	Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 #:2966	D Filed 09/13/21 Page 1 of 11 Page ID 5		
1 2 3 4		FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT SEP 13, 2021 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BY: DEPUTY		
5 6				
7 8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT		
9 10	CENTRAL DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	SOUTHER	N DIVISION		
12 13	CHROMADEX, INC.,	Case No.: SACV 16-02277-CJC (DFMx)		
14	Plaintiff,			
15 16 17	v.) ELYSIUM HEALTH, INC., and MARK) MORRIS,))) [SECOND DRAFT] VERDICT FORM))		
18 19	Defendants.			
20 21) ELYSIUM HEALTH, INC.,)			
22	Counterclaimant,) v.			
23 24	CHROMADEX, INC.,			
25 26) Counter-Defendant.))			
27	/	,		
28				

	Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 2 of 11 Page ID #:29666
1	I. CHROMADEX'S CLAIMS AGAINST ELYSIUM
2 3	A. <u>Breach of Contract – NIAGEN Supply Agreement & pTeroPure Supply</u> <u>Agreement</u>
4 5 6	1. Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim against Elysium for breach of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement and/or the pTeroPure Supply Agreement?
7 8	Yes No
9 10	If you answered "yes," answer Question I.A.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section I.B.
11 12	2. What are ChromaDex's damages for Elysium's breach of contract?
13 14	DAMAGES: \$
15 16	B. <u>Trade Secret Misappropriation</u>
17	1. Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Elysium misappropriated a trade secret of ChromaDex under State law?
18 19	Yes No
20 21	Answer Question I.B.2.
22 23	2. Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Elysium misappropriated a trade secret of ChromaDex under Federal law?
24 25	Yes No
26 27	If you answered "yes" to one or both of Questions I.B.1 or I.B.2, answer Question I.B.3. If you answered "no" to both Questions I.B.1 and I.B.2, skip to Section I.C.
28	

	Case 8:16-cv-0	02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 3 of 11 Page ID #:29667					
1	3. S	should Elysium be required to disgorge profits from its sales of Basis ontaining NR purchased on June 30, 2016?					
3	Y	/es No					
4							
5	C. <u>Aiding</u>	and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty					
6	1. D	Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that					
7		Elysium aided and abetted Mark Morris in his breach of fiduciary duty?					
8							
9	Y	/es No					
10							
11	If you answere I.D.	ed "yes," answer Question I.C.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section					
12	1.2.						
13	2. S	should Elysium be required to disgorge profits from its sales of Basis ontaining NR purchased on June 30, 2016?					
14							
15	Y	/es No					
16							
17	Answer Question I.C.3.						
18	3. S	should Elysium be required to disgorge a price discount?					
19							
20	Y	/es No					
21							
22	//						
23	//						
24	//						
25 26	//						
26 27	//						
27	//						
20							
		-3-					

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 4 of 11 Page ID #:29668

D. ChromaDex's Non-Contract Damages Against Elysium

1

5

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

//

//

//

Answer Question I.D.1 if you answered "yes" to Questions I.B.3 (disgorgement of profits for trade secret misappropriation) and/or I.C.2 (disgorgement of profits for aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty). By answering "yes" to one or both of those Questions, you found that disgorgement of Elysium's profits is an appropriate measure of damages for its trade secret misappropriation and/or its aiding and abetting a breach of fiduciary duty.

⁶ Skip to Section II if you answered "no" to Questions I.B.1 (no state trade secret misappropriation), 1.B.2 (no federal trade secret misappropriation), and 1.C.1 (no aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty). By answering "no" to all of those Questions, you found that Elysium did not misappropriate a trade secret under State or Federal law and did not aid and abet a breach of fiduciary duty.

Also skip to Section II if you answered "no" to Questions I.B.3 (no disgorgement of profits for trade secret misappropriation) and I.C.2 (no disgorgement of profits for aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty). By answering "no" to both of those Questions, you found that disgorgement of Elysium's profits is not an appropriate measure of damages for its trade secret misappropriation and its aiding and abetting a breach of fiduciary.

1. What amount of profits should Elysium be required to disgorge from its sales of Basis containing NR purchased on June 30, 2016?

DAMAGES: \$_____

Answer Question I.D.2 if you answered "yes" to Question I.C.3 (disgorgement of price discount for aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty). Skip to Section I.E if you answered "no" to Question I.C.3 (no disgorgement of price discount for aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty).

