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

	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor.
2	OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS
3	MR. PACE: Ladies and gentlemen, I want to take some
4	time to talk about some of the most important aspects in this
5	case. I want to talk about some of the contract issues that
6	you've heard about. But what we really want to start on is
7	talking about some of those things that Counsel before me
8	simply glossed over, that he dismissed by making a reference to
9	some shenanigans.
10	This is a case about fake customers. This is a case
11	about fake data. This is a case about fake information. This
12	is a case about my clients being lied to in terms of the
13	technology that they were obtaining, in terms of the results
14	that they were supposed to be receiving. It is about my
15	clients investing in the technology, what the what my
16	Counsel has referenced so lightly was \$11 million over
17	\$11 million that they actually paid out on this technology in
18	the early belief that it was technology that was actually going
19	to work and actually have an impact in the real world, only
20	ultimately to be faced with having to deal with a fake
21	customer, a fake company, fake data, and ultimately fake
22	testing results that lead them to realize that no more money
23	was going to go into this investment. And, in fact, they were
24	entitled to get back the \$11 million that they had already paid
25	out.

June 28, 2017

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

	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	I do want to address this in terms of a time line for
2	you, and I actually have a time line to present to you. But
3	before I get there, I want to start with this point that I was
4	just making for you, which is to say that there is a time my
5	clients had purchased certain technology. They wanted to see
6	it operate in their home base in North Carolina. That's where
7	they were. They wanted to see it work in their backyard. Show
8	me what this can do. Let me see how it operates. And that's
9	what the Plaintiffs, what Mr. Rossi, and his company Leonardo
10	didn't want to have that happen.
11	So if we could go to the June 20, 2014, e-mail,
12	Page 10.
13	So when my clients pressed to have this occur, this
14	testing occur in North Carolina, Dr. Rossi came up with an
15	alternative. He said he comes and says he has found a
16	solution this was in June of 2014 he's found a customer
17	that is going to use his technology in a real-world setting, a
18	chemical making chemicals and additives, chemical additives
19	and catalyzers. He says that this customer has a factory in
20	Florida.
21	Now, this all sounds very serious, very real, very
22	concrete. Got a real process that you are working on. He's
23	got a factory. And apparently we even have a gender because it
24	is at "his" factory in Florida. And then he makes clear that
25	the customer won't have any access to the technology, but the

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

r	Andrea Rossi, et al. V. Inomas Darden, et al., 10 CV 21155 CMA
1	workers will but he has workers, and the workers will be
2	told how to operate the system.
3	Now, none of what is being told to my clients during
4	this time period because we will see in a moment that this
5	is actually about a company called JM Products, and it's a
6	company here in June 2014 that had no facility at all. It had
7	no factory at all. It had no chemical additives process at
8	all, had no employees at all, certainly no one to be
9	instructed. And, subsequently, we would be told was actually
10	being run by Andrea Rossi. So as opposed to finding a
11	customer, is not what you say if you talk about yourself. You
12	don't find a customer, you if he, in fact, were the
13	customer. He is trying to give the impression purposely,
14	There's somebody in Florida. Let me take my technology away
15	from you in North Carolina. Let me take it down to Florida far
16	away from you, and then let me and then I am going to
17	pretend to run a test and pretend to operate it down there in
18	Florida or operate it in Florida. But in either event, I need
19	to get it away from you.
20	Now, who does he team with to do this? He teams with
21	one of the other parties here, Henry John son.
22	If we can go to my next exhibit. Is there 7?
23	And one of the ways that they sell this new company
24	on to my clients is they explain to my clients that it's a
25	company that's connected to a very important British company, a

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

very large publicly traded British company called Johnson
Matthey, that not surprisingly is involved in the chemical
business.

So they come and say, Well, this is an affiliate of Johnson Matthey that you are going to be dealing with. That furthers my clients' interest because they think that's a well-known, reputable company. If you are going to be doing something with them in Florida, maybe that's okay for us to send our plant down.

And so the parties put together -- my clients put together a document to reflect this. Okay. Here's what you are telling me. We are going send our plant down to Florida, and we are going to go to Florida to work for Johnson Matthey which is the company they thought that they were going to get involved with, they thought they were having activity with.

Then what comes along is the Plaintiffs say, oh, well, we can't have the contract signed by Johnson Matthey because they don't want to have themselves too publicly known to be associated with this business, so we are going to use another name. We are going to call it JM Products or, at that time, JM Chemical Products.

