

NORTH CAROLINA  
MECKLENBURG COUNTY  
MEDIA NETWORK, INC. d/b/a  
GATEWAY MEDIA,

Plaintiff,

v.

LONG HAYMES CARR, INC. d/b/a  
MULLEN/LHC and CARNEY MEDIA, INC.,

Defendants.

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE  
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION  
05 CVS 15428

MECKLENBURG COUNTY  
FILED #97  
SEP. 14 2007  
AT 0CLOCK M  
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT

VERDICT SHEET

We, the jury, return as our unanimous verdict the following answer(s) to the issues submitted:

1. Did Carl Haynes tell Brad Heard after he received the insertion orders for the 2005 one-sheet program that the orders were non-cancelable?

Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

If you answer the first issue "No", you will not answer the remaining issues and your verdict is for the Defendant.

2. Was Carl Haynes authorized to make that representation on behalf of Defendant Mullen?

Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

If you answer this issue "Yes", you will skip the third issue. If you answer this issue "No", you will answer the third issue.

3. Did the Defendant Mullen ratify the representation made by Carl Haynes to Gateway (after the 2005 one-sheet insertion orders were issued) that the 2005 insertion orders were non-cancelable?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answer this issue "No", you will not answer the remaining issues and your verdict is for the Defendant.**

4. Did the Plaintiff commit commercial bribery with respect to its alleged payments of cash and goods to Carl Haynes or his consulting company High Plains?

**If you answer this issue "No", you will skip the fifth issue proceed to the sixth issue. If you answer this issue "Yes", you will answer the fifth issue.**

Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

5. Did Mullen know of the alleged payments of cash and goods from Gateway to Carl Haynes or his consulting company, High Plains, at the time it allowed Haynes to continue negotiating with the vendors for the 2005 one-<sup>sheet</sup> program and later accepted Gateway's performance of the one-sheet insertion orders for 2005? AD

Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answer this issue "No", you will not answer the remaining issues and your verdict is for the Defendant.**

6. Was Mullen's conduct a proximate cause of Gateway's injury?

Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**If you answer this issue "No", you will not answer the remaining issue and your verdict is for the Defendant.**

7. In what amount, if any, has the Plaintiff Gateway been injured?"

\$ 1,258,695

This 14 day of September, 2007.

Signature of the Foreperson of the Jury



Printed Name of the Foreperson of the Jury

Mark Gise