

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR., derivatively on  
behalf of Reading International, Inc.,

Appellant,

v.

DOUGLAS MCEACHERN, EDWARD  
KANE, JUDY CODDING, WILLIAM  
GOULD, MICHAEL WROTONIAK, and  
nominal defendant READING  
INTERNATIONAL, INC., A NEVADA  
CORPORATION

Respondents.

Electronically Filed  
Aug 30 2019 11:23 a.m.  
Supreme Court Case No. 75053  
Consolidated with Supreme Court  
Case Nos. 76981, 77648 & 77733

District Court Case  
No. A-15-719860-B

Coordinated with:  
Case No. P-14-0824-42-E

Appeal (77648 & 76981)

Eighth Judicial District Court, Dept. XI  
The Honorable Elizabeth G. Gonzalez

JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981  
Volume VI  
JA1251– JA1500

Steve Morris, Esq. (NSB #1543)  
Akke Levin, Esq. (NSB #9102)  
Morris Law Group  
411 E. Bonneville Ave., Ste. 360  
Las Vegas, NV 89101  
Telephone: (702) 474-9400

Attorneys for Appellant  
James J. Cotter, Jr.

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2015-06-12	Complaint	I	JA1-JA31
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Douglas McEachern	I	JA32-JA33
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Edward Kane	I	JA34-JA35
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Ellen Cotter	I	JA36-JA37
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Guy Adams	I	JA38-JA39
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Margaret Cotter	I	JA40-JA41
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - RDI	I	JA42-JA43
2015-06-18	Amended AOS – Timothy Storey	I	JA44-JA45
2015-06-18	Amended AOS – William Gould	I	JA46-JA47
2015-08-10	Motion to Dismiss Complaint	I	JA48-JA104
2015-08-20	Reading International, Inc. ("RDI")'s Joinder to Margaret Cotter, Ellen Cotter, Douglas McEachern, Guy Adams, & Edward Kane ("Individual Defendants") Motion to Dismiss Complaint	I	JA105-JA108
2015-08-28	T2 Plaintiffs' Verified Shareholder Derivative Complaint	I	JA109-JA126
2015-08-31	RDI's Motion to Compel Arbitration	I	JA127-JA148
2015-09-03	Individual Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint	I	JA149-JA237
2015-10-06	Transcript of 9-10-15 Hearing on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss & Plaintiff Cotter Jr. ("Cotter Jr.")'s Motion for Preliminary Injunction	I, II	JA238-JA256
2015-10-12	Order Denying RDI's Motion to Compel Arbitration	II	JA257-JA259
2015-10-19	Order Re Motion to Dismiss Complaint	II	JA260-JA262
2015-10-22	First Amended Verified Complaint	II	JA263-JA312
2015-11-10	Scheduling Order and Order Setting Civil Jury Trial, Pre-Trial Conference and Calendar Call	II	JA313-JA316

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2016-02-12	T2 Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint	II	JA317-JA355
2016-02-23	Transcript of 2-18-16 Hearing on Motion to Compel & Motion to File Document Under Seal	II	JA356-JA374
2016-03-14	Individual Defendants' Answer to Cotter's First Amended Complaint	II	JA375-JA396
2016-03-29	RDI's Answer to Cotter, Jr.'s First Amended Complaint	II	JA397-JA418
2016-03-29	RDI's Answer to T2 Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint	II	JA419-JA438
2016-04-05	Codding and Wrotniak's Answer to T2 Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint	II	JA439-JA462
2016-06-21	Stipulation and Order to Amend Deadlines in Scheduling Order	II	JA463-JA468
2016-06-23	Transcript of 6-21-16 Hearing on Defendants' Motion to Compel & Motion to Disqualify T2 Plaintiffs	II	JA469-JA493
2016-08-11	Transcript of 8-9-16 Hearing on Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, Motion to Compel & Motion to Amend	II, III	JA494-JA518
2016-09-02	Cotter Jr.'s Second Amended Verified Complaint	III	JA519-JA575
2016-09-23	Defendant William Gould ("Gould")'s MSJ	III, IV, V, VI	JA576-JA1400
2016-09-23	MIL to Exclude Expert Testimony of Steele, Duarte-Silva, Spitz, Nagy, & Finnerty	VI	JA1401-JA1485
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 1) Re: Plaintiff's Termination and Reinstatement Claims ("Partial MSJ No. 1)	VI, VII, VIII, IX	JA1486-JA2216 (FILED UNDER SEAL JA2136A-D)

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 2) Re: The Issue of Director Independence ("Partial MSJ No. 2")	IX, X	JA2217-JA2489  (FILED UNDER SEAL JA2489A-HH)
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 3) On Plaintiff's Claims Related to the Purported Unsolicited Offer ("Partial MSJ No. 3")	X, XI	JA2490-JA2583
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 4) On Plaintiff's Claims Related to the Executive Committee ("Partial MSJ No. 4")	XI	JA2584-JA2689
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 5) On Plaintiff's Claims Related to the Appointment of Ellen Cotter as CEO ("Partial MSJ No. 5")	XI, XII	JA2690-JA2860
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 6) Re Plaintiff's Claims Re Estate's Option Exercise, Appointment of Margaret Cotter, Compensation Packages of Ellen Cotter and Margaret Cotter, and related claims Additional Compensation to Margaret Cotter and Guy Adams ("Partial MSJ No. 6")	XII, XIII, XIV	JA2861-JA3336
2016-09-23	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment ("MPSJ")	XIV, XV	JA3337-JA3697
2016-10-03	Order Granting Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel Production of Documents & Communications Re the Advice of Counsel Defense	XV	JA3698-JA3700



**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2016-10-03	Order Re Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Permit Certain Discovery re Recent "Offer"	XV	JA3701-JA3703
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to MIL to Exclude Expert Testimony	XV	JA3704-JA3706
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial-MSJ No. 1	XV	JA3707-JA3717
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 2	XV	JA3718-JA3739
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 3	XV	JA3740-JA3746
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 4	XV	JA3747-JA3799
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 5	XV	JA3800-JA3805
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 6	XV, XVI	JA3806-JA3814
2016-10-13	Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s MPSJ	XVI	JA3815-JA3920
2016-10-13	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s MPSJ	XVI	JA3921-JA4014
2016-10-13	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Gould's MSJ	XVI	JA4015-JA4051
2016-10-13	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Partial MSJ No. 1	XVI, XVII	JA4052-JA4083
2016-10-13	Cotter, Jr.'s Opposition to Partial MSJ No. 2	XVII	JA4084-JA4111
2016-10-13	Cotter, Jr.'s Opposition to Partial MSJ No. 6	XVII	JA4112-JA4142
2016-10-17	Cotter Jr.'s Appendix of Exhibits ISO Opposition to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 1	XVII, XVIII	JA4143-JA4311 (FILED UNDER SEAL JA4151A-C)

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2016-10-17	Cotter Jr.'s Appendix of Exhibits ISO Opposition to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 2	XVIII	JA4312-JA4457
2016-10-17	Cotter Jr.'s Appendix of Exhibits ISO Opposition to Gould's MSJ	XVIII	JA4458-JA4517
2016-10-21	Individual Defendants' Reply ISO of Partial MSJ No. 1	XVIII	JA4518-JA4549
2016-10-21	Individual Defendants' Reply ISO Partial MSJ No. 2	XVIII, XIX	JA4550-JA4567
2016-10-21	RDI's Reply ISO Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 1	XIX	JA4568-JA4577
2016-10-21	RDI's Reply ISO Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 2	XIX	JA4578-JA4588
2019-10-21	RDI's Consolidated Reply ISO Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ Nos. 3, 4, 5 & 6	XIX	JA4589-JA4603
2016-10-21	RDI's Reply ISO Gould's MSJ	XIX	JA4604-JA4609
2016-10-21	Gould's Reply ISO MSJ	XIX	JA4610-JA4635
2016-10-21	Declaration of Barnett ISO Gould's Reply ISO MSJ	XIX	JA4636-JA4677
2016-10-21	Individual Defendants' Reply ISO Partial MSJ Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6	XIX	JA4678-JA4724
2016-10-26	Individual Defendants' Objections to Declaration of Cotter, Jr. Submitted in Opposition to Partial MSJs	XIX	JA4725-JA4735
2016-11-01	Transcript of 10-27-16 Hearing on Motions	XIX, XX	JA4736-JA4890
2016-12-20	RDI's Answer to Cotter Jr.'s Second Amended Complaint	XX	JA4891-JA4916
2016-12-21	Order Re Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ Nos. 1-6 and MIL to Exclude Expert Testimony	XX	JA4917-JA4920
2016-12-22	Notice of Entry of Order Re Partial MSJ Nos. 1-6 and MIL to Exclude Expert Testimony	XX	JA4921-JA4927

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-10-04	First Amended Order Setting Civil Jury Trial, Pre-Trial Conference, and Calendar Call	XX	JA4928-JA4931
2017-10-11	Individual Defendants' Motion for Evidentiary Hearing Re Cotter Jr.'s Adequacy as Derivative Plaintiff	XX	JA4932-JA4974
2017-10-17	Gould's Joinder to Motion for Evidentiary Hearing re Cotter Jr.'s Adequacy as Derivative Plaintiff	XX	JA4975-JA4977
2017-10-18	RDI's Joinder to Motion for Evidentiary Hearing re Cotter Jr.'s Adequacy as Derivative Plaintiff	XX	JA4978-JA4980
2017-11-09	Individual Defendants' Supplement to Partial MSJ Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6	XX	JA4981-JA5024
2017-11-21	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Supplement to Partial MSJ Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5 & 6	XX	JA5025-JA5027
2017-11-27	Transcript of 11-20-17 Hearing on Motion for Evidentiary Hearing re Cotter Jr.'s Adequacy & Motion to Seal	XX	JA5028-JA5047
2017-11-28	Individual Defendants' Answer to Cotter Jr.'s Second Amended Complaint	XX, XXI	JA5048-JA5077
2017-12-01	Gould's Request For Hearing on Previously-Filed MSJ	XXI	JA5078-JA5093
2017-12-01	Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 1 & 2 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5094-JA5107
2017-12-01	Declaration of Levin ISO Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 1 & 2 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5108-JA5118

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-12-01	Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 5 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5119-JA5134
2017-12-01	Declaration of Levin ISO Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 5 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5135-JA5252
2017-12-01	Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 6 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5253-JA5264
2017-12-01	Declaration of Levin ISO Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 6 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5265-JA5299
2017-12-01	Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 3 & Gould MSJ	XXI, XXII	JA5300-JA5320
2017-12-01	Declaration of Levin ISO Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to So-Called MSJ Nos. 2 & 3 & Gould MSJ	XXII	JA5321-JA5509
2017-12-04	Individual Defendants' Reply ISO Renewed Partial MSJ Nos. 1 & 2	XXII	JA5510-JA5537
2017-12-04	Gould's Supplemental Reply ISO of MSJ	XXII	JA5538-JA5554
2017-12-05	Declaration of Bannett ISO Gould's Supplemental Reply ISO MSJ	XXII, XXIII	JA5555-JA5685
2017-12-08	Joint Pre-Trial Memorandum	XXIII	JA5686-JA5717
2017-12-11	Transcript of 12-11-2017 Hearing on [Partial] MSJs, MILs, and Pre-Trial Conference	XXIII	JA5718-JA5792
2017-12-19	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration of Ruling on Partial MSJ Nos. 1, 2 & 3 and Gould's MSJ on OST ("Motion for Reconsideration")	XXIII, XXIV	JA5793-JA5909

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-12-26	Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion For Reconsideration	XXIV	JA5910-JA5981
2017-12-27	Gould's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration	XXIV	JA5982-JA5986
2017-12-27	Declaration of Bennett ISO Gould's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration	XXIV, XXV	JA5987-JA6064
2017-12-28	Order Re Individual Defendants' Partial MSJs, Gould's MSJ, and MILs	XXV	JA6065-JA6071
2017-12-28	Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Stay on OST	XXV	JA6072-JA6080
2017-12-29	Notice of Entry of Order Re Individual Defendants' Partial MSJs, Gould's MSJ, and MIL	XXV	JA6081-JA6091
2017-12-29	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay on OST	XXV	JA6092-JA6106
2017-12-29	Transcript of 12-28-17 Hearing on Motion for Reconsideration and Motion for Stay	XXV	JA6107-JA6131
2018-01-02	Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay	XXV	JA6132-JA6139
2018-01-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay	XXV	JA6140-JA6152
2018-01-03	RDI's Errata to Joinder to Individual Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay	XXV	JA6153-JA6161
2018-01-03	RDI's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Show Demand Futility	XXV	JA6162-JA6170
2018-01-03	Cotter Jr.'s Reply ISO Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay	XXV	JA6171-JS6178

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-01-04	Order Granting Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification	XXV	JA6179-JA6181
2018-01-04	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification	XXV	JA6182-JA6188
2018-01-04	Order Denying Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration and Stay	XXV	JA6189-JA6191
2018-01-04	Adams and Cotter sisters' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law	XXV	JA6192-JA6224 (FILED UNDER SEAL JA6224A-F)
2018-01-05	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to RDI's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Show Demand Futility	XXV	JA6225-JA6228
2018-01-05	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law	XXV	JA6229-JA6238
2018-01-05	Declaration of Krum ISO Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law	XXV	JA6239-JA6244
2018-01-05	Transcript of 1-4-18 Hearing on Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification	XXV	JA6245-JA6263
2018-01-08	Transcript of Hearing on Demand Futility Motion and Motion for Judgment	XXV	JA6264-JA6280
2018-01-10	Transcript of Proceedings of 01-8-18 Jury Trial–Day 1	XXV	JA6281-JA6294
2018-02-01	Cotter Jr.'s Notice of Appeal	XXV	JA6295-JA6297
2018-04-18	Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel (Gould)	XXV, XXVI	JA6298-JA6431

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-04-23	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Omnibus Relief on OST	XXVI, XXVII	JA6432-JA6561  (FILED UNDER SEAL JA6350A; JA6513A-C)
2018-04-24	Gould's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel	XXVII	JA6562-JA6568
2018-04-24	Gould's Declaration ISO Opposition to Motion to Compel	XXVII	JA6569-JA6571
2018-04-24	Bannett's Declaration ISO Gould's Opposition to Motion to Compel	XXVII	JA6572-JA6581
2018-04-27	Cotter Jr.'s Reply ISO Motion to Compel (Gould)	XXVII	JA6582-JA6599
2018-04-27	RDI's Opposition to Cotter's Motion for Omnibus Relief	XXVII	JA6600-JA6698
2018-05-03	Transcript of 4-30-18 Hearing on Motions to Compel & Seal	XXVII	JA6699-JA6723
2018-05-04	Second Amended Order Setting Jury Trial, Pre-trial Conference, and Calendar Call	XXVII	JA6724-JA6726
2018-05-07	Transcript of 5-2-18 Hearing on Evidentiary Hearing	XXVII, XXVIII	JA6727-JA6815
2018-05-11	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to RDI's Motion for Leave to File Motion	XXVIII	JA6816-JA6937
2018-05-15	Adams and Cotter sisters' Motion to Compel Production of Docs re Expert Fee Payments on OST	XXVIII, XXIX	JA6938-JA7078
2018-05-18	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Motion to Compel Production of Docs re Expert Fee Payments	XXIX	JA7079-JA7087
2018-05-18	Adams and Cotter sisters' Pre-Trial Memo	XXIX	JA7088-JA7135
2018-05-18	Cotter Jr.'s Pre-Trial Memo	XXIX	JA7136-JA7157

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-05-24	Transcript of 05-21-18 Hearing on Adams and Cotter sisters' Motion to Compel	XXIX	JA7158-JA7172
2018-06-01	Adams and Cotter sisters' Motion for Summary Judgment ("Ratification MSJ")	XXIX	JA7173-JA7221
2018-06-08	Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel on OST	XXIX, XXX, XXXI	JA7222-JA7568
2018-06-12	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Relief Based on Noncompliance with Court's May 2, 2018 Rulings on OST ("Motion for Relief")	XXXI	JA7569-JA7607
2018-06-13	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Ratification MSJ	XXXI	JA7608-JA7797
2018-06-13	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to RDI's Demand Futility Motion	XXXI, XXXII	JA7798-JA7840
2018-06-15	Adams and Cotter sisters' Reply ISO of Ratification MSJ	XXXII	JA7841-JA7874
2018-06-18	RDI's Combined Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel & Motion for Relief	XXXII	JA7875-JA7927
2018-06-18	Adams and Cotter sisters' Joinder to RDI's Combined Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel & Motion for Relief	XXXII, XXXIII	JA7928-JA8295
2018-06-18	Gould's Joinder to RDI's Combined Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel & Motion for Relief	XXXIII	JA8296-JA8301
2018-06-18	Cotter Jr.'s Reply ISO Motion for Relief Re: 05-02-18 Rulings	XXXIII, XXXIV	JA8302-JA8342
2018-06-20	Transcript of 06-19-18 Omnibus Hearing on discovery motions and Ratification MSJ	XXXIV	JA8343-JA8394



**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-07-12	Order Granting In Part Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel (Gould) & Motion for Relief	XXXIV	JA8395-JA8397
2018-07-12	Order Granting in Part Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Omnibus Relief & Motion to Compel	XXXIV	JA8398-JA8400
2018-08-14	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Judgment	XXXIV	JA8401-JA8411
2018-08-16	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Judgment	XXXIV	JA8412-JA8425
2018-08-24	Memorandum of Costs submitted by RDI for itself & the director defendants	XXXIV	JA8426-JA8446
2018-08-24	RDI's Appendix of Exhibits to Memorandum of Costs	XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI	JA8447-JA8906
2018-09-05	Notice of Entry of SAO Re Process for Filing Motion for Attorney's Fees	XXXVI	JA8907-JA8914
2018-09-05	Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Retax Costs	XXXVI	JA8915-JA9018
2018-09-07	RDI's Motion for Attorneys' Fees	XXXVI, XXXVII	JA9019-JA9101
2018-09-12	RDI's Motion for Judgment in Its Favor	XXXVII	JA9102-JA9107
2018-09-13	Cotter Jr.'s Notice of Appeal	XXXVII	JA9108-JA9110
2018-09-14	RDI's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Retax Costs	XXXVII	JA9111-JA9219
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix ISO Opposition to Motion to Retax ("Appendix") Part 1	XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX	JA9220-JA9592
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 2	XXXIX, XL, XLI	JA9593- JA10063
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 3	XLI, XLII, XLIII	JA10064- JA10801

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 4	XLIII, XLIV	JA10802- JA10898
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix Part 5	XLIV, XLV	JA10899- JA11270
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 6	XLV, XLVI	JA11271- JA11475
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 7	XLVI, XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX, L	JA11476- JA12496
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 8	L, LI, LII	JA12497- JA12893
2018-09-14	Suggestion of Death of Gould Upon the Record	LII,	JA12894- JA12896
2018-09-24	Cotter Jr.'s Reply to RDI's Opp'n to Motion to Retax Costs	LII	JA12897- JA12921
2018-09-24	Cotter Jr.'s Appendix of Exhibits ISO Reply to RDI's Opposition to Motion to Retax Costs	LII, LIII	JA12922- JA13112
2018-10-01	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to RDI's Motion for Judgment in its Favor	LIII	JA13113- JA13125
2018-10-02	Transcript of 10-01-18 Hearing on Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Retax Costs	LIII	JA13126- JA13150
2018-11-02	Cotter Jr.'s Letter to Court Objecting to Proposed Order	LIII	JA13151- JA13156
2018-11-02	Cotter Jr.'s Errata to Letter to Court Objecting to Proposed Order	LIII	JA13157- JA13162
2018-11-06	Order Granting in Part Motion to Retax Costs & Entering Judgment for Costs ("Cost Judgment")	LIII	JA13163- JA13167
2018-11-06	Notice of Entry of Order of Cost Judgment	LIII	JA13168- JA13174
2018-11-16	Order Denying RDI's Motion for Attorneys' Fees	LIII	JA13175- JA13178

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-11-06	Order Denying RDI's Motion for Judgment in Its Favor	LIII	JA13179- JA13182
2018-11-20	Notice of Entry of Order Denying RDI's Motion for Attorneys' Fees	LIII	JA13183- JA13190
2018-11-20	Notice of Entry of Order Denying RDI's Motion for Judgment in Its Favor	LIII	JA13191- JA13198
2018-11-26	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration & Amendment of Cost Judgment, for Limited Stay of Execution on OST	LIII	JA13199- JA13207
2018-11-30	RDI's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration and Response to Motion for Limited Stay of Execution on OST	LIII	JA13208- JA13212
2018-11-30	Adams and Cotter sisters' Joinder to RDI's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration and Response to Motion for Limited Stay of Execution	LIII	JA13213- JA13215
2018-12-06	Order Re Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration & Amendment of Judgment for Costs and for Limited Stay	LIII	JA13216- JA13219
2018-12-06	Cotter Jr.'s Notice of Appeal from Cost Judgment	LIII	JA13220- JA13222
2018-12-07	Notice of Entry of Order Re Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration & Amendment of Cost Judgment and for Limited Stay	LIII	JA13223- JA13229
2018-12-14	Cotter Jr.'s Notice of Posting Cost Bond on Appeal	LIII	JA13230- JA13232

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-06-18	Adams and Cotter sisters' Joinder to RDI's Combined Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel & Motion for Relief	XXXII, XXXIII	JA7928- JA8295
2018-11-30	Adams and Cotter sisters' Joinder to RDI's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration and Response to Motion for Limited Stay of Execution	LIII	JA13213- JA13215
2018-01-04	Adams and Cotter sisters' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law	XXV	JA6192- JA6224  (FILED UNDER SEAL JA6224A-F)
2018-06-01	Adams and Cotter sisters' Motion for Summary Judgment ("Ratification MSJ")	XXIX	JA7173- JA7221
2018-05-15	Adams and Cotter sisters' Motion to Compel Production of Docs re Expert Fee Payments on OST	XXVIII, XXIX	JA6938- JA7078
2018-05-18	Adams and Cotter sisters' Pre-Trial Memo	XXIX	JA7088- JA7135
2018-06-15	Adams and Cotter sisters' Reply ISO of Ratification MSJ	XXXII	JA7841- JA7874
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Douglas McEachern	I	JA32-JA33
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Edward Kane	I	JA34-JA35
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Ellen Cotter	I	JA36-JA37
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Guy Adams	I	JA38-JA39
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - Margaret Cotter	I	JA40-JA41
2015-06-18	Amended AOS - RDI	I	JA42-JA43
2015-06-18	Amended AOS – Timothy Storey	I	JA44-JA45
2015-06-18	Amended AOS – William Gould	I	JA46-JA47