My clients were certainly a little suspicious or questionable about that activity, and so what they had is they had Henry Johnson certify -- if I can go to my next document. He said, okay, well, you know what, if you are going to tell us

June 28, 2017

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

	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	that this name is something a little different, it's a
2	subsidiary. At least assure us or guarantee us that this
3	company we are going to contract with is owned by, it says here
4	as you can read, "an entity formed in the United Kingdom."
5	It's another way of saying an English company which, in fact,
6	is what Johnson Matthey was. And then once they had that, they
7	said, okay, we are convinced. You've go the connection. You
8	are not a sham company. They would find out later that they
9	were.
10	And then they, in fact, entered this document that
11	Counsel referred to, I believe as the "term sheet." That's the
12	correct reference to it. They finalized the term sheet for
13	sending their plant that they paid over \$1.5 million for, down
14	to Florida at the request of Andrea Rossi.
15	And then when we go to Exhibit 44. So they end up
16	signing a term sheet. But again, as we talked about, that term
17	sheet makes it very clear that there is a company in existence.
18	My clients were never told that there is no real company. We
19	don't even have a factory yet. They didn't even have a
20	location at the time that these documents were sold.
21	At the time that Henry Johnson and Andrea Rossi were
22	trying to convince my client to send their plant down to
23	Florida, they didn't have a warehouse even. Yet, they came in
24	making promises. No, we have got a factory down there in
25	Florida. We need this. We are ready to use your E-Cat
L	

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

1	technology. And they lure this plant away from my client, away
2	from my client being able to watch it operate, and send it down
3	to Florida out of their, kind of, general supervision.
4	You have also heard they, then, move so what they
5	have done, then, is that they moved this plant the plant's a
6	container.
7	In fact can you do me a favor? Can you put up the
8	two pictures of the E-Cat just so people have an image.
9	Because I know it's so hard for me to talk about these things
10	and you don't get to actually see something. So let me take
11	this down, if I can, just for a second.
12	Okay. So we've we've talked about this E-Cat
13	plant. Can I just explain to everyone for a second what we are
14	talking about? You are looking here at the inside of, kind of,
15	a shipping container. An E-Cat plant is a number of is a
16	bunch of little devices, each of which put water into, it's
17	supposed to heat it up, turn that water into steam, and then
18	send the steam out.
19	So what you are seeing in your picture here is these
20	boxes made out of blue are a number of different E-Cat options.
21	There is actually about 115 of them in this one little
22	container. That's Dr. Rossi there in the middle of this
23	picture. So this is what an E-Cat plant, the inside of it,
24	looks like.
25	But if I can go to the warehouse photograph. So next,
ļ	

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

1	this plant, that container, my clients agree allowed to be
2	shipped down to Florida. And, again, this kind of ruse
3	continues that it's down there in Florida because I have got a
4	real customer that I'm supposed to be working for, that we're
5	providing this steam energy to.
6	Again, the February 27th e-mail. I want to provide
7	you just one example. This is an e-mail you can see here from
8	Andrea Rossi to Tom Darden to J.T. Vaughn. And what we can see
9	here at the very beginning of the e-mail, itself, you can see
10	just a line down there where he says, "Today the director of JM
11	phoned me and said they are satisfied. Monday he will write
12	you a letter with a report of the energy they received from us
13	during the month of February."

14 Again, this is clearly -- this is not Andrea Rossi saying I am just giving you my own information. He's saying, 15 16 Oh, I've got a real third party who is involved here, somebody 17 who is independent, somebody who is separate, and somebody that I am actually, honestly dealing with. And my clients, of 18 19 course, are taking comfort and assurance in that, that there is 20 an independent party that's operating here, and, in fact, 21 Andrea Rossi isn't alone in this regard.

If I can put up just -- if you can put up just one of the JM Products letters. Henry Johnson is sending letters to my client on behalf of JM Products. And if we can highlight this here for a second. Notice a reference, a connection to a

Ŀ.

