FILED
NOV 05 2024
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFIC STEEL GROUP,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMERCIAL METALS COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 20-cv-07683-HSG

VERDICT FORM

United States District Court
Northern District of California

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form and the jury instructions provided by the Judge. Your verdict must be unanimous. We, the jury, return these answers as our verdict in this case:

United States District Court
Northern District of California

Relevant Antitrust Market

Question No. 1:

Did Pacific Steel prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, the existence of a relevant antitrust market for steel rebar supplied from within 500 miles of Rancho Cucamonga, California ("the Relevant Market")?

✓ YES _____ NO

If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 1, continue to Question No. 2.

If you answered "No" to Question No. 1, go to the end of this Verdict Form.

Unlawful Restraint of Trade (Sherman Act Section 1 and California State Law)

Question No. 2:

Did Pacific Steel prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the challenged agreement between Commercial Metals and Danieli was an unreasonable restraint of trade in the Relevant Market?

✓ YES _____ NO

Continue to Question No. 3.

Attempted Monopolization (Sherman Act Section 2)

Question No. 3:

Did Pacific Steel prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Commercial Metals attempted to monopolize the Relevant Market?

✓ YES _____ NO

If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 2 or Question No. 3, continue to Question No. 4.

If you answered "No" to both Question No. 2 and Question No. 3, go to the end of this Verdict Form.

Injury and Causation

Question No. 4:

Did Pacific Steel prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the challenged restraint was a material cause of injury to Pacific Steel?

✓ YES _____ NO

If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 4, continue to Question No. 5.

If you answered "No" to Question No. 4, go to the end of this Verdict Form.

Damages

Question No. 5:

State the amount of damages proven by Pacific Steel, by a preponderance of the evidence, for the claim(s) you found proven:

Categories of Damages	Damages
Lost Profits on Mill Operations	$ 74,050,240
Lost Rebar Transportation Savings	$ 12,922,541
Lost Fabrication Cost Savings	$ 10,786,661
Increased Cost to Purchase Mill	$ 12,277,361
Total	$ 110,036,803

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Presiding Juror should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Courtroom Deputy that you have reached a verdict. The Presiding Juror should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

Date: 11/5/2024 **By:** [signature]