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-04-24	Bannett's Declaration ISO Gould's Opposition to Motion to Compel	XXVII	JA6572- JA6581
2016-04-05	Codding and Wrotniak's Answer to T2 Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint	II	JA439- JA462
2015-06-12	Complaint	I	JA1-JA31
2016-10-17	Cotter Jr.'s Appendix of Exhibits ISO Opposition to Gould's MSJ	XVIII	JA4458- JA4517
2016-10-17	Cotter Jr.'s Appendix of Exhibits ISO Opposition to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 1	XVII, XVIII	JA4143- JA4311  (FILED UNDER SEAL JA4151A-C)
2016-10-17	Cotter Jr.'s Appendix of Exhibits ISO Opposition to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 2	XVIII	JA4312- JA4457
2018-09-24	Cotter Jr.'s Appendix of Exhibits ISO Reply to RDI's Opposition to Motion to Retax Costs	LII, LIII	JA12922- JA13112
2018-11-02	Cotter Jr.'s Errata to Letter to Court Objecting to Proposed Order	LIII	JA13157- JA13162
2018-11-02	Cotter Jr.'s Letter to Court Objecting to Proposed Order	LIII	JA13151- JA13156
2018-04-23	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Omnibus Relief on OST	XXVI, XXVII	JA6432- JA6561  (FILED UNDER SEAL JA6350A; JA6513A-C)
2016-09-23	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment ("MPSJ")	XIV, XV	JA3337- JA3697

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-11-26	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration & Amendment of Cost Judgment, for Limited Stay of Execution on OST	LIII	JA13199- JA13207
2017-12-19	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration of Ruling on Partial MSJ Nos. 1, 2 & 3 and Gould's MSJ on OST ("Motion for Reconsideration")	XXIII, XXIV	JA5793- JA5909
2018-06-12	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Relief Based on Noncompliance with Court's May 2, 2018 Rulings on OST ("Motion for Relief")	XXXI	JA7569- JA7607
2017-12-29	Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay on OST	XXV	JA6092- JA6106
2018-04-18	Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel (Gould)	XXV, XXVI	JA6298- JA6431
2018-06-08	Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel on OST	XXIX, XXX, XXXI	JA7222- JA7568
2018-09-05	Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Retax Costs	XXXVI	JA8915- JA9018
2017-12-28	Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Stay on OST	XXV	JA6072- JA6080
2018-02-01	Cotter Jr.'s Notice of Appeal	XXV	JA6295- JA6297
2018-09-13	Cotter Jr.'s Notice of Appeal	XXXVII	JA9108- JA9110
2018-12-06	Cotter Jr.'s Notice of Appeal from Cost Judgment	LIII	JA13220- JA13222
2018-12-14	Cotter Jr.'s Notice of Posting Cost Bond on Appeal	LIII	JA13230- JA13232
2018-01-05	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law	XXV	JA6229- JA6238

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2016-10-13	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Gould's MSJ	XVI	JA4015- JA4051
2018-05-18	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Motion to Compel Production of Docs re Expert Fee Payments	XXIX	JA7079- JA7087
2016-10-13	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Partial MSJ No. 1	XVI, XVII	JA4052- JA4083
2018-06-13	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Ratification MSJ	XXXI	JA7608- JA7797
2018-06-13	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to RDI's Demand Futility Motion	XXXI, XXXII	JA7798- JA7840
2018-10-01	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to RDI's Motion for Judgment in its Favor	LIII	JA13113- JA13125
2018-05-11	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to RDI's Motion for Leave to File Motion	XXVIII	JA6816- JA6937
2018-01-05	Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to RDI's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Show Demand Futility	XXV	JA6225- JA6228
2018-05-18	Cotter Jr.'s Pre-Trial Memo	XXIX	JA7136- JA7157
2018-06-18	Cotter Jr.'s Reply ISO Motion for Relief Re: 05-02-18 Rulings	XXXIII, XXXIV	JA8302- JA8342
2018-01-03	Cotter Jr.'s Reply ISO Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay	XXV	JA6171- JS6178
2018-04-27	Cotter Jr.'s Reply ISO Motion to Compel (Gould)	XXVII	JA6582- JA6599
2018-09-24	Cotter Jr.'s Reply to RDI's Opp'n to Motion to Retax Costs	LII	JA12897- JA12921
2016-09-02	Cotter Jr.'s Second Amended Verified Complaint	III	JA519- JA575
2017-12-01	Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 1 & 2 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5094- JA5107

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-12-01	Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 3 & Gould MSJ	XXI, XXII	JA5300-JA5320
2017-12-01	Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 5 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5119-JA5134
2017-12-01	Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 6 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5253-JA5264
2016-10-13	Cotter, Jr.'s Opposition to Partial MSJ No. 2	XVII	JA4084-JA4111
2016-10-13	Cotter, Jr.'s Opposition to Partial MSJ No. 6	XVII	JA4112-JA4142
2017-12-27	Declaration of Bannett ISO Gould's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration	XXIV, XXV	JA5987-JA6064
2016-10-21	Declaration of Bannett ISO Gould's Reply ISO MSJ	XIX	JA4636-JA4677
2017-12-05	Declaration of Bannett ISO Gould's Supplemental Reply ISO MSJ	XXII, XXIII	JA5555-JA5685
2018-01-05	Declaration of Krum ISO Cotter Jr.'s Opposition to Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law	XXV	JA6239-JA6244
2017-12-01	Declaration of Levin ISO Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 1 & 2 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5108-JA5118
2017-12-01	Declaration of Levin ISO Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 5 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5135-JA5252
2017-12-01	Declaration of Levin ISO Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to Partial MSJ Nos. 2 & 6 & Gould MSJ	XXI	JA5265-JA5299



**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-12-01	Declaration of Levin ISO Cotter Jr.'s Supplemental Opposition to So-Called MSJ Nos. 2 & 3 & Gould MSJ	XXII	JA5321-JA5509
2016-09-23	Defendant William Gould ("Gould")'s MSJ	III, IV, V, VI	JA576-JA1400
2018-08-14	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Judgment	XXXIV	JA8401-JA8411
2017-10-04	First Amended Order Setting Civil Jury Trial, Pre-Trial Conference, and Calendar Call	XX	JA4928-JA4931
2015-10-22	First Amended Verified Complaint	II	JA263-JA312
2018-04-24	Gould's Declaration ISO Opposition to Motion to Compel	XXVII	JA6569-JA6571
2017-10-17	Gould's Joinder to Motion for Evidentiary Hearing re Cotter Jr.'s Adequacy as Derivative Plaintiff	XX	JA4975-JA4977
2018-06-18	Gould's Joinder to RDI's Combined Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel & Motion for Relief	XXXIII	JA8296-JA8301
2017-12-27	Gould's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration	XXIV	JA5982-JA5986
2018-04-24	Gould's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel	XXVII	JA6562-JA6568
2016-10-21	Gould's Reply ISO MSJ	XIX	JA4610-JA4635
2017-12-01	Gould's Request For Hearing on Previously-Filed MSJ	XXI	JA5078-JA5093
2017-12-04	Gould's Supplemental Reply ISO of MSJ	XXII	JA5538-JA5554
2017-11-28	Individual Defendants' Answer to Cotter Jr.'s Second Amended Complaint	XX, XXI	JA5048-JA5077

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2016-03-14	Individual Defendants' Answer to Cotter's First Amended Complaint	II	JA375- JA396
2017-10-11	Individual Defendants' Motion for Evidentiary Hearing Re Cotter Jr.'s Adequacy as Derivative Plaintiff	XX	JA4932- JA4974
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 1) Re: Plaintiff's Termination and Reinstatement Claims ("Partial MSJ No. 1)	VI, VII, VIII, IX	JA1486- JA2216  (FILED UNDER SEAL JA2136A-D)
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 2) Re: The Issue of Director Independence ("Partial MSJ No. 2")	IX, X	JA2217- JA2489  (FILED UNDER SEAL JA2489A- HH)
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 3) On Plaintiff's Claims Related to the Purported Unsolicited Offer ("Partial MSJ No. 3")	X, XI	JA2490- JA2583
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 4) On Plaintiff's Claims Related to the Executive Committee ("Partial MSJ No. 4")	XI	JA2584- JA2689
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 5) On Plaintiff's Claims Related to the Appointment of Ellen Cotter as CEO ("Partial MSJ No. 5")	XI, XII	JA2690- JA2860

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2016-09-23	Individual Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 6) Re Plaintiff's Claims Re Estate's Option Exercise, Appointment of Margaret Cotter, Compensation Packages of Ellen Cotter and Margaret Cotter, and related claims Additional Compensation to Margaret Cotter and Guy Adams ("Partial MSJ No. 6")	XII, XIII, XIV	JA2861-JA3336
2015-09-03	Individual Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint	I	JA149-JA237
2016-10-26	Individual Defendants' Objections to Declaration of Cotter, Jr. Submitted in Opposition to Partial MSJs	XIX	JA4725-JA4735
2017-12-26	Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion For Reconsideration	XXIV	JA5910-JA5981
2018-01-02	Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay	XXV	JA6132-JA6139
2016-10-13	Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s MPSJ	XVI	JA3815-JA3920
2016-10-21	Individual Defendants' Reply ISO of Partial MSJ No. 1	XVIII	JA4518-JA4549
2016-10-21	Individual Defendants' Reply ISO Partial MSJ No. 2	XVIII, XIX	JA4550-JA4567
2016-10-21	Individual Defendants' Reply ISO Partial MSJ Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6	XIX	JA4678-JA4724
2017-12-04	Individual Defendants' Reply ISO Renewed Partial MSJ Nos. 1 & 2	XXII	JA5510-JA5537
2017-11-09	Individual Defendants' Supplement to Partial MSJ Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6	XX	JA4981-JA5024

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-12-08	Joint Pre-Trial Memorandum	XXIII	JA5686- JA5717
2018-08-24	Memorandum of Costs submitted by RDI for itself & the director defendants	XXXIV	JA8426- JA8446
2016-09-23	MIL to Exclude Expert Testimony of Steele, Duarte-Silva, Spitz, Nagy, & Finnerty	VI	JA1401- JA1485
2015-08-10	Motion to Dismiss Complaint	I	JA48-JA104
2018-08-16	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Judgment	XXXIV	JA8412- JA8425
2018-11-20	Notice of Entry of Order Denying RDI's Motion for Attorneys' Fees	LIII	JA13183- JA13190
2018-11-20	Notice of Entry of Order Denying RDI's Motion for Judgment in Its Favor	LIII	JA13191- JA13198
2018-01-04	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification	XXV	JA6182- JA6188
2018-11-06	Notice of Entry of Order of Cost Judgment	LIII	JA13168- JA13174
2018-12-07	Notice of Entry of Order Re Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration & Amendment of Cost Judgment and for Limited Stay	LIII	JA13223- JA13229
2017-12-29	Notice of Entry of Order Re Individual Defendants' Partial MSJs, Gould's MSJ, and MIL	XXV	JA6081- JA6091
2016-12-22	Notice of Entry of Order Re Partial MSJ Nos. 1-6 and MIL to Exclude Expert Testimony	XX	JA4921- JA4927
2018-09-05	Notice of Entry of SAO Re Process for Filing Motion for Attorney's Fees	XXXVI	JA8907- JA8914

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-01-04	Order Denying Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration and Stay	XXV	JA6189- JA6191
2018-11-16	Order Denying RDI's Motion for Attorneys' Fees	LIII	JA13175- JA13178
2018-11-06	Order Denying RDI's Motion for Judgment in Its Favor	LIII	JA13179- JA13182
2015-10-12	Order Denying RDI's Motion to Compel Arbitration	II	JA257- JA259
2018-01-04	Order Granting Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification	XXV	JA6179- JA6181
2016-10-03	Order Granting Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel Production of Documents & Communications Re the Advice of Counsel Defense	XV	JA3698- JA3700
2018-07-12	Order Granting in Part Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Omnibus Relief & Motion to Compel	XXXIV	JA8398- JA8400
2018-07-12	Order Granting In Part Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel (Gould) & Motion for Relief	XXXIV	JA8395- JA8397
2018-11-06	Order Granting in Part Motion to Retax Costs & Entering Judgment for Costs ("Cost Judgment")	LIII	JA13163- JA13167
2018-12-06	Order Re Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration & Amendment of Judgment for Costs and for Limited Stay	LIII	JA13216- JA13219
2016-10-03	Order Re Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Permit Certain Discovery re Recent "Offer"	XV	JA3701- JA3703
2016-12-21	Order Re Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ Nos. 1–6 and MIL to Exclude Expert Testimony	XX	JA4917- JA4920

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-12-28	Order Re Individual Defendants' Partial MSJs, Gould's MSJ, and MILs	XXV	JA6065-JA6071
2015-10-19	Order Re Motion to Dismiss Complaint	II	JA260-JA262
2016-12-20	RDI's Answer to Cotter Jr.'s Second Amended Complaint	XX	JA4891-JA4916
2016-03-29	RDI's Answer to Cotter, Jr.'s First Amended Complaint	II	JA397-JA418
2016-03-29	RDI's Answer to T2 Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint	II	JA419-JA438
2018-08-24	RDI's Appendix of Exhibits to Memorandum of Costs	XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI	JA8447-JA8906
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix ISO Opposition to Motion to Retax ("Appendix") Part 1	XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX	JA9220-JA9592
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 2	XXXIX, XL, XLI	JA9593-JA10063
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 3	XLI, XLII, XLIII	JA10064-JA10801
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 4	XLIII, XLIV	JA10802-JA10898
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix Part 5	XLIV, XLV	JA10899-JA11270
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 6	XLV, XLVI	JA11271-JA11475
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 7	XLVI, XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX, L	JA11476-JA12496
2018-09-14	RDI's Appendix, Part 8	L, LI, LII	JA12497-JA12893

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-06-18	RDI's Combined Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Compel & Motion for Relief	XXXII	JA7875-JA7927
2019-10-21	RDI's Consolidated Reply ISO Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ Nos. 3, 4, 5 & 6	XIX	JA4589-JA4603
2018-01-03	RDI's Errata to Joinder to Individual Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay	XXV	JA6153-JA6161
2016-10-13	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s MPSJ	XVI	JA3921-JA4014
2018-01-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification and Stay	XXV	JA6140-JA6152
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial-MSJ No. 1	XV	JA3707-JA3717
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 2	XV	JA3718-JA3739
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 3	XV	JA3740-JA3746
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 4	XV	JA3747-JA3799
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 5	XV	JA3800-JA3805
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 6	XV, XVI	JA3806-JA3814
2017-11-21	RDI's Joinder to Individual Defendants' Supplement to Partial MSJ Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5 & 6	XX	JA5025-JA5027
2016-10-03	RDI's Joinder to MIL to Exclude Expert Testimony	XV	JA3704-JA3706

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-10-18	RDI's Joinder to Motion for Evidentiary Hearing re Cotter Jr.'s Adequacy as Derivative Plaintiff	XX	JA4978- JA4980
2018-09-07	RDI's Motion for Attorneys' Fees	XXXVI, XXXVII	JA9019- JA9101
2018-09-12	RDI's Motion for Judgment in Its Favor	XXXVII	JA9102- JA9107
2015-08-31	RDI's Motion to Compel Arbitration	I	JA127- JA148
2018-01-03	RDI's Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Show Demand Futility	XXV	JA6162- JA6170
2018-11-30	RDI's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration and Response to Motion for Limited Stay of Execution on OST	LIII	JA13208- JA13212
2018-09-14	RDI's Opposition to Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Retax Costs	XXXVII	JA9111- JA9219
2018-04-27	RDI's Opposition to Cotter's Motion for Omnibus Relief	XXVII	JA6600- JA6698
2016-10-21	RDI's Reply ISO Gould's MSJ	XIX	JA4604- JA4609
2016-10-21	RDI's Reply ISO Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 1	XIX	JA4568- JA4577
2016-10-21	RDI's Reply ISO Individual Defendants' Partial MSJ No. 2	XIX	JA4578- JA4588
2015-08-20	Reading International, Inc. ("RDI")'s Joinder to Margaret Cotter, Ellen Cotter, Douglas McEachern, Guy Adams, & Edward Kane ("Individual Defendants") Motion to Dismiss Complaint	I	JA105- JA108
2015-11-10	Scheduling Order and Order Setting Civil Jury Trial, Pre-Trial Conference and Calendar Call	II	JA313- JA316



**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2018-05-04	Second Amended Order Setting Jury Trial, Pre-trial Conference, and Calendar Call	XXVII	JA6724-JA6726
2016-06-21	Stipulation and Order to Amend Deadlines in Scheduling Order	II	JA463-JA468
2018-09-14	Suggestion of Death of Gould Upon the Record	LII,	JA12894-JA12896
2016-02-12	T2 Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint	II	JA317-JA355
2015-08-28	T2 Plaintiffs' Verified Shareholder Derivative Complaint	I	JA109-JA126
2015-10-06	Transcript of 9-10-15 Hearing on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss & Plaintiff Cotter Jr. ("Cotter Jr.")'s Motion for Preliminary Injunction	I, II	JA238-JA256
2016-02-23	Transcript of 2-18-16 Hearing on Motion to Compel & Motion to File Document Under Seal	II	JA356-JA374
2016-06-23	Transcript of 6-21-16 Hearing on Defendants' Motion to Compel & Motion to Disqualify T2 Plaintiffs	II	JA469-JA493
2016-08-11	Transcript of 8-9-16 Hearing on Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, Motion to Compel & Motion to Amend	II, III	JA494-JA518
2016-11-01	Transcript of 10-27-16 Hearing on Motions	XIX, XX	JA4736-JA4890
2017-11-27	Transcript of 11-20-17 Hearing on Motion for Evidentiary Hearing re Cotter Jr.'s Adequacy & Motion to Seal	XX	JA5028-JA5047
2017-12-11	Transcript of 12-11-2017 Hearing on [Partial] MSJs, MILs, and Pre-Trial Conference	XXIII	JA5718-JA5792

**JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS  
FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Vol. #</b>	<b>Page Nos.</b>
2017-12-29	Transcript of 12-28-17 Hearing on Motion for Reconsideration and Motion for Stay	XXV	JA6107-JA6131
2018-01-05	Transcript of 1-4-18 Hearing on Cotter Jr.'s Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification	XXV	JA6245-JA6263
2018-01-08	Transcript of Hearing on Demand Futility Motion and Motion for Judgment	XXV	JA6264-JA6280
2018-01-10	Transcript of Proceedings of 01-8-18 Jury Trial–Day 1	XXV	JA6281-JA6294
2018-05-03	Transcript of 4-30-18 Hearing on Motions to Compel & Seal	XXVII	JA6699-JA6723
2018-05-07	Transcript of 5-2-18 Hearing on Evidentiary Hearing	XXVII, XXVIII	JA6727-JA6815
2018-05-24	Transcript of 05-21-18 Hearing on Adams and Cotter sisters' Motion to Compel	XXIX	JA7158-JA7172
2018-06-20	Transcript of 06-19-18 Omnibus Hearing on discovery motions and Ratification MSJ	XXXIV	JA8343-JA8394
2018-10-02	Transcript of 10-01-18 Hearing on Cotter Jr.'s Motion to Retax Costs	LIII	JA13126-JA13150

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of MORRIS LAW GROUP; I am familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing documents for mailing; that, in accordance therewith, I caused the following document to be e-served via the Supreme Court's electronic service process. I hereby certify that on the 28th day of August, 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **JOINT APPENDIX TO OPENING BRIEFS FOR CASE NOS. 77648 & 76981**, was served by the following method(s):

☒ Supreme Court's EFlex Electronic Filing System:

Stan Johnson  
Cohen-Johnson, LLC  
255 East Warm Springs Road, Ste. 110  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Christopher Tayback  
Marshall Searcy  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP  
865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA

Attorneys for Respondents  
Edward Kane, Douglas McEachern, Judy  
Coddington, and Michael Wrotniak

Mark Ferrario  
Kara Hendricks  
Tami Cowden  
Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
10845 Griffith Peak Drive Suite 600  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135

Attorneys for Nominal Defendant  
Reading International, Inc.

Donald A. Lattin  
Carolyn K. Renner  
Maupin, Cox & LeGoy  
4785 Caughlin Parkway  
Reno, Nevada 89519

Ekwan E. Rhow  
Shoshana E. Bannett  
Bird, Marella, Boxer, Wolpert,  
Nessim, Drooks, Lincenberg &  
Rhow, P.C.  
1875 Century Park East, 23rd Fl.  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2561

Attorneys for Respondent  
William Gould

Judge Elizabeth Gonzalez  
Eighth Judicial District  
court of  
Clark County, Nevada  
Regional Justice Center  
200 Lewis Avenue  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

By: /s/ Gabriela Mercado

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES COTTER, JR., derivatively  
on behalf of Reading International,  
Inc.,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No.

MARGARET COTTER, ELLEN COTTER, A-15-719860-B  
GUY ADAMS, EDWARD KANE, DOUGLAS  
McEACHERN, TIMOTHY STOREY,  
WILLIAM GOULD, JUDY CODDING,  
MICHAEL WROTONIAK, and DOES 1  
through 100, inclusive,  
Defendants.

and

READING INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
a Nevada corporation,  
Nominal Defendant.

---

(CAPTION CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE.)

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF JAMES COTTER, JR.  
Los Angeles, California  
Wednesday, July 6, 2016  
Volume III

Reported by:  
JANICE SCHUTZMAN, CSR No. 9509  
Job No. 2343561  
Pages 568 - 838

Page 568

1 BY MR. TAYBACK:

2 Q. I just want to make sure that I've got a  
3 complete list here because I'll ask you some  
4 follow-up questions about these.

5 You said that you had a lot of experience 09:57AM  
6 with Reading.

7 By that, can you elaborate for me on what  
8 you believe is the relevant experience that you had  
9 that would make it such that the stockholders would  
10 benefit by your reinstatement as CEO now. 09:57AM

11 A. I was involved with the company since 2002.  
12 I was involved as a director. I became more  
13 involved in the operations of the company since  
14 about 2005. I was familiar with all of the assets  
15 and the businesses of Reading with all of the 09:58AM  
16 executives since 2007.

17 And again, I believe that I had done a very  
18 good job at the company since my appointment as  
19 president and since my appointment as CEO.

20 Q. Okay. And I'll get to the good job part of 09:58AM  
21 it. I just wanted to focus first on the experience  
22 that you thought -- the relevant experience, and  
23 you've identified that for me.

24 Would you agree with me that Ellen Cotter  
25 also has a lot of experience with Reading? 09:58AM

Page 584

1 BY MR. TAYBACK:

2 Q. When's the very first time that you can  
3 remember ever discussing with anybody any concern  
4 that you had about the independence of any director  
5 on the Reading board? 11:21AM

6 MR. KRUM: Same objections.

7 THE WITNESS: Well, when Guy Adams -- after  
8 my father died, Guy Adams wanted to reward my father  
9 with a bonus, after he had died, a significant,  
10 significant bonus, and comparing my dad to Jack 11:21AM  
11 Welch and that, given that GE had rewarded Jack  
12 Welch such a substantial retirement package when he  
13 left GE, that my dad should be similarly rewarded.

14 And at that point, I remember having a  
15 discussion with both Bill Gould and Ed Kane saying, 11:22AM  
16 what is generating this? They had both felt it was  
17 bizarre behavior, and at that point, we had -- I  
18 believe we had discussed whether he was independent.

19 Again, didn't have any idea as to the level  
20 of his reliance on Reading and entities that my 11:22AM  
21 sisters controlled. So that's one example.

22 BY MR. TAYBACK:

23 Q. So -- but is that the first time that you  
24 recall discussing with anybody the indep- -- your  
25 concern about the independence of any board member? 11:22AM

Page 636



1 THE WITNESS: I didn't sug- --

2 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Objection?

3 MR. KRUM: Foundation.

4 THE WITNESS: I never suggested that the  
5 bonus that was awarded or that Guy wanted to be 11:31AM  
6 awarded to my father would have -- any of it would  
7 have circled back to Guy.

