sustain an objection to a question, you must ignore the question and not guess what the answer might have
been. Sometimes I may disallow evidence -- this is also called striking evidence -- and order you to disregard or ignore it. That means you must not consider that evidence when you are deciding the case. I may allow some evidence for only a limited purpose. When I instruct you that I have admitted an item of evidence for a limited purpose, you must consider it for only that purpose and no other.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, this is a civil case, and the Plaintiffs have the burden of proving their case by a preponderance of the evidence. That means that the several Plaintiffs in this case must prove that in light of all the evidence, what they claim is more -- that their claims are more likely true than not true. So if you put the evidence favoring the Plaintiffs and the evidence favoring Defendants on opposite sides of balancing scales, the Plaintiffs need to make the scales tip to their side. If Plaintiffs fail to meet this burden, you must find in favor of the particular Defendant.

To decide whether any fact has been proved by a preponderance of the evidence, you may, unless I instruct you otherwise, consider the testimony of all the witnesses, regardless of who called them, and all exhibits the Court allowed regardless of who produced them.

After considering all the evidence, if you decide a claim or fact is more likely true than not, then the claim or fact has been proved by a preponderance of the evidence. On
certain issues called affirmative defenses, the Defendants asserting them have the burden of proving the elements of defenses by a preponderance of the evidence.

While serving on the jury, you may not talk with anyone about anything related to the case. You may tell people that you are a juror and give them information about when you must be in court, but you must not discuss anything about the case itself with anyone.

You should not even talk about the case with each other until you begin your deliberations. You want to be sure that everything you hear, all the evidence, the lawyers' closing arguments and my instructions on the law are received before you begin deliberating. You should keep an open mind until the end of the trial because premature discussions may lead to a premature decision.

In this age of technology, I want to emphasize that in addition to not talking face-to-face with anyone about the case, you must not communicate with anyone about the case by any other means. This includes e-mails, text messages and the Internet, including social networking websites such as Facebook, Myspace and Twitter. You should not Google or search online or offline for any information about the case, the parties or the law. Do not read or listen to the news about this case or research any fact, issue or law related to it.

The law forbids jurors to talk with anyone else about
the case and forbids anyone else to talk to jurors about it. It is very important that you understand why these rules exist and why the they are so important. You must base your decision only on testimony and other evidence presented in the courtroom. It is not fair to the parties if you base your decision in any way on information you acquire outside the courtroom. For example, the law often uses words and phrases in special ways, so it is important that any definitions you hear come only from me and not from any other source.

Only you jurors can decide a verdict in this case. The law sees only you as fair, and only you have promised to be fair. No one else is so qualified.

Let me walk you through the trial. First, the lawyers may make opening statements, but they do not have to. Remember, opening statements are not evidence, and they are not supposed to be argumentative. They are simply an outline of what the particular party intends to prove.

Next, the Plaintiffs will present their witnesses and ask them questions. After they do so, the Defendants may ask the witnesses questions. This is called cross-examining the witness. Then the Defendant may present -- Defendants may present their witnesses, and the Plaintiffs and third-party Defendants may cross-examine them.

You should base your decision on all the evidence, regardless of which party presented it. After all the evidence
is in, the parties' lawyers present their closing arguments to summarize and interpret the evidence for you, and then I give you instructions on the law, and then you go to the jury room to deliberate.

At this time, we will hear the parties' opening statements. We will hear, first, from the Plaintiffs, and then we will take a brief recess before we hear the remaining arguments -- or statements, I'm sorry.

OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS
MR. CHAIKEN: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, my name is Brian Chaiken, and along with my cocounsel, John Annesser, John Lukacs, Rob Bernstein, we have the privilege to represent Dr. Andrea Rossi, who is in the courtroom today, and his company Leonardo Corporation.

Dr. Rossi is the inventor and creator of an amazing technology that you are going to learn a lot about over the next several weeks. The Defendants in this case understood the value of that technology, and they sought to obtain a license to it. They negotiated a license agreement with my client, Dr. Rossi. They agreed to pay him money for it. They received the benefit for it. They received the intellectual property and the trade secrets that went along with it. But when it came time to pay him in full, they refused. And that's why we are all here today.

The evidence in this case is going to show that for
the three years following the entrance of that license agreement, the Defendants made numerous statements to the public about this technology. They claimed it had the potential to change the world. They claimed that it was independently validated, independently tested, that it worked and, in fact, that it was worth well over $\$ 2$ billion. With a "B," 2 billion.

They are going to come here today, and they are going to argue that despite making all of those statements about this technology, that it is worth zero today. That's what they are going to tell you.

Dr. Andrea Rossi was born in Italy. You heard a little bit about that earlier. He was educated in Italy. He obtained the equivalent of a Ph.D. in Italy. He spent the next -- excuse me -- he spent the last 20 years or so developing and creating what's called the E-Cat technology.

My mouth sometimes gets a little dry. I apologize.
Let me spell that out for you. E-Cat, E-C-A-T.
Now, what is the E-Cat technology? The E-Cat technology allows for the creation, by using its device, to create excess energy. That means energy goes in, more energy comes out. And the beauty of this technology is that it is inexpensive, and it's clean energy, meaning it doesn't emit any radioactive waste or harmful things to the environment.

The Judge in this case, Your Honor, had mentioned
something called L-E-N-R. Low-Energy Nuclear Reaction. E-Cat technology falls within the field of LENR technology.

I am going to read to you some statements made by a leader in LENR technology about Dr. Rossi and the E-Cat. I am going to try to read slowly because sometimes I read too fast and the court reporter can't take it all down.

First: This new energy source produces clean and affordable energy because it emits no pollution or radiation and creates no radioactive waste. Moreover, the minute amount of raw energy required is abundantly available. Thus, the cost structure of LENR energy sources is much better than even today's most advanced coal and natural gas energy sources. Commercializing LENR technology would lead to clean, abundant energy.

Second: To create fusion energy, you have to break the bonds in atoms, and that takes a tremendous amount of force. That's why the big government fusion projects have to use massive lasers to extreme heat, millions of degrees centigrade to break the bonds. Breaking those bonds at much lower temperatures is inconsistent with the laws of physics as they are now known.

Third: The E-Cat has been tested extensively by an independent committee of Swedish and Italian scientists. Published reports of such tests placed its coefficient of performance, that's COP, between 2.6 and 5.6.

Let me briefly stop to explain what that means. COP, coefficient of performance, you are going to hear a lot about over the next several weeks. COP. It is a very simple mathematical formula. It's calculated by putting energy output divided by energy input. So if I put one unit of energy in, and five came out, we'd have a COP of 5 . Pretty simple.

The fourth statement I am going to read to you: In December of 2012 and March of 2013, representatives of Bologna University, Uppsala University, and the Royal Institute of Technology in Sweden conducted independent tests of high temperature E-Cats. The published report of the tests concluded the E-Cat has an energy density beyond any known battery, fuel or chemical. The E-Cats created excess energy of three to five times as much. A published report of the March 2014 test indicates the E-Cat produce a COP of over 3, over a 32-day test period.

Fifth: Dr. Rossi has accomplished two critical things. First, he has the truly novel means of causing the reaction to occur. And the logic or rationale for why his idea works is very strong.

Said another way, Rossi's system logically will generate more energy than others.

The second area in which Rossi has been a leader is with materials. He focused on nickle instead of the hugely more expensive palladium and platinum which behaved similarly.

While the success with any of these would be very valuable, the fact that he could experiment with such an inexpensive material gave him an advantage.

And sixth and last, with respect to the $\$ 2$ billion figure, we are going to provide a draft of the test report prepared by the Royal Swedish Academy of Scientists which awards the Nobel Prize in physics. The report described a 32-day test conducted by a number of prominent European physicists, apparently, including members of the committee that selects the Nobel Prize winner. And it concludes that Dr. Rossi has discovered a new source of energy with properties rivalling nuclear fission but without releasing radiation or producing radioactive waste. So this technology seems to be without precedent and extremely valuable.

Now, the reference material for all of those statements that $I$ just read to you come from the same source. You will probably be surprised to learn that that source is the Defendants. Mr. Darden, Mr. Vaughn and their companies said all of those things about my client and his technology.

Before you, we set up this rather large time line. Now, my team and I, during the course of this case, we are going to populate this time line. We are going to populate it with evidence in this case. Above the line, we are going to populate it with statements made in writing by the Defendants in this case to my clients or to their investors.

Below the line, we are going to populate this time line with statements that the Defendants claim they made orally or statements that they made in writing which contradict what they said above the line.

Let me give you a little bit of a preview of what that evidence is going to be. And I will start walking along the time line. In June of 2013, Defendants Mr. Vaughn, Mr. Darden, were first introduced to my client, Dr. Andrea Rossi. At the time, Mr. Darden was the CEO of Cherokee. Mr. Darden was an investment manager at Cherokee. Cherokee holds itself out as a sophisticated, experienced investment fund that has invested and raised over $\$ 2.2$ billion over the last 30 years. After they were introduced, they started negotiating the license agreement.

I think it is still going. Thanks, guys.
At all times during the negotiations, Mr. Darden, Mr. Vaughn representing themselves as part of Cherokee. At all times during those negotiations, Dr. Rossi represented himself as the inventor and creator of the E-Cat technology through his corporation Leonardo Corporation.

Let's fast-forward to October 24, 2013, two days before the license agreement is signed by the parties. Defendant Darden forms a new entity called Industrial Heat, LLC. The very next day, October 25, 2013, an e-mail is sent to the employees of Cherokee, and you see it on the screen in
front of you.
Specifically, they write to the employees of Cherokee, "Please join Tom Darden and John Mazzarino as the partner of Tom Darden, along with Dr. Andrea Rossi, to celebrate and congratulate Cherokee and Leonardo companies on their joint venture for the future success of cold fusion." That is consistent with what they told Dr. Rossi during the negotiations.

The very next day, the parties, Dr. Rossi is invited to sign the license agreement. He shows up at the offices of Cherokee. He is told for the first time, We just formed a new entity called Industrial Heat. Don't worry, though. It is going to be backed, it's going to be funded by Cherokee, it is going to be a wholly owned subsidiary of Cherokee. Don't worry. It's going to be able to make the payments to you. You have nothing to worry about, Dr. Rossi.

So based on those representations, Dr. Rossi signed an agreement on behalf of Leonardo with this new entity Industrial Heat. And but for those representations, Dr. Rossi never would have agreed to an exclusive license of his game-changing technology with a newly created entity that didn't have a dime in its newly created bank account.

Let's fast-forward. Actually, let 's go to the next day. The agreement is signed. Let me tell you a little bit about some of the more -- most specific and interesting terms
of this license agreement. In order to avoid having the types of disputes that we have before you today, the parties actually agreed to an independent third party to decide, to kind of be the referee, to make sure that if the parties had disagreements, he would be the arbiter. He would be the judge. He would say, I am going to make the final decisions. And they call that person -- if you want to pull it up, Rob -- an Expert Responsible For Validation or ERV. You are going to read the term in the contract which discusses the ERV.

Now, a contract provided that Defendant Industrial Heat would pay, in return for getting that exclusive license to this technology, they would pay Dr. Rossi $\$ 100$ million. They are going to pay it in three separate tranches or installments.

First, they agreed to pay $\$ 1.5$ million upon the execution of the agreement. In return for that, they became the owners of the device, the equipment that actually produced the energy. And that was called, pursuant to the agreement, the one-megawatt E-Cat. Second, upon the completion, the successful completion, as determined by the expert responsible for validation, of a one-day test of this one-megawatt E-Cat, certified in writing by that expert responsible for validation, Dr. Rossi would be entitled to a payment of $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$, at which point, he would, then, turn over all of the intellectual property to the Defendants.

Third, Dr. Rossi would be entitled to a payment of
$\$ 89$ million. For that, he had to run a test of the one-megawatt E-Cat for a period of 400 days. And if it successfully performed for 350 of those days, he would be entitled to that $\$ 89$ million.

Let's go back to the date of the contract, October 26, 2013. That first payment is made, $\$ 1.5$ million, upon signing of the contract. Interestingly, half of that, 750,000 of it came from an entity called Cherokee, not Industrial Heat.

Let's fast-forward to February 2013. The Defendants create one, what will be many, investor PowerPoints. In that PowerPoint, they write specifically, "Cherokee is the lead investor with more than 2.5 million invested to date, and Cherokee will continue to invest."

Now, starting in February and moving forward, a few months later, the parties begin preparations for the validation test, the one-day test that would earn my client $\$ 10$ million. And, in fact, leading up to the test, they had to agree to that ERV, that expert responsible for validation. In fact, in April of 2013, you are going to see that Mr . Darden specifically agrees to use a gentleman by the name of Dr. Fabio Penon as the expert responsible for validation.

You are going to hear from Mr. Penon -- excuse me -from Dr. Penon during the course of this trial. He is going to come and he is going to testify. He is going to testify that he created a protocol for purposes of these tests. The parties
agreed to that protocol. They selected various pieces of equipment for purposes of measuring the necessary things to show success. And he is going to explain to you what the results of those tests were.

April 30th, May 1st, 2013, the test is performed, the validation test is performed. Dr. Penon, five days later, issues his final report, says, E-Cat performed successfully, Dr. Rossi's entitled to receive a 10 million dollar payment. He puts that in writing. Five days later, another independent third party, another nuclear engineer issues another report, and he says, Dr. Rossi has successfully transferred his intellectual property to the Defendants, is entitled to receive that 10 million dollar payment. In fact, 10 million dollar payment is made.

Upon the completion of that test, the evidence will show, that the Defendants wasted no time telling their investors and potential investors that the E-Cat technology actually works and that Dr. Rossi has successfully transferred his intellectual property to them. In May of 2013 -- not going to show a copy of this, but -- in May of 2013, Industrial Heat reported to its investors that their initial technology creates excess energy between 3 and 20 times the amount of energy required to operate the device. A month later, July -- two months later, July 2013, Defendants write to their investors that they successfully operated and built a reactor independent
of Dr. Rossi. That means, they didn't need him to successfully build and run the equipment.

Let's fast-forward to August of 2013. The equipment, the one-megawatt plant, is delivered to the Defendants in North Carolina where they have a facility.

So here we are, August on our time line. Now, this is a significant date because the parties' agreement states that the guaranteed performance test is supposed to begin immediately upon delivery of the one-megawatt plant to the Defendants, August of 2013. Now, at this time, as you've heard me say already, the one-megawatt unit is owned and controlled by the Defendants, they have it, it's in their plant. The test doesn't start in August 2013. Why?

I'll give you three reasons. First, the Defendants, at that time, didn't have the money to pay my client if the test was successful. Two, the Defendants didn't obtain healthcare authorizations from the state of North Carolina, which would allow them to operate a low-energy nuclear reactor. Three, a group of independent third-party professors from some prestigious universities in Europe told the Defendants and Dr. Rossi that they wanted to test the stuff.

The Defendants recognized that such an independent third-party test would be very valuable to their marketing efforts, and, therefore, they said, let's wait on the guaranteed performance test, let's have these third parties do
it. Dr. Rossi recognized that, he agreed, he said, we can delay it.

So from August 2013 to the spring of 2014, the parties prepared for and allowed those independent professors to run that test. In fact, that test was successfully completed by those professors. They issued a report stating, that they received positive COP from Dr. Rossi's E-Cat. Thank you.

