1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT
7		
8	NORTHERN DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA
9		
10	OPTRONIC TECHNOLOGIES, INC., d/b/a Orion Telescopes & Binoculars ®, a California	Case No: 5:16-cv-06370-EJD-VKD
11	Orion Telescopes & Binoculars ®, a California corporation,	VERDICT FORM
12	Plaintiff,	
13 14	v.	
15	NINGBO SUNNY ELECTRONIC CO., LTD.,	
16	SUNNY OPTICS, INC., MEADE INSTRUMENTS CORP., and DOES 1 - 25,	
17	Defendant.	
18		
19		
20	·	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	·	Case No. 5:16-cv-06370-EJD-VKI

VERDICT FORM

. 1	WE, THE JURY, unanimously find as follows.			
2	I. CLAI	CLAIMS		
3 4 5	Please assess awarded the s	nine Defendants' liability and damages owed, if any, for each of Plaintiff's claims. damages for each claim separately and without regard to whether you have already same or similar damages on another claim, and do not increase or decrease such ed on what you may have awarded on a different claim.		
6	A.	CLAIM ONE: Sherman Act § 1 - Price or Credit Term Fixing		
7	1(a).	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants agreed with a		
8	competitor to	fix the price or credit terms for telescopes and accessories?		
9		Yes No		
10	1(b).	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants agreed with a		
11	third party, otl	her than a competitor, to fix the price or credit terms for telescopes and accessories in		
12	a manner that unreasonably restrained trade such that the anticompetitive effects outweighed any			
13	procompetitiv	e effects?		
14		Yes		
15 16		red 'Yes" to either or both 1(a) or 1(b), please proceed to Question 2. If you o'' to both 1(a) and 1(b), you have found no liability on this claim and should renext claim.		
17 18	2.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that this conduct caused injury		
19	to Orion's bus	siness or property?		
20		Yes No		
21	If you answer	red "Yes", Defendants are liable and you should answer Question 3.		
22	3.	What are Plaintiff Orion's damages for this claim, if any?		
23		\$ 14 million.		
24				
25		[Proceed to Next Claim]		
26				
27				
28				
		C N 5 16 06070 DID VVD		

VERDICT FORM

	D CI AING TONIO. Ch A . 4 C 1 N. Manda . 4 H 4 C		
1	B. <u>CLAIM TWO: Sherman Act § 1 – Market Allocation</u>		
2	1(a). Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants agreed with a		
3	competitor or potential competitor either (a) not to compete with each other in the manufacture or		
4	sale of telescopes and accessories, or (b) to divide customers or potential customers between them?		
5	Yes No		
6	1(b). Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants agreed with a		
7	third party, other than a competitor or potential competitor, either (a) not to compete with each		
8	other in the manufacture or sale of telescopes and accessories, or (b) to divide customers or		
9	potential customers between them in a manner that unreasonably restrained trade such that the		
10			
11	Yes No		
12	If you answered 'Yes" to either or both 1(a) or 1(b), please proceed to Question 2. If you answered "No" to both 1(a) and 1(b), you have found no liability on this claim and should		
13	proceed to the next claim.		
14	2. Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that this conduct caused injury		
15			
16	to Orion's business or property?		
17	Yes No		
18	If you answered "Yes", Defendants are liable and you should answer Question 3.		
19	3. What are Plaintiff Orion's damages for this claim, if any?		
20	\$ 14 million.		
21	[Proceed to Next Claim]		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	2 Case No. 5:16-cv-06370-EJD-VKD		

1	C.	CLAIM THREE: Sherman Act § 2 – Attempted Monopolization
2	1.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants engaged in
3	anticompetitive conduct?	
4		Yes No
5	2.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants had a specific
6	intent to achie	eve monopoly power in the telescope manufacturing market?
7		Yes No
8	3.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that there is or was a dangerous
9	probability th	at Defendants could achieve monopoly power?
10		Yes No
11	4.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that this conduct caused injury
12	to Orion's bus	siness or property?
13		Yes _ X No
14		red "Yes" to each question, Defendants are liable and you should answer
15	Question 5.	
16	5.	What are Plaintiff Orion's damages for this claim, if any?
17		\$ 14 million.
18		
19		[Proceed to Next Claim]
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	· 	
		3 Case No. 5:16-cv-06370-EID-VKD

VERDICT FORM

- 1	ì		
1	D.	CLAIM FOUR: Sherman Act § 2 - Conspiracy to Monopolize	
2	1.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants knowingly	
3	entered into an agreement with another person or entity to obtain or maintain monopoly power in		
4	the telescope manufacturing market?		
5		Yes No	
6	2.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants specifically	
7	intended that one of the parties to the agreement would obtain or maintain monopoly power in the		
8	telescope man	nufacturing market?	
9	·	Yes No No	
10	3.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants committed an	
11	overt act in fu	rtherance of the conspiracy?	
12		Yes No	
13	4.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that this conduct caused injury	
14	to Orion's bus	siness or property?	
15		Yes No No	
16 17	If you answered "Yes" to each question, Defendants are liable and you should answer Question 5.		
18	5.	What are Plaintiff Orion's damages for this claim, if any?	
19		\$ Mmillian.	
20			
21		[Proceed to Next Claim]	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26	·		
27			
28			
1		4 Case No. 5:16-cy-06370-EJD-VKD	

1	E.	CLAIM FIVE: Clayton Act § 7
2	1.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants Ningbo
3	Sunny's and S	Sunny Optic's acquisition of Defendant Meade created a reasonable likelihood of
4	substantially l	essening competition or creating a monopoly in the telescope manufacturing market?
5		Yes No
6	2.	Did Orion prove by a preponderance of the evidence that this conduct caused injury
7	to Orion of th	e type the antitrust laws were designed to prevent?
8		Yes No
9		
10	If you answer Question 3.	red "Yes" to each question, Defendants are liable and you should answer
11	,	
12		What are Plaintiff Orion's damages for this claim, if any?
13	· ,	\$ 16.8 million.
14		[Proceed to Part II (Total Damages)]
15	н. тота	AL DAMAGES
16	Please compu	ite the total damages to be awarded to Orion based on the damages awarded, if any,
17	for each clair awardable as	n above. Orion is only entitled to recover for a loss once, even if that loss is damages under one or more of Orion's claims. Accordingly, in totaling Orion's
18	damages, do not count the same type of loss more than once (do not double-count).	
19		11 0
20	Plaint	iff Orion's total damages are as follows: \$ [6.8 million.
21		
22	WHEN THE JURY HAS REACHED A VERDICT, THE PRESIDING JUROR	
23	MUST SIGN	THIS VERDICT FORM AND SIGNAL THE BAILIFF THAT THE JURY IS
24	READY TO	RENDER A VERDICT.
25		
26	Date:	11/26/19 Presiding Juror:
27		Signature
28		•

Case No. 5:16-cv-06370-EJD-VKD