8 My only point was there didn't appear to be  
9 a legitimate business reason for his recommendation,  
10 and without that, the question was, well, what's 11:31AM  
11 driving this? And it wasn't just a question shared  
12 by me. It was a question shared by Bill Gould and  
13 Ed Kane.

14 BY MR. TAYBACK:

15 Q. At the -- as of May 21st, approximately 11:31AM  
16 then, by that point in time, you knew that Mr. Adams  
17 did not favor retaining you as CEO; correct?

18 A. I knew that he wanted to become interim CEO  
19 and by virtue of that, yes, he wanted to, he did not  
20 favor me remaining as CEO. 11:31AM

21 Q. The fact that they were even talking about  
22 an interim CEO meant that you weren't going to be  
23 CEO; correct?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. The step before finding an interim CEO is 11:32AM

1 to have terminated you as CEO; correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. So by the time that you started to have  
4 conversations around May 21st regarding Mr. Adams'  
5 independence, you already knew that he, as a board 11:32AM  
6 member, did not favor retaining you as CEO; correct?

7 MR. KRUM: Objection, misstates the  
8 testimony.

9 THE WITNESS: No, not true.

10 I don't know when I learned about it. I 11:32AM  
11 never even knew that my position as CEO was in  
12 jeopardy until literally days before that board  
13 meeting.

14 BY MR. TAYBACK:

15 Q. When you say that board meeting, you 11:32AM  
16 mean --

17 A. May 21st.

18 And I had only learned through a  
19 conversation with a director that -- who was  
20 speculating, that Guy was looking to become interim 11:33AM  
21 CEO. And, you know, once I saw the agenda item  
22 where the first item on the agenda was the status of  
23 the president and CEO, I knew that something was  
24 going down.

25 Q. Isn't it true that, in fact, it was the 11:33AM



1 fact that Mr. -- that you knew that Mr. Adams did  
2 not -- Mr. Adams had decided that he wanted to  
3 terminate you as CEO, that that's what prompted you  
4 to raise issues about the level of Mr. Adams'  
5 compensation from Cotter-controlled entities and his 11:33AM  
6 independence?

7 MR. KRUM: Objection, vague.

8 THE WITNESS: I don't think that -- again,  
9 it's similar to why he would have awarded my dad a  
10 massive posthumous bonus. I didn't have a reason 11:34AM  
11 for it, but my speculation was he's doing this  
12 because he's not independent.

13 Now, when I learned that he was looking to  
14 terminate me and that he had been working with my  
15 sisters in terms of orchestrating my termination, I 11:34AM  
16 thought, like I did with the bonus, there's no valid  
17 business reason for terminating me as CEO.

18 I did -- I was performing very well. I had  
19 done nothing wrong. There was no business reason  
20 for him to terminate me. 11:34AM

21 So I thought, hey, there must be another  
22 reason driving this. And that did lead me to  
23 question -- further question his independence and  
24 his reliance on my sisters and on Reading for his  
25 livelihood. 11:35AM

1 BY MR. TAYBACK:

2 Q. So it is correct that you began to question  
3 Mr. Adams' independence because you knew that he was  
4 in favor of your termination as CEO?

5 MR. KRUM: Objection, misstates the 11:35AM  
6 testimony.

7 THE WITNESS: Even had I not been  
8 terminated as CEO, having a director on board with  
9 that kind of reliance on the controlling stockholder  
10 is something I would have wanted to address in time. 11:35AM

11 BY MR. TAYBACK:

12 Q. So certainly, then, in September of 2014  
13 when you started to have questions about Mr. Adams'  
14 independence based upon his recommendation of a  
15 bonus, you must have undertaken some steps then to 11:35AM  
16 get to the bottom of why Mr. Adams might lack  
17 independence?

18 A. Well, there was a lot going on in  
19 September of 2014 with my father's death, with  
20 taking on the role of CEO, with the art- -- this 11:36AM  
21 artificial crisis that my sister Ellen and Margaret  
22 generated in the company, with their efforts to  
23 create an executive committee, their absolute  
24 refusal to report to me as CEO. There were a number  
25 of issues that I was dealing with. 11:36AM

Page 646

1           And while that would have been a good issue  
2     to address, you have to do it over time. And there  
3     was only so much that I could focus on.

4           Q.    So between September of 2014 and roughly  
5     May 21st of 2015, you didn't do anything to           11:36AM  
6     investigate your professed view that Mr. Adams  
7     lacked independence as a board member; correct?

8           MR. KRUM:  Objection --

9           THE WITNESS:  Between --

10          MR. KRUM:  -- misstates the testimony,           11:36AM  
11     assumes facts not in evidence, conflates the  
12     chronology.

13          THE WITNESS:  Between September 14th and?

14     BY MR. TAYBACK:

15          Q.    Between September of 2014 --           11:36AM

16          A.    Right.

17          Q.    -- and May -- roughly May 21st of 2015, you  
18     did not do anything to investigate your professed  
19     belief that Mr. Adams lacked independence as a board  
20     member; correct?           11:37AM

21          MR. KRUM:  Same objections.

22          THE WITNESS:  Again, I don't know when I  
23     undertook to investigate Guy Adams's reliance on  
24     Reading and entities my sisters purportedly  
25     controlled.           11:37AM

1 BY MR. TAYBACK:

2 Q. But it was not significantly before  
3 May 21st, 2015?

4 A. That I had investigated it?

5 Q. Yes. 11:37AM

6 A. That seems correct.

7 Q. You knew Mr. Adams was compensated for the  
8 work that he did with respect to the captive  
9 insurance companies utilized by Cecelia; correct?

10 A. I did. 11:38AM

11 Q. You'd known that for a long time because  
12 you were involved with Cecelia; correct?

13 A. I knew that he was compensated, yes.

14 Q. And you knew exactly how much he was  
15 compensated; correct? 11:38AM

16 A. I did.

17 Q. In fact, was part of your job at Cecelia to  
18 work with Mr. Adams with respect to the captive  
19 insurance companies that he had helped set up?

20 A. I don't know if I was working with 11:38AM  
21 Mr. Adams. I certainly got him information when he  
22 requested it.

23 Q. And did -- at any point in time, did you  
24 feel, while you worked with Mr. Adams with respect  
25 to those captive insurance companies, that he 11:38AM

Page 648



1 MR. KRUM: Asked and answered.

2 BY MR. TAYBACK:

3 Q. You don't have an opinion as to whether or  
4 not the actions they actually took exceeded Nevada  
5 law?

04:25PM

6 A. I don't have an opinion, no.

7 Q. The -- with respect to the appointment of  
8 Mr. Wrotniak, you agree, as you certified  
9 previously, that there are, in fact, no  
10 qualifications required to be a director or to sit  
11 on even a certain committee; correct?

04:26PM

12 MR. KRUM: Objection, asked and answered or  
13 incomplete hypothetical.

14 THE WITNESS: I mean, none that I'm aware  
15 of.

04:26PM

16 MR. KRUM: Well --

17 BY MR. TAYBACK:

18 Q. So --

19 MR. KRUM: -- excuse me.

20 Misstates the testimony, too.

04:26PM

21 BY MR. TAYBACK:

22 Q. So when you say Mr. Wrotniak was  
23 unqualified, that's your opinion. It's not like  
24 there were qualifications that are required for  
25 appointment to a particular committee?

04:26PM

Page 808

# **EXHIBIT 39**

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

DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR.,	)	
individually and	)	
derivatively on behalf of	)	
Reading International,	)	
Inc.,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. A-15-719860-B
vs.	)	Coordinated with:
MARGARET COTTER, et al.,	)	Case No. P-14-082942-E
Defendants.	)	
and	)	
READING INTERNATIONAL,	)	
INC., a Nevada	)	
corporation,	)	
Nominal Defendant	)	

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MARGARET COTTER  
TAKEN ON MAY 13, 2016  
VOLUME II

REPORTED BY:  
PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400

1           A.    The meeting that I told him about Simon  
2    Roberts?

3           **Q.    Yes.**

4           A.    I think they were at the meeting about  
5    other possible candidates for the board.

6           **Q.    So, having gone through that sequence,**  
7    **does that refresh your recollection at all about the**  
8    **time frame in which you had this communication with**  
9    **Mr. Roberts and meeting with other directors in**  
10   **which you discussed your communication with**  
11   **Mr. Roberts?**

12          A.    I don't recall when I first had a  
13    conversation with Mr. Roberts.

14                   The meeting with the other directors I  
15    believe was sometime in 2015 in the fall.

16          **Q.    Was there any other person with whom you**  
17    **spoke or communicated about becoming an RDI director**  
18    **at any point in time in 2015?**

19          A.    Michael Wrotniak.

20          **Q.    Who is he?**

21          A.    He is somebody that I went to college  
22    with, and he is married to a friend of mine.

23          **Q.    What's her name?**

24          A.    Patricia Wrotniak.

25          **Q.    How long have you known Michael**



1 Wrotniak?

2 A. I met him in college, so --

3 Q. We have your education. You don't have  
4 to do the calculations.

5 A. Thank you.

6 Q. And how long have you known his wife  
7 Patricia?

8 A. I've known her longer than Michael  
9 Wrotniak.

10 Q. Dating back to when, whether my date or  
11 place in life?

12 A. Freshman year in college.

13 Q. So you've known her since freshman in  
14 college and Michael Wrotniak since later in college?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. I assume because she started dating him,  
17 correct?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. Sometimes lawyers can fuse together a  
20 couple points of data.

21 When did you first communicate with  
22 either Patricia or Michael Wrotniak about Michael  
23 Wrotniak joining the RDI board of directors?

24 A. Sometime in the fall of 2015.

25 Q. Describe your relationship with Patricia

1     **Wrotniak, please.**

2             A.    She is a college friend. I speak to  
3   her -- I don't know -- once every three or four  
4   weeks. I see her maybe four times a year. It  
5   varies. She had kids very early on after college,  
6   so I really didn't see her that much.

7             And now that I have kids and work, I  
8   don't see her that often.

9             **Q.   Does she still -- well, as of today is**  
10   **she one of your best friends?**

11            MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

12            THE WITNESS: I would consider her a  
13   close friend.

14   BY MR. KRUM:

15            **Q.   And describe your relationship with**  
16   **Michael Wrotniak.**

17            A.    I don't talk to him or see him as I --  
18   as I had done with Patricia. I would maybe see him  
19   once a year if I went to her house for dinner, but I  
20   wouldn't consider I have, you know, an ongoing  
21   relationship with him.

22            **Q.   How often do you communicate with him?**

23            A.    Now?

24            **Q.   How often did you communicate with him**  
25   **in 2014?**

1           A.    Oh, he would email me if he wanted show  
2   tickets.

3           **Q.    How often did you communicate with him**  
4   **in 2015?**

5           A.    I don't know.

6           MR. KRUM:   I'll ask the court reporter  
7   to mark as Exhibit 160 --

8           THE REPORTER:   Yes.

9           MR. KRUM:   -- two pages, the first of  
10   which is dated April 9, 2015, and appears to be an  
11   email from Margaret Cotter to Kelley Anderson with  
12   the subject "Michael Wrotniak."   Production numbers  
13   are MC2812 and 13.

14                 (Whereupon the document referred  
15   to was marked Plaintiffs'  
16   Exhibit 160 by the Certified  
17   Shorthand Reporter and is attached  
18   hereto.)

19           MR. FERRARIO:   This has a red mark on  
20   it.

21           MR. KRUM:   A what?

22           MR. FERRARIO:   158.   There you go.

23           MR. KRUM:   Oh, I passed you a prior  
24   exhibit --

25           MR. FERRARIO:   That's all right.

# **EXHIBIT 40**

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES COTTER, JR., derivatively  
on behalf of Reading International,  
Inc.,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No.

MARGARET COTTER, ELLEN COTTER, A-15-719860-B  
GUY ADAMS, EDWARD KANE, DOUGLAS  
McEACHERN, TIMOTHY STOREY,  
WILLIAM GOULD, JUDY CODDING,  
MICHAEL WROTONIAK, and DOES 1  
through 100, inclusive,  
Defendants.

and

READING INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
a Nevada corporation,  
Nominal Defendant.

---

(CAPTION CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE.)

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF JONATHAN GLASER  
Los Angeles, California  
Wednesday, June 1, 2016

Reported by:  
JANICE SCHUTZMAN, CSR No. 9509  
Job No. 2312217  
Pages 1 - 293

Page 1



1 search -- CEO search was concluded and they  
2 announced Ellen was becoming the permanent CEO, one,  
3 I was not in the least bit surprised and, two, I  
4 told Andrzej in the conversation I had with him that  
5 I was not necessarily troubled by that either. 04:18PM

6 Q. Did you say to Andrzej, the CFO, why you  
7 were not troubled by that?

8 A. I don't recall, no.

9 Q. Why weren't you troubled by that?

10 A. I recognize, one, the difficulty of finding 04:18PM  
11 anybody else, particularly with the circus going on;  
12 and, two, I think she knows the company pretty well,  
13 has been there a long time, probably learned the  
14 business from her dad.

15 So I'm not convinced that there's some 04:18PM  
16 knight in shining armor out there to come in and be,  
17 you know, a great -- you know, a much better CEO of  
18 this company. I'm okay with Ellen.

19 Q. Did you -- I believe you indicated that you  
20 spoke to someone on behalf of Pico -- 04:19PM

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- Pico Holdings?

23 A. Yeah.

24 Q. Do you recall -- you don't remember who the  
25 name was? 04:19PM

# **EXHIBIT 41**

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

DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR.,	)	
individually and	)	
derivatively on behalf of)	)	
Reading International,	)	
Inc.,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. A-15-719860-B
vs.	)	Coordinated with:
MARGARET COTTER, et al.,	)	Case No. P-14-082942-E
Defendants.	)	
and	)	
READING INTERNATIONAL,	)	
INC., a Nevada	)	
corporation,	)	
Nominal Defendant)	)	

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF WILLIAM GOULD  
TAKEN ON JUNE 8, 2016  
VOLUME 1

JOB NUMBER 315485  
REPORTED BY:  
PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400



1 school.

2 A. Including high school.

3 Q. No. Following high school.

4 A. Oh, following. I went to Loyola  
5 Marymount University, was an English major, and then  
6 after that went to U.C.L.A. Law School, graduated in  
7 1963.

8 Q. And in whatever form suits you, if you  
9 would, please, describe your professional  
10 experience, job position and title.

11 A. I'm a partner at the Law Firm of Troy  
12 and Gould. Basically I'm a corporate lawyer. I  
13 don't do litigation. I do business transactions,  
14 security offerings, capital raising, and then  
15 disputes among partners.

16 So those would be my main areas of  
17 expertise.

18 Q. Has that been the case since you began  
19 practice?

20 A. It has. But the level of it changed  
21 from being more into the weeds than now being more  
22 in corporate governance type things.

23 Q. And describe for us, if you would,  
24 please, your corporate governance practice.

25 A. I advise boards of directors on proper

1 procedures to be followed and how the directors can  
2 fulfill their responsibilities in following through  
3 and taking actions.

4 Q. And by "responsibilities," are you  
5 referring to their fiduciary duties?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And I do not intend make this a law  
8 exam, Mr. Gould. I'm not going to ask a dozen of  
9 these questions, but I'll ask a couple of  
10 foundational questions.

11 So if you would, please, with that as  
12 context, what in general terms would you describe  
13 the fiduciary obligations of directors of public  
14 companies to be?

15 MR. SWANIS: Objection. Form.

16 MR. HELPERN: Join.

17 MR. RHOW: You can answer.

18 THE WITNESS: Well, I think it -- a  
19 fiduciary is very similar to a trust beneficiary  
20 type of relationship. And the directors have to use  
21 their best efforts and due care in making decisions  
22 on behalf of the corporation for the benefit of the  
23 corporation and the shareholders. That's the  
24 essence of it.

25 ///

1 three members of the C.E.O. search committee?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Okay. So let me backfill a little bit.

4 So the first step in the C.E.O. search  
5 process was formation of the committee; is that  
6 right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And how did that come to pass?

9 A. Early on when -- there were two  
10 committees that were being formed. One committee  
11 was a committee -- was an executive committee, one  
12 committee was a search committee.

13 This happened, oh, I would say, in June  
14 of 2015, around that time, June or July.

15 Ellen asked me if I would like to be a  
16 member of the executive committee.

17 And I said "No, I don't have time for  
18 it." I knew that would be an extensive job. But I  
19 did tell her at that time that I would be willing to  
20 serve on the search committee.

21 So, when the board approved it, she  
22 basically included my name as one of the four  
23 persons who would be on that committee.

24 Q. Did Ellen select the four members of the  
25 committee?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Did anybody respond?

3 A. There was responses, and I think, you  
4 know -- I think the general feeling was that as long  
5 as -- my feeling was -- I should just say it that  
6 way -- my feeling was I didn't feel as strongly  
7 about it as he did, because any major decisions of  
8 the executive committee would have to be reported to  
9 the board.

10 And I felt that a lot of corporations do  
11 have executive committees, and it didn't bother me  
12 as it bothered Tim.

13 Q. When you say, Mr. Gould, any major  
14 decisions would have to be reported to the board,  
15 are you saying that the executive committee would  
16 make the decision but that the board would learn to  
17 it?

18 MR. SWANIS: Object to form.

19 MR. HELPERN: Join.

20 MR. RHOW: I think it's vague, but you  
21 can answer.

22 THE WITNESS: Well, I think that, you  
23 know, the problem -- I think both reported, and I  
24 think -- I think the executive committee using its  
25 judgment would not make important decisions without



1 having them vetted out by the board. It's like the  
2 chief executive of the company would not make major  
3 decisions without clearing it with the board.

4 And so I -- I wasn't concerned until I  
5 saw the executive committee -- unless I saw that the  
6 executive committee was doing things outside their  
7 scope of what I thought their authority should be.

8 BY MR. KRUM:

9 Q. You understand that the executive  
10 committee set the date for the 2015 annual  
11 shareholders meeting, right?

12 MR. HELPERN: Objection to form.

13 MR. SWANIS: Join.

14 THE WITNESS: I wasn't aware of that. I  
15 mean I may have been aware of it at the time but  
16 I've forgotten it.

17 BY MR. KRUM:

18 Q. Do you recall that the executive  
19 committee set the date for the -- the record date  
20 with respect to the 2015 annual shareholders  
21 meeting?

22 MR. RHOW: Foundation.

23 MR. SWANIS: Object to form.

24 MR. RHOW: Foundation.

25 MR. HELPERN: Join.

1 MR. RHOW: You can answer.

2 THE WITNESS: I can't recall that.

3 BY MR. KRUM:

4 Q. Given the circumstances that existed in  
5 2015, what was your thought at the time about  
6 whether the executive committee should set the  
7 record date and the annual shareholder meeting date  
8 or that the full board should do some?

9 MR. SWANIS: Objection. Form,  
10 foundation.

11 MR. HELPERN: Join.

12 THE WITNESS: I had no thought about it.

13 BY MR. KRUM:

14 Q. What discussion was there at the board  
15 meeting you've been describing at which the  
16 executive committee was repopulated about who would  
17 or should be a member of that executive committee?

18 A. Well, I think Tim Storey expressed his  
19 concerns about having the committee in general.

20 I think Jim Cotter, Jr., expressed  
21 concerns about having the composition of the  
22 executive committee. He was concerned about --  
23 particularly about Guy Adams.

24 Q. What did he say about Guy Adams?

25 A. He said that Guy Adams, he felt, was not

1 an independent director.

2 Q. Do you recall what, if anything, he said  
3 as to why he thought Mr. Adams did not qualify as an  
4 independent director?

5 A. He -- he said that a large percentage of  
6 Guy Adams's income was dependent upon the Cotter  
7 family and the corporation.

8 Q. Had you ever heard or been told that  
9 previously?

10 A. I'm not so sure I had known -- I think  
11 Jim Cotter, Jr. Had mentioned this at meetings, but  
12 I had no direct knowledge of that. I had no idea  
13 about Guy Adams's net worth or what his income was.

14 I did know he had worked for Jim Cotter,  
15 Sr., done some work for him. But I had always  
16 assumed Guy had a number of other business  
17 activities that he really earned his living by.

18 Q. Okay. Did you ever learn otherwise?

19 MR. SWANIS: Objection to form.

20 THE WITNESS: Yes.

21 BY MR. KRUM:

22 Q. When?

23 A. About three weeks ago or a month ago.

24 Q. What did you learn about three weeks or  
25 a month ago?



1           A.    I learned that in Guy Adams's deposition  
2   he admitted that a great percentage of his net worth  
3   had come from the corporate -- not his net worth,  
4   but his earnings had been derived from the  
5   corporation and from the Cotter family.

6           **Q.    And by "the corporation" you're**  
7   **referring to RDI?**

8           A.    RDI.

9           **Q.    What, if anything, did you do as a**  
10   **consequence of learning that information?**

11           A.    I was asked whether Guy Adams was -- if  
12   I considered him independent for the purposes of his  
13   service on the comp committee.

14           **Q.    Who asked you that?**

15           A.    Craig Tompkins and Ellen Cotter.

16           **Q.    What was your response?**

17                   MR. SWANIS: I just want to object to  
18   this line of questioning, object on attorney-client  
19   privilege.

20                   I didn't know if you were heading into  
21   the -- the person that asked him that.

22                   MR. KRUM: Well, no. I haven't asked  
23   about what Mr. Tompkins said --

24                   MR. SWANIS: Let me finish.

25                   MR. KRUM: I'm sorry. Go ahead.



1 MR. SWANIS: To the extent that  
2 communications with Mr. Tompkins for the purposes of  
3 soliciting or providing information is providing  
4 legal advice to the company, those communications  
5 are privileged.

6 To the extent the purpose was not for  
7 the purpose of providing -- or communications were  
8 not for the purpose of providing advice, then you  
9 may answer the question.

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you. This was not  
11 really legal advice. He asked -- They asked my  
12 opinion, how I felt about it.

13 BY MR. KRUM:

14 Q. What did you tell him?

15 A. I told him that I did not believe he was  
16 independent for the purpose of serving on the  
17 audit -- on the nomination -- on the compensation  
18 committee.

19 Q. Did you explain why you thought that?

20 A. Yes, I did.

21 Q. What did you tell him?

22 A. I said that even though he did not  
23 violate the test -- the concrete test laid out by  
24 the Exchange, that there is an overriding test on  
25 particular types of transactions where a person

1 might be not independent for that type of  
2 transaction.

3 And clearly if Mr. Adams's income was  
4 substantially derived from Reading and the Cotter  
5 family, if his whole livelihood depended on them, he  
6 could not be independent in passing on the  
7 compensation of the Cotter family members.

8 **Q. What other types of transactions were**  
9 **you referencing in your last answer, if any, beyond**  
10 **passing on compensation of Cotter family members?**

11 A. That -- that's what I was referencing,  
12 just that particular matter.

13 **Q. What types of transactions are subject**  
14 **to the overriding test you just described?**

15 MR. HELPERN: Objection. Form.

16 MR. SWANIS: Join. Foundation.

17 THE WITNESS: Well, if a question -- a  
18 party, for example, was totally independent, has a  
19 separate business relationship or transaction  
20 proposed with the company, even though that person  
21 might otherwise be independent for all other  
22 purposes, that transaction brings into question that  
23 person's independence with respect to that  
24 transaction. That's what I was referring to.  
25 ///

1 BY MR. KRUM:

2 Q. Mr. Gould, what other discussions, if  
3 any, have you had with anyone regarding the subject  
4 of Mr. Adams's independence or lack of independence?