Now, while they're preparing to run that test, a few things happened. First, in October of 2013, the Defendants are going to tell you that Dr. Rossi, by not having a test start in August of 2000 -- in August 2013, they're going to say that the time for performance of that guaranteed performance test had expired. They're going to claim that they told him specifically in October of 2013, that he no longer had the opportunity or the rights to collect the 89 million dollars.

MR. PACE: Your Honor, I am going to object to the cartoon characters. They weren't referenced to Defendants prior to the opening statement.

THE COURT: Please remove.
MR. CHAIKEN: They're going to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that my client was made aware, that he would not have the opportunity to earn 89 million dollars, and despite being told that, he continued to work for them for free all the way through 2016 -- it's over there.

What they're not going to tell you is that, although

Mr. Darden is going to make that claim that he told that to Dr. Rossi orally, that the evidence in this case is going to contradict that statement. In fact, there's going to be a lot of written evidence showing that the Defendants knew, understood, and even agreed to allow that guaranteed performance test to take place. What also -- another thing they're not going to tell you is that before we came here today, during the discovery period of this case, they produced over 65,000 documents to me and my team.

Not one of those documents, out of 65,000 , will you find a single communication where they say the time for the guaranteed permission test had expired or that Dr. Rossi was going to be unable to collect that 89 million dollars. Not one.

Mr . Darden's oral statement in October of 2013 is also going to be contradicted. It's going to be contradicted by Mr. Vaughn -- thank you -- Mr. Vaughn's going to testify that his company, Industrial Heat, never told Dr. Rossi that the time for the guaranteed performance test had expired. Why? Because they were afraid that if they told him that, he would stop working and their ability to continue to market this technology would be lost.

You're going to see throughout the course of this case, that there is going to be a mountain of written evidence which shows that Defendants agreed to the guaranteed
performance test when it was performed. Now, let's fast-forward back to our time line. Spring of 2014, the test, in Europe, those independent third-party professors issue their report. Dr. Rossi attends that test, Mr. Darden attends that test, Mr. Vaughn attends that test, their chief engineer, a gentleman by the name of $T$. Barker Dameron, who you're going to hear from in this case, he attends that test. They come back, Mr . Darden wastes no time telling his investors once again, hey, this technology works. He writes to his investors and says these independent professors have verified that this technology works.

Now, they're back from Europe, Dr. Rossi says, we've had the independent test, it's validated, let's get started on the guaranteed performance test. And he writes an e-mail to Mr. Darden and Mr. Vaughn. He says, I am writing with a plan of operation, let's go get the authorizations that we need from the North Carolina healthcare office. And he says, Mr. Darden, you've told me that you have an expert working on getting those authorizations, let's go, let's get started.

How does Mr. Darden respond? Does he say, Dr. Rossi, I don't know what you're talking about? I told you back in October the time for the test is expired. You can't collect the 89 million dollars anymore.

Doesn't say that at all. Heck, doesn't say anything about starting the test, getting healthcare authorizations. He
says nothing.
Dr. Rossi again tries via a written e-mail, in May -following up May 2014, he says, I'm happy to do this test for you right there in your facility, in North Carolina. I will even set up a drying facility. I know how to do it. Let's find a customer. We'll attach my E-Cat to it. I'll provide you with steam that can dry various products. And he says, hey, your engineer Mr. Dameron, he used to work for GlaxoSmithKline, huge pharmaceutical company. He says, Why don't you get Glaxo on the line? We can dry their products for them.

Response from Mr. Darden, silence.
Finally, frustrated with his inability to get the test started, he says, you know what? Dr. Rossi says, I'll find my own customer, and I'll get my own healthcare authorizations, and I'm going to get this thing started. And in fact, that's what he does. He lives in Miami. He goes to the Florida healthcare office. He gets the authorization he needs. And he finds a customer, a customer that can use the steam for an experimental process to dry various products. And he brings that to Defendants and says, let's go, let's get started. All the while, the Defendants continue to market his technology.

Let's fast-forward to July 2014 -- actually, I take that back. Before we get to July -- thank you -- June 2014, Mr. Vaughn e-mails Mr. Darden in response to what's going on
with Dr. Rossi's request. And you'll see that Mr. Vaughn admits that Dr . Rossi no longer has an obligation at this time to continue to consult with, to assist, to help Industrial Heat in any way, shape, or form. He says it right there in his e-mail. He says, this consulting obligation has already expired.

The very next month, July 2014, Industrial Heat is attempting to raise 200 million dollars. They create a confidential memorandum for that purpose. In that confidential memorandum, did they tell the potential investors that Dr. Rossi no longer has an obligation -- excuse me, no longer has a right to achieve that 89 million dollar payment? The opposite takes place. They state right there, Dr. Rossi still would be entitled to receive 89 million dollars on the successful completion of that 350-day or 400-day test.

In addition to that, they concede that Dr. Rossi is the key to their plans. In their investment memorandum, they specifically state that they have a dependence on one key person, and it's not Mr. Darden, and it's not Mr. Vaughn. In fact, they state the future success of Industrial Heat is dependent upon one key individual, Dr. Andrea Rossi. And if the services of such individual were no longer to be available, its future success would likely be materially and adversely affected. They're telling their investors that they've got LeBron James on their team, and if they want to go to the NBA
finals, they're going to ride him there.
August 2014, still moving along our time line, the one-megawatt unit is shipped to Miami, pursuant to an agreement. This agreement was made by Leonardo Corporation, Industrial Heat, one of our third-party Defendants, JM Products.

Now, you've heard one of the reasons why the Defendants are going to say they don't have an obligation to pay my client the 89 million dollars. They're going to say the test didn't start on time.

JM Products is the second reason they're going to claim they shouldn't have to pay my client. They're going to claim that Dr. Rossi misrepresented to them who JM Products was, what JM Products was all about. They're going to claim, that JM Products wasn't a real company and it didn't have a real manufacturing process.

The evidence is going to show, that the Defendants, a sophisticated investment company led by a gentleman who is graduated from Yale Law School, was fully informed of everything that JM Products was, everything that JM Products did well before they executed that agreement to merely ship the one-megawatt unit down to Florida. Specifically, the Defendants were fully informed, JM Products was a newly formed entity prior to them entering into that term sheet. Second, Dr. Rossi's real estate attorney Mr. Johnson, who's sitting
here before you, was the incorporator of that entity. He was named as the president of that entity. They had met him before they entered the license agreement. They knew that he had no manufacturing experience whatsoever. They knew that Dr. Rossi, as he had told them early that year, April, May 2014, had found the customer, was going to create the facility, was going to build that facility from scratch.

The evidence is going to show, that their engineer, Mr. Dameron actually flew to Miami, visited a newly leased facility to help create and set up the facility for purposes of running the tests. The evidence is going to show that they knew the entire time that Dr . Rossi was going to run that facility.

They're going to say that they were tricked, they were duped, they shouldn't have to pay. The evidence is going to show that's not true.

Let's fast-forward, February 2015, the equipment is now in Miami. They're getting ready to start the guaranteed performance test -- over here -- you're going to see Dr. Fabio Penon, the expert responsible for validation, and in February, the beginning of February 2015, Dr. Penon is going to e-mail Mr. Darden, Mr. Rossi and he's going to say, here's my protocol, here's the test plan for the guaranteed performance test. Now, February 18th -- to the 331 -- February 18th, 2015, Dr. Rossi e-mails Mr. Darden and he says, the ERV has arrived,
the plant is ready to start. Does Mr. Darden respond by saying, I don't know what you are talking about? Why do you have the expert responsible for validation there? I told you back in October of 2013 that you couldn't do it.

Doesn't say that.
What does he say? He says, Thanks for the positive news for us and the world.

Next one, February 18 through February to 20th, Dr. Penon, Mr. Darden trade e-mails discussing the protocol for the one-megawatt plant. Again, does Tom Darden say, can't do it, can't run the tests? Does he say, I don't know what you're doing in Miami, because I'm not paying you that 89 billion dollars?

Doesn't say any of that.
Instead, he writes an e-mail to Mr. Penon -- excuse me, to Dr. Penon and says, Thank you very much for your important work. This evaluation will have the eyes of the world on it once we release any information. And then once they start up the test, he responds to Dr. Rossi, Congrats on the startup. This demonstration will have a great impact beginning in about a month when we have the visitor from overseas.

He doesn't say, Stop, don't run this test, I'm not paying you.

```
He says, Congrats.
```

Two days later, the test starts up. Dr. Rossi writes another e-mail to Defendants, Darden and Vaughn. He says, I'm having problems with some of the equipment, it's still performing, but I'm having some problems.

Why is that important? Because the evidence is going to show that over the course of that 350-day test, Dr. Rossi didn't hide anything from the Defendants. He told them when he was having problems. He told them when he was having issues. If someone was trying to deceive someone else, why would they tell them in writing of all the problems they were having?

Now, it's around this time, February, March 2015, you're going to hear some testimony from Mr. Darden. He's going to say, I knew back then that something funny was going on there, that this test couldn't be relied on, something fishy was happening in his plan.

He's not going to be able to put any physical evidence or any written evidence to support that, but he's going to say, I knew something was wrong.

But despite his suspicions that something was wrong, it didn't stop him from bringing investors to the facility to talk to Dr. Rossi, to learn about the E-Cat technology, to understand what he was doing. In fact, the evidence is going to show, that several times between February 2015 and July of 2015 and even later, he brought potential investors to the plant to talk to Dr. Rossi.

And that brings us to -- let's see-- we also knew in March of 2015, the test has been running for several weeks now. Unequivocally, we know that this plant was producing steam. How do we know? Because Mr. Darden himself put it in writing. In fact, you're going to see an e-mail from Mr. Darden, March 23, 2015. He writes to one of his investors. He says specifically, we're definitely producing steam for a customer. My lack of clarity is just around precisely how much. We cannot definitively represent this yet. What is the nature of the customer?

But these are picky nuances, not related to the core issue. What does that mean? That means the Defendants in this case didn't care what the customer was doing. They never asked to see what was going on in the JM Products side of the facility, it didn't matter because they were able to bring investigators in, and they were able to raise money without knowing what was going on on that side of the plant. The fact is and the evidence will show, the Defendants didn't care what was going on in the JM Products side of the facility until this lawsuit was filed. They never asked to go see it. It wasn't of interest.

May 2015, payday. Defendants successfully sell 4 percent of their company in exchange for 50 million dollars. That's a 1 billion dollar valuation. They kept 96 percent, they gave out 4 percent of their shares for 50 million dollars.

Company called Woodford gave them that money.
Oh, they're going to claim that money didn't go into their pockets. That, instead, it was used to invest in other LENR technologies. Ladies and gentlemen, the evidence will show, that they still have ownership of those technologies. They still have the right to get the benefit of those technologies. My client has no right to those technologies and will receive no benefit from those technologies.

THE COURT: Three minutes.
MR. CHAIKEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
The evidence is going to show, immediately after receiving that 50 million dollars, the story changed. The narrative changed. Suddenly Dr. Rossi was no longer -- was no longer cooperative. The test results were no longer going to be valid. The technology, we're not sure if it works anymore. The evidence will show, they completely changed their tune after they received the money. The Defendants are going to give you a lot of defenses in this case. They're going to give -- they're going to raise a lot of excuses as to why they should have to pay the 89 million dollars to my client. And for a few of them, the last one they're going to tell you is, is that the test results, verified and certified by the agreed-upon experts for validation, they were impossible, they're going to tell you. They're going to tell you that the plant design couldn't possibly have dissipated the amount of
heat it was creating. They're going to tell you that the equipment couldn't possibly have pumped the amount of water that could have gone through it. They're going to tell you that the electricity records and the energy records don't line up with FPL.

And I'm going to tell you, the evidence is going to show, we have a response to all of those things. And at the end of the day, at the end of the day, the evidence is going to show, Defendants entered into a contract, Defendants received the benefit of that contract to the tune of over 50 million dollars. And the evidence is going to show, that they refused to pay my client what he was owed, which is 89 million dollars.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to give you now a 10-minute recess. We'll be taking you to the jury room. My courtroom deputy will meet you there and ask you to fill out a form that gives us your contact information that we can have during the trial to reach you, if we need to. She's also going to give each one of you my business card. It has the phone number to my office. That is the phone number to call from now on, for any reason, if you're running late or have any other issue. Please do not discuss the case. We'll bring you back inside so you can hear the remaining opening statements, and we're in recess.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(The jury exited the courtroom at 2:40 p.m.)
THE COURT: All right. We're in recess.
MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor.
(A recess was taken from 2:41 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.)
THE COURT: I believe you've all received the note
from the juror, Janis Gross. Any objection to releasing her?
MR. LUKACS: No, Your Honor.
MR. PACE: We have not, Your Honor, sorry.
THE COURT: She wrote, she has a planned vacation from July 21st to July 25 th that she forgot to mention.

MR. PACE: I'm sorry. What -- do you know the number for that juror? I apologize.

MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: 36.
MR. PACE: 36.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: 36.
MR. LUKACS: No objection, Your Honor, to a cause challenge, excuse for cause, excuse me.

THE COURT: Alan, when you bring them in, if you can just ask her to wait, and once the others are in just let her know she is being excused.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: Janis Gross?
THE COURT: Gross. We're ready for the rest of the panel. Thank you.

MR. LUKACS: We received the timing of next week.

THE COURT: I wasn't extending the time.
MR. LUKACS: Okay.
THE COURT: I mean, that doesn't mean that we don't have trial the other days. Those are just days where I'm not going to go to the ten-to-four schedule. Let's go later and start earlier to try to recover some of the lost time. I had done that when we lost Monday due to the Court closure. Now we lost more time.

MR. LUKACS: Okay.
(The jury entered the courtroom at 3:02 p.m.)
THE COURT: It's all right.
Everyone, please be seated.
OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS
MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor.
And good afternoon, everyone.
This is a case about written promises, and it's about blatant lies. It's about fake-testing results. It's about fake invoices. It's about a fake customer. It's about high hopes that my clients had for technology and how those hopes were destroyed when it turned out in the real world the technology didn't work.

Now, you heard Mr. Chaiken discuss with you that my clients should be paying $\$ 89$ million for something that occurred in Florida, for a testing that occurred in Florida. But you know what? He didn't tell you anything about that
test, did he? Let me tell you about this supposed test.
I want to put up on the screen right now two images, if we can, that you are going to see of -- of this plant. These are the devices that were in Florida. If I can zoom in, in fact, just on the upper corner, when we talk about a E-Cat, I want this to help everyone, that's what we're talking about. It's a little box. It's a box, water goes into the box, the box is supposed to turn that water into steam.

Now, there were 115 of these magic boxes that were in a container down in Florida, and that Plaintiffs are claiming for what was -- what occurred with those boxes for a one-year period in Florida entitles them to $\$ 89$ million.

Now, let me explain what was supposed to be happening with these boxes in Florida. According to what the Plaintiffs were claiming, or did claim, these boxes were producing every day enough steam to fill up this courtroom hundreds of times. Not once. Not twice. Hundreds of times every day, day in and day out.

Steam, as you know, 212 degrees Fahrenheit, roughly, when it start -- water starts to boil, that's when it starts to turn into steam. This -- this container -- these pictures that I'm showing you here, right here, this would have been an oven. It would have been turning it, they would have been running out steam 212 agrees, constantly, all day long.