June 28, 2017

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

P	
1	Johnson Matthew instead of Matthey. Clever. Johnson Matthew
2	platinum sponges. And this is Mr. Johnson on behalf of
3	JM Products telling my client how much energy that they've
4	received, how much steam power they have been getting from this
5	E-Cat plant.
6	Unbeknownst to us at the time, what the letter doesn't
7	say is and the evidence will show you, however, is that
8	Andrea Rossi actually wrote this letter and that all that Henry
9	Johnson did was sign it, that JM Products had no ability to
10	determine how much steam or energy they were being provided.
11	They simply put whatever Andrea Rossi said because he, in fact,
12	wrote the letter. And they don't tell you that JM Products had
13	absolutely no use for this massive amount of steam that was
14	supposedly being produced.
15	My clients went down and visited this plant on more
16	than one occasion. During that time, they actually met James
17	Bass. James Bass also presented himself as being involved with
18	JM Products and being able to independently provide assurances
19	to my clients that JM Products was a real company that was
20	receiving this steam power.
21	In fact, if we can put up an e-mail from between
22	Mr. Rossi Andrea Rossi and Mr. Bass from March of 2015.
23	And, in fact, if we can go to the first the lower e-mail for
24	just a second.
25	So this is Mr. Bass. He is writing to Andrea Rossi
l	

June 28, 2017

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

IT

1	before one of these meetings occurs when somebody is going to
2	come into the warehouse. And he is asking, How do you know how
3	much power is being delivered? Because he has no idea, but
4	he's got to handle a meeting. And so he's saying, I've got to
5	meet with somebody. If I need to tell them, I need to have
6	some idea of what's going on. Somebody tell me something.

7 So we can close that and go up to Andrea Rossi's 8 response. So he's asked, What should I be telling these 9 people? Andrea Rossi, The answer is simple. We need all of 10 this energy for our production. Obviously, we measure the 11 energy input. He knows they don't, but he wants this to be 12 communicated. You are not supposed to give more information. 13 You are sure -- you for sure are not supposed to tell them 14 anything about the plant of JM, that's JM Products, exactly as 15 you did with the IH persons, that's the Industrial Heat 16 persons. In other words, keep everybody -- make sure it is a 17 mystery to everybody. I am going to tell you what to do. You 18 go out and do it and keep the wool pulled over these people's 19 eyes.

Now, we're also talking about a test, and he's made several references to a test that's being conducted in Florida. And results of those tests -- remember them referencing an individual named Fabio Penon? Well, let's talk about a few aspects of that test, if we can, for a second because what opposing Counsel said was that Defendants' position is that

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

1 this testing that supposedly occurred in Florida doesn't count 2 because it started too late under the parties' contract. And 3 that's true. 4 In fact, we will explain to you. I have a time line that I want to talk to you about for a few minutes shortly. 5 But I also want you to understand that that is just a fraction 6 7 of the problems of what was going on down in this warehouse in 8 Florida and why the results of what were going on in Florida 9 are completely unreliable. 10 So I'll give you one example, if I can start with 11 Exhibit 54. What -- what was being claimed by Andrea Rossi, by 12 Leonardo Corporation, what was being claimed by Henry Johnson, 13 by James Bass, by JM Products, was that a massive amount of 14 water was being turned into steam on an everyday basis and 15 being provided as power over to JM products. This is the basis 16 for this test that you are supposed to be turning all of this 17 water into steam and providing it -- and pushing it out of the 18 E-Cat device, the E-Cat plant. 19 One of the things you are going to see and you are 20 going to hear from our witness's testimony, however, is --21 actually, let me take a step back, if I can, because I want to 22 give you some perspective.

23 What they claim is every day -- I am probably about 15 24 feet away from you all -- a pool the size of 15 feet, of 20 25 feet, 4 feet deep, it's about 9,000 gallons of water. They

June 28, 2017

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

r	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	claim every day about that much water was going through this
2	E-Cat plant and being turned into steam. And in case you want
3	to know, when water is turned into steam, it expands 17,000
4	1700 times. So we are not talking a big pool of water. We are
5	1700 pools of steam being produced in this warehouse on a given
6	day, according to what they are claiming was happening.
7	Now, for those who, I'm sure, people are aware, but
8	just in case for those who are not, steam water turns into
9	steam right around 212 degrees Farenheit. You will see a lot
10	of references to Celsius in this case; it's 100 degrees
11	Celsius, extraordinarily hot.
12	If this warehouse was, in fact, producing 1700
13	swimming pools' worth of steam on an everyday basis, day in and
14	day out, it would have turned itself into an oven. The people
15	inside of the container would have been unable to survive, and
16	yet this is exactly what these individuals are claiming.
17	In fact, we have witnesses who have gone back and
18	looked at if as much steam was being produced, how hot would it
19	have gotten in there. And it would have gotten into the
20	hundreds and hundreds of degrees. It would have gotten to,
21	essentially, the boiling point of water.
22	You are also going to hear testimony, people who come
23	into this warehouse and were fine. In fact, they went into the
24	container, the E-Cat plant container while it was supposedly
25	running and were fine.