5 A. The only people I talked to about that  
6 were Ellen and Craig Tompkins. I don't recall  
7 discussing it with anybody else.

8 Q. Mr. Adams has resigned from the RDI  
9 board of directors compensation committee, correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. But he was on the RDI board of directors  
12 compensation committee when it approved the  
13 compensation packages -- the new compensation  
14 packages for Ellen Cotter and Margaret Cotter  
15 earlier in calendar year 2016, correct?

16 MR. HELPERN: Objection to form.

17 MR. SWANIS: Join.

18 BY MR. KRUM:

19 Q. Mr. Adams also was a vocal proponent in  
20 support of terminating Jim Cotter, Jr., correct?

21 MR. SWANIS: Objection to form.

22 THE WITNESS: Yes.

23 MR. HELPERN: Join.

24 MR. RHOW: I'm --

25 ///

1 words "given the situation"?

2 A. None of the candidates met the perfect  
3 profile that we all wish we would come up with, you  
4 know, somebody like from central casting.

5 Ellen did not have certain of the  
6 qualities we were looking for in the sense of the  
7 real estate experience and this and that. But none  
8 of the candidates had what we were looking for.

9 So, as we interviewed these  
10 candidates -- and by the way, all of them were very,  
11 very qualified good candidates. They really were.  
12 I was very impressed with the quality of the people  
13 that Korn Ferry had put forward.

14 And this became apparent to me, anyway,  
15 that Ellen was the type of person who would continue  
16 the continuity, that people liked her, that she had  
17 had a good reputation, we had been working with her  
18 for all these years. And given all those  
19 circumstances, she stood head and shoulders above a  
20 person who would be asked to come into this horrible  
21 vicious situation.

22 It made it almost an impossible task for  
23 somebody to enter this corporate management  
24 structure and be able to thrive.

25 Q. So is it fair to say your view was that



1 foundation.

2 MR. HELPERN: Join.

3 THE WITNESS: Yes.

4 BY MR. KRUM:

5 Q. When did you first hear that?

6 A. Around the same time frame, early --  
7 early 2015.

8 Q. You understood that there were disputes  
9 between Ellen and Margaret Cotter on one hand and  
10 Jim Cotter, Jr., on the other hand regarding certain  
11 trust matters, correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And was your understanding of the nature  
14 of those disputes?

15 A. Well, I didn't get much into those  
16 disputes, but my general understanding is that it  
17 all basically concerned an amendment to a trust  
18 where the -- Margaret had been the sole trustee, and  
19 now when Jim, Sr., was very sick, he amended that  
20 trust to make Jim, Jr., a co-trustee.

21 That was the essence of what I knew  
22 about it.

23 Q. And the trust to which you just  
24 referred, was that the trust that was going to hold  
25 the RDI class B voting stock?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And so the issue was about whether  
3 Margaret alone or Margaret as co-trustee with  
4 Jim, Jr., would control over 50 percent of the RDI  
5 class B voting stock, right?

6 A. Right.

7 Q. And the point of that is the person or  
8 persons who controlled that voting stock were in a  
9 position to select and elect members of the RDI  
10 board, right?

11 MR. SWANIS: Objection. Form.

12 THE WITNESS: Yes.

13 BY MR. KRUM:

14 Q. Did any other member of the RDI board of  
15 directors ever express in your presence or in an  
16 email that you saw a view on the issue of whether  
17 Margaret or Margaret and Jim should be trustees of  
18 the voting trust?

19 MR. SWANIS: Objection. Form.

20 MR. HELPERN: Join.

21 THE WITNESS: Well, Jim, Jr., showed me  
22 some videos of his father contemporaneously with the  
23 signing of the -- of the amendment, and the  
24 discussion came up generally, but it was never part  
25 of the board proceedings. I don't recall it.

1 finished.

2 A. I'm ready.

3 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 274?

4 A. I do.

5 Q. What is it?

6 A. It's an email from Jim, Jr., to me  
7 giving me some information about Linda Pham's  
8 history with the company.

9 Q. Do you have any recollection as you sit  
10 here today, Mr. Gould, why --

11 Well, did you know at the time why he  
12 sent this email to you?

13 A. Well, I was then acting as lead director  
14 and was communicating with the other directors on  
15 the general subject. And I had established a pretty  
16 good line of communication with Jim, Jr.

17 Q. Okay. What was the status of the Linda  
18 Pham investigation as of February 20, 2015?

19 A. I'm not certain.

20 Q. Meaning you don't recall?

21 A. I don't recall.

22 Q. Okay. We're done with that exhibit.

23 When was the first time you heard anyone  
24 speak of or refer to replacing Jim Cotter, Jr., as  
25 C.E.O., including with an interim C.E.O.?

1           A.    That would have been in late April,  
2    early May 2015.

3           **Q.    What happened then?**

4           A.    There was a notice sent out to the board  
5    indicating there would be a meeting to discuss,  
6    among other things, the status of the -- something  
7    like this, the status of the C.E.O. or something  
8    like that.

9                   And I called for an independent board  
10   meeting to find out what this was all about and what  
11   the issues were.

12                   And that's when I first heard it.

13           **Q.    How did you first hear?**

14           A.    At some meeting we had -- there were  
15   several meetings, so excuse me if I'm not specific  
16   about which one on which date.

17                   But at this meeting I heard the three  
18   other directors, Tim -- not Tim Storey, but Guy,  
19   Doug and Ed Kane say they felt that -- that Jim's  
20   performance was such that he should be replaced.

21           **Q.    Was that at the first supposed board**  
22   **meeting pursuant to the -- where the agenda item was**  
23   **status of president and C.E.O.?**

24                   MR. SWANIS:  Objection to form.

25                   THE WITNESS:  No.  It was before that.



1 BY MR. KRUM:

2 Q. What is Exhibit 11?

3 A. Exhibit 11 is a -- basically is an email  
4 from me to the independent directors, basically  
5 setting the agenda for this telephonic meeting we  
6 were going to have.

7 Q. Did you send Exhibit 11 on or about  
8 March 6 or 7, 2015?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Directing your attention to the next to  
11 last page of Exhibit 11, it bears production number  
12 249 in the lower right-hand corner.

13 Do you have that?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. You see that item number four concerns  
16 Tim Storey acting as ombudsman --

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. -- and so forth?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Is that the arrangement to which you  
21 were referring a moment ago?

22 A. Yes, it is.

23 Q. Does that refresh your recollection --

24 A. Yes, it does.

25 Q. Let me finish.

1 Does that refresh your recollection  
2 that -- that it was in March of 2015 that the five  
3 non-Cotter directors agreed to Tim Storey being a  
4 committee of one or the ombudsman to work with the  
5 Cotters?

6 A. Yes.

7 MR. SWANIS: Objection to form.

8 MR. HELPERN: Join.

9 BY MR. KRUM:

10 Q. Now, did the -- did the conference call  
11 of March 12 occur that's referenced both in the  
12 cover email Exhibit 11 and the --

13 A. Yes, it did.

14 Q. And who said what during that call  
15 regarding Tim Storey serving as a committee of one  
16 or ombudsman to work with the Cotters?

17 A. Well, I think all the directors felt  
18 that that was a reasonable approach to try. And it  
19 was felt by -- by everybody that hopefully Tim could  
20 accomplish three things. First of all, he would  
21 mediate -- help mediate the disputes among the three  
22 family members; secondly, he would monitor the  
23 progress of how Jim, Jr., was coming along and how  
24 the other siblings were doing, as well; and finally  
25 he would report back to the board as to how he

1 viewed the progress of -- of these relationships.

2 And everybody seemed to agree with that.

3 Q. When you say "everybody seemed to  
4 agree," you mean that no one said anything in words  
5 or substance that communicated -- well, strike that.

6 Why do you say everyone seemed to agree?

7 A. Well, the only issue I can remember was  
8 the fact that we were worried about Tim's time. He  
9 lived in Auckland, and he had to fly over here and  
10 spend time. And we knew it would be time consuming  
11 and expensive.

12 And he indicated he would be willing to  
13 do it.

14 Q. What did -- when you say he would help  
15 mediate the disputes among the three family members,  
16 to what are you referring?

17 A. I'm referring to the fact that on one  
18 hand Jim was saying that Ellen wasn't giving him  
19 the -- her business plan, and she -- Margaret was  
20 being -- refusing to do -- excuse me -- to provide  
21 anything.

22 And they were saying that Jim was making  
23 unreasonable demands on them and he was asking them  
24 for things that he shouldn't be asking them for.

25 So, Tim, who is a very successful and

1 foundation.

2 MR. HELPERN: Join.

3 THE WITNESS: Yes. We did not wait  
4 until the end of June.

5 BY MR. KRUM:

6 Q. Both you and Mr. Storey expressed to  
7 Messrs. Kane, Adams and McEachern that the process  
8 should be completed, correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Did any of them provide any response  
11 other than to communicate that they were unwilling  
12 to allow that to happen?

13 MR. HELPERN: Objection to form.

14 MR. SWANIS: Join.

15 THE WITNESS: They clearly made the  
16 statements that you had said, that they -- they felt  
17 that they were convinced that Jim's performance was  
18 such that it had to be cut off at an earlier point;  
19 that the time had come to make a decision, and we  
20 should not wait the extra month or so to get Tim  
21 Storey's final report.

22 Q. Did any of the -- any of Messrs. Kane,  
23 Adams or McEachern ever provide any responses to any  
24 interim reports provided by Mr. Storey?

25 MR. HELPERN: Objection. Lacks



1 that I think was when we received the notice of the  
2 board meeting where on the agenda was an item that  
3 looked suspicious. And that agenda item was  
4 something like "consideration of C.E.O. status."

5 Q. When you say -- when you say it looked  
6 suspicious, why do you say that?

7 A. Because there hadn't -- to me there  
8 hadn't been any discussion of that at that point.

9 Q. Did that turn out to be -- did that turn  
10 out to mean a motion to terminate Jim Cotter, Jr.,  
11 as the president and C.E.O.?

12 MR. HELPERN: Objection. Form and  
13 foundation.

14 MR. SWANIS: Join.

15 MR. RHOW: You can answer.

16 THE WITNESS: I forgot the question.

17 MR. KRUM: Okay. Sure. Would you read  
18 the question back, please.

19 (Whereupon the question was read  
20 as follows:

21 "Question: Did that turn out to  
22 be -- did that turn out to mean a  
23 motion to terminate Jim Cotter,  
24 Jr., as the president and  
25 C.E.O.?"

1 THE WITNESS: It eventually turned out  
2 to be that, yes.

3 BY MR. KRUM:

4 Q. And when you say "eventually," is that  
5 because the vote did not occur at that first  
6 meeting?

7 A. That's correct.

8 MR. KRUM: I'll ask the court reporter  
9 to mark as Exhibit 277 what purports to be a  
10 May 19th, 6:38 P.M. email from Ellen Cotter to the  
11 other members of the RDI board of directors, carbon  
12 copy to William Ellis. It bears production number  
13 GA5340.

14 (Whereupon the document referred  
15 to was marked Plaintiffs'  
16 Exhibit 277 by the Certified  
17 Shorthand Reporter and is attached  
18 hereto.)

19 THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm prepared.

20 BY MR. KRUM:

21 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 277?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. What is it?

24 A. This is an agenda for the meeting of the  
25 board of directors that was scheduled for the 21st

1 That's fine. I had the time to do it.

2 So she -- she came out to my office with  
3 Craig Tompkins and said that there was -- I think  
4 she mentioned the two directors -- she said there  
5 was a meeting coming up in like 48 hours, and she  
6 said that these were two people that had been vetted  
7 out by the three other -- other than Tim Storey and  
8 myself, by Guy and -- and Doug, and that there were  
9 two very qualified people that she felt should be on  
10 the board.

11 She went through and explained it to me.

12 I -- I was surprised on the shortness of  
13 notice, because the meeting was coming up. And I  
14 was also surprised I had not heard about this until  
15 that time. I expressed that comment to Ellen.

16 **Q. What was her response, if any?**

17 A. Well, they wanted to -- I guess the  
18 thought was that this committee, this so-called  
19 nominating committee had been doing the work, and  
20 they didn't want to get everybody -- to, you know,  
21 get things too firm until they had decided it was  
22 worth going forward with these two people.

23 **Q. What information, if any, did Ellen**  
24 **Cotter provide you about these two people?**

25 A. She provided me with resumes of both

1 BY MR. KRUM:

2 Q. I don't know whether I should be  
3 insulted by those objections.

4 A. I just have -- corporate governance, I  
5 don't know about that. Because they were -- they  
6 were involved in their own companies and -- they  
7 might have had some corporate governance experience.  
8 I think both of them probably did. Not public  
9 corporate governance, though.

10 Q. So that we can obviate these objections  
11 when you use the term "corporate governance,"  
12 Mr. Gould, what do you mean?

13 A. Well, I mean the general best practices  
14 that boards of directors should follow in operating  
15 companies and overseeing them.

16 Q. Did you ever express to Ellen Cotter the  
17 notion that the time afforded you and/or other  
18 directors who were not members of the special  
19 nominating committee to consider the persons  
20 proposed was inadequate?

21 A. Not exactly in those terms. But I did  
22 express my unhappiness that I was brought this  
23 information on such short notice.

24 Q. Did she indicate that there was some  
25 rush?



1           A.    Yes.  Because the -- I thought the proxy  
2   statement apparently was in the process of being  
3   prepared and had to go out.

4           **Q.    And by that time had you heard or**  
5   **learned that Tim Storey was not going to continue to**  
6   **be a director?**

7                   MR. SWANIS:  Objection to form,  
8   foundation.

9                   THE WITNESS:  Sometime around that time  
10   I was informed that he was not going to be staying  
11   for reelection.

12   BY MR. KRUM:

13          **Q.    Who told you what in that regard?**

14          A.    Well, I heard just -- I heard from Ellen  
15   who told me that they had decided that -- that the  
16   nominating committee had decided that he was not  
17   going to be -- that they did not want to nominate  
18   him; that the directors, the non- -- except for  
19   myself, who, by the way, I have tremendous  
20   confidence in Tim Storey, but the other directors  
21   had lost confidence in him, and that Ellen and  
22   Margaret I still think felt his -- he was focusing  
23   too much on process and procedure rather than  
24   substance.

25          **Q.    What did she tell you, if anything,**

1 what due diligence, if any, RDI had done regarding  
2 either or both of them?

3 And by RDI, I mean generally or  
4 specifically the so-called nominating committee.

5 A. Well, she -- first of all, she had  
6 known -- she had known Judy Coddling for quite a  
7 while. So she went through her statements about  
8 that. I don't remember specifically what she said.

9 But on Michael, again, she had  
10 Margaret's strong push on him. And I'm not sure if  
11 she went into any questions about diligence, any  
12 issues about diligence.

13 Q. Did you subsequently learn anything  
14 about what diligence, if any, had been done with  
15 respect to either or both of Ms. Coddling and  
16 Mr. Wrotniak?

17 A. Well, one -- the one bit of diligence  
18 that -- that was somehow missed, and that was the  
19 fact that it came to our attention after the first  
20 session where the board reviewed -- the two new  
21 directors as a whole were taking up the subject of a  
22 board meeting, it came to our attention that Andy  
23 Shapiro had uncovered by Googling that Judy Coddling  
24 had been involved in a matter involving -- I think  
25 it was in L.A. and something involving the

1 educational thing.

2 And there was a -- there were certain  
3 criminal things that were mentioned in this -- in  
4 this article.

5 And I was kind of surprised that we  
6 hadn't -- we hadn't come up with that. I mean it  
7 was embarrassing to have some third party just  
8 Google and come up with something at least we should  
9 have known about when we first considered; not that  
10 it made any difference, because subsequently we did  
11 take that into account. We grilled her on it for a  
12 great period of time, and she satisfied us.

13 But I wish I had known it the first  
14 go-around.

15 **Q. When you say, Mr. Gould, that "we**  
16 **grilled her on it," who did what?**

17 A. Well, the directors asked her questions  
18 about it. She was on the call, it was a conference  
19 call that was on a Saturday morning. I think it was  
20 on a weekend. Maybe it wasn't.

21 And she answered questions about what  
22 happened in this matter and how could she explain  
23 this -- this episode that occurred. And she did  
24 explain it.

25 **Q. Were all of the directors on that call?**



1 A. I believe they were.

2 Q. What was said, if anything, about her --  
3 the status of her employment during that phone call?

4 MR. SWANIS: Objection. Form.

5 THE WITNESS: Her employment?

6 BY MR. KRUM:

7 Q. Right. So, for example, was she asked  
8 if she expected to continue to be employed by the  
9 person -- excuse me -- by the entity by which she  
10 then was employed?

11 A. I don't recall that discussion.

12 Q. Did anybody ask in words or substance  
13 "Are you going to get fired on account of these  
14 matters that were reported in the press that were  
15 brought to our attention" --

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. -- "by Andy Shapiro?"

18 A. Well, yes. And she basically satisfied  
19 our concerns. I mean what she basically told us was  
20 this was more of a political thing and there was no  
21 substance to it.

22 And this seemed to be confirmed by the  
23 way certain governmental entities do business.

24 Q. You reviewed the proxy for the 2015  
25 annual shareholders meeting, right?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And you saw that it described her  
3 employment?

4 A. I didn't read that that carefully about  
5 other people. I don't read the whole proxy as to  
6 every single aspect of it. I read the parts that  
7 pertain to me and then the most important parts of  
8 it that I want to make sure are correct. But I  
9 didn't dwell on her employment.

10 Q. Did you ever hear or learn that her  
11 employment had terminated?

12 A. I don't recall.

13 Q. So as we sit here today, to the best of  
14 your knowledge, Ms. Cotter -- Ms. Cotter -- well,  
15 it's close.

16 A. It's close.

17 MR. RHOW: You got it both on Ms. and  
18 Cotter.

19 BY MR. KRUM:

20 Q. Try again. As you sit here today,  
21 Mr. Gould, is it your understanding that  
22 Ms. Coddington, Judy Coddington, continues to be employed  
23 by the same entity by which she was employed when  
24 she was added to the RDI board of directors?

25 A. I don't have any understanding on that.

1           Q.   Did you ever hear or learn that her  
2   employment with the entity by which she was employed  
3   when she was added to the RDI board of directors  
4   terminated following issuance of the proxy and prior  
5   to the 2015 annual shareholders meeting?

6           A.   The timing I can't tell you, but I do  
7   know I did hear that there was a -- some kind of a  
8   termination of that employment, yes. I can't tell  
9   you when I heard it.

10          Q.   Who -- who are the persons primarily  
11   responsible for preparing the proxy for the 2015  
12   annual shareholders meeting?

13          A.   Well, for this meeting I think we had a  
14   cast of thousands because there was so much involved  
15   with the disputing facts that the different sides  
16   had.

17                Basically it would be prepared first by  
18   the -- usually be prepared by Craig Tompkins who  
19   would take the proxy, put it together, submit it to  
20   outside counsel.

21                Now, there were several different  
22   outside counsel that had to be -- had to review this  
23   proxy. The various factions had their attorneys who  
24   also looked at it.

25                So that's the way -- by the time the



1 board got it, it was almost a semi-completed  
2 document. And most of us on the board -- I mean I'm  
3 just speaking for myself. I don't read every single  
4 part of the proxy statement. You read the parts  
5 that, you know, pertain to you and the most  
6 important parts of it, but a lot of the stuff you  
7 just skip over.

8 **Q. With respect to the proxy statement for**  
9 **the 2015 annual shareholders meeting, did you direct**  
10 **any particular questions to anybody about any aspect**  
11 **of it?**

12 A. Yes. I think there were some mistakes  
13 made in the column of stock ownership and when  
14 the -- I think it's in this -- on the proxy  
15 statement rather than in the -- in the 10-K, but  
16 there were some -- some minor errors. And I think I  
17 did comment on those.

18 **Q. Did you review the portion of the proxy**  
19 **statement for the 2015 annual shareholders meeting**  
20 **that -- well, strike that.**

21 **What -- when you say mistakes in the**  
22 **column of stock ownership, are you talking about --**  
23 **well, what were those mistakes, if you recall?**

24 A. Well, they were -- one was -- there were  
25 a couple of them. They had -- the footnote was in



1           **Q.   How did that call come to pass, if you**  
2   **know?**

3           A.   Yes.  The call came because there had  
4   been this discovery of this letter or this email  
5   Andy Shapiro had sent out to the board members about  
6   this problem that Judy Coddling had had with the City  
7   of Los Angeles with this -- this education issue.

8                   And all of us were blind sided.  I was  
9   blind sided to get that information and was a little  
10  bit disappointed that we hadn't done our own Google  
11  search.

12          **Q.   Was an email or an outlook calendar**  
13   **invitation or something of that nature sent around**  
14   **to schedule this call with Ms. Coddling on a**  
15   **Saturday?**

16          A.   I believe that the call was -- was set  
17   up informally.  I don't think -- I'm not sure there  
18   was an Outlook calendar set up on it.

19          **Q.   When you say "informally," was that mean**  
20   **telephonically?**

21          A.   Telephonically, yes.

22          **Q.   If I told you that Jim Cotter, Jr., was**  
23   **not on the call, would that refresh your**  
24   **recollection as to whether he was?**

25                   MR. SWANIS:  Object to form.

# **EXHIBIT 42**

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

DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR.,	)	
individually and	)	
derivatively on behalf of	)	
Reading International,	)	
Inc.,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. A-15-719860-B
vs.	)	Coordinated with:
MARGARET COTTER, et al.,	)	Case No. P-14-082942-E
Defendants.	)	
and	)	
READING INTERNATIONAL,	)	
INC., a Nevada	)	
corporation,	)	
Nominal Defendant	)	

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF WILLIAM GOULD  
TAKEN ON JUNE 29, 2016  
VOLUME 2

Job No.: 319129  
REPORTED BY:  
PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400

1 Q. Can you read the handwriting to the  
2 right of that?

3 A. "8-K will be filed tomorrow."

4 Q. Okay. Do you recall to what 8-K that  
5 referred?

6 A. I don't.

7 Q. Okay. So this is in October of 2014.

8 Do you recall any -- any events that  
9 warranted or required the filing of an 8-K by the  
10 company in October of 2014?

11 A. When did the litigation -- it depended  
12 on when the litigation got filed. Was that -- had  
13 that been filed by that time?

14 Q. My understanding, Mr. Gould, is that the  
15 litigation was filed in January of 2015.

16 A. I see.

17 MR. RHOW: Don't speculate.

18 THE WITNESS: I just don't remember when  
19 it was.

20 BY MR. KRUM:

21 Q. Okay. Well, I can always find documents  
22 to prompt your memory.

23 A. Okay.

24 Q. Now, as a practical matter, would you  
25 have seen the 8-K before it was filed?

1 A. As a practical matter, I would have.

2 Q. What was the practice you employed in  
3 terms of reviewing 8-K's filed by the company?

4 A. Usually the company's counsel would  
5 submit to the directors before they would file a  
6 version of the 8-K for the directors to review.

