Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 1 of 11 Page ID #:29830

FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT		
SE	EP 15, 2	2021
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
BY:	rrp	DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHROMADEX, INC.,)	
Plaintiff, v. ELYSIUM HEALTH, INC., and MARK MORRIS,))) [THIRD DRAFT] VERDICT FORM)	
Defendants.		
ELYSIUM HEALTH, INC.,		
Counterclaimant, v.		
CHROMADEX, INC.,		
Counter-Defendant.)))	
	,	

1	I.	CHRO	DMADEX'S CLAIMS AGAINST ELYSIUM
2	A. Breach of Contract – NIAGEN Supply Agreement & pTeroPure Supply		
3	Agreement		
4 5		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 by not paying for the June 30, 2016 purchase orders?
6			Supply Agreement by not paying for the June 30, 2016 purchase orders?
7			Yes No
9	If you	answe	ered "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			DAMAGES: \$
14 15	В.	Trade	e Secret Misappropriation
16 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	Answ	er Que	estion 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			ered "yes" to one or both of Questions I.B.1 or I.B.2, answer Question I.B.3. ered "no" to both Questions I.B.1 and I.B.2, skip to Section I.C.
28			

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 3 of 11 Page ID #:29832

1	3.	Should Elysium be required to disgorge profits from its sales of Basis containing ingredients purchased on June 30, 2016?
2		
3		Yes No
4	G A: 1:	
5	C. <u>Aidir</u>	ng and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty
6	1.	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?
9		Yes No
10		
11	If you answ I.D.	ered "yes," answer Question I.C.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section
12		
13 14	2.	Should Elysium be required to disgorge profits from its sales of Basis containing ingredients purchased on June 30, 2016?
15		Yes No
16		
17	Answer Que	estion I.C.3.
18 19	3.	Should Elysium be required to disgorge a price discount?
20		Yes No
21		
22	//	
23	//	
24	//	
25	//	
26	//	
27	//	
28	//	

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 4 of 11 Page ID #:29833

1	D. ChromaDex's Non-Contract Damages Against Elysium			
2 3 4	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.			
5				
6 7	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 that all and about a breach of fiduciary duty.			
8	did not aid and abet a breach of fiduciary duty.			
9 10	Also skip to Section II if you answered no to Questions 1.B.3 (no disgorgement of profits for trade secret misappropriation) and LC2 (no disgorgement of profits			
11	Questions, you found that disgorgement of Elysium's profits is not an appropriate			
12	breach of fiduciary duty claims.			
13	1. What amount of profits should Elysium be required to disgorge from its			
14	sales of Basis containing ingredients purchased on June 30, 2016?			
15	DAMAGES: \$			
16				
17	Answer Question I.D.2 if you answered "yes" to Question I.C.3 (disgorgement of price			
18	discount for aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty). Skip to Section I.E if you			
19	answered no to Question 1.C.3 (no disgorgement of price discount for dialing and			
20				
21	2. What amount of price discount should Elysium be required to disgorge?			
22	DAMACEC O			
23	DAMAGES: \$			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 5 of 11 Page ID #:29834

1	E. <u>Punitive Damages</u>			
2	Answer Question I.E.1 if you answered "yes" to Questions I.B.1 (state trade secret			
3 4	misappropriation), I.B.2 (federal trade secret misappropriation), and/or I.C.1 (aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty). Skip to Section II if you answered "no" to			
5	Questions I.B.1 (state trade secret misappropriation), I.B.2 (federal trade secret misappropriation), and I.C.1 (aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty).			
67	1. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Elysium acted with malice, oppression, or fraud?			
8 9	Yes No			
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?			
14	PUNITIVE DAMAGES: \$			
15 16 17	II. CHROMADEX'S CLAIMS AGAINST MORRIS			
18	A. Breach of Contract – February Confidentiality Agreement & July Confidentiality Agreement			
20 21	1. Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris breached the agreement he signed with ChromaDex or February 26, 2016?			
22 23	Yes No			
24 25	If you answered "yes," answer Question II.A.2. If you answered "no," skip to Question II.A.3.			
26				
27 28				

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 6 of 11 Page ID #:29835 2. Should Mark Morris be required to disgorge compensation? Yes No Answer Question II.A.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? 3. Yes No If you answered "yes," answer Question II.A.4. If you answered "no," skip to Section II.B.Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris breached the July 15, 2016 contract? 4. Yes ___ No ___ If you answered "yes," answer Question II.A.5. If you answered "no," skip to Section II.B.Should Mark Morris be required to disgorge compensation? 5. Yes No B. Misappropriation of Trade Secrets Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris misappropriated a trade secret of ChromaDex under state law? 1. Yes ___ No ___ Answer Question II.B.2.