June 28, 2017

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

	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	And, in fact, even Plaintiff even Dr. Rossi has
2	recognized that if, in fact, all of that heat was really being
3	generated, it really would be dangerous for somebody's health.
4	Now, he claims there's a way of that he developed; he
5	designed a way of getting some of this heat or a large part of
6	the heat out of that warehouse. But what you are going to hear
7	about that is, he'll explain this, kind of, elaborate system of
8	pipes and fans that we use to take that heat out of the
9	warehouse. You are going to see a lot of pictures of this
10	warehouse. You are not going to see one picture of those pipes
11	and that fan and any of that stuff operating. You are going to
12	hear about a lot of people who were inside that warehouse, none
13	of whom saw this.
14	You are going to see some third parties. Remember the
15	Judge instructed you, you should particularly give or consider
16	interests of the parties when providing testimony. All right?
17	So parties who are involved in the lawsuit, maybe they've got
18	an interest. But a third party has no interest. The third
19	party is going to come in and say there was no such device in
20	this warehouse. I would have seen it if it was in the
21	warehouse.
22	I've described for you yet another problem with this
23	results that we were being told, the things we were saying were
24	supposedly happening in Florida. And I will stick with my
25	swimming pool example, if I can, for just a second, because

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

	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	that swimming pool, that 20 feet by 15 feet by 4 feet of water,
2	that massive amount of water, well, to turn it into steam, what
3	you have to do is actually get it into these E-Cat devices. It
4	doesn't magically go there. You have these little pumps.
5	Can I can you put up just for a second the image of
6	the the E-Cat image, and then I will get to the pumps for a
7	second.
8	So I showed you a minute ago what these devices looked
9	like. I don't know how well you can see this picture, but if
10	you can see, there's kind of there's four layers here. And
11	in front of each of those layers, you can count them, there are
12	six little devices. Those are called pumps. Those are water
13	pumps. These are the devices that are supposed to take the
14	water from a tank and bring it into these E-Cat devices so that
15	they can turn it into the steam, allegedly. That's what's
16	being claimed.
17	Can I get my close-up of the pumps.
18	The problem is, you just saw a picture of these, there
19	is only 24 of them connected to this one unit that was
20	producing, supposedly producing all the steam. We know the
21	maximum amount of water that those pumps can move in an hour.
22	You can multiply it by 24. You can multiply it by the total
23	number of pumps. What you come up with, what you recognize is
24	even if these pumps were working as hard as they possibly can
25	24/7, doing everything at their maximum capacity, they move

I

June 28, 2017

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

,	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	about half the water of that swimming pool. So there is no way
2	that they, in fact, as they claimed to us, We were turning a
3	swimming pool worth of water into 1700 swimming pools' worth of
4	steam every day, well, now we know couldn't have been doing it
5	on the steam side, you would have burned everybody out of
6	there. Couldn't have been doing it on the water side because
7	you couldn't have moved the water out of there with the pumps.
8	And, in fact, there is another element that goes in
9	here. In order to make this water into steam, allegedly, you
10	have to use some electricity. You have to put electricity into
11	these E-Cat devices. I am purposely not talking about the
12	details of the technology, but it is just another thing, you've
13	got to use electricity to help heat them up.
14	If we can go to that exhibit, the chart.
15	We've talked about the problem with the steam. We've
16	talked about the problem with the water. What else happens?
17	After this lawsuit is filed, we go get the electrical bills
18	from FPL. And lo and behold, we find a problem with the
19	electricity as well, that what the electricity that they are
20	claiming to use is not consistent with what the electricity
21	that FPL is telling us is actually was being used at this
22	warehouse. In fact, there's days when they claim that they
23	were using more power than FPL was even selling to them.
24	And so further evidence and, in fact, we were
25	getting this data the data that they are providing to us is
l	

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

Ŀ.