7 Q. Your practice was to review them?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And was it also your practice to  
10 communicate to counsel for the company any comments  
11 or corrections you had?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Was there a practice at the company with  
14 respect to counsel for the company or whomever else  
15 distributed the 8-K's undertaking to contact each of  
16 the directors and obtain feedback, or was it left to  
17 the director to choose whether to respond?

18 How did that process play out typically?

19 A. It would be -- it would change a little  
20 bit depending on nature of the 8-K. But usually the  
21 8-K draft would come out; say if you have any  
22 comments or suggestions, notify Craig Tompkins or  
23 whoever was responsible for the preparation of the  
24 8-K.

25 Q. And was there a practice that



1 Mr. Tompkins or whomever it was would wait a certain  
2 period of time before filing the 8-K so as to make  
3 sure directors had an opportunity to review and  
4 respond?

5 A. We would try, but we had -- the 8-K had  
6 a firm deadline. It had to be filed in four days.  
7 And so all the directors knew that that was the time  
8 frame.

9 And sometimes these 8-K's would come out  
10 at inconvenient times for some directors. They  
11 couldn't get back to him in time.

12 Q. Directing your attention to the item two  
13 items above the "filings 13D's," you see it begins  
14 "William 'Bill' Ellis"?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And then there is some handwriting to  
17 the right of that.

18 Can you read that?

19 A. Yes, I can.

20 Q. Was does it --

21 A. It says,

22 "Approve employment agreement.

23 Corporate secretary approve" -- or

24 "corporate secretary," and then it

25 says "approve 60,000 stock



1 internal candidates through Korn Ferry's unique  
2 proprietary assessment process.

3 Do you see that?

4 A. I do.

5 Q. Do you recall that Korn Ferry's  
6 proprietary assessment process was one of the stated  
7 reasons for engaging Korn Ferry?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Okay. To your knowledge, was any  
10 candidate put through a Korn Ferry proprietary  
11 assessment process?

12 A. To my knowledge, no.

13 Q. In fact, the C.E.O. search committee  
14 told Korn Ferry not to pursue that process with any  
15 candidates because the committee had already settled  
16 on Ellen Cotter, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. I direct your attention, Mr. Gould,  
19 further down on the second paragraph on the first  
20 page of Exhibit 375.

21 Toward the end of the line the sentence  
22 says -- reads as follows:

23 "But I think that it would be a big  
24 mistake for Reading to just anoint  
25 one of the internal candidates as

1 MR. TAYBACK: That's good.

2 THE WITNESS: I'm prepared.

3 BY MR. KRUM:

4 Q. Mr. Gould, do you recognize Exhibit 377?

5 A. I recognize the interview preparation  
6 portion of it.

7 Q. Are you talking about the attachments to  
8 the emails --

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. -- the second and third pages?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. What did you do -- what did you -- well,  
13 strike that.

14 So you received and reviewed the Reading  
15 International interview preparation two -- page  
16 document?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. What did you do with it, if anything,  
19 beyond read it?

20 A. Well, I thought about the questions and  
21 made some notes at the time and got prepared for  
22 this call that Korn Ferry said they were going to  
23 have with each of us.

24 MR. TAYBACK: Mark, could I just ask,  
25 can we take a short break, just two minutes?

1 MR. KRUM: Sure.

2 VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: We are off the  
3 record.

4 The time is 11:33.

5 (Brief recess.)

6 VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: We are on the  
7 record.

8 The time is 11:39.

9 BY MR. KRUM:

10 Q. Mr. Gould, directing your attention to  
11 the -- was it a call or a meeting that followed your  
12 receipt of the Korn Ferry interview preparation  
13 document.

14 A. It was a call.

15 Q. Okay. Who participated in that call?

16 A. Just myself and Bob Mayes and one other  
17 person from Korn Ferry.

18 Q. How long did your call last?

19 A. My recollection is it was over an hour,  
20 maybe an hour and 15 minutes, around that period of  
21 time.

22 Q. As best you can recall, what did they  
23 say and what did you say?

24 A. Well, we talked generally about each of  
25 these subjects. And, you know, I think at that time

1 BY MR. KRUM:

2 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 378?

3 A. I do.

4 Q. Did you receive it on or about the date  
5 it bears, September 3, 2015?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. What happened next in the -- with  
8 respect to the RDI C.E.O. search?

9 A. My recollection is that there was a  
10 subsequent version of this following this one, but  
11 I'm not certain. Because I know I had a  
12 conversation with at least Craig Tompkins where he  
13 pointed out to me -- and I think he was right --  
14 that there was too much emphasis on solely the real  
15 estate side of it.

16 Q. Did you have any conversations with  
17 anyone at Korn Ferry with respect to the position  
18 specification document on or after September 3,  
19 2015?

20 A. I can't re- -- I can't remember specific  
21 conversation about that.

22 Q. So, for example, when you -- when you  
23 referred in your prior response to a conversation  
24 you had with Craig Tompkins, how did that conclude?

25 A. I don't recall.



1 MR. RHOW: I will ask.

2 BY MR. KRUM:

3 Q. So, Mr. Gould, continuing on on  
4 page 23 -- production number 234 in the lower right  
5 of Exhibit 386, what does that handwriting say?

6 A. Well, again there are three points. One  
7 was -- the first point looks like "public company  
8 experience."

9 The second point I'm having a hard time  
10 making out, something about exposure. And the third  
11 one was "international," I was wondering about his  
12 international experience.

13 Q. Take a look at the page of Exhibit 386  
14 that bears production number 239 on the lower right.  
15 There's some handwriting in the left-hand margin.

16 What does that say?

17 A. He was sometimes in California. And  
18 then something about relationship, and then "move  
19 New York City."

20 I -- I was making these notes quickly,  
21 and I don't -- I can't really recall what they  
22 related to.

23 Q. Okay. Do you recall what your -- as a  
24 general matter what your impressions were of  
25 Mr. Brooks, if any, beyond the four points you

1 listed on the page bearing production number WG230?

2 A. Yes. I was -- I was impressed with  
3 Mr. Brooks. I thought he had a very pleasant  
4 personality, he seemed like he had good people  
5 skills. He was short of experience on being --  
6 being with a public company. He was primarily a  
7 real estate person totally. But overall I thought  
8 he -- he conducted himself very well during the  
9 interview.

10 Q. At the conclusion of the interview did  
11 you view Mr. Brooks as a -- as someone who might --  
12 you might approve or suggest offering the C.E.O.  
13 position?

14 A. I thought he was in the hunt at that  
15 point. That was how I would say.

16 I hadn't reached any conclusions but I  
17 felt that I was really grateful to Korn Ferry for at  
18 least presenting one good candidate.

19 Q. He was the first one you interviewed?

20 A. The first one we interviewed.

21 Q. Okay. Let's go to the page bearing  
22 production 245 in the lower right. This is the  
23 first page of the candidate report for Mr. Cruse,  
24 C-r-u-s-e, still on Exhibit 386.

25 Do you have that?



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Can you read your handwriting on the --  
3 on the face page of the report regarding Mr. Cruse?

4 A. Yes. I was impressed with him as you --  
5 as -- I will read what I said. My notes on him  
6 were,

7 "Very impressive, but he might take  
8 another position."

9 He was talking about something else he  
10 was interested in. I said, "very" something -- I  
11 can't read what I said. But then I note -- then it  
12 says,

13 "I like him, this guy is good, he  
14 likes deals and is very  
15 impressive."

16 So, he made a very good impression on  
17 me.

18 Q. Okay. Let's go to the next page.

19 What does your handwriting next to the  
20 blacked out compensation box say?

21 A. It says,

22 "Discretionary, tied to standards."

23 I was -- I was I guess there -- my note  
24 there says,

25 "Discretionary or tied to

1 standards."

2 So I guess I was -- I don't remember  
3 what I was actually thinking then. I was wondering  
4 about his compensation package, what it would be.

5 Q. I direct your attention to the portion  
6 of the report on -- regarding Mr. Cruse that bears  
7 production number WG255 in the lower right-hand  
8 corner, still part of Exhibit 386.

9 Do you see the portion of the text  
10 that's underlined?

11 Do you have 255?

12 A. I do.

13 Q. You see the portion of the text that's  
14 underlined concerning Mr. Cruse being willing to  
15 function as an interim C.E.O. so RDI had an  
16 opportunity to try him out and vice versa?

17 A. Yes, I do.

18 Q. Do you recall that?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And what were your thoughts about that?

21 A. Interesting -- interesting way to go.  
22 It might be something we should think about.

23 Q. And so what were your thoughts about  
24 Mr. Cruse at the conclusion of his interview?

25 A. Very favorable. But I did find that he

1 had -- again, there were some limitations in his  
2 background.

3 As you go through here there were some  
4 issues with him, as well. He was presently base --  
5 basically he was operating his own private equity  
6 firm. He really hadn't had the kind of experience  
7 in anything other than the real estate area,  
8 although he had done hotels and deals of that sort.

9 But I -- I did feel as much as I liked  
10 him, I wanted to see more people.

11 Q. On the page bearing production number  
12 WG254, there is some handwriting in the upper right.

13 What does that say?

14 A. Oh, he was talking about his work in the  
15 hospitality business. And I was trying to -- I made  
16 a note that says hospitality tied to theaters.  
17 Because theaters is a -- in a sense kind of a --  
18 it's related to the hospitality business.

19 Q. Okay. Let's look at the candidate  
20 report on Mr. Chin which begins at WG257 as part of  
21 Exhibit 286.

22 Do you have that?

23 A. I do.

24 Q. You see on the next page that bears  
25 production number WG258 there's some handwriting?



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. At the bottom what does the handwriting  
3 say?

4 A. Yeah. At the bottom it says -- this is  
5 a restructuring guy. His emphasis was really more  
6 on companies that are in trouble. He was -- he was  
7 a very -- you know, he was a good candidate, but his  
8 skills were directed more toward coming in and being  
9 a -- a business doctor.

10 Q. Okay. And in the left-hand margin, what  
11 does that handwritten note say?

12 A. "Too high." That relates to  
13 compensation. I -- whatever was in that column  
14 looked to me that it was way out of anything that  
15 RDI would be offering any permanent C.E.O.

16 Q. Did you have that thought about the  
17 compensation for any candidates other than Mr. Chin?

18 A. I don't recall right now whether I did  
19 or not.

20 Q. Okay. Let's go to the candidate report  
21 for Mr. Sheridan, it begins on WG267 of Exhibit 386.

22 The next page 268 has some handwriting  
23 in the upper right-hand margin.

24 What does that say?

25 A. "Where are you from?"

1           **Q. Do you have any idea what that meant?**

2           A. Yes. I was trying to find out what part  
3 of the country he was from, because he went to the  
4 University of Michigan Law School and -- and the  
5 University of Michigan undergraduate, and I was  
6 wondering whether he was from Michigan.

7           **Q. You don't have many notes with respect**  
8 **to Mr. Sheridan.**

9                   **Do you recall what impression you had**  
10 **after you interviewed him?**

11          A. Well, I remember my impression changed.  
12 At first I was a little dubious that a lawyer could  
13 be coming in and be the right kind of person for the  
14 job.

15                   But after talking to him I was -- I saw  
16 that he had a great deal of good experience and  
17 seemed to have been performing very well in the  
18 areas that he had been trained in.

19           **Q. So at the conclusion of his interview**  
20 **did you think he was in the hunt?**

21          A. Yes.

22           **Q. And was that true for each of the four**  
23 **candidates except for Mr. Chin?**

24          A. I believe there were -- I think that  
25 there were two or three of them that I liked better



1 than others. And if I had prioritize them, I would  
2 put Mr. Sheridan and I think maybe Mr. Brooks are  
3 two of the ones that I thought were the better of  
4 the two.

5 Q. Okay. Did you meet Mr. Clayton? That  
6 is the fifth candidate --

7 A. Not at this -- not at that session. I  
8 think we had a separate meeting later on with  
9 Mr. Clayton. I'm not certain.

10 Q. What were your impressions of  
11 Mr. Clayton?

12 A. As I sit here right now I can't recall  
13 any particulars of that -- of that meeting, of that  
14 interview.

15 Q. Did you also meet a candidate by the  
16 name of Martin Caverly?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. When did you meet him?

19 A. I don't remember when, but I do remember  
20 meeting him. I believe he came in later at a  
21 subsequent session.

22 Q. Now, he came in in December, correct?

23 A. I believe that's right. I think he  
24 could not make the original schedule in -- in  
25 November.

1           **Q. Did Ellen Cotter participate in the**  
2   **interviews on Friday the 13th of any or all of**  
3   **Brooks, Cruse, Chin and Sheridan?**

4           A. No.

5           **Q. Why not, if you know?**

6           A. Yes. At the beginning as we were about  
7   to begin our interviewing session we all arrived at  
8   the company, Ellen came into the room and said that  
9   she had decided that she was going to throw her hat  
10   into the ring for this job; and she felt that given  
11   that, it would be unethical and improper for her to  
12   be involved in the search committee.

13          **Q. What was the discussion that ensued, if**  
14   **any?**

15          A. I believe that all of us -- my rec- --  
16   my -- my response and I know Doug's was that we  
17   agree we don't think she should be involved in the  
18   search committee if she, herself, is going to be a  
19   candidate.

20          **Q. What else, if anything else, was**  
21   **discussed about the search committee or the search**  
22   **in view of Ellen's announcement that she was going**  
23   **to be a candidate?**

24          A. I can't recall anything at that time  
25   other than that.

1           **Q. Do you recall anything at any subsequent**  
2   **point in time prior to the decision to select Ellen?**

3           MR. TAYBACK: Object to the form of the  
4   question.

5           MR. FERRARIO: I'll object to the extent  
6   it calls for attorney-client communications.

7           MR. RHOW: Do you have --

8           THE WITNESS: I can't really recall  
9   anything else about that, about Ellen, her role in  
10   the search committee or anything else.

11   BY MR. KRUM:

12           **Q. Did you or anyone else ask her when she**  
13   **had decided to be a candidate?**

14           A. No.

15           **Q. Did you or anyone else ask her when she**  
16   **first considered being a candidate?**

17           A. No.

18           **Q. Did you or anyone else ask her why she**  
19   **had not disclosed prior to the day of candidate**  
20   **interviews that she was a candidate?**

21           A. Well, I believe in making her statement  
22   to the search committee members other than herself,  
23   she indicated that she had just decided that she was  
24   going to do it.

25           **Q. So your -- your memory is that when she**

1 announced before the first candidate interview at or  
2 about 8:30 in the morning on November 13, 2015, that  
3 she had been decided -- she had decided to be a  
4 candidate that she also indicated that she had just  
5 decided or words to that effect?

6 A. Words to that effect.

7 Q. And as best you can recall, what did she  
8 say in that respect?

9 A. Just the -- all I can remember is the  
10 notion that she said she had decided that she wanted  
11 to give it a try, and so she didn't think it would  
12 be proper for her to be on -- working with us on the  
13 search committee anymore.

14 Q. Okay. But the question I was asking was  
15 about what's your best recollection as to what she  
16 had said about when she had decided?

17 A. I can't recall actually what she said  
18 about that.

19 Q. And --

20 A. My impression was that she had just  
21 decided it. That's my impression.

22 Q. What's the basis for that impression?

23 A. Well, I don't know that. I can't give  
24 you any basis for it.

25 Q. Okay. Was there any discussion at that



1 remember having thought about that.

2 BY MR. KRUM:

3 Q. Did you or, to your knowledge,  
4 Mr. McEachern seek the advice of counsel with  
5 respect to the conduct of the C.E.O. search at any  
6 point in time?

7 A. No.

8 Q. What happened next after the four  
9 candidate interviews of Friday, November 13, 2015?

10 A. After that -- after that there was a --  
11 another candidate that was proposed by Korn Ferry.  
12 And I believe we had a subsequent session with  
13 Mr. Caverly. As I recall, he came in at a different  
14 time.

15 And then we had to interview Ellen.

16 So there was a subsequent -- one or two  
17 subsequent interview sessions sometime in December.  
18 One of them was done by Skype and one with the --  
19 the new candidate, which Korn Ferry had recommended  
20 was in New York, was running a privately-owned  
21 hotel, had been running it. And we interviewed that  
22 gentleman on Skype.

23 Q. Do you recall his name?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Did it begin with a D?



1 A. Could have.

2 Q. Okay. I'm sorry. I don't have the name  
3 at hand.

4 And what were your impressions of that  
5 candidate?

6 A. I thought the candidate was a --was  
7 good. I think it would have been better to have the  
8 interview in person where you get a better -- can  
9 see better the movements and look into their eyes  
10 and get a better feel for it.

11 It wasn't -- I don't think the interview  
12 on Skype was as good as a personal interview. He  
13 had the camera turned a little funny and it  
14 wasn't -- wasn't as good.

15 Q. When -- when relative to the other two  
16 candidate interviews that occurred after  
17 November 13, 2015, was Ellen interviewed?

18 A. Ellen was interviewed I believe after  
19 the Skype interview in -- with the fellow in  
20 New York, and then we had Ellen come in -- it could  
21 have been the same day as the -- as the Reading  
22 Christmas party.

23 And we interviewed Ellen -- I think she  
24 was the last candidate we interviewed.

25 Q. Who -- who is the "we"? You --

1           If I recall, he wasn't too aggressive  
2     during that interview session.

3           **Q.     With respect to the interview of Ellen**  
4     **Cotter that occurred in December, perhaps on the day**  
5     **of the Reading holiday party, how long did that**  
6     **last?**

7           A.    My guess is it -- I'm mean I'm just  
8     trying to put it -- the exact time, I guess, is  
9     about 45 minutes.

10          **Q.     Okay.   Who led that interview?**

11          A.    I did.

12          **Q.     What did you cover?   What were the**  
13     **topics you covered?**

14          A.    Doug -- when I say I led it, I think it  
15     was really Doug and myself.   He we covered all kinds  
16     of things; I mean what prior involvement, what she  
17     saw, what her future thinking was about the future  
18     of the company, how she saw her shortcomings.

19                We went through the whole gamut of -- of  
20     the same kinds of questions that we asked the  
21     others.   The only difference with Ellen was that we  
22     had had 20 years of prior experience dealing with  
23     her.   We knew a lot about her.

24          **Q.     So what did that -- what did that mean?**  
25     **That there was less in the interview learning about**

1 Q. And how long did those discussions last?

2 A. I would say they lasted 30 minutes.

3 Q. Who said what?

4 A. Well, I was actually the one that said  
5 after listening to Ellen, thinking about it, and  
6 looking at the prior candidates, even though they  
7 were all good, that she had probably made the most  
8 sense for where we were at this time. Because she  
9 had a great reputation, the people liked her at the  
10 company.

11 We all enjoyed our own -- we all thought  
12 highly of her, every one of us. She is intelligent.  
13 She had the kind of a personality that could help  
14 get through some of these difficulties dealing with  
15 other people.

16 And she had theatrical experience. She  
17 was willing to bring in real estate help.

18 And that this was a very tough time to  
19 bring in somebody from the outside given the fact  
20 that no one knew who would actually control this  
21 company a year down the line.

22 And for all those reasons, you know, it  
23 became apparent to me, my -- I just said, "This  
24 makes the most sense for the company."

25 And Doug said, "You know, I agree with

1     you."

2             **Q.     That was my next question, Mr. Gould.**

3                     **The reasons you just described, are**  
4     **those your reasons and is that what you articulated?**  
5     **Was that what you and Mr. McEachern together**  
6     **articulated or --**

7             A.     Most of them were my -- were my  
8     statements, but Doug did add a few of his own.  And  
9     I probably incorporated some of his statements in  
10    there.

11            Now, before we got into too much detail,  
12    the question was raised about Margaret leaving  
13    because she was -- she is Ellen's sister.  And, you  
14    know, both Doug and I said, "I don't think we need  
15    to do that."

16            I forget whether Margaret did excuse  
17    herself or not.  I don't remember whether she did.  
18    But from my standpoint it was just clear in my mind  
19    that this was the best solution.

20            **Q.     What did Margaret say, if anything,**  
21     **during that discussion among the three of you?**

22            A.     Margaret didn't really say too much.  
23    She was -- she -- I think Doug and I did most of the  
24    talking.

25            **Q.     Did Margaret exhibit any response to**



1 meetings.

2 Q. And in point of fact the executive  
3 committee held meetings and conducted business,  
4 correct?

5 A. It did.

6 Q. At any point in time in or after June of  
7 2015, to your knowledge did the company ever  
8 disclose in an 8-K or otherwise the changes to the  
9 composition and/or the function of the executive  
10 committee of the RDI board of directors?

11 A. I don't recall. I can't remember it.

12 Q. Did you ever have any discussions with  
13 anybody regarding the subject of whether the company  
14 could or should make a disclosure of any type  
15 regarding the changes to the composition and/or the  
16 function of the executive committee of the RDI board  
17 of directors?

18 A. I don't remember that discussion. I  
19 know at each of our meetings we had more lawyers  
20 than directors. And I think we left that subject up  
21 to the lawyers to do -- to decide whether there  
22 should be a filing made on it.

23 Q. Well, when you say that, that you think  
24 you left that subject up to the lawyers, do you  
25 actually recall a discussion in which the conclusion



1 was to leave that subject, meaning whether the  
2 company could or should make a disclosure regarding  
3 the new members or the new function of both of the  
4 executive committee, to the lawyers?

5 A. No.

6 Q. That's just your surmise looking  
7 backwards as what might have happened?

8 A. That's usually what would happen with  
9 these meetings on questions of disclosure and things  
10 like that, yes.

11 Q. And by the lawyers, to whom are you  
12 referring?

13 A. The lawyers for the company.

14 Q. Ellis --

15 A. Bill Ellis, Craig Tompkins and then  
16 outside counsel, as well. We usually had outside  
17 counsel. Or Mike Bonner would be at almost every  
18 meeting. He was a very good securities lawyer.

19 Q. I'm not asking you who said what. I'm  
20 just asking whether it happened.

21 Did you ever have any discussions with  
22 Mike Bonner about the executive committee?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Did you ever have any discussions with  
25 him about S.E.C. filings? Made by the company, of

1 previous. I don't mean to do so.

2 Either during the conversation -- well,  
3 during the conversation following Ellen Cotter's  
4 interview, who said what, if anything, about Korn  
5 Ferry?

6 A. We did discuss this earlier, but my  
7 recollection was at the time that -- that somebody  
8 said, "Well, we -- if she's our preferred candidate,  
9 then, you know, we can probably tell Korn Ferry  
10 until we decide -- or the board decides this thing,  
11 let's not have them incur any more expense doing  
12 what they were doing with respect to the other  
13 candidates. Let's see if we can keep this down --  
14 the expense down."

15 Q. What are the annual revenues of RDI?

16 MR. TAYBACK: Objection. Vague as to  
17 time.

18 BY MR. KRUM:

19 Q. In 2015 or any other time that you can  
20 identify?

21 A. Well, several -- several hundred  
22 million.

23 Q. And what was the expense that would have  
24 been saved by having Korn Ferry stand down?

25 A. It was, you know, maybe 50 -- \$50,000.

1 It doesn't seem like much, but I don't  
2 throw money in the street unless I have to.  
3 Especially when it's other people's money.

4 Q. Do you recall that -- that the Korn  
5 Ferry materials provided to the board of directors  
6 indicated that Korn Ferry would make its proprietary  
7 assessment of finalists including the internal  
8 candidates?