2. What amount of price discount should Elysium be required to disgorge?

DAMAGES: \$_____

	Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 5 of 11 Page ID #:29669						
1	E. <u>Punitive Damages</u>						
2	Answer Question I.E.1 if you answered "yes" to Questions I.B.1 (state trade secret misappropriation), I.B.2 (federal trade secret misappropriation), and/or I.C.1 (aiding						
4	and abetting breach of fiduciary duty). Skip to Section II if you answered "no" to Questions I.B.1 (state trade secret misappropriation), I.B.2 (federal trade secret						
5	misappropriation), and I.C.1 (aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty).						
6 7	1. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Elysium acted with malice, oppression, or fraud?						
8	Yes No						
9 10							
11	If you answered "yes," answer Question I.E.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section II.						
12	2. What amount of punitive damages do you award in favor of ChromaDex and against Elysium?						
13 14	PUNITIVE DAMAGES: \$						
15							
16 17	II. CHROMADEX'S CLAIMS AGAINST MORRIS						
18 19	A. <u>Breach of Contract – February Confidentiality Agreement & July Confidentiality</u> <u>Agreement</u>						
20 21	1. Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris breached the agreement he signed with ChromaDex on February 26, 2016?						
22	Yes No						
23							
24 25	If you answered "yes," answer Question II.A.2. If you answered "no," skip to Question II.A.3.						
26	//						
27	// //						
28	//						
	-5-						

	Case 8:16-cv-	-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 6 of 11 Page ID #:29670						
1 2		Should Mark Morris be required to disgorge compensation? Yes No						
3								
4	Answer Question II.A.3.							
5 6	3.	Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it and Mark Morris entered into a valid and enforceable contract on July 15, 2016?						
7 8		Yes No						
9 10	If you answe II.B.	red "yes," answer Question II.A.4. If you answered "no," skip to Section						
11 12 13		Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris breached the July 15, 2016 contract?						
14 15 16		Yes No red "yes," answer Question II.A.5. If you answered "no," skip to Section						
17 18 19		Should Mark Morris be required to disgorge compensation? Yes No						
20 21	B. <u>Misap</u>	propriation of Trade Secrets						
22 23	1.	Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris misappropriated a trade secret of ChromaDex under state law?						
24 25		Yes No						
26	Answer Question II.B.2.							
27								
28								

	Case 8:16-0	cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 7 of 11 Page ID #:29671					
1 2	2.	Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris misappropriated a trade secret of ChromaDex under federal law?					
3		Yes No					
4							
5	If you answered "yes" to one or both of Questions II.B.1 or II.B.2, answer Question II.B.3. If you answered "no" to both Questions II.B.1 and II.B.2, skip to Section II.C.						
6							
7	3.	Should Mark Morris be required to disgorge compensation?					
8		Yes No					
9							
10	C. Brea	ach of Fiduciary Duty					
11							
12	1.	Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris breached a fiduciary duty to ChromaDex?					
13		Wark Womis breached a maderary duty to emomables:					
14		Yes No					
15	If way area	would "war" anower Question II C 2. If way anoward "no " ship to Section					
16	IJ you ansv II.D.	vered "yes," answer Question II.C.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section					
17							
18	2.	Should Mark Morris be required to disgorge compensation?					
19		Yes No					
20							
21	//						
22	//						
23	//						
24	//						
25	//						
26	//						
27							
28	//						
	//						
		-7-					

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 8 of 11 Page ID #:29672

D. ChromaDex's Damages - Mark Morris

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Answer Question II.D.1 if you answered "yes" to Questions II.A.2 (disgorge compensation for breach of February 2016 contract), II.A.5 (disgorge compensation for breach of July 2016 contract), II.B.3 (disgorge compensation for trade secret misappropriation), and/or II.C.2 (disgorge compensation for breach of fiduciary duty). By answering "yes" to one or more of those Questions, you found that disgorgement of compensation is an appropriate measure of damages for Morris' breach of the February 2016 contract, breach of the July 2016 contract, trade secret misappropriation, and/or breach of fiduciary duty.