And yet look at this picture I want to show you that
we obtained during the course of this discovery.
Here's Dr. Rossi. He's not only close to these E-Cat boxes that are supposed to be pumping out courtrooms full of steam at 212 degrees Fahrenheit, he's touching them. I'm not sure if you can see them there, but he actually has a stethoscope. He's putting a stethoscope up to them, and he's trying to listen to these little E-cat boxes. And, yeah, he's wearing a jacket. Supposedly next to device that's producing hundreds of courtrooms worth of super hot steam, this man is wearing a jacket and using a stethoscope to try to listen to the devices. This is what they're claiming should be -- earn them $\$ 89$ million.

Still there's more. I showed you a picture. If I can show you here again, this is the -- sort of these E-Cat boxes, they were set up all in the container. There's 115 of them. That's what he was supposed to be working on down in Florida with these magic boxes.

Now, in that first picture there, none of those worked. They didn't work. They were never operative. There was 51 of them that didn't work at all the entire time period. You're supposed to run 115. 51 never worked. Out of the remaining 64, some worked sometimes, some worked other times. In fact, when an engineer from Industrial Heat finally got inside this warehouse and finally got inside the E-Cat plant to look at it, this is what he was finding, in terms of some of
these separate reactors, some of these separate E-Cat boxes. They clearly weren't being used.

He found corrosion, he found capped water lines, he found clear evidence that they had never used some of these things during the entire one-year time period. Again, this is what Plaintiffs claim earned them $\$ 89$ million.

I want to tell you a little bit more about those magic boxes and what Plaintiffs claim occurred in Florida. The amount of water that Plaintiffs say that they were turning into steam every day is the size of a large swimming pool, about 9,000 gallons of water. Every day they were able to turn 9,000 gallons of water into steam. And steam expands greatly, and so that turns out to be -- one swimming pool would be well over a thousand swimming pools worth of steam.

But what did some -- what did our people discover when they went down and looked at the operations in Florida and discovered what was going on? If I could show you here, there are -- in order for these magic boxes to work, the water has to get into them, so you have to have little pumps. You have to have pumps to bring the water into them. The grand total of the pumps that were working -- these are -- this is a picture of six of them. There was three sets more like this, so it's 24 of these pumps. These 24 pumps together, working 24 hours a day, working as hard as they possibly can at their maximum can move about half a swimming pool a day, so less than 5,000
gallons. So if you're claiming to us that you're turning 9,000 gallons of water into steam, but it's impossible for you to get 9,000 gallons of water into your magic boxes, that can't be true, that can't be credible, and that doesn't earn you \$89 million.

I can give you several more examples, but I'm going to just limit myself to -- really just to one more. So the magic boxes, the E-Cat boxes in Florida, they required electricity to work, so the -- there's a tube in the inside of the box. Electricity goes into the tube, the tube is supposed to heat up and turn all the water around it into steam. That's basically how the E-Cat device is supposed to work.

So what happened is there were folks in Florida who were telling us, including Fulvio Fabiani, who's not here today, but he'll be here during this trial, was reporting to us, Here's how much electricity these guys are using down in Florida. Here's information you need to know about how the plant is operating.

Once the lawsuit got filed, we went to Florida Power \& Light, went to FPL and said, Hey, give us the power records for this warehouse in Florida where these tests were occurring. Because we know the information we were being told by Plaintiffs, we know the information we were being told by Fulvio Fabiani, let's compare it. You would think that they would have some similarity. This is the comparison.

And, in fact, there were days in here when Plaintiffs and Fulvio Fabiani are claiming that they were using more energy than FPL was even selling them. In any event, their numbers were completely out of whack with what FPL was reporting, you know, was reporting was being provided.

So we're going to get to the question now, I think, of, well, why were these boxes in Florida then? Why did you let -- you heard from the Plaintiffs, we agree, my clients owned these E-Cat boxes. They did. They were -- they -- they paid the $\$ 1.5$ million. They then paid an additional $\$ 10$ million. So they paid a lot of money; they were theirs. Why in the world would they let them go to Florida? Fair question.

After my clients invested over $\$ 11$ million in Plaintiffs, provided over $\$ 11$ million to Leonardo Corporation, they wanted to see if these devices could work in a real world setting, in a context with a real business. They offered some of these solutions in North Carolina to Andrea Rossi, and the evidence is going to show you that he got -- that he regularly rejected them. But even Andrea Rossi would say to my clients, a phrase he used is, The marketplace is truth.

That means if you really want to show the value of this technology that I've supposedly created, you need to get a real business to use it. That's what -- that's what's going to convince people that this is useful technology. It's not just something you can do in a lab, it's not just something that can
be done, you know, off in a -- you know, in a very careful setting. It can actually work in the real world.

Now, Plaintiffs would not agree to do -- to any of the options that were provided to them in North Carolina, which is where my clients are based; there's where they wanted to keep the technology. So then he came along -- but then they came along at one point with an idea, with a solution. They said, Well, I found the customer, you know, this whole idea of doing something in the real world, the marketplace is truth, he comes back and says that he's found a customer that can actually use this E-Cat technology. I've got an e-mail from you here. This is June of 2014. This is Andrea Rossi writing to my clients, he's writing to -- you see the Thomas Darden, you see J.T. Vaughn. He tells us, Leonardo Corporation has found the solution. A customer has been found.

That's not I'm a customer, or I'm going to open a company or anything like that. He's saying, We found -- we found the customer to use the M 1 plant to use the E-Cat boxes, to use the E-Cat boxes and his chemical additives and -- and catalyzers.

What you really need to take from this is somebody has a business. There's a real business that has a real use for this technology, exactly what Industrial Heat wanted, exactly what IPH wanted, exactly what my clients wanted. This customer even has a factory, a factory that exists down in Florida. Let
me move the plant, let me take these E-cat boxes that you paid for, Industrial Heat, that are yours, let me take them down to Florida because I have a real customer who's going to make real a real use of this.

In fact, it got even more attractive for my clients because what Andrea Rossi told my clients is that this company that's going to operate in Florida is an affiliate of a larger company called Johnson Matthey. Now, a lot of us haven't heard much about Johnson Matthey. It's a large chemical company in the United Kingdom, in England. It's got over 10,000 employees. It's got offices all over the world. My client was so convinced of this that my client even prepared a document, a contract to enter with Johnson Matthey saying, Okay, that's -that's great, this is -- remember we talked, a real customer, proving something works in the real world. Well, if you can -if you can provide a benefit or service to one of these multinational companies with over 10,000 employees, that's pretty good. That's a real customer.

It went even further, and Plaintiffs talked about -had a meeting in North Carolina. And in this meeting, North Carolina, they brought Mr. Johnson, and he came up and talked about this new company, this subsidiary called -- it was going to be called JM Products, at the time JM Chemical Products. The name got changed over time. And they talked about this company, this subsidiary, and how it was connected
to Johnson Matthey; in fact, how it was owned by Johnson Matthey. Indeed, Henry Johnson even signed a document. They had him sign a piece of paper.

Give me just one second. He -- he swore to my clients that this company of his, this small company, was owned by an entity formed in the United Kingdom. There will be no evidence -- the evidence will be unquestioned that that's a lie. No doubt about it, no dispute about it. They can't deny it. In fact, this company, JM Chemical Products, now the Defendant in this case, or the third-party Defendants in this case, JM Products, it's owned by a trust. It's owned by a trust that was set up in the United States. It's owned by a trust that was set up by Henry Johnson. He knew exactly who owned JM Products. He knew it wasn't owned in the United Kingdom, but he knew he was pulling the wool over my -- the eyes of my client by trying to get him to think that it was associated with a real customer.

The parties eventually do sign this agreement. They signed this contract that says, We're going to let these E-Cat boxes go down to Florida, and we're going to let Andrea Rossi use them in Florida to provide benefits to this real customer, JM Products. And, in fact, you'll notice here, it's very clear, this document that's signed in August of 2013 -- of 2014, it says that this JM Products operates a production facility in Miami. So they've got a real business going down
there. They're representing we've got a real business. And we require low temperature steam. We need what Leonardo Corporation is selling.

Well, it turns out, that my clients discover later on, is that JM Products was a company set up by Henry Johnson at Andrea Rossi's direction. It had no products, it had no employees, it had no assets. It was under the complete control of Andrea Rossi. In fact, it had no supposed manufacturing facility in Florida. Indeed, days after my client signed this term sheet, what happened, Andrea Rossi had to go out and find a warehouse. He didn't have one. So he said, well, they fell for it, you know, they've agreed to sign up for us. We're supposed to have a production facility. Maybe we should run out and grab one.

It's not even JM Products does it. He gets it from Leonardo and then says, JM Products, I'll give you half of them. This is what's -- this is the nature of the relationship. This is pulling the wool over my clients' eyes.

My clients agree, as a result, to allow their -- these E-Cat boxes to go down to Florida. And the deception continues even after everyone gets to Florida.

If I can go to the February 2015 e-mail.
This is an e-mail from Andrea Rossi that he's sending to my clients, Thomas Darden, J.T. Vaughn, several others, and you can see here this is -- this is right after they're
supposedly starting their task. And what -- what does he tell my clients? Today the director of $J M$ phoned me and said they are satisfied. Monday he will write you a letter about the energy they're receiving.

So he's making it sound like there's some independent party that he's dealing with. Oh, I -- I actually phoned this guy. During his deposition, what he's testified to is we're not quite sure who the director of JM Products is, but he says that he ran the entire facility in Doral. So unless he was calling himself, I'm not sure how this phone call occurred.

But it makes a reference to a letter in there, right? It says that you're going to start getting something from this JM Products company. They're going to start sending you letters telling you about essentially how great it is, the power that they're getting.

And sure enough, my clients start to get letters. They start to get letters from Henry Johnson on behalf of this separate company that's saying, Here's the power that we're getting from the Leonardo Corporation, and that, you know, on a monthly basis, for example.

What my clients don't know is Andrea Rossi wrote this letter. In fact, they kept a copy of the letter that he wrote. He would write the letter, he would then send it over to Henry Johnson to have it filled out, and then have Henry Johnson sign his name to it. Henry Johnson had no idea
how much power JM Products used. In fact, it had no use for any of the steam that was going over there. He simply did whatever Andrea Rossi told him to do. Andrea Rossi would say, Just tell them this much, and he'd turn around, and he'd go ahead, and that's what he'd tell my clients.

And then it doesn't end there because then they also enlisted one of the other parties you've seen in the courtroom, James Bass. He was presented to Industrial Heat and to others as the director of engineering for this company, this separate independent customer called JM Products. He's supposed to be the director of engineering. Now, as a director of engineering, you would assume, as my clients assumed, that he would know something about what was going on at JM Products, maybe how they were using this power that they were receiving.

Here's an e-mail from James Bass asking Andrea Rossi, What do I say? How do you measure the output? He has no idea what JM Products is doing because it's not a real company. And what does Andrea Rossi tell him? It's simple, we need -- I won't get into the technical, but one megawatt hour per hour, that's what that little reference to. It's -- it's amount of power that could power an entire residential subdivision. It's massive. But -- but still, he says, Tell them -- he's putting it in quotes, When you talk to somebody, tell them we need this -- all this power for our production.

There is no production. There's nothing they're
making at JM Products.
Says, Obviously, we measured the energy input. You know, he says -- you know, Mr. Bass, lie, tell them we're measuring the energy you're getting even though everyone knows that you're not. Mr. Bass has admitted that they're not. Mr. Rossi, Andrea Rossi has admitted that they're not. You are not supposed to give more information. You are sure -- you for sure are not supposed to show them anything about the plant of JM, of JM Products. Exactly as you did with the IH, that's short for Industrial Heat, persons.

They kept my clients in the dark purposely. They would not let my clients see anything about what was going on at JM Products.

So when Industrial Heat was told that there was a real customer that was using this steam in Florida, and that -this, ladies and gentlemen, is the amazing production process, after we finally had a chance to get discovery and someone had finally had a chance to take a picture inside of this JM Products facility. It's pipes. That's not a massive production facility. That's not something that needs the amount of energy they could -- they could support an entire residential subdivision.

Now, what the Plaintiffs also didn't tell you is that those pipes you just saw, they're in a container. They're in a box in this warehouse in Florida. I don't know if you can see
it too well here, but there's a little black box on that image, that's where -- that's where those pipes are. That's the entire JM Products production facility. But you see the fake wall in front of it? That was put up to keep my clients out. My clients were never allowed on the other side of that wall. They were strictly told, You can't go there because JM Products is engaged in this secretive manufacturing process. You've now seen what that secretive manufacturing process is, ladies and gentlemen. It's the series of pipes in a container box that are doing nothing.

And also, do you remember when Mr . Chaiken was up here, and he talked to you about Andrea Rossi got approval, got Government approval to have his operations in Florida? I want you to take a look at what this Government approval is. It's a fire certificate. Not only is it just a fire certificate, but look what it tells you about JM Products. Does it tell you JM Products changing the world? Does it tell you JM Products using massive amounts of electricity? Does it say JM Products, you know, handling chemicals?

The word's "occupancy." They just had a couple of big containers in a giant warehouse in Florida. It was easy for them to convince the fire department folks. At the very least, this is by no means some special Florida regulatory approval for anything. There was no approval that was required.

So I've explained -- and I have to keep an eye on the
time. You've been very patient with me.
I've explained the test that was done in Florida for which they say my clients should pay them $\$ 89$ million, and we've seen that that was a sham. That was a fake customer. Turns out after this lawsuit gets filed, my clients go back and start looking at some of the other things that happened when they start realizing what's going on, and turns out that's not the only lies that have been told to my client.

You heard and you saw on your time line, you saw Mr . Chaiken talk to you about a -- I think the reference, if you recall, is to a validation test. So it was a short test, it was 24 hours. It was done in Italy, not -- not too long after the license agreement was signed. Under that license agreement, the Plaintiffs were required to do -- were required to do this test of that whole -- if you remember that image I showed you, they were supposed to do a test of a hundred -over a hundred of these E-Cat boxes in Florida. This was -- it was supposed to show us that it would work for a 24-hour period. But days before that test began, Andrea Rossi came to my clients, and here is another story.

He says he met with health officials in Italy. They told him there's a problem with going forward running this test. But he says they found -- they worked together and found an acceptable solution. At the end, he says, I'll activate only half of the reactors -- that's the -- that's his phrase
for the E-Cat, the magic boxes. So now instead of testing over a hundred E-Cat reactors, he tells my clients, You can't do that. We can only test at most 30 of these reactors.

Turns out this is not true. This is not what happened, but my clients weren't told all the information. My clients weren't told -- this is what my clients were told, this is what my clients relied upon.

Now, I should tell you 'cause this is actually important as well. When Dr. Rossi said this, what did my -what my clients did say, Well, wait a second, that's not what's in the license agreement. We're willing to accept it because they believed him. But what did they do? They wrote it down. They wrote -- it's called -- they wrote an amendment to the license agreement. That's what you do. If you've got a written agreement with written promises that you agree you're going to follow, then if you're not going to follow them, you put it in writing, and you have it signed by all the parties. That's called an amendment to an agreement, an amendment to a license agreement. That's exactly what they did here. They wrote down the changes, and then everybody signed it. Andrea Rossi signed it, Tom Darden signed it, that third company that you heard Mr. Chaiken refer to called AmpEnergo -- I'm going to call them AEG because I butcher the name AmpEnergo.

After that, however, Andrea Rossi changed the goal -or the goalpost again, and rather than even testing 30 boxes,
he decided that the test would only be limited to 18 boxes.
So my clients originally agreeing to test over a
hundred of these E-Cat boxes and see that all hundred-some-odd of them were working and all going great, turned out they only ended up testing at the end of the day 18.