9 A. I do remember something like that, yes.

10 Q. Did you have any discussions with  
11 McEachern and/or Margaret Cotter about whether to  
12 follow through with the process that had been  
13 described to the full board previously by having  
14 these assessments done or by having the board  
15 determine whether to do so?

16 A. Well, at that point the internal  
17 candidates had dropped out. And so there would be  
18 no need to do assessments of them.

19 And I don't -- and I don't -- I think  
20 all of us felt that we didn't need an independent  
21 assessment of Ellen because we knew her so well.

22 Q. By the way, how do you know that Wayne  
23 Smith dropped out?

24 A. I was told at some point that -- I  
25 forget by whom, that following Ellen's announcement,

1 A. I'm not certain.

2 Q. Was this letter -- when you say this  
3 letter was public, was this distributed as part of a  
4 press release?

5 A. It clearly went out to the employees and  
6 others at the company, but I'm not -- I don't know  
7 whether it went out as a press release or not.

8 Q. Did you see drafts of this letter?

9 A. I don't recall.

10 Q. When you say you're not certain who  
11 drafted it, do you have an understanding or  
12 expectation based on some other experience?

13 A. Well, should I surmise?

14 MR. RHOW: No.

15 BY MR. KRUM:

16 Q. If you have a --

17 A. I have no understanding.

18 Q. Okay. If you have a basis, I am  
19 entitled to hearing it. But if you're simply  
20 surmising as you sit here today, I don't need to  
21 hear that.

22 A. Okay. I don't have a basis as to who  
23 prepared it.

24 Q. When did the board meeting occur with  
25 respect to the selection of the permanent C.E.O.?



1           A.    I believe it was in the first week of  
2   January.  First -- first ten days.

3           **Q.    Did someone make a presentation on**  
4   **behalf of the C.E.O. search committee?**

5           A.    Yes.  I did.

6           **Q.    Was it a -- did you have notes or did**  
7   **you have a written presentation that you used?**

8           A.    I basically went through what we had  
9   done and presented to the board what had happened  
10   and the reasons why we selected Ellen as the  
11   preferred candidate to recommend.

12                   And then I don't believe I had prepared  
13   notes.  I just did it off the cuff.

14           **Q.    Was there any discussion?**

15           A.    Yes.

16           **Q.    Excluding any comments that Jim Cotter,**  
17   **Jr., made or any responses to those comments, was**  
18   **there any discussion?**

19           A.    Yes, there was.

20           **Q.    Ed Kane said he agreed, right?**

21           A.    My -- my recollection is that's right.

22           **Q.    Did he explain why?**

23           A.    I don't remember that he did.

24           **Q.    Okay.  What else was said by anyone as**  
25   **best you can recall in terms of the discussion about**



1 and Korn Ferry personnel?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Did that occur -- okay.

4 Do you see in the last paragraph of that  
5 page that continues over onto the second page, it  
6 indicates that on December 17th the committee  
7 elected you to serve as the committee's chairman?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. What did you do as chairman of this  
10 C.E.O. search committee?

11 A. I ran the -- well, the meetings, and --  
12 and I also issued the letter, made the report to the  
13 board and then issued the -- the letter to the  
14 employees.

15 Q. And the meetings to which you're  
16 referring were on December 17th and the telephonic  
17 meeting on December 29th?

18 A. Let me see here. It would be the  
19 meeting, yes, on December 17th and the telephonic  
20 meeting on the 29th and the letter that went out.

21 Q. Is this correct that the committee --  
22 the C.E.O. search committee had a meeting on  
23 December 17th at 4:00 P.M.?

24 MR. RHOW: Bottom of page two.

25 THE WITNESS: Yes. My recollection --

1 my recollection is that it is correct.

2 BY MR. KRUM:

3 Q. Was that in person?

4 A. Yes. I believe -- I believe we -- that  
5 was the day of the -- that might have been the day  
6 of the Christmas party.

7 Q. Directing your attention to what's  
8 labeled as page three of seven, and that is of the  
9 C.E.O. search committee report, it's actually the  
10 fourth page of Exhibit 313, do you see that it says  
11 the committee discussed among other things, and so  
12 forth, and then it lists six lengthy bullet points?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Take such time as you need to review  
15 those.

16 My question is does that fairly and  
17 accurately describe what the committee discussed on  
18 the 17th of December?

19 A. Generally, yes.

20 Q. And when you say "generally," is that a  
21 qualification that you --

22 A. No. It's just that I can't remember  
23 every specific aspect of it, but in general that's  
24 my recollection of what was discussed.

25 Q. Directing your attention to the third

1 bullet point that begins with the words "The  
2 benefits and detriments of the selection of Ellen  
3 Cotter as the committee's recommended candidate," do  
4 you recall anything other than what's discussed  
5 there -- strike that.

6 Do you recall anything other than what's  
7 listed there being discussed by the committee with  
8 respect to Ellen as a candidate?

9 A. I believe that one other factor there  
10 was that having Ellen selected would create problems  
11 with one of the major shareholders, Jim, Jr.

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. Which was brought up.

14 Q. Anything else?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Directing your attention to the fourth  
17 bullet point that refers to Korn Ferry's  
18 recommendation about moving forward with the  
19 assessment process for Ellen Cotter, Dan Sheridan  
20 and Marty Caverly --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- what do you recall, if anything,  
23 being discussed about that other than the preclusion  
24 to not do so?

25 A. Well, that because -- just generally

1           Exhibit 391 does not reference any  
2   actions or observations of the special nominating  
3   committee with respect to Mr. Storey not being  
4   renominated, correct?

5           A.    Correct.

6           Q.    Nor does it make any mention of the fact  
7   that Ellen and Margaret Cotter who purported to  
8   control and vote approximately 70 percent of the  
9   voting stock had taken the position that they would  
10   not vote to reelect him?

11          A.    On that point I don't know whether they  
12   had taken that position. I had heard something to  
13   that effect, but I don't know whether they had taken  
14   that position.

15          Q.    So, did it occur to you when you read  
16   Exhibit 391 and the second paragraph on the third  
17   page of the document that simply saying that  
18   Mr. Storey had retired was omitting information that  
19   some shareholder might consider to be material to  
20   the circumstances of his departure from the RDI  
21   board of directors?

22          A.    No. I -- first of all, I wasn't very  
23   much involved in that process at all. I didn't know  
24   very much about it and was surprised to hear about  
25   it. I think I heard it from Tim Storey primarily.



1 But my knowledge of some of these things  
2 about what happened occurred after the actual  
3 resignation.

4 Q. Okay. Did you ever speak to anybody  
5 about issuing a further 8-K updating the disclosure  
6 regarding the circumstances of the departure of Tim  
7 Storey from the RDI board of directors?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Do you recall that at one of the  
10 meetings in May or June of 2015, Mr. McEachern  
11 invited Jim Cotter to resign rather than be  
12 terminated?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And do you understand that that's how it  
15 came to pass that Mr. Storey retired, is he was  
16 given the choice of not being renominated and  
17 whatever consequences, if any, flowed from that or,  
18 quote, retiring?

19 A. I come to -- I've come to learn that.  
20 And I don't know how much of that I knew at the  
21 time, because I was kept out of that process.

22 Q. Directing your attention, Mr. Gould, to  
23 the three paragraphs on the third page of  
24 Exhibit 391 starting with the word Dr. Coddington, do  
25 you see those?



1 Cotter-related entities?

2 A. No.

3 Q. To the best of your recollection, you  
4 didn't receive a phone call from him following the  
5 May or June meeting in which he refused to speak to  
6 the subject at which he explained anything about his  
7 relationship or compensation with Cotter-related  
8 companies?

9 A. I can't recall that conversation.

10 Q. At the time you read drafts of  
11 Exhibit 392 had you received any information,  
12 whether from Guy Adams or any other source, bearing  
13 upon the subject of whether he in any respect was  
14 financially independent or financially dependent on  
15 Cotter family entities?

16 A. There were discussions raised by Jim  
17 Cotter, Jr., which raised questions about  
18 Mr. Adams's financial dependence. But there was no  
19 hard evidence provided to anybody as to what whether  
20 that would be.

21 And it had not been our practice to ask  
22 people how much of their livelihood -- each  
23 director, for example, I had never been asked by the  
24 board or anybody else had.

25 So my answer was if he disclosed this --

1 and I mentioned this at the board meeting, every  
2 director prepares a D and O questionnaire. And they  
3 disclose all these things in there.

4 So all the directors don't have to know  
5 the personal finances of Jim, Jr., and myself, but  
6 the person collecting those D and O questionnaires  
7 does, and that person is a lawyer, and that person  
8 will then make a judgment as to whether or not  
9 Mr. Adams is independent or not.

10 **Q. Is it your understanding, Mr. Gould,**  
11 **that certain of the information sought by questions**  
12 **in the D and O questionnaires concerns financial**  
13 **matters and financial dependence as measured by**  
14 **Exchange -- Securities Exchange listing rules?**

15 **A. Yes.**

16 **Q. Do you have an understanding as to**  
17 **whether that measure of independence is the same or**  
18 **different than the measure of independence for the**  
19 **purpose of related party transactions?**

20 **MR. TAYBACK:** Objection. Calls for a  
21 legal opinion. You're a lawyer, but still  
22 objection.

23 **THE WITNESS:** Yeah. I think that's kind  
24 of a complicated question because I'm not sure that  
25 the -- that it calls for exactly all the information

1 to the portion that concerns Mr. Wrotniak, and you  
2 see that that will carry over to page 17, did you  
3 have any communications with anybody about whether  
4 that information should be supplemented to include  
5 information concerning his historical personal  
6 relationship -- his wife's historical close personal  
7 relationship with Margaret Cotter?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Did you think about that?

10 A. No.

11 Q. That is how he came to be a candidate to  
12 be added to the RDI board of directors, right?

13 A. Yes.

14 MR. FERRARIO: Objection. Lacks  
15 foundation.

16 MR. TAYBACK: Objection.

17 BY MR. KRUM:

18 Q. Well, when you had a meeting at your  
19 office on Friday, I think it was, Ellen Cotter told  
20 you -- Ellen Cotter told you how it was both Judy  
21 Coddington and Michael Wrotniak had come to be  
22 candidates, right?

23 A. She did.

24 Q. And she was forthright and she told you  
25 about the historical personal relationship between

1 Judy Coddington and Mary Cotter?

2 A. She did.

3 Q. And she told you about the relationship  
4 between Michael Wrotniak's wife and Margaret, right?

5 A. She did.

6 Q. Now, directing your attention,  
7 Mr. Gould, back to Judy Coddington's description on  
8 page 15.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Do you see that in the third sentence it  
11 says,

12 "She is currently, and has since of  
13 2010 been, the managing director of  
14 The System of Courses, a division  
15 of Pearson, P.L.C., a leading  
16 education company providing  
17 education products and services to  
18 institutions, governments and  
19 direct to individual learners"?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. At that -- at the time you reviewed  
22 drafts of this document did you have any  
23 understanding as to whether she knew or expected  
24 that position to terminate?

25 A. No.



1 question.

2 Q. Do you recall whether Mr. Shapiro in his  
3 email raised the issue of whether Ms. Coddington's  
4 employment was going to be terminated?

5 A. I don't remember.

6 MR. TAYBACK: Mark, when it's a  
7 convenient point for you, can we just take two  
8 minutes?

9 MR. KRUM: Sure. We'll be there in just  
10 a couple minutes.

11 BY MR. KRUM:

12 Q. Mr. Gould, I direct your attention to  
13 page 21 of Exhibit 392. And in particular to the  
14 first line in the chart entitled "Amount and nature  
15 of beneficial ownership." You see it says Ellen M.  
16 Cotter footnotes two and eight?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And then under the class B stock column  
19 it says number of shares 1,173,888 and percentage  
20 69.8?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And of course footnotes two and eight on  
23 the next page, page 22, include some explanation of  
24 those numbers, right?

25 A. Correct.



1 Q. Did you review this information?

2 A. No.

3 Q. You understood at the time there were  
4 disputes with respect to who controlled certain RDI  
5 stock, such as whether it was part of the James  
6 Cotter, Sr. Trust, whether it was part of the  
7 Estate, whether it had flowed into the voting trust,  
8 whether it had poured over into the voting trust and  
9 issues of that sort, right?

10 A. Oh, yes.

11 Q. And so why is it that you took no steps  
12 to ascertain whether this information including as  
13 set out in footnotes two and eight on page 22 of  
14 Exhibit 392 was correct?

15 A. If I spent time going through this proxy  
16 statement verifying all the facts in it, I would  
17 spend my lifetime doing it.

18 These are not the things that directors  
19 look at. I look at my own facts, how they pertain  
20 to me, but I don't know anything -- I pay virtually  
21 no attention to what's happening in the litigation  
22 among the family members.

23 So I don't even know where to start. I  
24 don't know how many shares they own. I just know  
25 that the three of them control the shares of the

1 stock of the company. But I don't know who owns  
2 what shares.

3 Q. Well, let me ask you a different  
4 question.

5 Did you ever hear or learn or were you  
6 ever told that there was a dispute about -- or a  
7 question, even, about whether any or all of the  
8 Cotters could vote the class B voting stock held in  
9 the name of the Jim -- James Cotter, Sr. Living  
10 Trust?

11 A. Yes, I was told that.

12 Q. And you see at footnote eight on page 22  
13 of Exhibit 392, about six lines from the bottom  
14 there is a discussion of the 696,080 shares of  
15 class B voting stock?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Did it occur to you that if the  
18 information about who had the right to vote that  
19 stock contained in the proxy statement was  
20 erroneous, that owners of class B voting stock who  
21 were not members of the Cotter family would be  
22 making decisions about whether to vote, how to vote,  
23 whether to act and so forth based on erroneous  
24 information?

25 MR. RHOW: Form of the question,

1 foundation.

2 THE WITNESS: No. You know, I never  
3 really even thought about that question. I'm  
4 assuming -- I had assumed at the time that these --  
5 the facts and legal conclusions were being attended  
6 to by the people who were most directly involved in  
7 them. And I had no involvement in them.

8 BY MR. KRUM:

9 Q. When you say, Mr. Gould, you had no  
10 involvement, you had no discussions with those  
11 people about these issues?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. And who were those people?

14 A. Those people would be Craig Tompkins and  
15 Bill Ellis at the company. They would be the  
16 individuals, Jim Cotter, Jr., Margaret and Ellen,  
17 and the outside counsel, Mike Bonner and others who  
18 helped prepare the -- the proxy statement.

19 Q. Okay. Well, there were disputes between  
20 Ellen and Margaret on the one hand --

21 A. Jim.

22 Q. -- and Jim, Jr. on the other hand on  
23 those issues, right?

24 A. Correct.

25 MR. FERRARIO: That's what it says.



1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And that it includes in the first  
3 paragraph under the words "Change of control of  
4 registrant" a description of, among other shares,  
5 shares that are reflected in the company's stock  
6 register as held in the name of James J. Cotter,  
7 Sr.?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And was your view of this the same as  
10 the view that you articulated with respect to  
11 information of this nature as included in the proxy,  
12 meaning that it was someone else's responsibility?

13 A. Yes.

14 MR. KRUM: Ekwan, you don't have the  
15 documents that were marked yesterday, do you?

16 MR. RHOW: I don't.

17 MR. KRUM: Okay. Here's what I'm going  
18 do, and if it's okay, Ekwan, instead of looking at  
19 the document --

20 MR. RHOW: That's fine.

21 MR. KRUM: -- I'm just going to show him  
22 one that has my --

23 MR. FERRARIO: Are you looking at  
24 yesterday's --

25 MR. KRUM: Yes. 347 is the document

1 **recollection?**

2 A. Well, the proposal of the new two  
3 candidates to me and I think to Jim, Jr., was done  
4 without a great deal of public knowledge. I did not  
5 know the process was even going on until that  
6 meeting in my office, I believe it was on a Friday,  
7 with Craig and Ellen where they informed me of what  
8 had been happening.

9 Q. And that was the Friday two days before  
10 you received this email from Jim, right?

11 A. I believe so, yes.

12 Q. I direct your attention, Mr. Gould, to  
13 the top of the second page of Exhibit 398.

14 Do you see that Mr. Cotter suggests that  
15 the board discuss the qualifications of board  
16 candidates?

17 A. Yes, I do.

18 Q. Did you agree with that observation?

19 A. Well, there is some truth in the  
20 observation that ordinarily boards decide on  
21 candidates to some extent based on their  
22 qualifications and experience.

23 But in this case there are a number of  
24 other factors that also were in play given the fact  
25 that, you know, we had a conflict among the -- the



1 directors and that unless we made some decisions  
2 going forward, the company would continue to be  
3 involved in this ongoing dispute as to almost  
4 everything.

5 Q. Okay. And how did that consideration  
6 impact the -- whether or not the board should have  
7 discussions about qualifications of candidates to be  
8 added to the board?

9 A. Well, that's -- that's one of the  
10 factors mentioned. And the other factor is that the  
11 board become constituted in a way that will help,  
12 you know, project the company into the future and  
13 have the confidence of the C.E.O. of the company.

14 And that was another factor that was  
15 important to the directors -- or I should say it was  
16 important to me.

17 I mean at this point this company had  
18 been involved in dispute after dispute after  
19 dispute. Many of Jim's points -- Jim, Jr.'s points  
20 as a general principle were valid, but there was  
21 also the factor of trying to get this company back  
22 on track. And I think that's what I was concerned  
23 about in approving the two new directors.

24 Q. Did you have any discussions with the  
25 so-called special nominating committee about whether

# **EXHIBIT 43**

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

DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR., )  
individually and )  
derivatively on behalf of )  
Reading International, )  
Inc., )  
Plaintiff, ) Case No. A-15-719860-B  
vs. ) Coordinated with:  
MARGARET COTTER, et al., ) Case No. P-14-082942-E  
Defendants. )  
and )  
READING INTERNATIONAL, )  
INC., a Nevada )  
corporation, )  
Nominal Defendant )

DEPOSITION OF: EDWARD KANE  
TAKEN ON: MAY 2, 2016

REPORTED BY:  
PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400

1 and it became in- -- difficult.

2 And so the regulators came down and they  
3 suggested that I leave, and I did.

4 **Q. When did you first meet Jim Cotter, Sr.?**

5 A. He was in the master's of tax program  
6 with me in 1963. So I met him in the fall of 1963.

7 **Q. When did you and he become friends?**

8 A. Very shortly thereafter. We found that  
9 we had similar backgrounds even though we don't --  
10 didn't have similar religions.

11 But we were both middle class, lower  
12 middle class. We lived in that neighborhood. We  
13 didn't have any money when we went to college or law  
14 school.

15 And we just -- just became fast friends.

16 He was the first person I invited to my  
17 house for dinner.

18 I was married. I had gotten married in  
19 the summer of '63. And we started socializing with  
20 he and his, I guess, fiance, Mary Ellen Cotter, went  
21 to the World's Fair with them, because Mary was  
22 working for American Airlines, could get us free  
23 tickets.

24 And then I got the position with Donovan  
25 Leisure. And he joined the -- the IRS as a trial

1 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

2 THE WITNESS: Trying to think. I can't  
3 think of any.

4 BY MR. KRUM:

5 Q. Answer this as you see fit, Mr. Kane.

6 Describe your historical relationship  
7 with Ellen and Margaret Cotter.

8 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague,  
9 overbroad.

10 THE WITNESS: I knew them as children,  
11 just as I know Jim, Jr. I don't think my  
12 relationship was any different with the three of  
13 them.

14 It was just a relationship I've had with  
15 someone I've known all my -- all their lives.

16 BY MR. KRUM:

17 Q. Do your family and the family of Jim  
18 Cotter, Sr., socialize?

19 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

20 BY MR. KRUM:

21 Q. Socialize meaning see each other  
22 socially.

23 A. No. No. Just because of the distance.

24 Q. Between San Diego and Los Angeles?

25 A. Right. Right. Right.



1 A. Probably two, two and a half years ago.

2 Q. What was your compensation in that role?

3 A. I think I was paid \$6500 month.

4 Q. And just to be clear, so that ended  
5 in -- somewhere between the beginning and the middle  
6 of 2014?

7 A. Something like that.

8 Q. Since that time have you had any income  
9 other than as a Reading director?

10 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

11 BY MR. KRUM:

12 Q. Excluding passive investment income.

13 A. Well, I have self-funded -- my wife and  
14 I have self-funded retirement plans. That's  
15 passive, I suppose you could say.

16 Q. Okay. So, since the work ended with the  
17 Community Medical Group --

18 A. Uh-huh.

19 Q. -- your sole source of income has been  
20 your self-funded retirement plans and your work as a  
21 Reading director, correct?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. How many retirement plans do you have,  
24 sir?

25 A. My wife has one and I have two.

1           **Q.   What are the principal balances of your**  
2   **two self-funded retirement plans?**

3           A.   Mine?

4           **Q.   Yes.**

5           A.   In excess of \$2 million.

6           **Q.   What sort of financial obligations do**  
7   **you have of a material magnitude, whether it be**  
8   **rent, mortgage, cars, that kind of thing?**

9           A.   I have home equity loans, less than  
10   \$200,000.

11                   I have two other home equity loans, but  
12   they're joint with my children. One with one child,  
13   one with the other, \$100,000. But the money is  
14   sitting there in a savings account -- in the bank  
15   account where -- who gave me that. That's in case  
16   there's -- we're in Europe or something or something  
17   fatal happens they'll have access to money right  
18   away.

19                   So, it's joint accounts, but it's my  
20   Social Security number.

21                   (Whereupon Mr. Ferrario re-entered  
22   the deposition proceedings at this  
23   time.)

24   BY MR. KRUM:

25           **Q.   Is that it -- excuse me.**

1                   Is that it in terms of your material  
2   financial obligations?

3           A.    That's it.

4           Q.    Okay. Mr. Kane, I'm going to show you  
5   what previously has been marked as Plaintiff's  
6   Exhibit 94.

7                   (Whereupon the document previously  
8                   marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 94  
9                   was referenced and is attached  
10                  hereto.)

11           MR. FERRARIO: I think you pick the most  
12   inconvenient depo sites I've ever been to. From the  
13   room we had to shoehorn everybody into, now to a  
14   location without parking.

15           MR. KRUM: Yeah. I didn't know about  
16   the parking. But I called another person who would  
17   have had us in a high-rise downtown, but he just  
18   retired. So, good for him.

19           MR. FERRARIO: And actually, Esquire has  
20   a pretty nice facility downtown so --

21   BY MR. KRUM:

22           Q.    All right. Mr. Kane, take such time as  
23   you need to review this document.

24                   The first question I'm going to have  
25   about this and any other document I show you is do

1 real estate people or New York people with political  
2 know-how and/or simply directors with real estate  
3 experience in New York City, Australia and New  
4 Zealand?

5 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Misstates the  
6 document.

7 THE WITNESS: I think it would be  
8 helpful to this board to have people with extensive  
9 real estate experience. But I don't -- I don't  
10 think now that it is a requirement that they be  
11 knowledgeable in New York real estate, because I  
12 think we have people onboard that are.

13 BY MR. KRUM:

14 Q. Does, to your knowledge, Judy Coddling  
15 have any real estate expertise?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Does Michael Wrotniak have any real  
18 estate expertise?