1	
1	coming not only from Plaintiffs, it's coming from one of the
2	Defendants in this third-party Defendants in this case,
3	Fulvio Fabiani and his company U.S. Quantum Leap.
4	And, again, this is we are receiving the false
5	information while it is operating. Oh, here's how much
6	electricity we are using. We don't find this out until we
7	actually the lawsuit is filed, and we go to FPL and say,
8	Please give us your records. And then we look at the FPL
9	records and say, Well, wait a second. How can you some days be
10	using so much less power than FPL says and then other days
11	miraculously you are using even more power than FPL is
12	supposedly selling to you?
13	Let me I have beaten that up enough. I understand.
14	But you are going to hear a lot of evidence about this testing,
15	and you are going to understand, hopefully now, why from my
16	clients' standpoint, by this point in time, they have said that
17	test is not valid. We know it's not valid. We have shown you
18	repeatedly that it's not valid. You can't use that test to
19	claim that you are entitled to any money from us.
20	Now, I did promise you a while ago a time line. So I
21	want to actually show you a time line and take us all the way
22	back. And I do appreciate your patience.
23	So, now, if I can, let me I'm going to take you all
24	way back and see if I can kind of walk through some of these
25	events. I'm sorry. I actually didn't even take the time, did

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

I, to tell you a little bit about my clients, and I should
have. And I apologize. I was a little fired up when I got up
here this afternoon.

My client Tom Darden and his colleagues have been successful entrepreneurs in a number of projects, often involving environmental challenges. They have invested, for example, a real estate company -- or real estate entities that buy property that have been contaminated, and then they clean it up, and then they turn around and they sell. They put it back to more productive uses and hopefully possible uses.

11 They have been involved in projects to convert 12 businesses into using clean energy sources as opposed to things 13 like fossil fuels and focusing on those kind of assets and 14 those kind investments that others have shunned and others have 15 turned away from.

16 Now, in 2012, Tom Darden and some of his colleagues 17 developed an interest in a new area, but they're still environmentally related. This was the possibility of 18 19 alternative energy sources, something that could be a 20 replacement for fossil fuels. And it's in connection with that 21 interest that he met Andrea Rossi in 2012 and what, then, led 22 to a very long series of negotiations and discussions that 23 ultimately led to them entering this license agreement that we 24 are all going to sit down and look here in just a couple 25 minutes. In fact, you can just even look from the time period.

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

1	
1	They met over the summer. They don't even sign this agreement
2	until October of 2016.
3	There is also another party involved, and that's
4	important they are going to become important, and let me
5	explain to you why. This agreement that is entered is not just
6	with Industrial Heat and Andrea Rossi and his company Leonardo.
7	There is also a third company involved Ampenergo, called
8	Ampenergo. We will call it AEG because I keep mispronouncing
9	Ampenergo.
10	But and AEG is going to tell you, and they are
11	going to contradict the things that you just heard Counsel come
12	up here and say that was going on before this license agreement
13	was signed. They are actually aligned with Dr. Rossi. They
14	were a company that was formed to helped him market his
15	technology, to try to find somebody like an Industrial Heat to
16	sell his technology to. And their testimony is going to be
17	that they knew when all of this occurred that there was no
18	Cherokee my opposing Counsel has made reference to Cherokee
19	Funds or a Cherokee company that was being invested. They knew
20	that.
21	In fact, it was Tom Darden and some of his colleagues,
22	including John Mazzarino, who were going to create a new
23	company to invest in this new technology. It's a risky
24	endeavor, but they were going to pursue it. And not only did
25	they pursue it, you have already heard the evidence, this is

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

Ŀ.

1	
1	not like the JM Products that has no money, that has no
2	employees, that has no funds other than what Leonardo was
3	provided. What have you already heard here today? This
4	Industrial Heat that he wants to make fun of paid \$1.5 million
5	for the E-Cat plant.
6	They had \$10 million then paid after a validation test
7	that we will talk about because it was done inappropriately.
8	It was done to deceive us. But still this is not this is a
9	real business with real funds that were being developed and
10	being collected. They were being obtained by people like Tom
11	Darden, by people like J.T. Vaughn, by people like John
12	Mazzarino, who were working hard, not just at this effort but
13	in a lot of other efforts because they were committed to this
14	technology, to trying to find this new technology.
15	In fact, I am going to get I need to get back to my
16	time line, but I just feel like I have got to stop here for a
17	second because all I kept hearing was that this money, you
18	heard \$50 million, is that a number that any of you have heard
19	before? He must have said it 10 times. Let's be clear about
20	the money that we are talking about. We'll get to it in a
21	minute because it is well down my time line, but I want to stop
22	and talk about it.
23	None, not a penny of that money went into Tom Darden's
24	pocket. Not a penny of that money went into J.T. Vaughn's
25	pocket. All of that money that was being invested was being
Ļ	