Now, remember what I told you about Florida, how all those E-cat boxes that were down there, there was 115 sent there, most of them never worked. That's what made my clients start realizing maybe most of those didn't even work back in Italy. But we got suckered into allowing only 18 of them to be tested when there was a hundred of them that were supposed to be used.

Mr . Chaiken spoke to you about the license agreement for some time. I don't think he showed you very much of the license agreement. I want to be able to talk to you a little bit about that.

I want to start with one thing because Mr. Chaiken was talking to you about Cherokee. Remember, he was kind of -- and never really defining it for you, but he was saying Cherokee was going to go this, and Cherokee was going to do that.

This is a license agreement. You can read it. You're going to get a chance to read it. It doesn't once mention Cherokee. Nowhere. It never says Cherokee is going to make any payments. It never says Cherokee is going to be providing any financial backing.

So, now, they claim that there were other promises that were being made to them that aren't reflected in the license agreement. But that's not what they said when they signed the license agreement.

In fact, when they signed the license agreement, they agreed at that time that the agreement, it contained all of their promises, every single one of them. And it says it supersedes. That means it gets rid of any prior agreements, oral or written. These are the things you put in your contracts and make sure everybody understands. If there is something you are supposedly relying on, make sure it is in writing. Don't kid yourself. There is nothing special about the particular day that this was signed on. If Dr. Rossi was telling you the truth and if he walked in and suddenly there was a different name on the documents than what he was going to sign, instead of him signing an agreement with Google, he signed an agreement with Gaga, he could have said, I'm not signing. Or write it in that Industrial Heat is going to be backed by somebody.

Not in here. Didn't happen. Because it's not true.
I want to talk just quickly, if I can, about the payments. And Mr. Chaiken explained some of this to you already, so I'll go relatively quickly, which is to say the license agreement, to start, involved the payment of 1.5 million dollars. That's a substantial payment. And that's for
the magic boxes, the E-Cat boxes that my clients purchased. When you put all of those together, they would call them an E-Cat plant. Mr. Chaiken called them a 1MW plant. I apologize for all the different phrases and terms, and over time, you'll get, you know, you will hear them enough. But for now, put all the boxes together, you call them a plant. So 1.5 million dollars for a plant.

There was the next payment, 10 million dollars. That was for all the technology that the Plaintiffs had. It's called -- it was kind of -- it is called intellectual property or IP. That means everything you knew. So 1.5 million dollars, you get a bunch of these E-Cat magic boxes. 10 million dollars more, you get everything that I know about this technology. That's what -- that's what the promise was.

And then the last payment was if you can go out and show in the real world that this thing can perform at an amazingly high level, not only that, but that you do it as soon as you send us this plant, as soon as we get this the plant, you turn around and you run it and you show us how, you know, how amazing it is.

Now, I have already talked to you about the test that they actually ended up eventually doing, which was the one where we've already seen where Mr. Rossi is next to practically a furnace and wearing a jacket. But they also didn't try to test it or didn't test it promptly. That's what the agreement
says. The agreement -- Mr. Chaiken told you that all of these E-Cat boxes arrived where my clients are located in North Carolina. They arrived in August of 2013. Nothing happened in August of 2013. Nothing happened in September of 2013. Nothing happened in October of 2013.

So then Mr. Chaiken also says, Well, but no one ever told Dr. Rossi that the time might be running out.

Oh, they more than told him. They actually created a document about it. It's called the second amendment. Remember, we talked about this. If you have got a contract, if you've made written promises, if you want to change it, you put it in writing, and you sign it.

Well, everybody realized that the time period for running that guaranteed performance test had run out by October, because you had to start it immediately. Immediately when something shows up in August is not, you know -- is not October. Maybe it's September. I would think probably more like August, but in any event. So they put it in writing. They said, oh, we are willing -- they're willing to extend the time. We will give you more time. But you have to test something that's a little bit different than what you said. You now have created a new device. It's called a six-cylinder unit. I shouldn't say new device. Created an alternative device called a six-cylinder unit, that we want you to test that instead.

Now, you don't need to understand a whole lot about this six-cylinder unit. I've thrown a lot at you already, and I apologize for that. But here is all that you really need to know, that you didn't hear Mr. Chaiken once say anything about the six-cylinder unit. I am guessing this is the first time you are hearing it. No one has ever tested it. No one even claims that they ever tested a six-cylinder unit. So the parties were willing to extend the time period, but only if they made a change.

Dr. Rossi didn't -- you know, he signed this document, but he never ran the test on this type of unit. Again, written promises, you can change written promises, but if you are going to change the written promises, you put it in writing. That's the pattern here.

In fact, they even said that in the license agreement. If I could look at Section 16.9 -- I'm moving around on you here a lot, but just for a second here. That's not just good practice. That's not just the way that wise people operate. That's not the way that business people operate.

By the way, Andrea Rossi, the testimony you will hear, has owned a number of different businesses. He is not an unsophisticated individual. But they even put in writing. They said, Look, you can change this thing, but if you are going to change it, you have got to write it down.

It's a written instrument signed by the parties. They
did it on a couple of occasions. According to Andrea Rossi though, later on they never did it. He doesn't have an explanation for it. He doesn't have any signed contract or signed amendment. He knew his time had expired.

Instead, he was more focused on conning Industrial Heat and IPH to shipping their -- these boxes down in Florida for their supposed fake customer. That's their approach. Along with Henry Johnson and James Bass, they created and presented to my client a fake customer, JM Products, a company with no business, under the hidden control of Andrea Rossi. Along with Fulvio Fabiani, as well as Johnson, they provided my clients with false information and false data to promote what they were doing in Florida.

Now, I have one final point, and I am almost done, and I appreciate your tolerance. My clients are Tom Darden J.T. Vaughn, and their colleagues have been successful entrepreneurs in a number of projects addresses environmental challenges. That's included a large number of projects cleaning up contaminated property so they can be back to a productive use. It's involved converting businesses into using clean renewable energy sources. That's what they have focused their efforts and their successes on.

Now, you heard Plaintiffs' Counsel talk to you about this 50 million dollars, this 50 million dollar payment. But -- and I think he said this, but I wanted to make sure that
everyone heard it. Tom Darden did not receive a penny of that 50 million dollars. J.T. Vaughn did not receive a penny of that 50 million dollars. A company invested 50 million dollars in their companies that were pursuing LENR technologies. In fact, you remember Mr. Chaiken literally told you, he described my clients as the leading LENR investors. They are. That's why the money was invested with them. That's where the money went to, to making an effort to try to find a technology that works. It didn't go into Andrea's, because his technology doesn't work.

Now, Plaintiffs read to you various messages that Industrial Heat has sent to investors over time, their investors. But Mr. Chaiken was highly selective in what he was reading to you.

They also argue their claim is predicated on this idea that Industrial Heat only said great things about Andrea Rossi until March of 2013 when they got that 50 million dollar investment, and then they turned on him. That's their theory. Turned on him like that.

Mr. Chaiken showed you part of this document. This is a document from July 2013. So this is well before that money was paid. This is -- and this is the very document that says other things; for example, it calls Andrea Rossi a key employee under a section called Risk Factors. Having Andrea Rossi as your key employee is a risk. What else does it say? Rossi has
a history of failed business relationships and conflicts. And he is difficult to communicate and work with.

However, he appeared to have a remarkable technology. So the principals of $I H$-- that's Industrial Heat -- were willing to invest a great deal of time and to be more tolerant of eccentric or difficult interpersonal characteristics than one actually -- more than one normally would or that Rossi had experienced with others in his prior business relationship.

This led to an unusual and attractive business structure. Industrial Heat, IH, took excessive risk with relatively small amounts of capital fund, but no large payments would be owed unless the technology proved to be extremely successful. This is what Industrial Heat and its parent company and another company were telling investigators. This is what they believed. They thought there was a remarkable technology here. And as a result, they were extremely tolerant. They were trying to find ways that they could make this work.

THE COURT: Five minutes.
MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor.
And as we have discussed, though, over the last 40 minutes, the fact of the matter is these E-Cat boxes, they're not filled with magic. Turned out that they were just simply filled with lies. That's when my clients' tolerance ended. My clients were tricked by the Plaintiffs. They were tricked by
the fake company of JM Products. They were tricked by the fake data that was being provided them by people like Fulvio Fabiani.

In the end, my clients don't owe anyone $\$ 89$ million. What my clients are owed is the return of the millions of dollars, well over 10 -- well over $\$ 11$ million that they paid out because of the broken promises made to them and the lies that were told to them.

Thank you.
THE COURT: Mr. Leon De La Barra.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Thank you, Your Honor.
OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANTS J.M. PRODUCTS, ET AL.

MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Ladies and gentlemen, I want to begin by addressing one very important issue. As Your Honor mentioned earlier: What the attorneys say is not evidence. What Mr. Pace just said is not evidence. What Mr. Chaiken said earlier is not evidence. Consequently, what I am about to tell you is not evidence. Over the course of the next few weeks, you will hear sworn testimony and review multiple documents. That is the evidence that you will rely on when you return your verdict.

That being said, please indulge me some time to walk through the facts and circumstances of this case and the reasons that, what the evidence will show, there is no scheme
to defraud Mr. Pace's clients.
Now, we have heard a lot of talk about a license agreement. You may remember, license agreement was entered into in October of 2012. That is nearly two years before the formation of JM Products or two years before Mr. Darden and Mr. Vaughn meet Mr. Henry Johnson. Now, those two events would have occurred around June or July 2014. Similarly, that is over two years before Mr . James Bass comes into the picture. That would happen in late 2014 to early 2015.

Now, we have heard a lot about this license agreement. Everyone knows it required a one-year test. Upon completion of that one-year test, Dr. Andrea Rossi and the other corporations would be entitled to an $\$ 89$ million payment. Mr. Chaiken spoke about the license agreement. Mr. Pace showed you several portions of the license agreement.

What he didn't show you was a single provision requiring a customer to be used in connection with the test or with the technology at all. That's because there is no requirement. In fact, Mr. Vaughn, as a corporate representative for Industrial Heat, will testify that they didn't care about a customer. It simply wasn't important to them.

With that being said, fast-forward to July of 2014, around this time frame, discussions were starting between Dr. Andrea Rossi, Defendants Mr. Darden, Mr. Vaughn about
beginning a test and perhaps moving the plant down to Florida.
Now, what Mr. Pace didn't tell you is that my client, Mr. Henry Johnson, only met with Defendants on one occasion. In that occasion, it was made very clear to Defendants Darden and Vaughn -- consequently Industrial Heat and IPH -- that Mr. Johnson was the president of JM Products and would only handle the corporate matters. In fact, they were well aware that Mr. Johnson was Mr. Rossi's real estate attorney. In fact, you will hear testimony from Mr. Johnson himself where he says, We figured there would be a technical person running the operation. Mr. Johnson clearly didn't have any manufacturing experience. They knew that he wouldn't be the person to run the operation down in Florida. Similarly, Mr. Pace stated that his clients were told that there -- were never told that there wasn't a facility down in Doral or that there was -- and that there wasn't a use for the steam. That's clearly false. That's going to be contradicted by his own clients.

Mr. Darden will testify that he knew -- they knew that JM Products was a newly formed entity and that it was going to have a new facility. Similarly, Industrial Heat of which Mr. Vaughn will testify, the corporate representative, he will testify that Industrial heat knew that JM Products would have a new facility for the sole purpose of experimenting with new processes. Industrial Heat and IPH claim that Rossi and Johnson made certain representations about Johnson Matthey.

Mr. Pace showed you -- Madam Court Reporter, can you switch, please.

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Bear with me. I'm not the best with technology.

You will note right up here. This is the actual term sheet that was signed by the parties. You will note that Johnson Matthey is nowhere in here. That's because such representations was never made. Mr. Pace showed you a draft of the agreement. That draft was quickly corrected to reflect the true party that was entering into this agreement.

Now, Mr. Johnson did not know -- will testify that he did not know what Johnson Matthey was at the time. In fact, at the meeting I mentioned, Mr . Johnson will testify that the only reference to Johnson Matthey made at that meeting was quite simply that Johnson Matthey would be a supplier of materials for JM Products.

Mr. Vaughn and Industrial Heat will testify that they have no recollection of anything Mr . Johnson said at that meeting.

Now, this is the term sheet that was eventually entered into. Over the course of the next few weeks, between the date of the meeting in July through August 13th when this term sheet was eventually signed by the parties, Industrial Heat and Dr. Rossi went back and forth over several terms in
the agreement. It is undisputed that Industrial Heat negotiated the terms of this agreement and, in fact, even had their attorneys at the time review it. Again, this has been stipulated to. It is undisputed in this case.

Conversely, Mr. Johnson did not make any comments or any revisions to the term sheet.

And, like I said, in mid-August Leonard, Industrial
Heat, and JM products signed and entered into this term sheet.
Now, what did this term sheet provide? I want you to pay particular attention to a few paragraphs here.

Paragraph 7, states that Industrial Heat will provide maintenance for the plant.

Paragraph 8 provides that Leonardo would be responsible for the operation of the one-megawatt plant.

Paragraph 9 states something crucial to this case. The personnel of JM Products will not have access to the inside of the one-megawatt plant for the information about how the plant operates.

If I go down to paragraph 14, the term sheet expressly provided Industrial Heat the ability to provide whatever security, whatever monitoring and whatever control measures it deemed appropriate to protect the plant and to properly analyze its performance.

Around the same time the term sheet was entered into, you saw a document that's titled Compliance With OFAC. OFAC is
an acronym. It simply stands for Office of Foreign Asset Control. Throughout the trial, you will get the chance to review this document. You will notice that this document contains no reference to a specific company, especially no reference to Johnson Matthey as being the owner of JM Products.

Now, it is true, the document does say that it -JM Products is owned by an entity in the United Kingdom. However, Mr. Johnson will testify there was a specific intent for this -- for JM Products to be owned by a trust or an entity in the United Kingdom. You will learn throughout the trial that there was simply no intent to deceive Industrial Heat into entering into this agreement.

Now, Mr. Bass, what can I tell you about my client, Mr. James Bass? He's an engineer. Graduated at the top of his class summa cum laude from Rutgers University. His background is in electrical engineering, specifically with controls or control boards or what he likes to call closed loop systems. Now, he has worked hard his entire life and is now self-employed. He has a company. He works as an independent contractor.

So here is Mr. Bass, he's working as an independent contractor. Around the time that JM Products is getting into shape, a contract has just expired, and an old colleague reaches out to him. He says, Hey, Jim, I have a job opportunity for you. It is this great client. It's called

JM Products. They're in need of an electrical engineer.
So what does he do? He meets with JM Products. He is intrigued, and he decides just to hop aboard.

Now, what is the scope of his work? The scope of his work, you will learn throughout the weeks of trial, the primary focus was to create a control board for JM Products. This control board was to facilitate the processes that, if their experiments proved fruitful, could be used in their production facility. Given his scope of work and given his background, he was given the title of director of engineering. Industrial Heat will testify that they have absolutely no reason to believe that Mr. Bass was in fact -- was not, in fact, the director of engineering. Simply put, it's because he was.

There is no dispute that Mr . Bass was involved in moving the plant to Florida. Again, this is a stipulated fact, something that Defendants -- sorry -- Industrial Heat and IPH do not dispute.