19 A. Pardon?

20 Q. Does Michael Wrotniak have any real  
21 estate expertise?

22 A. I don't know.

23 Q. Did you speak with either of them before  
24 they were added to the RDI board of directors?

25 A. Yes.



1 Q. Both of them?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Did you ask either -- did you ask  
4 Wrotniak if he had any --

5 A. No.

6 Q. -- real estate expertise?

7 A. No.

8 Q. When you spoke with Mr. Wrotniak, was  
9 that in person or by telephone?

10 A. I think initially it was by telephone.

11 Q. Was anyone else on the call?

12 A. Not to my knowledge.

13 Q. How long did it last?

14 A. I don't remember.

15 Q. Was it -- can you give me a time range?  
16 Ten minutes? An hour?

17 A. I can't.

18 Q. Two hours?

19 A. I can't -- I don't remember. I remember  
20 speaking with him. I don't know how long it went.

21 Q. Do you recall what he said or what you  
22 said in words or substance?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Now, when you spoke with Ms. Coddling  
25 before she was added to the RDI board, was that in



1 I think Bill Gould added a lot of value  
2 and expertise.

3 I'm trying to think of the other  
4 directors.

5 Of course Margaret and Ellen added value  
6 because of 16 to 20 years in live theaters and  
7 cinema.

8 So, these were a valuable people. But  
9 the question that I was addressing was whether he --  
10 he was searching for the value that they added or  
11 felt he added himself, which he did.

12 BY MR. KRUM:

13 Q. Well, let's -- I want to be clear on  
14 this, Mr. Kane.

15 A. Yeah.

16 Q. So your -- the value you could add is  
17 what you just described with respect to tax matters,  
18 right?

19 A. Right.

20 Q. And did you or did you not add that  
21 value during the time you were on the board and Jim  
22 Cotter, Sr., was alive?

23 A. Absolutely.

24 Q. And the value there Mr. Gould could add  
25 had to do with corporate governance and legal

# **EXHIBIT 44**

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

DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR.,	)	
individually and	)	
derivatively on behalf of)	)	
Reading International,	)	
Inc.,	)	
	)	Case No. A-15-719860-B
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Coordinated with:
vs.	)	
	)	Case No. P-14-082942-E
MARGARET COTTER, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
and	)	
<hr/>		
READING INTERNATIONAL,	)	
INC., a Nevada	)	
corporation,	)	
	)	
Nominal Defendant)	)	
<hr/>		

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF ROBERT MAYES  
TAKEN ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2016

REPORTED BY:  
PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400  
Job No.: 331292

1 with him via Skype, but --

2 Q. Do you recall any other communications  
3 that you or, to your knowledge, anybody else at Korn  
4 Ferry had with anybody at RDI again between the  
5 meeting following the interviews on that Friday to  
6 which you testified and your call where Mr. Tomkins  
7 told you to stand down?

8 A. Yeah. The only --

9 MS. LINDSAY: Objection. Lacks  
10 foundation.

11 BY MR. KRUM:

12 Q. You can go ahead.

13 A. The only communication would have --  
14 would have come from me.

15 Q. Okay. Part of the Korn Ferry engagement  
16 with RDI for the C.E.O. search was to perform some  
17 sort of proprietary Korn Ferry assessment of the  
18 final candidates, right?

19 MS. LINDSAY: Objection. Lacks  
20 foundation.

21 THE WITNESS: Yes.

22 BY MR. KRUM:

23 Q. Okay. What exactly is that proprietary  
24 assessment?

25 A. It is a -- what we call a -- a success

1 plan. It's developed on the other side of the shop  
2 within leadership -- within our leadership and  
3 consulting business.

4 In that case we had a Ph.D. named Jim  
5 Aggen, who led the success profile. And basically  
6 it's a deeper dive on -- on sort of the ingredients  
7 not only for the experience of the candidate but for  
8 the make-up of the candidate.

9 And so to develop that success profile,  
10 Jim and I, primarily Jim had longer -- had long  
11 conversations with each of the search committee  
12 members.

13 And the intention of that success  
14 profile is to mainly go deeper with the short list  
15 of candidates.

16 So, that -- that never took place. The  
17 second half of that engagement, if you will, never  
18 took place.

19 **Q. So that's the proprietary Korn Ferry**  
20 **assessment was not done with respect to any**  
21 **candidates?**

22 **A. No.**

23 **Q. Not with respect to Ellen Cotter?**

24 **A. No.**

25 **Q. Not with respect to the person who**



1 received 20 minutes of conversation during the  
2 debriefing following the interviews?

3 A. No.

4 Q. No one?

5 A. No.

6 (Off-the-record discussion.)

7 BY MR. KRUM:

8 Q. Who's Robert Wagner -- Robert Wagner?

9 A. Yeah. Rob's a partner at Korn Ferry.

10 And Rob had a relationship -- has a relationship  
11 with Craig Tomkins that dates back to college.

12 And so our initial relationship with RDI  
13 was via that history.

14 Q. That's the answer to the next question.

15 Thank you.

16 You worked on a prior engagement for  
17 RDI, right?

18 A. Yeah. Worked with Jim on the head of  
19 real estate search.

20 Q. Did you ever communicate to Jim or to  
21 Bill Ellis or to anybody else at RDI that you  
22 thought one or more of the candidates that Korn  
23 Ferry had presented for the head of real estate were  
24 good fits for the position?

25 MS. LINDSAY: Objection. Vague.

1 sentence that begins "The" and then the third line  
2 says "integrated search/assessment methodology."

3 Do you see that?

4 A. Yep.

5 Q. Is that a reference to the Korn Ferry  
6 proprietary assessment about which you testified  
7 earlier today?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay. That's all for that.

10 Okay, Mr. Mayes. I'll show you what  
11 previously has been marked as Exhibit 378.

12 A. Okay.

13 (Whereupon the document previously  
14 marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 378  
15 was referenced and is attached  
16 hereto.)

17 BY MR. KRUM:

18 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 378?

19 A. Yep.

20 Q. What is it?

21 A. Typical sort of search kick-off email  
22 and position spec.

23 Q. Okay. What's a position spec?

24 A. It's an approved document that we  
25 utilized to effectively source candidates.

1 Q. And when you say "source candidates"?

2 A. Generate interest among the candidate  
3 pool.

4 Q. Okay. Does that mean identify the  
5 possible candidates and generate interest?

6 A. Sure.

7 Q. And how is the position spec or position  
8 specification document created?

9 What's the -- what was the process done  
10 in this case to create the draft position  
11 specification that's part of 378?

12 A. Individual conversations with each of  
13 the search committee members.

14 Q. Did you have those conversations?

15 A. I did.

16 Q. With each of Ellen Cotter, Margaret  
17 Cotter, Bill Gould and Doug McEachern?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. And do you recall one conversation from  
20 another as you sit here today?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Is the -- is the confidential position  
23 specification that's part of Exhibit 378 beginning  
24 with the document that has 003 in the lower  
25 right-hand corner of the document that was created

1 foundation.

2 THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. Correct.

3 BY MR. KRUM:

4 Q. I direct your attention back to your  
5 September 18 email. The second paragraph, the third  
6 sentence reads, quote,

7 "The good news is that the search  
8 committee is very much aligned on  
9 the mandate and profile of the  
10 appropriate chief executive  
11 officer, with Craig having a  
12 slightly different perspective that  
13 we took into account," close quote.

14 Do you see that?

15 A. Yep.

16 Q. To what does that refer?

17 A. As we discussed -- or as we mentioned a  
18 moment ago, Craig sort of de-emphasized the need for  
19 real estate experience and emphasized the need for  
20 consumer-oriented operating business experience.

21 Q. And the other -- and the four members of  
22 the committee emphasized the need for what?

23 A. Real estate experience.

24 Q. So at some point in time did Korn Ferry  
25 provide to the -- each of the members of the C.E.O.



1 THE WITNESS: No.

2 BY MR. KRUM:

3 Q. How many C.E.O. searches have you  
4 performed approximately?

5 A. A dozen.

6 Q. Okay. How many C.E.O. searches are you  
7 familiar with such that you would know the  
8 composition of the search committee, if any, above  
9 and beyond the dozen or so?

10 A. 50.

11 MS. LINDSAY: Objection. Vague.

12 BY MR. KRUM:

13 Q. And in how many of those searches, to  
14 your knowledge, was the interim C.E.O. even a member  
15 of the C.E.O. search committee?

16 A. I don't have a -- I don't have a broad  
17 enough -- I can't recall.

18 Q. Okay. Directing your attention to the  
19 proprietary assessment about which you've testified  
20 that was part of the Korn Ferry engagement of RDI,  
21 do you have that in mind?

22 A. I'm sorry?

23 Q. I direct your attention to the --

24 A. Oh, sure.

25 Q. -- the proprietary assessment that was



1 BY MS. LINDSAY:

2 Q. What are those reasons?

3 MR. KRUM: Same objections.

4 THE WITNESS: Any number of reasons. In  
5 some cases a -- a company will have a preference for  
6 an internal candidate, but they want to go to search  
7 to sort of evaluate the candidate vis-a-vis the  
8 external talent pool.

9 In other cases, on the opposite end of  
10 the spectrum, you know, a client will decide that  
11 the right external candidates are just too expensive  
12 and would create too much disruption internally --  
13 and/or would create too much disruption internally,  
14 so they promote from within.

15 BY MS. LINDSAY:

16 Q. Are there advantages that a company  
17 would think that an internal candidate would have?

18 MR. KRUM: Same objections.

19 THE WITNESS: The built-in advantage is  
20 less disruption. That's a uniform cause.

21 Beyond that there's no common --  
22 commonality.

23 BY MS. LINDSAY:

24 Q. What do you mean by "less disruption"?

25 A. Change makes team members nervous.

1 Q. In what way?

2 A. The same -- you know, the same way I  
3 would be, you know, disrupted if I had a new boss or  
4 if you had a new boss or if any one of us had a new  
5 boss.

6 Q. In your experience, when boards are  
7 evaluating candidates or the search committee,  
8 whoever is evaluating candidates, is the candidate  
9 background and experience only one factor in the  
10 evaluation?

11 A. It's a large factor, at least for  
12 getting the person the initial interview. It's the  
13 primary factor.

14 Q. Do they also consider other factors,  
15 like fit?

16 A. Absolutely.

17 Q. What are some other factors that they  
18 might consider?

19 A. Cultural fit, motivation, drivers,  
20 personal traits, style. There's many.

21 Q. And in your experience, can a strength  
22 in one of those factors make up for a weakness in  
23 another area?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. In your experience, do companies

1 sometimes hire employees who don't ultimately  
2 exactly fit the position specification as it was  
3 written?

4 MR. KRUM: Same objections, vague,  
5 incomplete hypothetical.

6 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I mean there's  
7 no -- there's -- I've never met a perfect candidate.

8 BY MS. LINDSAY:

9 Q. So, that happens often?

10 MR. KRUM: Same objections, plus  
11 mischaracterizes the testimony.

12 THE WITNESS: Typically, you know, the  
13 successful candidate will -- will fit 80 percent of  
14 the spec, 80 percent or greater. It's rare for a  
15 candidate to be hired without, you know, sort of  
16 that threshold.

17 BY MS. LINDSAY:

18 Q. In your experience, do some companies  
19 want to fill a position more quickly than others?

20 A. Definitely.

21 Q. And why might that be a concern?

22 MR. KRUM: Same objection.

23 THE WITNESS: Why does -- I'm sorry. I  
24 don't follow.

25 ///

1     **assessment process.**

2                   **When was that?**

3           A.     Probably about the time that he had --  
4     he called me. So that would have been December when  
5     they indicated that the board was inclined to name  
6     Ellen permanent C.E.O.

7                   I encouraged him to run -- encouraged  
8     him to run her through the assessment process; not  
9     so much as an evaluation but as an onboarding tool.

10          **Q.     And what is marked as Exhibit 422, is**  
11     **that is as a result of Ellen's assessment process?**

12          A.     No. No. They chose not to.

13          **Q.     And do you know why that was?**

14          A.     I believe Craig told me that "We" --  
15     "We, the board, already know her pretty well, so  
16     there's no need."

17                   And I think they, you know, frankly,  
18     wanted to avoid the expense.

19          **Q.     And what -- so what was this, then?**

20          A.     So that -- that's a candidate report.  
21     That's independent of an assessment.

22                   An assessment is a far deeper -- deeper  
23     dive on candidates. Sorry. No -- there were no  
24     assessments ultimately done relative to this search.

25                   This is -- the first half is the success



1 profile, the second half are the assessments. A  
2 success profile was developed, but no assessments  
3 ever took place.

4 Q. And have you had other searches where an  
5 internal candidate came forward and the deep  
6 assessment like you spoke about earlier did not take  
7 place and the internal candidate was chosen?

8 A. Not that -- not that I can recall. But  
9 this assessment technology is two years old. So,  
10 limited sample size.

11 Q. Did you -- you had met with Ellen a  
12 number of times, correct?

13 A. Yeah.

14 Q. Did you ever have any reason to believe  
15 that she wasn't a qualified candidate for the  
16 position?

17 MR. KRUM: Objection. Vague and  
18 ambiguous, foundation, assumes facts.

19 THE WITNESS: I thought relative to the  
20 spec that -- that she lacked real estate expertise.

21 BY MS. HENDRICKS:

22 Q. To your knowledge, does she have the  
23 operating experience and the other internal  
24 experience with the company?

25 A. Very much so.



1 But were any of the other candidates  
2 taken through that comprehensive assessment?

3 A. No.

4 Q. Okay. Now, you said that -- that in  
5 your opinion, Ellen Cotter didn't have the real  
6 estate experience.

7 How much time did you spend with her or  
8 talking about her real estate experience?

9 A. We talked about the real estate needs of  
10 the company for a few hours.

11 Q. What about her background? Did you talk  
12 in detail about her real estate --

13 A. No. No.

14 Q. Okay. Now, let me ask you a few  
15 questions about Bill Gould.

16 On how many occasions did you have  
17 conversations with Mr. Gould?

18 A. I suspect we had two or three  
19 conversations with the search committee which he was  
20 on the phone for, and then I had one -- or Jim Aggen  
21 and I had one conversation with him relative to the  
22 development of the success profile.

23 Q. Okay. So you only had one conversation  
24 with him separate from the committee; is that  
25 correct?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Is that right?

3 A. I think so.

4 Q. Okay. Now, during the conversations  
5 with the search committee, did he ever express any  
6 personal opinions or give you any feedback about  
7 what he was looking for in a C.E.O.?

8 A. Yeah.

9 Q. What -- what did he say?

10 A. Like I can't remember the specifics,  
11 what I can tell you is that all four members of the  
12 committee were consistent at the outset. This  
13 company really needs real estate expertise, we have  
14 this land in Manhattan, we need to figure out what  
15 to do with it to optimize value. They were very  
16 consistent.

17 Q. So they were consistent also that they  
18 were trying to look for the right person for the  
19 job, correct?

20 A. Right.

21 Q. Okay. So, it was always clear that they  
22 were -- the whole committee, including Bill Gould,  
23 was trying to find the right person to be the C.E.O.  
24 of the company, correct?

25 MR. KRUM: Objection. Foundation.

1 THE WITNESS: I assume that they were  
2 investing the time, that that was their goal.

3 BY MR. VERA:

4 Q. You had no reason to think that everyone  
5 on that committee, including Bill Gould, was doing  
6 everything they could to try to find the right  
7 person, correct?

8 MR. KRUM: Same objection. Misstates  
9 testimony.

10 THE WITNESS: Correct. I -- again,  
11 firms pay our fees and invest the time. I assume  
12 that their interest is to find the right C.E.O.

13 BY MR. VERA:

14 Q. But you -- you heard nothing from Bill  
15 Gould to give you any reason to think that he wasn't  
16 doing his best as a fiduciary to find the right  
17 person for the job?

18 A. Correct.

19 MR. KRUM: Same objection.

20 BY MR. VERA:

21 Q. Thank you.

22 Now, in your separate conversation that  
23 you had with Bill Gould, did he give you -- did he  
24 say anything else about what he was looking for in a  
25 C.E.O.?

1 A. I can't recall.

2 Q. You don't remember anything else that he  
3 said?

4 A. I think that the common themes were real  
5 estate experience, someone who was a patient leader  
6 who could sort of move things along slowly. Family  
7 company so things had happened slowly there through  
8 the years. Patient leader, and someone who, you  
9 know, theoretically had the temperament to deal with  
10 activist investors.

11 Those were the -- the things that came  
12 out of my conversations with Doug and Bill. And  
13 they were more sophisticated conversations than I  
14 had with Ellen and Margaret.

15 Q. Now, did you know Bill Gould prior to  
16 this search?

17 A. No.

18 Q. And the time that you met with him  
19 separate from the committee, was it on the phone or  
20 in person?

21 A. Phone.

22 Q. Who else was at that meeting or on that  
23 call?

24 A. Jim Aggen.

25 Q. And how long did that conversation last?



1           A.   Those typically are 45-minute to  
2   60-minute conversations.

3           Q.   Other than what you've told us so far,  
4   did Mr. Gould make any other representations or --  
5   or say anything else to you about what he would like  
6   in terms of a new C.E.O.?

7           A.   Bill was on the phone for the candidate  
8   debrief call after the interviews, so he certainly  
9   had opinions, but I can't recall.

10          Q.   But it was your impression that he took  
11   the process very seriously, correct?

12          A.   Yes.

13          Q.   And he was trying, again, to do  
14   everything he could to find the right person for the  
15   job?

16               MR. KRUM:   Same objection.

17               THE WITNESS:   Yeah.   I mean he -- he  
18   attended all the search committee calls, he was --  
19   he wasn't absent.

20   BY MR. VERA:

21          Q.   Right.   But did he do or say anything  
22   that made you think that he was doing anything other  
23   than trying to find the right person for the job?

24          A.   No.

25          Q.   Okay.



1 MR. VERA: Thank you. I have no further  
2 questions.

3 MR. KRUM: I have nothing further.  
4 Thank you, Mr. Mayes.

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

6 MS. LINDSAY: Thank you.

7 VIDEOTAPE OPERATOR: This concludes the  
8 deposition of Mr. Robert Mayes on August 18, 2016,  
9 which consists of two media files.

10 The original media files will be  
11 retained by Litigation Services.

12 We are off the record at 11:17.

13

14 (Whereupon at 11:17 A.M. the  
15 deposition proceedings were  
16 concluded.)

17 \* \* \*

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# **EXHIBIT 45**

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

DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA  
  
JAMES J. COTTER, JR., )  
individually and )  
derivatively on behalf of )  
Reading International, )  
Inc., )  
Plaintiff, ) Case No. A-15-719860-B  
vs. ) Coordinated with:  
MARGARET COTTER, et al., ) Case No. P-14-082942-E  
Defendants. )  
and )  
READING INTERNATIONAL, )  
INC., a Nevada )  
corporation, )  
Nominal Defendant )

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF DOUGLAS MCEACHERN  
TAKEN ON MAY 6, 2016

REPORTED BY:  
PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400

1 Q. Okay. Well, let me ask a question.

2 Let's try it again.

3 What was your understanding, if any, as  
4 to the point of hiring a director of real estate for  
5 RDI?

6 A. Jim wanted to hire a director of real  
7 estate who had been through some development  
8 activities in the past and had responsibilities for,  
9 take this building, building this building.

10 Q. When you say Jim wanted to hire him,  
11 were you suggesting that somebody disagreed other  
12 than Margaret?

13 A. This was his initiative. It wasn't a  
14 bad idea.

15 Q. Okay. To your knowledge, did anybody  
16 other than Margaret ever disagree with the notion of  
17 hiring a director of real estate for RDI?

18 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Assumes facts,  
19 lacks foundation.

20 THE WITNESS: I don't know. And I can't  
21 tell you that Margaret didn't want to hire somebody.

22 I remember being in discussions where  
23 Margaret was there and where she would be reporting.

24 BY MR. KRUM:

25 Q. So, setting aside the subject of

# **EXHIBIT 46**



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

DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR.,	)	
individually and	)	
derivatively on behalf of	)	
Reading International,	)	
Inc.,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. A-15-719860-B
vs.	)	Coordinated with:
MARGARET COTTER, et al.,	)	Case No. P-14-082942-E
Defendants.	)	
and	)	
READING INTERNATIONAL,	)	
INC., a Nevada	)	
corporation,	)	
Nominal Defendant	)	

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF DOUGLAS MCEACHERN  
TAKEN ON JULY 7, 2016  
VOLUME II

JOB NUMBER 321640  
REPORTED BY:  
PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400

1 corporate lives.

2 BY MR. KRUM:

3 Q. What -- what did you do and, to your  
4 knowledge, what did anybody else who was on the  
5 special nominating committee do with respect to Judy  
6 Coddling?

7 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

8 THE WITNESS: In addition to going  
9 through Ms. Coddling's resume, we personally met with  
10 her. And I'm trying to remember who all was in the  
11 meeting. The minutes are there and they will tell  
12 you who was there. It could have been Ed Kane,  
13 although I don't think he was a member of the  
14 committee. But we typically carpooled up to  
15 Los Angeles with each other, so I think it's  
16 reasonable to think he was there, Guy Adams and  
17 maybe Bill Gould as a lead director.

18 And we went with Judy and talked about  
19 what she had done in the past, what her business  
20 experiences had been and were quite -- I, I can't  
21 speak for everybody else, but I was quite favorably  
22 impressed about her business background and felt  
23 comfortable recommending her to the board of  
24 directors.

25 Q. What is your understanding, if any, as

1 to how the resume -- the Judy Coddling resume you  
2 reviewed came to be prepared?

3 A. I do not know.

4 Q. How did you receive it?

5 A. I think by email.

6 Q. From whom?

7 A. I don't know. You'd have to go back and  
8 look at email to find out.

9 (Whereupon Mr. Swanis entered the  
10 deposition proceedings at this  
11 time.)

12 BY MR. KRUM:

13 Q. Okay. What was it about her business  
14 experience that created a favorable impression for  
15 you?

16 A. Not -- it's been close to -- we're  
17 moving on to a year when I last saw Judy Coddling's  
18 resume, but she had been in the education field on a  
19 number of corporations, business experience.

20 I'd have to go through and pick out the  
21 resume and tell you the points of contact that I  
22 found impressive. And then her own personal  
23 demeanor and how she carried herself and the way she  
24 communicated, I thought she'd be very effective as  
25 board member.

1 answer the question and then we'll go off the  
2 record.

3 THE WITNESS: She described a  
4 relationship she had and discussed having been  
5 involved with Jim and his wife. As they were  
6 proposing and he reached out to her, she was  
7 associated with some pre-school or some prep school  
8 or some private school on the west side, and Jim had  
9 asked her -- Jim and his wife Gina had asked Judy to  
10 help support their child's candidacy.

11 BY MR. KRUM:

12 Q. What did Judy say about her relationship  
13 with Mary Cotter?

14 A. I don't know that she said anything  
15 about a relationship with Mary Cotter.

16 Q. Okay. And you made some reference to a  
17 relationship between Judy Coddington and Mary Cotter in  
18 earlier testimony.

