

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
EASTERN DIVISION

MATTEL, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC., et al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CV 04-9049 SGL (RNBx)

Consolidated with  
Case No. CV 04-09059 SGL (RNBx)  
Case No. CV 05-02727 SGL (RNBx)

Honorable Stephen G. Larson

**PHASE B VERDICT FORM AS  
GIVEN**

AND CONSOLIDATED ACTIONS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**VERDICT FORM - PHASE B**

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:

**I. Damages for Phase A Claims**

(Answer all four questions in this section.)

**Intentional Interference With Contractual Relations**

1. In Phase A of this trial, you found that MGA Entertainment, Inc. ("MGA") and Isaac Larian are liable to Mattel for intentional interference with contractual relations. What amount of damages, if any, should be awarded to Mattel?

As to MGA: \$ 20 MILLION  
As to Mr. Larian: \$ 10 MILLION

**Aiding and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty**

2. In Phase A of this trial, you found that MGA and Isaac Larian are liable to Mattel for aiding and abetting Carter Bryant's breach of fiduciary duty. What amount of damages, if any, should be awarded to Mattel?

As to MGA: \$ 20 MILLION  
As to Mr. Larian: \$ 10 MILLION

**Aiding and Abetting Breach of the Duty of Loyalty**

3. In Phase A of this trial, you found that MGA and Isaac Larian are liable to Mattel for aiding and abetting Carter Bryant's breach of the duty of loyalty. What amount of damages, if any, should be awarded to Mattel?

As to MGA: \$ 20 MILLION  
As to Mr. Larian: \$ 10 MILLION

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Conversion

4. In Phase A of this trial, you found that MGA, Isaac Larian and MGA Entertainment (HK) Limited ("MGA Hong Kong") are liable to Mattel for conversion. What amount of damages, if any, should be awarded to Mattel?

As to MGA: \$ 31,500 PLUS 7% INTEREST

As to Mr. Larian: \$ ~~0~~ CALCULATED FROM

As to MGA Hong Kong: \$ ~~0~~ THE DATE MATTEL'S  
PROPERTY WAS  
CONVERTED.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**II. Copyright Infringement**

5. Has Mattel proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MGA is liable to Mattel for copyright infringement?

Yes   X    
No       

If your answer is "yes," then answer Question 6.  
If your answer is "no," then answer Question 7.

6. Was MGA's copyright infringement willful?

Yes         
No   X  

Answer Question 7.

7. Has Mattel proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Isaac Larian is liable to Mattel for copyright infringement?

Yes   X    
No       

If your answer is "yes," then answer Question 8.  
If your answer is "no," then answer Question 9.

8. Was Mr. Larian's copyright infringement willful?

Yes         
No   X  

Answer Question 9.

9. Has Mattel proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MGA Hong Kong is liable to Mattel for copyright infringement?

Yes   X

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

No \_\_\_\_\_

If your answer is "yes," then answer Question 10.

If your answer is "no," then answer Question 11.

10. Was MGA Hong Kong's copyright infringement willful?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No X

Answer Question 11.

11. What amount of damages, if any, should be awarded to Mattel for the defendants' copyright infringement?

(a) Copyright Infringement by MGA  
\$ 6 Million

(b) Copyright Infringement by Isaac Larian  
Distributions Mr. Larian received from MGA attributable to Bratz-related works:  
\$ 3 Million

Value of Mr. Larian's ownership percentage of MGA attributable to Bratz-related works:  
\$ 0

(c) Copyright Infringement by MGA Hong Kong:  
\$ 1 Million

**III. Punitive Damages**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

12. Has Mattel proven by clear and convincing evidence that MGA acted with malice, oppression, or fraud?

Yes

No

If your answer is "yes," then answer Question 13.

If your answer is "no," then answer Question 14.

13. What amount of punitive damages, if any, should be awarded against MGA?

\$ 0

Answer Question 14.

14. Has Mattel proven by clear and convincing evidence that Isaac Larian acted with malice, oppression, or fraud?

Yes

No

If your answer is "yes," then answer Question 15.

If your answer is "no," then answer Question 16.

15. What amount of punitive damages, if any, should be awarded against Mr. Larian?

\$ 0

Answer Question 16.

16. Has Mattel proven by clear and convincing evidence that MGA Hong Kong acted with malice, oppression, or fraud?

Yes

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

No X

If your answer is "yes," then answer Question 17.

If your answer is "no," then answer Question 18.

17. What amount of punitive damages, if any, should be awarded against  
MGA Hong Kong?

\$ 0

Answer Question 18.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IV. Fraudulent Concealment**

(Answer all five questions in this section.)

18. Has Mattel proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MGA fraudulently concealed the bases for Mattel's claim of intentional interference with contract against it until at least April 27, 2002?

Yes  X

No      

19. Has Mattel proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Isaac Larian fraudulently concealed the bases for Mattel's claim of intentional interference with contract against him until at least April 27, 2002?

Yes      

No  X

20. Has Mattel proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MGA fraudulently concealed the bases for Mattel's claim of conversion against it until at least April 27, 2001?

Yes  X

No      

21. Has Mattel proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Larian fraudulently concealed the bases for Mattel's claim of conversion against him until at least April 27, 2001?.

Yes      


No  X

1 22. Has Mattel proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MGA Hong  
2 Kong fraudulently concealed the bases for Mattel's claim of conversion against it  
3 until at least April 27, 2001?

4 Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
5 No X

6  
7 Once this verdict form is completed, the foreperson of the jury should sign  
8 and date on the lines below.

9  
10 DATED: August 26, 2008

  
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Jury Foreperson

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28