So we fast-forward to about December of 2014 when the plant arrives in Florida. When the plant arrives, they start to install the plant. And in about February of 2015 Mr . Darden will testify that at that time -- he is going to claim that at that time, they knew -- himself and Mr. Vaughn, Industrial Heat, and IPH -- they knew that this test was not going to be legitimate. They knew that something bad was going on down there. I believe Mr. Chaiken alluded to that.

Despite these supposed claims, despite these supposed beliefs that they had back in February of 2015, Industrial Heat nor IPH ever requested additional equipment to be installed at the plant to ensure that they could have proper monitoring or the return of the plant itself. Those are two contractual rights that they had pursuant to the term sheet.

Now, shortly after those statements are made, the test begins, and as the test begins and the plant's running, Dr. Rossi, JM Products, they experiment and use the steam to process different materials. You will hear testimony that JM Products experimented with, amongst other things, platinum sponges and graphene.

Throughout the operation of the plant in Florida, throughout JM Products' use of the steam, Industrial Heat never once sent an invoice or demanded any payment from JM Products for the use of that steam. Industrial Heat nor IPH ever requested JM Products, Mr. Johnson, or Mr. Bass for that matter, to maintain any records of the E-Cat plant's operation or, similarly, asked for any specifics about the business of JM Products or to maintain any records about the business of JM Products and what it was that they were doing down there.

Now, Dr. Penon, who Mr. Chaiken mentioned was the ERV in connection with the license agreement, Mr . Penon will testify that there was no measurement needed on the JM Products side of the facility. Now, he created the test protocol. The
test protocol did not require any measurements to be taken on the JM Products side of the facility. Simply put, this wasn't relevant.

I believe I mentioned this, but just in case, Mr. Bass, his scope of employment again had nothing to do -strike that. Let me backtrack for a second. Mr. Bass was not responsible for the measurement or the operation of the E-Cat plant. Similarly, he wasn't responsible for the testing at JM Products either. As I mentioned, he worked on control boards. That was the scope of his business.

JM Products, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Bass, none of them ever provided the coefficient of performance, which is the COP, to Industrial Heat or IPH. That is the key element -- that is the key indicator of the E-Cat plant's performance. The testimony will show that none of my clients ever provided a COP to Industrial Heat or IPH. They simply never relied on anything my clients ever represented or ever stated as to the performance of the E-Cat plant that is the subject of this litigation.

So the test finishes. Leonardo demands of 11 million dollar. Industrial Heat and IPH say -- simply say, No, you are not entitled to it. So here we are.

THE COURT: Five minutes.
MR. LEON DE LA BARRA: Thank you, Your Honor.
So here we are. Industrial Heat and IPH claim it's an
elaborate scheme to deceive them as to the operation of the one-megawatt plant.

I want to reiterate something. My clients have no stake in the outcome of the tests. They have no claim to 89 million dollars in dispute. JM Products, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Bass did not play any role in the operation or the measurement of the E-Cat plant that is the primary focus of this litigation.

Industrial Heat and IPH never requested either of them -- any of them, I should say -- to take measurements or provide any reports about the plant. JM Products, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Bass did not make any representations about the COP, which, again, was the key indicator of the plant's performance. Dr. Penon will testify that the test protocol did not require any measurement on the $J M$ Products side. It is undisputed that Mr. Bass played no role in Industrial Heat and IPH's decision-making to bring the plant to Florida.

After you have heard all of this evidence, I will ask you to return your verdict for JM Products, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Bass. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Nunez.
MR. NUNEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANTS FULVIO FABIANI, ET AL.

MR. NUNEZ: May it please the Court, ladies and gentlemen, you have heard -- you have been hearing today from the Plaintiffs' side and the Defendants' side that this is a dispute that involves many millions of dollars, right? They are talking about 89 million dollars. The Plaintiffs -- the Defendants want over 11 million dollars.

Because Mr. Fabiani worked for Dr. Rossi, he has been dragged in this case. That is why my client is here. And why I am here -- my name is Rudy Nunez, again, I introduced myself earlier -- I'm here to defend Mr. Fabiani and his company.

Now, you heard the Judge's instructions earlier that your decision at the end of this case, you will be essentially the judges of the facts, what are the facts, and what does the evidence show? And your decision is going to be based on the exhibits that you're shown, your decision is going to be based on the testimony, and there is going to be testimony that was taken under oath that's also going to be presented to you.

Now, based on this evidence, I will ask you at the end of the case and I'll ask you at every opportunity I get, that you will find Mr. Fabiani and his company are not liable for the claims. There are two claims that Industrial Heat has brought against him. He is not seeking any affirmative relief. We're not -- Mr. Fabiani is not here trying to get paid for anything. Okay?

You will hear that Mr . Fabiani does have a dispute with Industrial Heat that he did not get paid his last payment, and I will get to that in a little while.

Now, I want to go through what I think the evidence that you will be presented in this trial -- I know you have been here a long time, especially you all have been here since very early, and I will do my best to get through this and not, ah, and not bore you too much.

Now, I want to go through the evidence as to Mr . Fabiani. I'm not going to talk too much about the things that you've heard already. And I want to point out and it's very important that when it comes to the claims against Mr. Fabiani, that you focus on the evidence with regard to him, all right, and not attribute to him things that others have done or said, the things that you have seen today, the exhibits that have been presented to you during these opening statements. All right?

So first of all, what's Mr. Fabiani's role? You didn't hear very much about him from anyone. You heard Mr. Pace mention him and with regard to the data and Mr. Pace's claim that there's some fake data or some false data. All right. Well, let's start, Mr. Fabiani and Mr. Rossi start working -- or better yet, Mr. Fabiani starts for Mr. Rossi in the middle of 2012 , and he starts working with regard to this

E-Cat technology and the E-Cat plant. Mr. Fabiani's experience, he is experienced in electronics, computer science, and in producing computer control boards. Okay?

So at around the same time that Mr . Fabiani and Dr . -starts working for Dr . Rossi, that's when Dr . Rossi and Mr. Darden when they start and they meet and they start negotiating this license agreement that you're going to see a lot about. You saw some of that today. Well, Mr. Fabiani is not a party of that agreement. Mr. Fabiani had no part in negotiating or bringing about that license agreement. And, most importantly, Mr. Fabiani has nothing to gain whether Industrial Heat has to pay Dr. Rossi in accordance with that license agreement.

Now, you heard there was -- you heard earlier, you'll hear the testimony that the E-Cat plant came to the Industrial Heat's facilities sometime in August 2013. Right after that, my client Mr. Fabiani enters into an agreement with Industrial Heat. And it is an agreement titled Technical Consulting Agreement. And that's -- that's a copy of it. It was attached to pleadings, the papers that are filed by the Defendant in this case. All right?

Now, let's take a look at this for a minute, and we'll see, I have highlighted some -- some areas. Let's look at that Paragraph 2. Now Mr. Fabiani -- and it's known that he has, as it says here, great technical and scientific competence in
electronics, electromechanics, and computer science. And he has experience in producing and assembling components of these energy plants. By these energy plants, it's the E-Cat plant. Okay?

Now, the consulting agreement, then it goes on to say -- I'm sorry -- just the second sentence, that Industrial Heat desires to engage United States Quantum Leap, which is Mr. Fabiani's company, to provide services to -- and this is important, because you heard Mr. Pace saying, What does the contract say? It's to manufacture and develop the mentioned -the above-mentioned energy plants. All right?

In the next page on paragraph 2, now it mentions that the company, Mr. Fabiani's company, is going to provide technical consulting and assistance to, again, manufacture and develop the electrical equipment and the electrical system for the above plants. All right?

Now, this agreement, this technical consulting agreement, this was for a one-year period, this was for a one-year term, right, that then was subsequently extended for two more terms. And those extensions of the agreement, they never changed the duties or responsibilities or what Mr. Fabiani was supposed to do under his contracts. Right? The language stayed the same. They just changed the dates. All right?

Now, in this case one of the claims, Industrial Heat
claims that Mr. Fabiani breached the agreement. He breached the agreement. All right? Now, you are going to be asked to decide whether or not he did. And to decide that, you are going to have to determine whether he breached a material term of that contract. And to determine that, you will consider -one of the things that you'll be instructed, you're going to consider is what is the purpose and intent of the contract?

Now, you are going to hear testimony from Mr. Darden, right, the president, he is the top guy for Industrial Heat. And his understanding of that technical consulting agreement was to support and help Dr. Rossi build the plant and continue developing the technology. All right? To essentially help build the device. Mr. Darden is expected to testify that Dr. Rossi asked him, $I$ want Mr. Fabiani to help me because of the area of expertise that he has. And Industrial Heat decided you know what? We want Dr. Rossi to work on this and create this and be successful. So you know what? We'll enter into this contract, we'll pay Mr. Fabiani, right? But to work for Mr. Rossi and at Mr. Rossi's direction.

You are going to hear very similar testimony from Mr. Vaughn, and he testifies or has testified as a corporate representative for Industrial Heat. Again, his testimony is going to be that the contract between Mr . Fabiani and Industrial Heat was for him to help Dr. Rossi and to work at the direction and discretion of Dr . Rossi.
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You also hear -- you've heard his name at some time today, a gentleman by the name of Barry West. Barry West was an independent -- is an independent contractor for Industrial Heat. He is going to be a witness for Industrial Heat. And Mr. West is going to testify that he worked essentially for three years, the entire time Mr. Fabiani had contracts, these consulting agreements, with Industrial Heat, that almost the whole time he worked along beside Mr. West. Mr. West also confirmed that Mr. Fabiani's role was in electrical design and maintenance of the plants. All right. Mr. West is going to testify that they knew Mr. Fabiani worked previously for Dr. Rossi, they knew they had this previous relationship, and that they didn't have a problem with that. They accepted that, because what they wanted, when they entered into this agreement with my client, was just anything Mr. Rossi needed to help the plant work, so they brought on Mr . Fabiani to do that.

Now, there is a provision in the contract -- and you're going to hear about this later on from the other side, and this has to do with the data and turning over data by Mr. Fabiani to Industrial Heat. And there is a provision, paragraph 6, that talks about all confidential information belongs to Industrial Heat. And if you are not able to see that, maybe I can zoom in just a little. And it references tester results. Okay?

With regard to this provision, you are going to hear
testimony from Mr. Darden. Strike that. You are going to hear testimony from Mr. Vaughn, all right, and that Mr. Fabiani was not the, let's say, data -- I think his -- the way he explained it was not the data-capturing expert for Industrial Heat. That's not his job, Mr. Fabiani's job, to collect this data.

Today, here in this trial, it is a big issue of the data, what data was provided, what data wasn't provided. All right? But when they entered this agreement and Mr. Fabiani started working for them and it was up in North Carolina, collecting data wasn't his job back then. All right?

Now, Mr. Darden and Mr. Vaughn will also confirm and the evidence will show that my client did turn over data. He was asked by Mr. Rossi at certain times to collect data to show and for his own knowledge to see how the plants were working how the technology was working. And they'll testify that that data was turned over to Industrial Heat. Okay? Even when the plan was in Florida, my client was turning over data to Industrial Heat.

Now, there is going to be testimony, you are going to hear how at the end of this test, however they want to call it -- again, it's not our dispute -- whether the test in Doral counted for purposes of the license agreement, for the amendments license agreement. That's not my case to prove or disprove. All right?

But what the evidence is going to show that it's at
that time, at the end of the test essentially when everything is going to blow up between the two parties, then they started saying, oh, where is this data, and we want this data, now they are claim that he didn't give them the data.

Well, that's going to be contradicted by a few things. Okay? First of all, you will hear from my client, he'll come in, hopefully -- and I think I told you earlier, he doesn't live in this country, he's travelling, he will be here next week, and I expect him testify in the trial. He's going to say that, again, while the plant was in Doral, he was turning over power consumption data to Industrial Heat.

Now, after everything blows up and these guys are fighting against each other, all right, my client is summoned by Industrial Heat to come to the offices of their attorneys. All right? So Mr. Fabiani's called and says you have go down to the offices of Mr . Pace. All right? Now, his understanding is that, one, they are going to make him an offer to extend his contract for another three years, and they are going to make the payment that is due to him under the existing contract that he had.

Now, my client goes to the offices of Industrial Heat's attorneys -- this is before the litigation starts -- and he turns over data. He goes on two occasions. He turns over data. And that promised contract -- or at least in his mind, he was going to get this extension of his contract -- no
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extension of the contract and no payment either. There was -the last payment under the contract was never made.

So at that point, the testimony will show, my client did not turn over certain raw data to them. It has been turned over subsequently. Okay?

Now, the last thing on this -- on issue of data -- and I think this is very important for you to keep in mind throughout this trial -- you are going to be presented with expert reports. All right? And those expert reports from Industrial Heat's experts, they utilize and they rely on the data that Mr . Fabiani did give them. Not just the raw data at the end, but the data that he was giving them during the test at Doral, the data that he turned over to them at their attorney's office, okay, their own experts rely on that data. At the same time, they make a claim that Mr. Fabiani didn't turn over data. Okay?

Now, let me move -- so there is the claim on the breach of contract. Okay?

THE COURT: Five minutes.
MR. NUNEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
There is a claim on the breach of contract. There is also the claim of this deceptive scheme. This alleged deceptive scheme, all right? You didn't hear anything today that my client had anything to do with JM Products. My client -- you would have heard it. There is nothing in writing
that he said anything about JM Products. There is nothing tying him to JM Products. Okay?

There is nothing -- you didn't hear today anything said by Mr. Pace that my client did anything or said anything about moving the plant to Florida. My client, you know why? Because there is no evidence to that. All right?

You are going to hear evidence -- Mr. Vaughn, he was questioned in his deposition, and he couldn't come up with a single factor to show my client, again, had anything to do with JM Products or moving the plant down to Florida.

There's another issue that they brought up that they weren't allowed into the JM Product's side of the building. Well, in that, you are going to hear from Mr. West, the contractor and witness for Industrial Heat, and he is going to testify to this, and he's going to -- his testimony is going to be that my client didn't have free access to JM Products. His access was restricted. He was restricted to where the containers were. He wasn't allowed to freely to cross over. Yes, there's testimony from Mr. West that he would go to the front offices of $J M$ Products, if they had computer issues. Okay. But he still had to go around. And the only Mr. West ever saw him go through those doors that you saw on that picture, it was one time, and he was allowed in by an employee of JM Products.

Now, the last part is this manipulation of data. Now,
you saw a graph today that Mr. Pace showed you, and it talked about the FP\&L numbers and that my client and his energy consumption numbers had shown that there was -- what was it? That there was more energy than that was reported by FP\&L. Their own witness, their expert witness Joe Murray who created that graph, his testimony is that that occurred on 14 days of the 350 -plus days of the test. That occurred on 14 days. That's why my client is in here is for those 14 days. But you are going to hear testimony from Mr. Murray, their expert, that he couldn't attribute that to either Mr. Fabiani, to the equipment that was measuring the input, the power input, or it could have even been a problem with FP\&L's numbers.

That's why my client is here. And, again, my time is running out. I am almost out of time. That I will ask you that at the end of this, that you find that Mr. Fabiani's not liable.

And the last thing I will leave with you -- and I think it's very important is Mr . West, again, a person who was a contractor for Industrial Heat, worked with Mr. Fabiani for almost three years side by side working on this technology, and he was asked whether he saw Mr. Fabiani do anything deceitful or dishonest to Industrial Heat, and his answer was simply no.