June 28, 2017

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

	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	put into new technologies, into other technologies. And, in
2	fact, why was it not being put into Dr. Rossi's technology?
3	Well, you've already figured out why. Because it
4	wasn't working. Because it didn't work, and they couldn't get
5	it to work, and so they were going to investigate in other
6	technologies, and they have invested in other technologies.
7	Now, Plaintiffs have made this statement for which
8	there will be zero proof that somehow my clients wanted to get
9	Dr. Rossi's technology, give it to others and then cut
10	Dr. Rossi out. They don't have a shred of evidence of that
11	because it never occurred. My clients never gave Dr. Rossi's
12	technology to anyone else. In, fact they maintained it as
13	confidential and as secret because they owned it.
14	We will talk about the license agreement in just a
15	minute, but they owned it. They got it transferred to them.
16	But they had no desire to share it with anyone else because
17	even though they believed in it initially, even though they did
18	believe it in 2012, they believed it in 2013, they believed in
19	2014, bless their heart, they were still believing it in 2015,
20	but at some point, they realized it is not really where the
21	investment is. It is not the opportunity. It has not proven
22	itself in the real world with real-world applications.
23	So let me turn I'm trying to be cognizant of my
24	time here. I have now mentioned a lot with this license
25	agreement, and I haven't even sat down and showed it to you.
	L

June 28, 2017

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

	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	My opposing Counsel, I don't think showed you very much of it,
2	so let's if we can take just a few minutes. Because in my
3	time line, there is a license agreement that has been entered.
4	It's very important. People put their promises in writing.
5	They signed their name to it. They are supposed to follow it.
6	If we could start with the license agreement. And
7	this is the agreement that everyone signed. You heard
8	Plaintiffs' version of what occurred. Let me tell you what, in
9	fact, occurred.
10	Andrea Rossi absolutely knew and had been told that
11	the company that was going to invest in his technology was a
12	new company that was going to be funded and financed by certain
13	individuals, that they were in the process of raising that
14	money, and that's what resulted in this company being formed
15	with Industrial Heat.
16	You are going to see Ampenergo. I told you about
17	them. They are the company that was helping Dr. Rossi market
18	his technology. They are a sophisticated company. They knew
19	absolutely what was going on. I don't believe you heard a
20	firearm next to Dr. Rossi's head, did you? Now, if somebody's
21	also so smart to invent this brilliant technology, if somebody
22	who's owned and he will testify to this multiple
23	companies, he has been running multiple companies for a large
24	period of time, he is not going to be fooled if somebody
25	surprises him at the last second and says, you know what, I

June 28, 2017 Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA

,	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	know you thought you were signing a contract with IBM, but you
2	are signing a contract with MBI. Oh, I don't know better, I'm
3	signing it. No. He knew exactly what was going on because the
4	parties had talked about it. He knew exactly the company that
5	was investing in him.
6	What else can I tell you? Mr. Chaiken made a number
7	of references to something called Cherokee. This is a long
8	document. You're going to get a chance to see it. You're
9	going to get a chance to read it all if you want to read it
10	all. What you are not going to find in there is a reference to
11	Cherokee.
12	If that was so important to Dr. Rossi and to Leonardo
13	and to anyone else, it would have been pretty easy to write it
14	in. It's not in there. Never talked about Cherokee
15	guaranteeing any money. Never talking about Cherokee owning or
16	somehow controlling Industrial Heat. It simply doesn't exist.
17	Now, in fact, one of the things that does exist in
18	this agreement can we go to 16.8 is the provision they
19	put in that says, Hey, everything that matters between us,
20	we've put here in writing. Let's I want you to see the
21	actual language because I'm summarizing it.
22	Really what it says here is these things that are in
23	writing, such as this license agreement, contains the entire
24	agreement among the parties. It is everything. There is
25	nothing magical out there somewhere. And then it says that it