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

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 7 of 11 Page ID #:29836

1 2	2.	Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that Mark Morris misappropriated a trade secret of ChromaDex under federalaw?
3		Yes No
4		
5		ered "yes" to one or both of Questions II.B.1 or II.B.2, answer Question ou 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?
9		Yes No
10	C. Bread	ch of Fiduciary Duty
11		
12	1.	Did ChromaDex prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that
13		Mark Morris breached a fiduciary duty to ChromaDex?
14		Yes No
15		
16	If you answ II.D.	ered "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	//	
	1//	

D. <u>ChromaDex's Damages – Mark Morris</u>

27

28

1 2 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 3 breach of July 2016 contract), II.B.3 (disgorge compensation for trade secret 4 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 5 compensation is an appropriate measure of damages for Morris' breach of the February 6 2016 contract, breach of the July 2016 contract, trade secret misappropriation, and/or breach of fiduciary duty. 7 8 Skip to Section III if you answered "no" to Questions II.A.1 (no breach of February 2016 9 contract), II.A.4 (no breach of July 2016 contract), II.B.1 (no state trade secret misappropriation), II.B.2 (no federal trade secret misappropriation), and II.C.1 (no 10 breach of fiduciary duty). By answering "no" to all of those Questions, you found that 11 Mark Morris did not breach either the February 2016 or July 2016 contract, did not misappropriate trade secrets under State or Federal Law, and did not breach a fiduciary 12 duty. 13 Also skip to Section III if you answered "no" to Questions II.A.2 (do not disgorge 14 compensation for breach of February 2016 contract), II.A.5 (do not disgorge 15 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 16 fiduciary duty). By answering "no" to all of those Questions, you found that 17 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 18 misappropriation, and breach of fiduciary duty 19 What amount of compensation should Mark Morris be required to disgorge? 20 1. 21 DAMAGES: \$ 22 23 24 25 26

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 9 of 11 Page ID #:29838

1	E. <u>Punitive Damages</u>			
2	Answer Question II.D.1 if you answered "yes" to Questions II.B.1 (state trade secret			
3	misappropriation), II.B.2 (federal trade secret misappropriation), and/or II.C.1 (breach			
4	of fiduciary duty). Skip to Section III if you answered "no" to Questions II.B.1 (no state			
5	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	Yes No			
9				
10	If you answered "yes," answer Question II.D.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section			
11				
12	2. What amount of punitive damages do you award in favor of ChromaDex and			
13	2. What amount of punitive damages do you award in favor of ChromaDex and against Mark Morris?			
14	PUNITIVE DAMAGES: \$			
15				
16	III. ELYSIUM'S COUNTERCLAIMS AGAINST CHROMADEX			
17	III. ELISIUM S COUNTERCLAIMS AGAINST CHROMADEA			
18	A. Breach of the Most-Favored-Nation Provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement			
19	1. Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that			
20	ChromaDex breached the Most-Favored-Nation provision of the NIAGEN Supply Agreement?			
21	W WFF-7 2-85-1 3-25-1			
22	Yes No			
23				
24	If you answered "yes," answer Question III.A.2. If you answered "no," skip to Section III.B.			
25				
26				
27				
28				

	Case 8:16-cv	7-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 10 of 11 Page ID #:29839	
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		DAMAGES: \$	
4			
5	B. Frauc	dulent Inducement	
6			
7	1.	Did Elysium prove by a preponderance of the evidence its claim that ChromaDex fraudulently induced Elysium to enter into the Trademark	
8		License and Royalty Agreement?	
9 10		Yes No	
11	IC		
12	If you answered "yes," answer Question III.B.2. If you answered "no," sign and date the verdict form.		
13	2.	How much are the royalties that Elysium paid as a result of entering into the Trademark License and Royalty Agreement?	
14		Trademark Dicense and Royalty Agreement.	
15		DAMAGES: \$	
16 17	C. <u>Punitive Damages</u>		
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		1.0	
24	" "	ered "yes," answer Question III.C.2. If you answered "no," sign and date	
25	the verdict form.		
26	2.	What amount of punitive damages do you award in favor of Elysium and	
27		against ChromaDex?	
28		PUNITIVE DAMAGES: \$	

Case 8:16-cv-02277-CJC-DFM Document 541 Filed 09/15/21 Page 11 of 11 Page ID #:29840

	D1 1 1	1	
1	Please sign and d	late this form, and th	en return it to the Court.
2			
3	Dated:		
4			
5	Signed:		
6		Presiding Juror	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

28