So I ask you to find my client is not liable for these two claims brought against him. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I know you have all
been here since early this morning. We adjourn now. If you remember, I indicated we did not have trial Monday or Tuesday. The court is closed on these dates. I ask that you return on Wednesday, July the 5th at 9 o'clock. Please be gathered in the jury room at $9 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. And have a happy July 4 th weekend. We'll see you at 9. Please do not discuss this with anyone or do any reading research about it.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
(The jury exited the courtroom at 4:19 p.m.)
THE COURT: We actually begin at 9:30. I told them 9 so they could all be here on time. Sometimes there are late jurors. So that was a fictional start time, but we begin at 9:30 on Wednesday.

MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor. Happy 4th of July.
THE COURT: You as well.
(The proceedings adjourned at 3:00 p.m.)
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| 3：7，76：9 | 112：8，112：9 | 52：17 | change［7］－115：4 | stance |
| capital［2］－87：3， | 112：18，112：22 | CENTENO［33］－ | 157：11，158：9， | 109：21，162：24 |
| 161：11 | 112:24, 113:1, | 39：18，39：21，39：23， | 158：12，158：13， | circumsta $109 \cdot 20$ |
| $\operatorname{capped}_{[1]}$－141：3 capturing［1］－178 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:10, } 114: 17 \\ & 114: 25,115: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 40：1，40：4，40：8， 40：12，40：16，40： | 158：23，158：24 changed［7］－135：12， | 109：20 <br> City［1］－ |
| $\boldsymbol{c a r}[11]-37: 24,38: 11$ ， | 118：21，118：2 | 52：15，52：17，52：20 | 35：13，135：16 | civil［ 18$]$－8：10， |
| 40：24，42：2，42：12， | 118：25，126：2 | 52：24，53：2，53：5， | 145：24，153：24 | 18：21，26：25，27：22， |
| 43：12，43：16，45：11， | 仿：8，126：24， | 53：8，59：18，59：24， | 175：21，175：23 | 27：24，37：14，44：25， |
| 60：15，74：2 | 127：7，134：13， | 60：1，63：25，64：2 | changes［1］－153： | 5：1，45：11， 47 |
| card［1］－136：20 | $\begin{aligned} & 135: 18,136: 23 \\ & 138 \cdot 16146 \cdot 10 \end{aligned}$ | 64:4, 64:7, 64:10 |  | $47: 20,51: 25,59: 10,$ |
| cards［1］－86：4 | 146：11，162：24 | 67：25，68：2，68：5 | characterist | $\mathrm{n} \mid 421-201$ |
|  |  | 6：8，81：14， 81 | 161：6 | 17，20：21， 20 |
| ：13，134：18， | 170：4，172：10， | center $[1]$－87：23 | haracters［1］ | 21：3， $21:$ |
| ：21 | 仿：14，172：2 | centigrade［1］ | 125：1 | 21：20，21：21， |
| career $[1]$－85：24 | 174：21，175：25 | 116：19 | charge［3］－37：2 | 1，22：9，22：212 |
| careers［1］－74：5 | 8：23 | CEO［1］－ | 83：19，87：24 | ：19， |
| careful［1］－144：1 | CASE［1］－1：2 <br> cases［3］－7：7，18：21， | certain［8］－32：18， $67: 10,78: 22,110$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 1125,11: 12, \\ & 11 \cdot 24110 \cdot \end{aligned}$ |
| Carolina［15］－12：10， | cases［］］－ 7.7 ，18．21， | 12：1，164：25， |  | 55：13，126：1， |
| 79：16，124：5， | Cassarino［1］－12： | 18：13，180：4 | charging［1］－22：5 | 0：12，130：13， |
| 124：17，127：17， | ${ }^{\text {cat }}$［3］－140：7，145：1， | certificate［2］－151：15 | check［3］－4：24， | 135：2 |
| 128：4，143：17， | 154：7 | Certificate．．． | 87：17，105：8 | 139：15，141：6， |
| 144：4，145：20， $145 \cdot 21,157 \cdot 3$ | Cat［50］－24：23， | .... [1] - 3:20 | chemical $[3]$－117：13， 144：19 $145 \cdot 9$ | $11: 8,155: 1,$ $30: 15,164: 2$ |
| 145：21，157：3，178：9 <br> carrier［1］－36：24 | 115:19, | $135: 22$ |  | 8:21, 170: |
| carry［3］－19：14，36：6， | 迷：4，116：22 | certify［1］－183：19 |  | 迷 |
| 76：18 | 退7：12，117：15 | CHAIKEN 44$]-1: 12$ | s［1］－151：19 | 179：4，180：15， |
| carrying［1］－109：17 | 仿：19，121：18， | 14：10，125：20， | herokee［28］－ 2 | 7，180：21， |
| cars［1］－73：25 | ，122：2， | 5：10 | 14，12：5，20：1 | 180：22 |
| Carter［3］－11：25， | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:7, 123:17, } \\ & \text { 125:7, 128:6, } \end{aligned}$ | Chaiken［21］－1：14， $9 \cdot 1,114: 11,138: 22$, | 21：4，21：8，21：12， 21.14119 .9 | claimed［2］－115：3， 115：4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:9, 12:11 } \\ & \text { cartoon }[1]-125: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $133: 21,139: 5,$ | 9：1，114：11，138：22， <br> 151：11，152：10， | 4， 1 | claiming［5］－13 |
| $\text { case }[117]-6: 6,6: 18 \text {, }$ | 140：2，140：14 | 22，154：1 | 119：25，120：2 | 139：15，140：1 |
| 8：10，8：11，9：8， | 140：24，141：1， | 4：17，155：2 | 20：5，120：11 | 142：1，143：2 |
| 11：15，11：22，13：6， | 142：8，142：12， | 6：3，157：1，157：6， | 120： | claims $[17]$－ $18: 12$ |
| 13：9，13：14，16：5， | 143：9，144：11， | 58：4，160：5， | 2：8，122：1 | 18：23，19：9，19：10， |
| 18：2，18：6，18：7， | 144：18，144：19， | 160：13，160：20， | 22：13，154：12 | 20：14，22：11， 23 |
| 18：14，18：18，19：12， | 146：19，147：20， 152：17 153：1， | 162：17，163：13， | 54：19，154：20， | 77：12，111：12， |
| 20：2，20：12，24：7， 24：11，24：13， $26: 19$, | 152：17，153：1， <br> 153：2，154：3，156：1， | 168：25，169：22 chain ［1］－109：20 | 154：23，154：24 | 158：7，169：1， 172:23, 173:13 |
| 24：11，24：13，26：19， | 156：3，156：12， | chair [3] - 74:25, 76:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cheryl }[1]-107: \text { : } \\ & \text { chief }[1]-127: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 㖪：25，176：1 |
| 29：7，30：16，30：20， | 157：2，161：22， | \％9 | child［6］－34：19， | 182：24 |
| 30：24，31：17，32：4， | 169：18，170：7， 170：14，170：18， | challenge［33］－91：8， | 34：25，36：25，45：21 | arification $[1]-8: 7$ |
| 34：7，35：22，35：23， | 170：14，170：18， 171：7，174：1， | 91：13，91：16，91：20， | 81：21 | clarity ${ }^{[1]}$－134：8 |
| 37：16，38：5，38：7， 39：7，39：10，39：13， | 171：7，174：1， <br> 174：15，175：3 | 91：24，92：3，92：7， | children［2］－83：8， $85 \cdot 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { class [2] - 30:22, } \\ & 167: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 41：20，42：6，43：8， | catalyzers［1］－144：20 | 23，92：25，93：2， | Childress［1］－ 12 | Clayton［7］－97：4， |
| 44：25，45：1，45：14， | Cats［2］－117：11， | 还：8，93：12，93：19， | choose [1] - 109:2 | 97：7，100：11，107：4， |
| 47：20，47：25，48：9， | 117：13 | 93：21，93：24，94：1， | CHOY［8］－16：18， | 107：14，107：18， |
| 48：13，48：18，48：23， | causes［1］－10：6 | 4：4，94：6，94：8， | 16：20，16：25，43：4 | 107：22 |
| 48：25，50：7，50：9， | causing ${ }_{\text {［1］}}$－117：18 | 94：10，94：13，94：16， | 43：10，83：16，83：18， | clayton［2］－5： |
| 51：24，52：23，61：24， | Cecilia［1］－6：4 | 94：18，94：20，95：4， | 84：4 | 105：13 |
| 62:14, 62:17, 77:11, 84:25, 90:2, 90:4, | CECILIA［1］－1：10 celebrate［1］－120： | 95：7，95：10，95：13， 95：16，137：18 | Choy［5］－5：9，16：18， | CLAYTON［3］－44：3， <br> 44：7，44：9 |
| 84：25， $90: 2,90.19$, $96: 13,106: 19$, | Centeno［8］－5：8， | challenges［2］－91：2， | 17：2，43：4，83：16 Chris［2］－ $9: 6,9: 9$ | clean［4］－115：23 |
| 107：3，108：11， | 39：18，39：21，52：14， | 159：18 | CHRISTOPHER［2］－ | 116：7，116：13 |
| 109：10，110：5， | 52：15，59：19，63：25， $81: 18$ | chance［4］－150：17， | 2：10，2：10 | 159：21 |
| 111：4，111：9， |  | 150：18，154：22， | Christopher［1］－ | cleaning［1］－159：19 |
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| clear [3] - 141:4, | closely [1] - 42:21 | 108:2 | 109:2 | Consulting [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 146:23, 164:4 | closing [4] - 86:4, | companies [6]-22:7, | concerning [1]-23:14 | 4:18 |
| clearly [4]-20:6, | 10:4, 112:12, 114:1 | 57:7, 118:18, 120:5, | concerns [3] - 7:9, | mption [2] - |
| 141:2, 164:11, 164:16 | re [1] - 138:7 | 160:4 | $7 \cdot 1981$ | 179:11, 182:3 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 164:16 } \\ \text { client }[42] \text { - 9:16 } \end{gathered}$ | clothin 64:5 | 20:2 | $77: 17$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { contact }[4]-7: 8 \\ 90: 3.136 \cdot 18 \end{gathered}$ |
| :25 | d | 22:19, 38:14, 43:5, | concluded |  |
| 退:19, 119:8, |  | , |  | 39:10, |
| 122:16, 124:15, | COCHRAN [5] - 40:2 | 8, 57:20 | co | 10:1 |
| 125:21, 130:9, | 3, 41:7, 41:11, | 5:13, 66:1 |  | 4, 151 |
| 130:12, 135:7, | 81:9 | 67:17 | conclusion | containers [2] - |
| 135:20, 136:12 | Cochran [2]-5:5, | 9:8 | 106:20 | 51:21, 181:18 |
| 145:11, | 40:22 | 83:18, 85:1, 93:16 | condition [4]-14:13 | ntains [1] - 167 |
| 146:16, | cocounsel $\left.^{11}\right]$ | 114:14, 126:18, 128:9, 130:15, a | 17:8, 42:13, 82:3 | contaminated [1] |
| 167:13, 167:25, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 128: 9,130: 15 \\ & 130: 18,134: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Conditioning [3] <br> 57:21, 79:9, 79 | 159 |
| 172:10, 174:17 | 116:24, 117:2 | 144:17, 145:6 | conditioning | cont |
| 177:15, 178:12 | 170:12 | 145:8, 145:9, | 79:5, 79:7 | 107:1, 122:13, |
| 178:17, 179:6, | cold [6]-24:16, 26:3 | 45:22, 145:25, | condominium [1] | 6:21, 128:22 |
| 179:13, 179:2 | 7:7, 27:13, 28:10 | 146:5, 146:9, 147:5, | 60:9 | 129:3, 176: |
| 180:3, 180:24, | 120:6 | 48:18, | conduct ${ }_{[1]}$-62 | continued [1] - 125:23 |
| 180:25, 181:4, <br> 181:5, 181:9, | Cold ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - $24: 1$ collaborate | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 9,1,19: 17, \\ & 3: 21,159: 9, \end{aligned}$ | conducted [2] - | CONTINUED ${ }_{\text {[1] - 2:1 }}$ |
| 181:16, 182:2 | collabora | 160:3, 161:14 | conducting ${ }_{[1]}-23: 17$ | $20$ |
| 8, 182:13 | 30:4 | 2:1, 167:4, | conference [ $[1]$ - 85:22 | contract [62] - 21:20 |
| 182:23 | colleague [1] - 167:23 | 7:19, 172:11 | confident | 22:2, 22:13, 22:15, |
| clients [52] - 9:7, | colleagues [4]-8:25, | 22, 175:8 | 129:9, 177:21 | 24:4,33 |
| 79:25, 106:4, 118:25, 138:19, | 0:15, 80:16, 159:16 | 175:13 | confirm [1] - 178:11 | 33:13, 33:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:25, 138:19, } \\ & \text { 138:23, 143:8, } \end{aligned}$ | collect [5] - 125:15, | Company [4] - 12:1 | firmed [1] - 177:9 | 66:19, |
| 143:13, | 126:13, 127:22 | compare [1] - 142: | licts [1] - 161 |  |
| 14 | coll | comparison [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Congrats [2] - 132: } \\ & \text { 132:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 68:16, 68:18, 68:19, |
| 144:24, 145:5, | colle | 42:25 | congratu | :21, 68:24, |
| 145:6, 146:4, 147:4, 147:19, 147:24, | Co | compensate [1] - 62 | 120:5 | :24, 70:1, 70 |
| 147:19, 147:24, <br> 148:2, 148:16, | college []]-28:11, | competence $[1]$ 174:25 | Congress [1] - 30: | :18, 70:21, 70 |
| 148:21, 149 | 53:19, 56:5, 56:14 | complete [1] - 147:7 | connected [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:4, 72:7, } 1 \\ & 21: 10,122: \end{aligned}$ |
| 149:12, | colon [1] | completed [2]-71:9, |  | 22:7, 136:9 |
| 150:12, 151:4, | Colorado [1]-88:22 | 125:5 | 68:20, | 6:10, 145: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:5, 152:3, 152:5, } \\ & 152: 20,153: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { combinations }[1] \text {. }$ | completely $[3$ | 169:23 | 6:19, 157:10 |
| 153:5, 153:6, 153:7, | 32:16 | completion [6]-21:9, | conning [1] - 159:5 |  |
| 153:10, 154:2, | coming [6] - 4:23 | 121:18, 121:19, | consequently [2] - | $: 10,176$ |
| 154:8, 156:1, 157:2, 159:12, 159:15, |  | :15, | 110: |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:12, 159:15, } \\ & \text { 160:6, 161:25, } \end{aligned}$ | comments [1] - 166:5 | 16 | 11:3, 111:6, | 79:18, 179:19, |
| 162:4, 162:5, 163:1, | commercial ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Compliance [1] } \\ \text { 166:25 } \end{array}$ | 111:20, 176:5, 176:7 | 9:24, 179:25 <br> 80:1, 180:2 |
| 164:14, 164:17, 170.15, 170:17, | 22:18 commer | component [1] - 59:12 | considering [1] 111:23 | 80:18, 180:2 |
| 170:15, 170:17 171:3 |  | components | ( | contractor [5] - |
| cli | committee [4] - | com | sistent ${ }_{11} 1$ |  |
| 161:24 clomax@jonesday |  | computer [10]-25:6, | $\begin{gathered} \text { constan } \\ 139: 24 \end{gathered}$ | 硣 |
| clomax@jonesday <br> com [1]-2:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { co } \\ & \text { co } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| close [5]-30:23, | 12, 12:13, 19:2 | 174:3, 175:1, 181:20 | 59:15, 72: | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 19,155: 10, \\ & \text { 175:22, 177:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :21, 71:22, 77:8, |  |  |  | ntractual [1] - 169:5 |
|  | 19:22, 112:18, 161:2 |  | $23: 6,24: 2,129: 5,$ | [2] - 119:3, |
| 16:21, 43:8, | 1 |  | , |  |
| 93:15, 167:17, 183:3 | 126:11 | concerned [1] - | 175:17, 176:10, 177:7 | contradicted [4]126:16, 164:17, |
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| ```Court's [1] - 3:17 COURT'S [1] - 108:15 courthouse [2] - 106:25, 109:17 Courtroom [1]-1:7 COURTROOM [5] - 4:12, 4:15, 4:18, 7:2, 108:14 courtroom [29]-4:20, 6:4, 6:12, 6:14, 6:23, 7:4, 7:5, 7:6, 7:24, 10:9, 13:16, 37:22, 90:5, 90:9, 106:10, 106:24, 107:13, 108:10, 108:18, 109:11, 113:5, 113:7, 114:13, 136:17, 137:2, 138:10, 139:16, 149:7, 183:9 courtrooms [2] - 140:3, 140:9 Courts [1] - 44:5 cousin [1] - 38:5 cover [3]-87:25, 104:17, 104:24 coworkers [1]-11:7 Craig [1]-11:25 create [8]-115:21, 116:15, 122:10, 129:8, 131:6, 131:10, 168:6, 176:16 created [11]-117:13, 120:21, 120:22, 122:25, 143:22, 157:8, 157:22, 157:23, 159:8, 169:25, 182:5 creates [3]-26:12, 116:9, 123:21 creating [2] - 115:16, 136:1 creation [1] - 115:20 creator [2]-114:15, 119:19 credibility [4]-19:18, 19:19, 19:21, 20:9 credible [1] - 142:4 crime [1] - 18:19 crimes [1] - 18:16 criminal [12]-8:11, 18:14, 18:15, 18:18, 27:23, 30:16, 39:7, 41:20, 46:21, 50:9, 51:24 critical [2]-81:6, 117:17 crjpace@jonesday. com [1]-2:14``` | ```cross [3] - 113:20, 113:23, 181:18 cross-examine [1] - 113:23 cross-examining [1] - 113:20 crucial [1]-166:15 Culbertson [1] - 1:18 culture \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(61: 6\) cum [1]-167:15 curriculum [1]-55:25 cursing [1] \(-75: 15\) customer [28]-85:3, 128:6, 128:15, 128:19, 131:6, 134:7, 134:10, 134:13, 138:18, 144:8, 144:10, 144:15, 144:16, 144:18, 144:24, 145:3, 145:14, 145:18, 146:17, 146:21, 149:10, 150:15, 152:4, 159:7, 159:9, 163:17, 163:21 cylinder [5] - 157:22, 157:24, 158:2, 158:5, 158:7 \\ D``` ```Dade [7]-25:22, 44:5, 76:7, 80:20, 83:6, 85:10, 93:5 daily [3]-74:17, 83:21, 84:5 damages [4]-18:6, 18:8, 18:22, 62:6 Dameron [6] - 11:24, 12:17, 127:6, 128:8, 131:9 DARDEN [1] - 1:7 Darden [49]-2:11, 8:13, 9:7, 11:23, 18:10, 20:14, 21:3, 118:18, 119:7, 119:9, 119:16, 119:23, 120:3, 120:4, 122:19, 126:1, 127:4, 127:8, 127:15, 127:17, 127:20, 128:12, 128:25, 129:19, 131:22, 131:25, 132:1, 132:9, 132:10, 133:2, 133:12, 134:4, 134:5, 144:13, 147:24, 153:21,``` ```Dade [7]-25:22, 44:5, 76:7, 80:20, 83:6, 85:10, 93:5 daily [3]-74:17, 83:21, 84:5 damages [4]-18:6, 18:8, 18:22, 62:6 Dameron [6] - 11:24, 12:17, 127:6, 128:8, 131:9 DARDEN [1] - 1:7 Darden [49]-2:11, 8:13, 9:7, 11:23, 18:10, 20:14, 21:3, 118:18, 119:7, 119:9, 119:16, 119:23, 120:3, 120:4, 122:19, 126:1, 127:4, 127:8, 127:15, 127:17, 127:20, 128:12, 128:25, 129:19, 131:22, 131:25, 132:1, 132:9, 132:10, 133:2, 133:12, 134:4, 134:5, 144:13, 147:24, 153:21,``` | ```159:15, 160:1, 163:5, 163:25, 164:4, 164:18, 168:20, 174:6, 176:8, 176:13, 178:1, 178:11 Darden's [1]-126:15 dark [1] - 150:11 data [34]-24:5, 159:12, 162:2, 173:21, 173:22, 177:19, 178:3, 178:4, 178:5, 178:7, 178:10, 178:12, 178:13, 178:16, 178:17, 179:3, 179:4, 179:11, 179:23, 179:24, 180:4, 180:6, 180:11, 180:12, 180:13, 180:14, 180:16, 181:25 data-capturing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 178:4 database [1]-103:5 DATE [1] - 183:23 date [6] - 78:15, 78:16, 122:5, 122:12, 124:7, 165:23 dates [2]-175:23, 183:3 daughter [1]-87:6 DAY [1]-1:9 days [20] - 78:22, 82:18, 83:1, 88:20, 89:14, 119:21, 122:2, 122:3, 123:6, 123:9, 133:1, 138:4, 143:1, 147:9, 152:19, 182:6, 182:7, 182:8 DC \({ }_{[1]}-2: 18\) De [4]-1:14, 9:14, 12:24, 162:10 de [1] \(-1: 18\) DE [27]-2:2, 4:9, 9:13, 12:25, 73:1, 73:7, 73:10, 73:14, 73:19, 73:24, 74:2, 74:21, 75:4, 75:7, 75:20, 76:1, 76:4, 76:25, 77:2, 92:2, 102:21, 137:14, 137:16, 162:11, 162:14, 165:4, 170:24 deadlines [2]-80:1, 80:5 deal [4]-56:24, 83:21, 84:4, 161:5 dealing [1] - 148:6``` |  | ```100:4, 100:15, 100:19, 101:7, 101:15, 101:23, 102:10, 103:13, 103:22, 104:11, 105:21, 111:14, 112:1, 113:19, 113:21, 113:23, 114:17, 115:2, 118:18, 118:24, 119:2, 119:7, 121:24, 122:9, 123:12, 123:16, 123:24, 124:4, 124:10, 124:12, 124:14, 124:16, 124:20, 124:22, 125:9, 125:17, 126:4, 126:25, 128:21, 128:22, 130:5, 130:8, 130:17, 130:23, 133:2, 133:7, 134:12, 134:18, 134:22, 135:17, 136:9, 146:10, 163:25, 164:3, 164:4, 168:16, 172:8 Defendants' [2]-3:10, 172:5 Defendants........ [1] - 3:18 Defense [1] - 97:11 defense [3]-47:11, 47:12, 97:6 defenses [7] - 19:12, 19:13, 19:14, 77:12, 112:1, 112:3, 135:18 defining \({ }_{[1]}\) - 154:19 definitely [2] - 67:9, 134:7 definitions [1] - 113:8 definitively [1] - 134:9 defraud [1]-163:1 degree [1] - 59:1 degrees [3]-116:18, 139:19, 140:4 delay [1] - 125:2 deliberate [2]-106:1, 114:4 deliberating [2] - 105:24, 112:13 deliberations [3] - 50:23, 110:8, 112:10 deliver \([1]-21: 24\) delivered [1] - 124:4 delivery [1] - 124:9 demanded [1] - 169:15 demands [1] - 170:20``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 66:24, 67:2, 67:25, 68:2, 68:5, 68:8, | provides ${ }_{[1]}-166: 13$ <br> providing [2]-23:9, | Q | rapidly ${ }_{[1]}$ - 15:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:3 } \\ & \text { reason }[4]-40: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| :13, 68:15, 68:22, | 154 | qualified [1]-113:12 | rather [2]-118:20, | 30:11, 136:22 |
