

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

HENRY LEE PICKETT, et al.,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
)
 v.)
)
 TYSON FRESH MEATS, INC.,)
)
 Defendant.)
 _____)

Civil No. 96-A-1103-N

VERDICT FORM

FILED

FEB 17 2004 *DMJ*

CLERK
U. S. DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DIST. OF ALA.

Do you find, by a preponderance of the evidence:

1. That there is a nationwide market for fed cattle?
 Yes No
2. That the defendant's use of captive supply had an anticompetitive effect on the cash market for fed cattle?
 Yes No
3. That the defendant lacked a legitimate business reason or competitive justification for using captive supply?
 Yes No
4. That the defendant's use of captive supply proximately caused the cash market price to be lower than it otherwise would have been?
 Yes No
5. That the defendant's use of captive supply injured each and every member of the plaintiffs' class?
 Yes No

652

If you have answered "yes" to each of the foregoing questions, then you should proceed to questions number 6 and 7. If you have answered "no" to any one or more of the foregoing questions, you may consider your deliberations completed and your foreperson should sign and date this verdict form.

6. What amount, if any, do you find that defendant's use of captive supply damaged the cash market price of fed cattle sold to IBP during the period from February 1, 1994, through October 31, 2002?

\$ 1,281,690.00

0000212

7. Did the defendant's use of captive supply depress the cash market price for fed cattle purchased by IBP by an equal percentage for each year of the class period?


 Yes

No

If your answer is yes, by what percent?

 %

DATED this 17 day of February, 2004.



FOREPERSON