June 28, 2017

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

r	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	supersedes, that really means replaces, that means gets rid of,
2	all prior agreements, written or oral. This is the thing you
3	put in an agreement when everyone agrees our deal is put in
4	writing and reflected here. This is what our deal is. I am
5	signing it, and I'm signing it on to this kind of provision.
6	So let me turn everything over to the blank screen for
7	a second. Let me just turn to the license agreement and talk
8	just a little bit more about what my client thought they were
9	getting into.
10	According to I'm sorry. I started to get away from
11	the microphone. I can't do that. According to Dr. Rossi, his
12	technology was able to have it was not just something that
13	could work in the laboratory, it is something that could work
14	in the real world that you could actually take it and use it to
15	produce something real. That was an important part to my
16	client looking at this endeavor.
17	So what my client so the way that this deal was set
18	up if I can have 3.2A we've talked about this already a
19	little bit. There was a first payment, \$1.5 million. That was
20	for the E-Cat. That was for the plant. That picture you saw
21	earlier with all those funny little boxes. That was
22	\$1.5 million was paid upfront and was paid, no dispute, you
23	heard it. They, then, owned this E-Cat plant, this container.
24	Next, after that, the license agreement provided for a
25	\$10-million payment. But to get that \$10-million payment,

June 28, 2017

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

F	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	Leonardo, Andrea Rossi's company had to do at least two things.
2	One, they had to pass a validation case, which we are going to
3	talk about in a second. And, two, they had to transfer, they
4	had to give all of their intellectual property, all of their
5	technology to Industrial Heat with the idea that, give us
6	everything and then we will be able to use it. We will be able
7	to put it into place. We will be able to do something with it.
8	Those are two very large payments. But the way that
9	the license agreement was set up, it was set up that there was
10	also an additional payment that could be achieved.
11	If you put Section 5.
12	I told you this was supposed to have real-world
13	application. So you pay \$1.5 million, that's lot of money,
14	\$1.5 million, you get the actual device, the plant, this E-Cat
15	plant. You pay 10 million more dollars, you get all of the
16	technology, everything. Everything that's known, the way that
17	the license agreement works.
18	Why would there be any more payment? Well, there is
19	an additional payment if you can show if Dr. Rossi and his
20	company could show that this thing could have, essentially, a
21	real-world impact. It is not just something that works in a
22	lab somewhere. Take that plant, that big old plant and run it
23	consecutively you know, run it for 350 out of 400 days and
24	achieve certain results out of it. This plant is supposed to
25	do be able to produce a massive amount of energy. Run the

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

	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	entire plant for 350 out of 400 days. That's going to tell
2	that's something that's commercially sellable.
3	If you can show in a lab that you can do something,
4	that's fine. If you want to make an impact on the world or on
5	the environment, you actually better be able to do something
6	other than that. You have to show you can do something in the
7	real world. And that's what this additional payment was pegged
8	to.
9	Now, I should say, while you have this on the screen,
10	you will note that I said 350 within a 400-day period. I
11	should have made the point here as well where it says
12	commencing on the date immediately following delivery of the
13	plant to the company. You heard Mr. Chaiken tell you that
14	happened in August of 2013.
15	I'm not saying that he is not exactly right. One of
16	our arguments, one of our positions is that they didn't do the
17	test on time. I told you a lot of reasons why what they did in
18	Florida was a you know, was an unreliable, was a sham. But
19	you don't even have to get that far because the fact of the
20	matter is there was a time period when this was supposed to be
21	done, and it wasn't.
22	I want to talk to you
23	THE COURT: Five minutes.
24	MR. PACE: Thank you, Your Honor.
25	So if I can turn just for a second well, I'm sorry.

June 28, 2017

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

r	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	Let me change my focus here. I wasn't aware of my time limit.
2	The evidence is going to show, first, that the parties
3	entered this license agreement. Second, that on two different
4	occasions the parties deviated from this written license
5	agreement. And what they did on each occasion is they wrote up
6	the deviation. They wrote down here's how things are
7	different. And they had all the parties sign it. That's the
8	way that it works when you have a contract. If you're not
9	going to follow the contract, you agree, and then you put
10	something in writing that says here's how we changed the
11	contract. That's never they have no evidence, there is no
12	evidence that that occurred.
13	Same thing when we are talking here about the testing
14	results. What you heard is certain descriptions that were
15	being made by my clients, one, when they weren't provided all
16	the information, and, two, during time periods before certain
17	things occurred.
18	No doubt, in 2013, in 2014, they were trying to be
19	optimistic. They were trying they understood that we are
20	not here to say anything to the contrary. They understood it
21	was a risky endeavor. They understood that there was a
22	possibility that they could be investing in a technology that
23	wouldn't work.
24	What they didn't sign up for was that someone was
25	going to be deceiving them. They didn't sign up for a fake

