



4. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro violated Plaintiff's right to procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #5.

5. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Michael Bedrin violated Plaintiff's right to procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #6.

6. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Mark Wejkszner violated Plaintiff's right to procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #7.

7. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Sean Robbins violated Plaintiff's right to procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #8.

8. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro violated Plaintiff's right to substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #9.

3-3-10  
DATE

Kristen Mueckleroy  
FOREPERSON

9. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Michael Bedrin violated Plaintiff's right to substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #10.

10. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Mark Wejkszner violated Plaintiff's right to substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #11.

11. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Sean Robbins violated Plaintiff's right to substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #12.

12. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated corporations in violation of its right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #13.

13. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Michael Bedrin treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated corporations in violation of its right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #14.

3-3-10  
DATE

*K. Muckler*  
FOREPERSON

14. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Mark Wejkszner treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated corporations in violation of its right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment?

       Yes   X   No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #15.

15. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Sean Robbins treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated corporations in violation of its right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment?

  X   Yes        No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #16.

16. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro intentionally interfered with a contractual or prospective contractual relation of the Plaintiff?

  X   Yes        No

If you responded "Yes" to Interrogatory #16, please proceed to Interrogatory #17. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #16, please proceed to Interrogatory #18.

17. If your answer was "Yes" to Interrogatory #16, do you also find that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro proved by a preponderance of the evidence that he was acting within the scope of his employment when he did so?

       Yes   X   No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #18.

3-3-10  
DATE

K Muckleroy  
FOREPERSON

18. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Michael Bedrin intentionally interfered with a contractual or prospective contractual relation of the Plaintiff?

Yes  No

If you responded "Yes" to Interrogatory #18, please proceed to Interrogatory #19. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #18, please proceed to Interrogatory #20.

19. If your answer was "Yes" to Interrogatory #18, do you also find that Defendant Michael Bedrin proved by a preponderance of the evidence that he was acting within the scope of his employment when he did so?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #20.

20. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Mark Wejkszner intentionally interfered with a contractual or prospective contractual relation of the Plaintiff?

Yes  No

If you responded "Yes" to Interrogatory #20, please proceed to Interrogatory #21. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #20, please proceed to Interrogatory #22.

21. If your answer was "Yes" to Interrogatory #20, do you also find that Defendant Mark Wejkszner proved by a preponderance of the evidence that he was acting within the scope of his employment when he did so?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #22.

3-3-10  
DATE

K. Muckleroy  
FOREPERSON

22. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Sean Robbins intentionally interfered with a contractual or prospective contractual relation of the Plaintiff?

Yes  No

If you responded "Yes" to Interrogatory #22, please proceed to Interrogatory #23. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #22, and you responded "No" to Interrogatories #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 20, your deliberations are now complete and you should return to the courtroom. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #22, but you answered "Yes" to one or more than one of Interrogatories #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 20, please proceed to answer the Interrogatories as to each Defendant for whom a "Yes" answer was given.

23. If your answer was "Yes" to Interrogatory #22, do you also find that Defendant Sean Robbins proved by a preponderance of the evidence that he was acting within the scope of his employment when he did so?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #24.

24. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro could reasonably believe that Plaintiff was emitting malodors caused by hydrogen sulfide based upon the evidence available to him?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #25.

25. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro's actions prevented Plaintiff from operating its plant or selling the plant to an interested buyer?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #26.

3-3-10  
DATE

Knuckleroy  
FOREPERSON

26. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro's conduct could be based on a reasonable mistake of fact under the circumstances he was confronted with in regard to Plaintiff?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #27.

27. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Thomas DiLazaro believed that his conduct in regard to Plaintiff was proper under the law and regulations of Pennsylvania and the United States?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #28.

28. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Michael Bedrin could reasonably believe that Plaintiff was emitting malodors caused by hydrogen sulfide based upon the evidence available to him?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #29.

29. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Michael Bedrin's actions prevented Plaintiff from operating its plant or selling the plant to an interested buyer?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #30.

30. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Michael Bedrin's conduct could be based on a reasonable mistake of fact under the circumstances he was confronted with in regard to Plaintiff?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #31.

3-3-10  
DATE

15 Muckleroy  
FOREPERSON

31. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Michael Bedrin believed that his conduct in regard to Plaintiff was proper under the law and regulations of Pennsylvania and the United States?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #32.

32. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Mark Wejkszner could reasonably believe that Plaintiff was emitting malodors caused by hydrogen sulfide based upon the evidence available to him?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #33.

33. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Mark Wejkszner's actions prevented Plaintiff from operating its plant or selling the plant to an interested buyer?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #34.

34. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Mark Wejkszner's conduct could be based on a reasonable mistake of fact under the circumstances he was confronted with in regard to Plaintiff?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #35.

35. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Mark Wejkszner believed that his conduct in regard to Plaintiff was proper under the law and regulations of Pennsylvania and the United States?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #36.

3-3-10  
DATE

1h Muckleroy  
FOREPERSON



36. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Sean Robbins could reasonably believe that Plaintiff was emitting malodors caused by hydrogen sulfide based upon the evidence available to him?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #37.

37. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Sean Robbins' actions prevented Plaintiff from operating its plant or selling the plant to an interested buyer?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #38.

38. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant Sean Robbins' conduct could be based on a reasonable mistake of fact under the circumstances he was confronted with in regard to Plaintiff?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #39.

39. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant Sean Robbins believed that his conduct in regard to Plaintiff was proper under the law and regulations of Pennsylvania and the United States?

Yes  No

Please proceed to Interrogatory #40.

40. Did Plaintiff prove by the preponderance of the evidence that it suffered damage as a result of Defendant Thomas DiLazaro's conduct?

Yes  No

If you responded "Yes" to Interrogatory #40, please proceed to Interrogatory #41. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #40, please proceed to Interrogatory #42.

3-3-10  
DATE

Th Muckleroy  
FOREPERSON

41. What amount of money do you award Plaintiff to compensate it for the damage it proved it suffered as a result of Defendant Thomas DiLazaro's conduct?

\$ 2,600,000.00

Please proceed to Interrogatory #42.

42. Did Plaintiff prove by the preponderance of the evidence that it suffered damage as a result of Defendant Michael Bedrin's conduct?

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

If you responded "Yes" to Interrogatory #42, please proceed to Interrogatory #43. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #42, please proceed to Interrogatory #44.

43. What amount of money do you award Plaintiff to compensate it for the damage it proved it suffered as a result of Defendant Michael Bedrin's conduct?

\$ 1,625,000.00

Please proceed to Interrogatory #44.

44. Did Plaintiff prove by the preponderance of the evidence that it suffered damage as a result of Defendant Mark Wejkszner's conduct?

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

If you responded "Yes" to Interrogatory #44, please proceed to Interrogatory #45. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #44, please proceed to Interrogatory #46.

45. What amount of money do you award Plaintiff to compensate it for the damage it proved it suffered as a result of Defendant Mark Wejkszner's conduct?

\$ 650,000.00

Please proceed to Interrogatory #46.

3-3-10  
DATE

ihmuckleroy  
FOREPERSON

46. Did Plaintiff prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it suffered damage as a result of Defendant Sean Robbins' conduct?

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

If you responded "Yes" to Interrogatory #46, please proceed to Interrogatory #47. If you responded "No" to Interrogatory #46, your deliberations are now complete and you should return to the courtroom.

47. What amount of money do you award Plaintiff to compensate it for the damage it proved it suffered as a result of Defendant Sean Robbins' conduct?

\$ 1,625,000.00

Your deliberations are now complete. Please return to the courtroom.

3-3-10  
DATE

W. Muckler  
FOREPERSON