| 69:1, 69:8, 69:11, 69:16, 69:18, 69:23, | proving [4]-18:12, <br> 111:9, 112:2, 145:1 | Quantum [9]-2:8 <br> 8:19, 9:19, 23:5, | $153: 25$ | reasonable [1]-18:19 |
| :4, 70:7, 70:10, | provision $[4]$ - 163 | $7,23: 8,23: 2$ | raw [3] - 116:10, | reasons [3] - 124:14 |
| :13, 70:16, 71: | 77:17, | 24:1, 175:7 | 180:4, 180:11 | 30:7, 162:2 |
| , 21, 72:5, 72:9, | 777: 2 | quarterly $[3]$ - 80 | ernstein@ac | ceive $[12]$ - 10 |
| 2:18, 73:6, 73:9, | pry | 8:1, | 1:16 | 08:24, 110:17 |
| 73:12, 73:16, 73:22, | Public [3] - 80:20, | qu | stein@acla | 10:21, 110:23 |
| 74:1, 74:15, 74:23, | 83:6, 93:5 | qu | .com [1] - 1 | , 123:12 |
| 75:6, 75:9, 75:22, | public [7]-32:14 | 65:11 | reach $[8]-7: 9,7: 18$, | :14, 135:8 |
| 6:5, 77:1, 78:2, | 76:7, 79:24, 85:10 | questioned [1] - 181:8 | 7:20, 28:22, 45:1 | 160:1, 160:2 |
| 13, 78:17, 78:2 | 87:2, 108:21, 115:3 | questioning [5] - 10:5, | 9:8, 50:17, 136:1 | received [ 99 - 13 |
| 79:5, 79:7, 79:9, | publications [1]-26:8 | 13:19, 14:2, 14:5, | ached [1]-23:8 | 112:12, 114:20 |
| 79:11, 79:14, 79:19, | publicly [1] -55:6 | 2:7 | reaches [2]-8:2, | :21, 12 |
| 79:23, 80:12, 80:20, <br> 80:23, 80:24, 81:8, | published [3] - | questionnaire ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 167:24 | 135:17, 136 |
| 80:23, 80:24, 81:8, <br> 81:9, 81:14, 81:17, | 116:24, 117:1 | 6:10, 8:10, 9:24 | reaching [1] | 137:6, 137:25 |
| 82:1, 82:3, 82:7, | Puerto [1] - 54:25 | questions [21] - 6:19, | reaction [1] - 117:19 | 135:12, 148:4 |
| 82:9, 82:13, 82:17, | pull ${ }_{[1]}$ - 121:7 | 9:2 | ns [1] - $24: 24$ | 149:14 |
| 82:24, $83: 4,83: 6$, $83: 16,83: 18,84: 4$, | pulling [2] - 146:15, | , $24,43: 21,43: 23$, | reactor [2]-123:2 | cently |
| 83:16, 83:18, 84:4, | 147:18 | 10, 63:10, 66:18, | 24:18 | 48:14, 49:23 |
| 84:8, 84:15, 84:17, 84:22, 85:6, 85:9, | pumped [1] - 136:2 | 73:3, 76:2, | reactors [4] - 141:1 | ceptionist [1] |
| 85:16, 85:17, 86:2, | pumping [1] - 140:3 | 76:3, $77: 3,77: 5$ | 152:25, 153:2, 153:3 |  |
| 86:7, 86:10, 86:12, | pumps [5] - 141:1 141:20, 141:21, | $\begin{array}{ll} 6,106: 14,1 \\ 3: 19,113: 20 \end{array}$ | read [14] - 11:10, 24:7, 26:7, 72:3, 112:23, | recess 114.7 - $136: 16$ |
| 86:15, 86:19, 86:24, $86 \cdot 25,87 \cdot 9,8711$ | 141:23 | quick [1] - 15:8 | :3, 116:5, 1 | 136:25, 137:3, 137:5 |
| 86:25, 87:9, 87:11, <br> 87:13, 87:16, 87:20, | punishme | quickly [3] - 155:2 | 18, | recognize [1] - 13:2 |
| 87:13, 87:16, 87:20, <br> 87:22, 88:3, 88:6, | 18 | 165:10 | :21, 154:22 | recognized [2]- |
| 88:11, 88:17, 89:1, | purchase [2]-60:18, | 2:9, 148:8 | 160:11 |  |
| 89:5, 89:8, 89:10, |  | quotes [1] - 149:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reading }[7]-14: 9 \text {, } \\ & 58: 5,71: 19,90: 4 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | 165:19 |
| , | 15, 64:19, 70:25 |  |  | record [] - 8:1 |
| protect ${ }_{[1]}$ - 166:2 | 156:1 | R | 183:7 | cords [6] - |
| protocol [7] - 122:25, |  | radiation |  | 169:18, 169:20 |
| 123:1, 131:23, | $111$ | 118:12 | 1,1, | cover $[1]$ - 138 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:9, } 169: 25, \\ & 170 \cdot 1 \quad 171 \cdot 11, \end{aligned}$ | 129:9, 164:23, 176:7 | radioactive [3] | real [27]-22:1 | recovery [ ${ }_{[1]}$ - 18:22 |
|  | purposely [1] - 150:11 | 5:24, 116:9, | 2:18, 130:1 | cruiter [1]-51: |
| 18:23, 19:9, 109:15, | purposes [6] - 30:3, | 8:13 | 130:2 | fer [1] - 153:2 |
| 111:11, 113:17, |  |  |  |  |
| 178:23 | 131:10, 178:22 |  |  |  |
| proved [4]-111:18, | pursuant [3] - 121:17 130:3, 169:6 | 10:8, 69:21, 108: |  | 118:15, 1 |
| 111:25, 161:12, | suing [1] - 160:4 | 134:16 | 5:4, 145: | 退:20, |
| 168:8 | put [20] - 13:16, 36:1 | 35:19 | , | 165:15, 167:4, |
| proves $[1]$ - 109:21 | 58:6, 85:3, 111:13 | sed [5] - 19:13 |  | ferenc |
| provide [12] -21:1, | 7:5, | 3:3, 73:4, 104:23, | 6:25, 147 | 125. |
| 109:8, 118:5, 128:6, | 134:4, 139:2, 151:4, | 19:1 | 9:17, 150:1 | references [] |
| 145:16, 146:21, | , | Ramirez [3]-5:2 | 156:16, 164:8 | 177:23 |
| 166:9, 166:11, <br> 166:20, 171:11, | 2, 156 | 6:21, 85:6 | realize ${ }_{[1]}$ - $62: 1$ | ect [1] - 165: |
| 175:8, 175:13 | :11, 157:18 | RAMIREZ [9] - 36:21, | lized [1] - 157: | flected [1] - 155:2 |
| provided [11] - | 13, 158:22 | 36:23, 37:4, 37:6, | realizing $[2]-152: 7$ | refused [2] - 114:23, |
| 121:10, 143:5, | 813, 170:2 |  | 154.9 | 136:11 |
| 143:14, 144:4, | putting [3] - 117:4, | ramp [1]-80: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { really }[12]-17: 17, \\ & 54: 16,59: 14,63: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 108:25, 173:1 |
| 159:11, 162:2, 166:20, 170:12, | $\begin{gathered} \text { putting }[3]-117: 4 \\ 140: 6,149: 22 \end{gathered}$ | ran [3]-36:24, 148:9, | 65:25, 76:23, 81:6, | 173:21, 173:2 |
| 166:20, 170:12, <br> 170:15, 178:7 |  | 158:1 | 142:7, 143:21, | 177:25 |
|  |  | Ransom [2] - 10:14, | 144:21, 154:19, | regarding [6] - 42:12, |
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| 134:19, 151:5, | six-cylinder [5] - | 42:16, 43:13, 46:9, | stand [8]-6:22, | states [5] - 22:2, 23:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 169:25, 170:2, | 157:22, 157:24, | 53:6, 54:7, 54:15, | 11:19, 14:20, 20:1, | 124:7, 166:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 171:15, 172:5, } \\ & \text { 177:18, 181:12 } \end{aligned}$ | 158:2, 158:5, 158:7 | 58:21, 63:23, 64:3, 64:11, 66:14, 68:5, | 25:20, 46:9, 47:1, | 166:15 |
| 182:20 | $\text { size }[1]-141: 10$ | $69: 7,69: 20,72: 1$ | stands [2]-78:14, | 8:19, 9:19, 23:5, |
| side's [1] - 110:6 | sized [1] - 65:11 | 73:12, 74:5, 76:4, | 167 | 70:9, 146:12, 175:7, |
| sides [2] - 76:22, | $\text { skills [2] - } 51: 12,$ | 79:6, 81:17, 81:25, | start [33] - 34:4, 41:16, | 83 |
| 111:15 |  | 87:15, 89:9, 91:16 | 3:11, 63:23, 7 | stating [1] - 125:6 |
| Siesta [1] - 80:9 | skip [1] - 63:17 | $\text { 9:12, } 102$ | $80: 6,85: 11,85: 1$ | $\text { stay }[5]-81: 5,82: 10,$ $89: 16,90: 10,107: 23$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { sign }[9]-71: 23, \\ 120: 10,146: 3, \end{array}$ | skipped [1] - 103: <br> slide [1] - 58:6 | $: 12,103: 15,$ | 125:10, 130:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 16,90: 10,107: 23 \\ & \text { stayed }[1]-175: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 146:18, 147:12, | Slocum [2]-11:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:23, 107:23, } \\ & \text { 114:8, 137:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:18, 132:1, } \\ & 132 \cdot 19 \quad 138 \cdot 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { steam }[25]-23: 17, \\ 128: 7,128: 19, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:25, 155:16, } \\ & \text { 157:12 } \end{aligned}$ | 12:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:8, 137:9, } \\ & \text { 137:12, 168:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:19, 138:6, } \\ & \text { 139:20, 148:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:7, 128:19, } \\ & \text { 134:3, 134:7, } 139 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { signed [24] - 72:6, } \\ \text { 119:22, 120:17, } \end{gathered}$ | small [4]-83:18, 93:16, 146:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:6 } \\ & \text { sort }[3]-36: 18,36: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:13, 148:16, } \\ & \text { 148:17, 152:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:16, 139:19, } \\ & \text { 139:21, 139:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 120:24, 146:2, | smelled [1] - 109:12 | 140:1 | 2:7, 154:9 | 4, 140:9, |
| 146:19, 146:23 | SM | sought [1] - 114:18 | 155:2 | 41:10, 141:12, |
| 147:9, 152:13, | 80:20, 80:23 | sound [1] - 148: | :15, 168:1 | 1:14, 142:2 |
| 153:17, 153:20, | Smith [8] - 5:4, 12:12, | sounds [1]-71:1 | 173:23, 174:6, | 142:11, 147:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:21, 155:4, } \\ & \text { 155:5, 155:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 80:11, 97:18, | $\begin{gathered} \text { source }[5]-113: 9, \\ 116: 7,118: 11, \end{gathered}$ | 183:12 <br> started [14]-13:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:2, 150:15, } \\ & \text { 164:16, 169:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 155:5, 155:13, } \\ & \text { 155:17, 158:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:11, 105:14 } \\ & 107: 4,107: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:7, 118:11, } \\ & \text { 118:16, 118:17 } \end{aligned}$ | started [14]-13:20, 18:7, 18:10, 51:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:16, 169:9, } \\ & \text { 169:14, 169:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 158:25, 159:3, $159: 4,165: 7$ | Snead [2] - 7:5, 7:10 | sources [3]-116:11, | 54:23, 75:14, | steamer [6]-64:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 159: 4,165: 7, \\ & 165: 24,166: 8 \end{aligned}$ | social [1] - 112:20 | 116:12, 159:21 <br> South [2]-57:19, 86: | $27: 19,128: 1$ | 64:4, 64:5, 65 66:23, 66:25 |
| significant ${ }_{[1]}$ - 124:7 | so | SOUTHERN ${ }_{[1]}-1: 1$ | 128:2 | steamers [1] - 65:5 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { signing }[3]-122: 6, \\ 155: 16,155: 18 \end{gathered}$ | solely [1]-13:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spanish [4]-66:10, } \\ & 66: 12,66: 13,75: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 178:9, 179:2 } \\ \text { starting [6] - 81:21 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STEPHANIE }[2]-2: 20, \\ & 183: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| silence [1]-128:12 | :6 | speaker [2] - 8:4 | 122:1 | Stephanie [1] - 7:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { similar }_{[1]}-176: 20 \\ & \text { similarity }[1]-142: 25 \end{aligned}$ | Solis [6] - 5:21, 65:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 14 \\ & \text { speaking }[3]-1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 127: 25,148: 1, \\ & 163: 24 \end{aligned}$ | Stephanie_McCarn @flsd.uscourts. |
| similarly [6] - 117:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:10, 105:15 } \\ & \text { 107:8, 108:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { spaking } \\ \text { 42:15, } 69: \end{gathered}$ | starts [8] - 83:1 | gov [1]-2:23 |
| 163:7, 164:13, | SOLIS [2] - 65:3, 65:8 | special [5] -26:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:1, 139:20, } \\ & 173: 24,173: 25, \end{aligned}$ | stethoscope [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:20, 169:19, } \\ & \text { 170:8 } \end{aligned}$ | solo [3] - 46:18, 47:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 25,113: 8, \\ & 151: 23,155: \end{aligned}$ | 173:24, 173:25, <br> 174:5, 179:22 | 140:6, 140:10 |
| simple [3] - 117:3, | sol | specialists [1] - 76:17 | startup ${ }^{11]}-132: 20$ | STEVEN $[7]$ - 17:4, |
| 117:6, 149:18 | $144: 15,15$ | specific [6] - 57:5, | ate [5] - 50:7 | 7:7, 17:12, 56:12, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { simply [15] - } 65: 7, \\ 75: 3,109: 20, \end{gathered}$ | solutions [1] - 143:17 | 66:18, 73:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:17, 129:13, } \\ & \text { 129:18, 129:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $56: 18,86: 19,86: 24$ |
| 113:16, 149:2, | someone [11]-11 | specifically $[8$ | State [2] - 67:8, 76:19 | 86:1 |
| 161:23, 163:21, | $12,74: 5,78$ | 120:2, 122:11 | Statement $[4]$ - 3:17, | still ${ }_{[18]}-38: 1,42: 2$ |
| 165:16, 167:1, | $9: 12,133: 9,$ | 22:19, 125:14 | 3:18, 3:18, 3:19 | 63:7, 67:21, 67:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:11, 168:13, } \\ & \text { 170:2, 170:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 150:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:18, 130:2 } \\ & \text { 134:7, 167:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { statement [7] - 20: } \\ & 27: 18,117: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 71:8, 104:16, |
| 170:21, 182:22 | sometime [2]-16:14, | specifics [2] - 76:2 | $125: 18,126:$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:15, 129:13, } \\ & 30: 2,133: 3,135: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| single [5] - 85:18, |  | 69:1 | 126:15 | 5:6, 140:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 126: 11,155: 7, \\ & 163: 16.181: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 15:19, 32:15, 76:19, | spell ${ }_{[2]}-86: 9,115: 18$ <br> spelling [1] - $96: 12$ | STATEMENT 114:9, 138:13, | 149:22, 181:21 |
| sister [3] - 46:1, | 77:1, 111:1, 115:17, | $\text { spent }[2]-115:$ | 162:12, 172: | stipulated [2] - 166:4 $168: 15$ |
| 82:19, 110:13 | 183:11 | 115:1 | statements [17] | Stop ${ }_{[1]}$ - 132:23 |
| sister's [1] - 45:21 | somewhat [2] - 15:8, | spoke | 13, 110:3, 110:4, | stop [4]-104:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sit }[3]-15: 23,84 \\ & 107: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 88:14 | 62:9, 62:19 <br> sponges [1] - 1 | 114:6, 114:8, 115:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 117: 1,126: 21, \\ & 133: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| sitting [2] - 16:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { soon }[2]-156: 17, \\ & 156: 18 \end{aligned}$ | spring [1] - 125:3 | 115:9, 116:3, | $\text { story }[2]-135: 12,$ |
| 130:25 | sophisticat | Spring [1] - 127:2 | 8:16, 118:2 | 152:20 |
| $\boldsymbol{s i x}[9]-28: 1,49: 6$, | $\text { 119:11, } 130$ | SR [1] - 1:17 | 9:2, 119:3, | stricken [30] - 91:13, |
| 100:10, 141:22, | $\text { sorry [45] - } 5$ | staffed [2]-81:2, | 6:24, 169:7 | $24,92: 3,92: 7$ |
| 157:22, 157:24, | 10:23, 14:13, 18:8, | 84:10 | 173:17 | 92:11, 92:14, 92:18, |
| 158:2, 158:5, 158:7 | 19:3, 25:7, 39:20, | stake [1] - 171:4 | STATES [2] - 1:1, 1:10 | 92:23, 92:25, 93:2, |

Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA

|  | ```suddenly [2] - 135:13, 155:14 sued [5] - 19:13, 40:2, 42:1, 43:6, 75:5 suffer [1]-90:18 sufficed [1] - 98:5 suggests [1] - 110:12 suing \([7]-8: 12,8: 17\), 18:7, 18:9, 19:5, 34:21, 40:4 Suite [3] - 1:14, 2:12, 2:17 Suites [1] - 38:13 suits [1] - 45:11 summa [1]-167:15 summarize [1] - 114:2 summary [1]-20:11 summer [2] - 77:20, 85:11 summoned [1] - 179:13 summons [2] - 77:13, 106:14 super [1] - 140:9 supersedes [1] - 155:8 supervisor [2] - 51:10, 74:6 supplement \({ }_{[1]}-10: 8\) supplier [1]-165:16 support [3]-133:17, 150:21, 176:11 supposed [25] - 4:25, 65:13, 81:18, 113:16, 124:8, 139:1, 139:8, 139:13, 140:3, 140:16, 140:21, 142:10, 142:12, 147:8, 147:13, 149:10, 150:7, 150:8, 152:16, 152:18, 154:11, 159:7, 169:1, 175:22 supposedly [4] - 140:8, 143:22, 148:1, 155:11 surprised [2] - 8:7, 118:17 suspicions [1] - 133:19 sustain \([3]\) - 14:15, 110:21, 110:24 sustained \([1]\) - 42:12 swamped [1] - 79:2 Sweden [1] - 117:10 Swedish [2]-116:23, 118:6 swimming [4] - 141:10, 141:13,``` | ```141:14, 141:25 switch [3] - 5:7, 68:17, 165:1 Switzerland [1] - 61:14 swore [1] - 146:4 sworn [4]-7:1, 108:13, 109:1, 162:20 syndrome [1] - 90:19 system [3] - 18:18, 117:21, 175:15 systems [2]-59:21, 167:17``` <br> table [1] - 8:23 <br> talks [1]-177:21 <br> Tallahassee [2] - 46:2, 82:19 <br> Tampa [1] - 38:6 <br> task [1] - 148:1 <br> teach [1]-27:12 <br> teacher ${ }_{[1]}$ - 76:7 <br> teachers [1]-10:13 <br> team [3] - 118:21, <br> 126:9, 129:25 <br> tech [1]-64:24 <br> Technical [1] - 174:18 <br> technical [12]-23:6, <br> 24:2, 26:9, 58:4, <br> 58:10, 58:11, <br> 149:19, 164:10, <br> 174:25, 175:14, <br> 175:17, 176:10 <br> technically [2] - 67:14, <br> 104:16 <br> technologies [6] - <br> 135:4, 135:5, 135:7, <br> 135:8, 160:4 <br> technology [58] - <br> 20:20, 21:9, 21:22, <br> 21:23, 21:24, 22:4, <br> 22:5, 22:7, 22:18, <br> 32:8, 55:7, 57:6, <br> 112:16, 114:16, <br> 114:18, 115:3, <br> 115:10, 115:16, <br> 115:19, 115:20, <br> 115:22, 116:2, <br> 116:4, 116:13, <br> 118:13, 118:19, <br> 119:19, 120:21, <br> 121:12, 123:17, <br> 123:21, 126:22, <br> 127:9, 127:11, <br> 128:22, 133:21, <br> 135:15, 138:19, <br> 138:21, 143:22, | ```143:24, 144:6, 144:11, 144:23, 156:9, 156:14, 160:8, 160:9, 161:3, 161:12, 161:16, 163:18, 165:5, 174:1, 176:12, 178:15, 182:20 Technology [1] - 117:10 temperature [2] - 117:11, 147:2 temperatures \([1]\) - 116:20 ten [4]-26:20, 36:23, 100:21, 138:5 ten-to-four [1]-138:5 term [16]-22:16, 24:16, 121:9, 130:24, 147:10, 165:6, 165:21, 165:24, 166:6, 166:8, 166:9, 166:19, 166:24, 169:6, 175:19, 176:4 terminal [1] - 89:23 terminate [1] - 68:16 terms [11]-23:13, 67:12, 67:15, 67:16, 72:16, 120:25, 140:25, 156:4, 165:25, 166:2, 175:20 test [88]-21:10, 51:12, 117:15, 117:16, 118:5, 118:8, 121:20, 122:1, 122:16, 122:17, 123:5, 123:6, 123:15, 124:8, 124:12, 124:16, 124:21, 124:23, 124:25, 125:5, 125:8, 125:10, 125:12, 126:6, 126:12, 126:19, 127:1, 127:2, 127:4, 127:5, 127:7, 127:13, 127:14, 127:22, 127:25, 128:3, 128:13, 129:15, 130:10, 131:19, 131:23, 131:24, 132:19, 132:23, 133:1, 133:6, 133:14, 134:2, 135:14, 135:22, 139:1, 152:2, 152:11, 152:15,``` |  |
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| 80:5, 83:24, 88:8, | women [2]-13:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:15, 155:9, } \\ & \text { 157:11, 158:11 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 88:19, 114:17, |  |  |  |
| 117:3, 134:2, | Wong [1] - 12:3 | 158:12, 158:13, |  |
| 162:19, 165:22 | Woodford [1] - 135:1 wool [2]-146:15, 147:18 | wrote [17]-10:1, 10:8, |  |
| 168:5 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { wrote }[17]-10: 1,10: 8, \\ \text { 28:14, 29:3, } 30: 22, \end{gathered}$ |  |
| weighing ${ }_{[1]}$ - 19:23 |  | 31:10, 35:18, 37:13, |  |
| weight [4] - 18:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { word }[4]-7: 23,7: 24, \\ & 7: 25,62: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 137:10, 148:21, |  |