⁸
⁸
⁸
⁹
⁹
⁹
⁹
⁹
⁹
¹⁰
¹⁰
¹⁰
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹²
¹³
¹³
¹⁴
¹⁵
¹⁶
¹⁷
¹⁸
¹⁸
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹²
¹³
¹³
¹⁴
¹⁵
¹⁶
¹⁷
¹⁸
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹²
¹³
¹³
¹⁴
¹⁴
¹⁵
¹⁵
¹⁶
¹⁷
¹⁸
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹²
¹³
¹⁴
¹⁵
¹⁴
¹⁵
¹⁵
¹⁶
¹⁷
¹⁷
¹⁸
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹²
¹³
¹⁴
¹⁵
¹⁵
¹⁵
¹⁶
¹⁷
¹⁷
¹⁸
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹⁹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹¹
¹²
¹⁵
¹⁵
¹⁶
¹⁷
¹⁷
¹⁸
¹⁹
¹

Also skip to Section III if you answered "no" to Questions II.A.2 (do not disgorge compensation for breach of February 2016 contract), II.A.5 (do not disgorge compensation for breach of July 2016 contract), II.B.3 (do not disgorge compensation for trade secret misappropriation), and II.C.2 (do not disgorge compensation for breach of fiduciary duty). By answering "no" to all of those Questions, you found that
 disgorgement of compensation is not an appropriate measure of damages for Morris' breach of the February 2016 contract, breach of the July 2016 contract, trade secret misappropriation, and breach of fiduciary duty

 20
 1. What amount of compensation should Mark Morris be required to disgorge?

 21
 DAMAGES: \$______

 23
 //

 24
 //

 //
 //

 //
 //

 //
 //

 //
 //

 26
 //

 //
 //

 27
 //

 28
 //

	Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 9 of 11 Page ID #:29673					
1	E. <u>Punitive Damages</u>					
2 3 4 5	Answer Question II.D.1 if you answered "yes" to Questions II.B.1 (state trade secret misappropriation), II.B.2 (federal trade secret misappropriation), and/or II.C.1 (breach of fiduciary duty). Skip to Section III if you answered "no" to Questions II.B.1 (no state trade secret misappropriation), II.B.2 (no federal trade secret misappropriation), and II.C.1 (no breach of fiduciary duty).					
6 7	1. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Mark Morris acted with malice, oppression, or fraud?					
8 9	Yes No					
10 11	If you answered "yes," answer Question II.D.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section III.					
12 13	2. What amount of punitive damages do you award in favor of ChromaDex and against Mark Morris?					
14 15	PUNITIVE DAMAGES: \$					
16	III. ELYSIUM'S COUNTERCLAIMS AGAINST CHROMADEX					
17						
17 18	A. Breach of the Most-Favored-Nation Provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement					
	1. Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex breached the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN					
18 19 20 21	1. Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex breached the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement?					
 18 19 20 21 22 	1. Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex breached the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN					
18 19 20 21	 Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex breached the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement? Yes No If you answered "yes," answer Question III.A.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section 					
 18 19 20 21 22 23 	 Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex breached the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement? Yes No 					
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	 Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex breached the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement? Yes No If you answered "yes," answer Question III.A.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section 					
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	 Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex breached the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement? Yes No If you answered "yes," answer Question III.A.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section 					

	Case 8:16-cv	-02277-CJC-DFM Document 530 Filed 09/13/21 Page 10 of 11 Page ID #:29674					
1 2	2.	How much did ChromaDex overcharge Elysium as a result of its breach of the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement?					
3 4		DAMAGES: \$					
5	B. Fraud	lulent Inducement					
6 7 8 9	1.	Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex fraudulently induced Elysium to enter into the Trademark License and Royalty Agreement?					
9 10		Yes No					
11 12	If you answered "yes," answer Question III.B.2. If you answered "no," sign and date the verdict form.						
13	2.	What are Elysium's damages for ChromaDex's fraudulent inducement?					
14 15		DAMAGES: \$					
16	C. <u>Punitive Damages</u>						
17 18 19		ered "yes" to Question III.B.1, answer Question III.C.1. If you answered estion III.B.1, sign and date the verdict form.					
20 21	1.	Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that ChromaDex acted with malice, oppression, or fraud?					
22		Yes No					
23 24 25	If you answered "yes," answer Question III.C.2. If you answered "no," sign and date the verdict form.						
26	2.	What amount of punitive damages do you award in favor of Elysium and against ChromaDex?					
27 28		PUNITIVE DAMAGES: \$					

	Case 8:16-cv-02277-C	JC-DFM	Document 530 #:29675	Filed 09/13/21	Page 11 of 11	Page ID	
1	Please sign and date this form, and then return it to the Court.						
2							
3	Dated:						
4							
5	Signed:						
6	P	residing	Juror				
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16 17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
			-11	-			