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

1	
1	customer called JM Products to be formed. They didn't sign up
2	to get fake testing data from Fabio Fulvio Fabiani, out
3	of fake measurement data out of Henry Johnson, fake
4	information during plant visits from James Bass. They didn't
5	sign up for testing results that are simply impossible given
6	just the general realities of the operation of that plant.
7	None of that is what they signed up for. None of that
8	obligated them to pay \$89 million.
9	In fact, what the testimony is going to show you here
10	is, not only were they tricked into shipping this plant down to
11	Florida, not only where they deceived into the operations of
12	the plant in Florida, but, in fact, going all the way back to
13	Italy to that initial test period when they paid out the
14	\$10 million. You are going to find out that, again, Andrea
15	Rossi controlling the situation, made false statements to my
16	clients about limitations that were placed on him by an Italian
17	health official that, in fact, weren't true.
18	At the end of the day, ladies and gentlemen, my
19	clients don't owe anybody \$89 million. What the verdict we'll
20	be asking you is that my clients should be paid back all of the
21	money that they paid, well over \$11 million; money paid to
22	Leonardo Corporation, money paid to USQL and Fulvio Fabiani and
23	money paid to a number of other individuals.
24	Thank you, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Thank you.

Proceedings June 28, 2017

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

r	Andrea Rossi, et al. V. momas barden, et al., 10 ev 21155 CMA
1	Ladies and gentlemen, I know you have been here since
2	early this morning. We will adjourn now for the day.
3	Some of you have written us some notes. The lawyers
4	and I will discuss those notes. I ask that you all return
5	tomorrow morning at 10:00. Please be gathered in the jury room
6	at 10:00.
7	Furthermore, one of your members needs to be
8	fingerprinted tomorrow, so we will stop at 2:00 p.m. to allow
9	you to get to that on time. So your schedule tomorrow is from
10	10:00 to 2:00.
11	Please remember my instructions not to discuss this
12	case with anyone, not to do any reading or research about it,
13	and avoid contact with the parties and the lawyers.
14	We'll see you tomorrow at 10:00. Have a good evening.
15	COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
16	(The jury exited the courtroom at 4:46 p.m.)
17	THE COURT: A few housekeeping matters. First of all,
18	as I said earlier, the third-party Defendants will present
19	their opening statements tomorrow first thing. You heard me
20	indicate our schedule for tomorrow. It's because one of the
21	jurors has to go be fingerprinted, and he said if he left by
22	2:00, that would be possible.
23	I am going to my courtroom deputy will be giving
24	you a revised trial schedule adding additional hours to the
25	schedule as I had gone over with you to make up for the court
l	

Proceedings June 28, 2017

r	Andrea Rossi, et al. v. Thomas Darden, et al., 16-cv-21199-CMA
1	closure on Monday, July 3rd, so we don't lose time. You will
2	be receiving that, in all likelihood, tomorrow morning.
3	You have seen these juror notes. You all let me know
4	tomorrow what you would like to do as to these two jurors. The
5	one is Etienne, Juror No. 2, and the other one is Chacon, who
6	realized he had a vacation July 13th.
7	I'll see everyone tomorrow morning.
8	MR. PACE: Your Honor, can we raise one thing? The
9	Plaintiffs have subpoenaed Tom Darden.
10	THE COURT: I'm sorry. I can't address it now. If
11	you like, we can address it first thing in the morning.
12	MR. PACE: Oh, yes, if we could do it in the morning,
13	that would be
14	THE COURT: Stephanie and I are here starting with
15	hearings at 8:15.
16	MR. PACE: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Thank you.
18	MR. LUKACS: Your Honor, can we see the notes?
19	THE COURT: Certainly.
20	MR. LUKACS: Thank you. May we approach?
21	THE COURT: Certainly.
22	(The proceedings adjourned at 4:49 p.m.)
23	
24	
25	