19 Do you have that in mind?

20 A. I do.

21 Q. And what is it you heard or learned in  
22 that respect?

23 A. But I would like to -- my earlier  
24 testimony I believe was I didn't know when I was  
25 aware of that relationship, it could have been as



1 being considered as a board member or it could have  
2 been three, four, five months later, is that she and  
3 Mary Cotter had a relationship that went back 20,  
4 25, 30 years, a longstanding relationship.

5 I don't know how it was created. I  
6 don't know how often they saw each other. I was  
7 just aware of that relationship.

8 Q. How did you come to learn about that  
9 relationship?

10 A. I don't recall.

11 Q. What did Ellen Cotter tell you and  
12 presumably other members of the special nominating  
13 committee about the relationship between Judy  
14 Coddington on one hand and any Cotter family member on  
15 the other hand?

16 A. At -- we were nominating Judy Coddington to  
17 fill a board position created when Tim Storey  
18 resigned. That was a month, two weeks, three weeks,  
19 some period of time before the annual meeting.

20 And sometime after Judy Coddington was  
21 appointed to the board, a number of us received an  
22 email from Andy Shapiro -- Andrew Shapiro, about  
23 some background information on Judy Coddington about a  
24 connection that she had with -- I don't remember the  
25 name of the company. It was some software reading



1 comprehension and learning company publisher that  
2 had a relationship with Apple that had a  
3 relationship and was doing work for the L.A.U.S.D.,  
4 Los Angeles Unified School District.

5 And pretty negative coverage had  
6 appeared in a series of articles. I remember some  
7 in the "L.A. Times."

8 And I think when that information  
9 surfaced, there was a whole lot more discussion that  
10 took place about Judy Coddling and her relationship  
11 with Ellen Cotter and the family.

12 Q. What's your recollection, if any, as to  
13 how Mr. Shapiro had learned that Judy Coddling -- or  
14 learned about Judy Coddling -- strike that.

15 Had she already been added to the board  
16 and the company announced that at the time  
17 Mr. Shapiro communicated what you just described?

18 A. It had happened before Andy Shapiro sent  
19 that information to us.

20 Q. What had happened before?

21 A. That she had been added to the board.

22 Q. Okay. What was the -- what steps, if  
23 any, did the special nominating committee take, if  
24 any, beyond interviewing candidates that Ellen  
25 Cotter referred to the committee and as well as

1 A. So we didn't do a background check on  
2 him.

3 Q. Who was responsible for the background  
4 checks?

5 A. I believe they were done under the  
6 auspices of Craig Tompkins or they could have  
7 been -- I think it was Craig Tompkins.

8 Q. Was he a member of the special  
9 nominating committee?

10 A. He attended as a -- he took the  
11 medicine, attended the meetings.

12 Q. Did he do anything beyond that?

13 A. To the best of my knowledge, no.

14 Q. So it's your understanding that the  
15 company had run a background check on Ms. Coddling  
16 before she was added to the board?

17 A. Yes, it is.

18 Q. And it's your understanding that the  
19 background check had not produced the information  
20 that had been communicated to the board members by  
21 Mr. Shapiro?

22 A. That is correct.

23 Q. Did you ever see the background check --

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. There was a document that Mr. Tompkins

1 produced that was described as a background check  
2 for Judy Coddling?

3 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Lacks  
4 foundation.

5 THE WITNESS: I -- I do believe I saw a  
6 background check that had been done on Judy Coddling.  
7 I asked to see it because, quite frankly, this was a  
8 bit of an embarrassing that this information would  
9 surface and we would not have been aware of it  
10 beforehand.

11 When we learned of it, we changed our  
12 background procedures to be more robust than they  
13 had been in the past.

14 BY MR. KRUM:

15 Q. The information that Mr. Shapiro  
16 transmitted to members of the RDI board of directors  
17 regarding Judy Coddling was all publicly available  
18 information, right?

19 A. I recall -- I think so, yes.

20 Q. So, did you ask Mr. Tompkins or anybody  
21 else what sort of background check was done that  
22 didn't discover publicly available information?

23 A. We had --

24 MR. SEARCY: Objection.

25 Go ahead.

1 arrangements for us to get together again with Judy  
2 personally to discuss the situation.

3 BY MR. KRUM:

4 Q. Over what period of time did these  
5 conversations with Ms. Cotter, who was in Florida,  
6 occur relative to receipt of the information from  
7 Mr. Shapiro?

8 Was it the same day? The same week?

9 A. A couple of nanoseconds.

10 Q. Okay. And how long thereafter did you  
11 and others spoke with Ms. Coddling?

12 A. More than a couple of nanoseconds. It  
13 could have been within the next week. I just don't  
14 remember.

15 There are minutes of that meeting with  
16 Ms. Coddling that will set forth the date.

17 Q. And what happened during that -- was it  
18 a meeting in person?

19 A. Yes, it was.

20 Q. And who was present?

21 A. Bill Gould was there, I was there. I

22 don't remember if Ellen Cotter was there or not. I  
23 think --

24 Well, get the minutes out. They'll tell  
25 you who was there.



1 I -- it's conceivable Guy Adams and Ed  
2 Kane were there also.

3 **Q. How long did the meeting last?**

4 A. No more than three hours.

5 **Q. And in substance who said what during**  
6 **that meeting?**

7 A. The majority of what was communicated  
8 was by Judy Coddling. And I believe we had  
9 instructed -- at some point we instructed Craig  
10 Tompkins to go do some research of all this stuff  
11 and try to find what was going on.

12 He found some additional information  
13 about Judy Coddling that had not been communicated by  
14 Mr. Shapiro.

15 And Judy explained the situation between  
16 Pearson -- thank you for the name of that --  
17 Pearson, which was a subcontractor to Apple Computer  
18 supplying and designing a curriculum for the L.A.  
19 Unified School District that was principally to be  
20 delivered via iPads that Apple was selling through  
21 some vendor to the L.A. Unified School District.

22 **Q. Where did this meeting occur?**

23 A. At the Reading office.

24 **Q. Was it on a weekend or a workday?**

25 A. The minutes will -- I believe it was on



1 that same meeting where we met with Judy Coddling.

2 Q. Okay. Do you recall anything else that  
3 anybody else said in words or substance from that  
4 meeting?

5 A. At some point either at that meeting or  
6 before we concluded we would go forward with Judy as  
7 a nominee for the board of directors. I and others  
8 were impressed with Judy's explanation and the  
9 research that Craig had done into the entire matter.  
10 We were positive and felt very good about  
11 renominating her.

12 Q. Did anyone at Reading, whether Craig  
13 Tompkins or anyone else, communicate with any third  
14 parties about Judy Coddling?

15 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

16 MR. SWANIS: Join. Calls for  
17 speculation.

18 THE WITNESS: I don't know.

19 BY MR. KRUM:

20 Q. Okay.

21 MR. KRUM: I'll ask the court reporter  
22 to mark --

23 MR. SEARCY: Before we start on the  
24 exhibits Mr. McEachern asked actually for a break a  
25 while back. I wanted to --

1 Q. When you say you believe so,  
2 Mr. McEachern, do you recall interviewing him?

3 A. We -- we would have had minutes that  
4 discussed the interview of Mr. Wrotniak.

5 Q. Okay. But do you have any recollection  
6 of doing so as you sit here today?

7 A. I don't have any specific recollection.

8 Q. Who interviewed him?

9 A. I believe it was the same group of  
10 three, Guy Adams, Ed Kane and myself.

11 Q. Was that -- did that interview occur in  
12 person?

13 A. I believe it took place by phone.

14 Q. How long did it last?

15 A. I don't recall.

16 Q. Who said what in words or substance?

17 A. I don't remember.

18 Q. Mr. Wrotniak was recommended by Ellen  
19 Cotter; is that right?

20 A. I believe he was recommended by Margaret  
21 Cotter and Ellen Cotter jointly.

22 Q. Okay. And what did they say when they  
23 recommended him?

24 A. I don't recall.

25 Q. Did you ever hear or learn or were you

1 ever told that his wife is a close personal friend  
2 of Margaret Cotter?

3 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Lacks  
4 foundation, vague.

5 (Whereupon Mr. Swanis re-entered  
6 the deposition proceedings at this  
7 time.)

8 THE WITNESS: I have been told that or  
9 heard that.

10 BY MR. KRUM:

11 Q. When is the first time you heard or  
12 learned or were told that?

13 A. Mr. Krum, I just don't remember.

14 Q. Do you recall from whom you heard or  
15 were told that?

16 A. I think from Jim Cotter, Jr.

17 Q. Was that after the committee had  
18 recommended nominating Mr. Wrotniak to stand for  
19 election at the 2015 annual shareholders meeting?

20 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Lacks  
21 foundation.

22 MR. SWANIS: Join.

23 THE WITNESS: I think so.

24 BY MR. KRUM:

25 Q. Okay. When you interviewed him, who

1 said what, if anything, regarding how he knew or was  
2 known to Ellen and/or Margaret Cotter?

3 A. I do not recall.

4 Q. What was done, if anything, to your  
5 knowledge, by you or any other member of the special  
6 nominating committee with respect to Mr. Wrotniak  
7 other than interviewing him prior to recommending to  
8 the full board of directors that he be nominated to  
9 stand for election at the 2015 annual shareholders  
10 meeting?

11 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

12 MR. SWANIS: Join.

13 THE WITNESS: We were doing a background  
14 check on Michael Wrotniak similar to what had been  
15 done on Judy Coddling and was the customary normal  
16 practice for Reading.

17 Craig Tompkins was instructed, "Listen,  
18 if we got all this information that showed up about  
19 Judy Coddling that was easily located through some  
20 Google search, well, darn it, go and do a similar  
21 search on Michael Wrotniak and see if there's  
22 anything out there that wouldn't have turned up in  
23 something akin to the background check that we had  
24 done on Michael Wrotniak."

25 And he did do that. I believe it is



1 documented in our minutes of that meeting.

2 BY MR. KRUM:

3 Q. Okay. What else, if anything, was done  
4 prior to Mr. Wrotniak being selected to stand for  
5 election to the RDI board of directors at the 2015  
6 annual shareholders meeting?

7 MR. SWANIS: Objection. Form,  
8 foundation.

9 MR. SEARCY: Join.

10 THE WITNESS: I don't recall.

11 BY MR. KRUM:

12 Q. Okay. Let me show you, Mr. McEachern,  
13 what previously has been marked as Exhibit 52.

14 This may be a document to which you were  
15 just referring?

16 (Whereupon the document previously  
17 marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 52  
18 was referenced and is attached  
19 hereto.)

20 BY MR. KRUM:

21 Q. Let me know when you've reviewed it.

22 A. Okay.

23 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 52?

24 A. I have a general recollection, yes.

25 Q. What is it?



1     sometime in 1985 forward and knew these people when  
2     Deloitte were the -- the auditors and met Ellen  
3     Cotter while she was down in Australia when I was  
4     there doing company business.

5     BY MR. KRUM:

6             Q.     So, back to the question. Did Korn  
7     Ferry interview Ellen Cotter as a candidate for the  
8     C.E.O. position?

9             A.     I think I said --

10            MR. SWANIS: Objection.

11            THE WITNESS: -- I don't know.

12     BY MR. KRUM:

13            Q.     Okay. Did they put Ellen Cotter through  
14     their proprietary assessment process?

15            MR. SWANIS: Same objections.

16            THE WITNESS: I don't think so.

17     BY MR. KRUM:

18            Q.     They didn't do that with anybody, to  
19     your knowledge, right?

20            A.     To my knowledge, no.

21            Q.     What discussions did you have with  
22     Margaret Cotter and Bill Gould, if any, about  
23     whether and how to proceed any further with the  
24     other final -- with the finalist -- the persons you  
25     identified as finalists after the Ellen Cotter

  
CLERK OF THE COURT

**MIL**  
**COHEN|JOHNSON|PARKER|EDWARDS**  
H. STAN JOHNSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 00265  
sjohnson@cohenjohnson.com  
255 East Warm Springs Road, Suite 100  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119  
Telephone: (702) 823-3500  
Facsimile: (702) 823-3400

**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**  
CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK, ESQ.  
California Bar No. 145532, *pro hac vice*  
christayback@quinnemanuel.com  
MARSHALL M. SEARCY, ESQ.  
California Bar No. 169269, *pro hac vice*  
marshallsearcy@quinnemanuel.com  
865 South Figueroa Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000

Attorneys for Defendants Margaret Cotter,  
Ellen Cotter, Douglas McEachern, Guy Adams, Edward Kane  
Judy Coddington, and Michael Wrotniak

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

**CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

JAMES J. COTTER, JR. individually and  
derivatively on behalf of Reading  
International, Inc.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MARGARET COTTER, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

AND

READING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,

Nominal Defendant.

Case No.: A-15-719860-B  
Dept. No.: XI

Case No.: P-14-082942-E  
Dept. No.: XI

Related and Coordinated Cases

**BUSINESS COURT**

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO  
EXCLUDE EXPERT TESTIMONY OF  
MYRON STEELE, TIAGO DUARTE-  
SILVA, RICHARD SPITZ, ALBERT  
NAGY, AND JOHN FINNERTY**

Judge: Hon. Elizabeth Gonzalez  
Date of Hearing: 10 / 25 / 16  
Time of Hearing: 8 : 30 AM

**NOTICE OF MOTION**

**TO: TO: ALL PARTIES, COUNSEL, AND THE COURT:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the above Motion will be heard the 25 day  
of October, 2016 at 8:30 AM in Department ~~XXVII~~<sup>XI</sup> of the above  
designated Court or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard.

Dated: September 23, 2016

**COHEN|JOHNSON|PARKER|EDWARDS**

By: /s/ H. Stan Johnson  
H. STAN JOHNSON, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 00265  
sjohnson@cohenjohnson.com  
255 East Warm Springs Road, Suite 100  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119  
Telephone: (702) 823-3500  
Facsimile: (702) 823-3400

**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP**  
CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK, ESQ.  
California Bar No. 145532, *pro hac vice*  
christayback@quinnemanuel.com  
MARSHALL M. SEARCY, ESQ.  
California Bar No. 169269, *pro hac vice*  
marshallsearcy@quinnemanuel.com  
865 South Figueroa Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000

*Attorneys for Defendants Margaret Cotter, Ellen  
Cotter, Douglas McEachern, Guy Adams,  
Edward Kane, Judy Coddling, and Michael  
Wrotniak*

1 **MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO EXCLUDE PROPOSED EXPERT TESTIMONY OF MYRON**  
2 **STEELE, TIAGO DUARTE-SILVA, RICHARD SPITZ, ALBERT NAGY, AND JOHN**  
3 **FINNERTY**

4 **TO: ALL PARTIES, COUNSEL, AND THE COURT:**

5 COMES NOW, Defendants Margaret Cotter, Ellen Cotter, Guy Adams, Edward Kane,  
6 Douglas McEachern, Judy Coddling, and Michael Wrotniak (collectively, "Moving Defendants"),  
7 by and through their counsel of record, Cohen|Johnson|Parker|Edwards and Quinn Emanuel  
8 Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, hereby submit this Motion *In Limine* to Exclude the Proposed Expert  
9 Testimony of Myron Steele, Tiago Duarte-Silva, Richard Spitz, John Finnerty, and Albert Nagy.

10 This Motion is based upon the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the  
11 pleadings and papers on file, and any oral argument at the time of a hearing on this motion.

12 ///

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 Dated: September 23, 2016

2 **COHEN|JOHNSON|PARKER|EDWARDS**

3  
4 By: /s/ H. Stan Johnson

5 H. STAN JOHNSON, ESQ.

6 Nevada Bar No. 00265

7 sjohnson@cohenjohnson.com

8 255 East Warm Springs Road, Suite 100

9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

10 Telephone: (702) 823-3500

11 Facsimile: (702) 823-3400

12  
13 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
14 SULLIVAN, LLP**

15 CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK, ESQ.

16 California Bar No. 145532, *pro hac vice*

17 christayback@quinnemanuel.com

18 MARSHALL M. SEARCY, ESQ.

19 California Bar No. 169269, *pro hac vice*

20 marshallsearcy@quinnemanuel.com

21 865 South Figueroa Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor

22 Los Angeles, CA 90017

23 Telephone: (213) 443-3000

24 *Attorneys for Defendants*

25 *Margaret Cotter, Ellen Cotter,*

26 *Douglas McEachern, Guy Adams,*

27 *Edward Kane, Judy Coddling, and*

28 *Michael Wrotniak*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES .....	1
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD.....	3
III. ARGUMENT.....	5
A. The Legal Opinion of Justice Steele Regarding the Application of Delaware Law to a Hypothetical Set of Facts Should Be Excluded In Its Entirety.....	5
1. Justice Steele’s Delaware Legal Opinion Does Not Assist the Trier of Fact .....	5
2. Justice Steele’s Legal Opinion Purports to Apply Delaware Law Even Though There Is Nevada Law Directly On Point.....	8
3. Justice Steele’s cursory review of the facts is inadequate and reveals an improper methodology.....	10
B. The Opinion of Tiago Duarte-Silva Regarding Supposed Losses the Company Has Suffered Since Plaintiff’s Termination Should Be Excluded In Its Entirety .....	11
1. Dr. Duarte-Silva’s Analysis Fails to Offer Any Causal Connection Between Defendants’ Conduct and the Supposed Losses .....	11
2. Dr. Duarte-Silva Does Not Use Any Standard or Commonly- Accepted Methodology In Evaluating Reading’s Stock Performance from June 15, 2015, to August 19, 2016 .....	14
(a) Dr. Duarte-Silva Did Not Perform an Event Study, a Standard Technique Used By Experts in the Field .....	14
(b) Dr. Duarte-Silva’s Methodology For Analyzing the Long- Run Performance of Reading’s Stock Is Far Out of Line With Other Experts in This Field.....	16
(c) Dr. Duarte-Silva’s Results Are Not Statistically Significant.....	18
3. Dr. Duarte-Silva Has No Basis to Offer An Opinion Regarding the “Offer” .....	19
C. The Opinion of Richard Spitz Regarding the CEO Search Should Be Excluded In Its Entirety Because Mr. Spitz Fails to Apply Any Methodology and Instead Simply Offers His Own Subjective Fact Interpretation.....	21

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

1.	Mr. Spitz, A Supposed Executive Search Expert, Actually Seeks to Offer Testimony About His Personal Reaction to Various Facts and Does Not Apply Any Legitimate or Recognized Methodology.....	21
2.	Mr. Spitz’s Proposed Testimony Regarding Margaret Cotter’s New York Real Estate Position Is Well Outside His Supposed Area of Expertise .....	25
3.	Mr. Spitz Is Unqualified to Offer Any Purported Expert Opinion Regarding Reading’s Stock Price or “Strategic Imperative” .....	26
D.	The Wide-Ranging Opinions of “Rebuttal” Expert Albert Nagy Should Be Excluded Because They Are Not Rebuttal Opinions At All, and Because Mr. Nagy Is Not Qualified to Offer Them .....	28
1.	Mr. Nagy Is Not a “Rebuttal” Expert.....	28
2.	Mr. Nagy Is Not Qualified .....	29
E.	The Proposed Testimony of John Finnerty Should Be Excluded to the Extent Dr. Finnerty Does Not Intend to Provide Purely Rebuttal Testimony .....	30
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	30

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Page

### CASES

<i>Andrews v. Harley Davidson, Inc.</i> , 106 Nev. 533, 769 P.2d 1092 (1990) .....	29
<i>Ashton v. Ashton</i> , 733 P.2d 147 (Utah 1987) .....	7
<i>Beam ex rel. Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia, Inc. v. Stewart</i> , 845 A.2d 1040 (Del. 2004) .....	10
<i>Brown v. Kinross Gold U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 531 F. Supp. 2d 1234 (D. Nev. 2008) .....	13
<i>Brown v. Nevada</i> , 110 Nev. 846 (1994) .....	3, 4
<i>Brown v. State</i> , 110 Nev. 846 (1994) .....	22
<i>Choat v. McDorman</i> , 96 Nev. 332 (1970) .....	5
<i>Clark v. Lubritz</i> , 113 Nev. 1089 (1997) .....	13
<i>Dawson v. State</i> , 84 Nev. 260, 439 P.2d 462 (1968) .....	24
<i>Donaldson v. Cent. Illinois Pub. Serv. Co.</i> , 313 Ill. App. 3d 1061 (2000) .....	15, 17
<i>Giles v. Gen. Motors Acceptance Corp.</i> , 494 F.3d 865 (9th Cir. 2007) .....	13
<i>Hallmark v. Eldridge</i> , 124 Nev. 492 (2008) .....	4, 14, 15, 17
<i>Hangarter v. Provident Life &amp; Accident Ins. Co.</i> , 373 F.3d 998 (9th Cir. 2004) .....	7
<i>In re Omnicom Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 541 F. Supp. 2d 546 (2008) .....	15
<i>In re Stratosphere Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 66 F. Supp. 2d 1182 (D. Nev. 1999) .....	10
<i>International Business Machines Corporation v. Fasco Industries, Inc.</i> , No. C-93-20326 RPA, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22533 (N.D. Cal. March 15, 1995) .....	29

1	<i>Ivanhoe Partners v. Newmont Min. Corp.</i> ,	
2	535 A.2d 1334 (Del. 1987) .....	20
3	<i>Jeep Corp. v. Murray</i> ,	
4	101 Nev. 640 (1985) .....	5
5	<i>Khanna v. McMinn</i> ,	
6	No. Civ. A. 20545-NC, 2006 WL 1388744 (Del. Ch. May 9, 2006) .....	10
7	<i>Las Vegas Sun, Inc. v. Franklin</i> ,	
8	74 Nev. 282 (1958) .....	7
9	<i>Lickey v. State</i> ,	
10	108 Nev. 191 (1992) .....	24
11	<i>Lord v. Nevada</i> ,	
12	107 Nev. 28 (1991) .....	4
13	<i>Louisiana Mun. Police Employees' Ret. Sys. v. Wynn</i> ,	
14	No. 14-15695, 2016 WL 3878228 (9th Cir. July 18, 2016).....	9
15	<i>McGlinchy v. Shell Chemical Co.</i> ,	
16	845 F.2d 802 (9th Cir. 1988) .....	11
17	<i>Morrison v. Air California</i> ,	
18	101 Nev. 233, 699 P.2d 600 (1985) .....	29
19	<i>Mulder v. Nevada</i> ,	
20	116 Nev. 1 (2000) .....	4
21	<i>Porter v. Nevada</i> ,	
22	94 Nev. 142 (1978) .....	4
23	<i>Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews &amp; Forbes Holdings Inc.</i> ,	
24	506 A.2d 173 (1986) .....	20
25	<i>Schwartz v. Estate of Greenspun</i> ,	
26	110 Nev. 1042 (1994) .....	22
27	<i>Shoen v. SAC Holding Corp.</i> ,	
28	122 Nev. 621, 137 P.3d 1171 (2006) .....	8
	<i>Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Fitzgerald</i> ,	
	94 Nev. 241 (1978) .....	14
	<i>Townsend v. Nevada</i> ,	
	103 Nev. 113 (1987) .....	3, 4, 22
	<i>Townsend v. State</i> ,	
	103 Nev. 113 (1987) .....	24
	<i>United States Fire Ins. Co. v. McClelland</i> ,	
	105 Nev. 504 (1989) .....	7

1	<i>United States v. 319.88 Acres of Land, More or Less, Situated in Clark Cty., Nev.,</i>	
2	498 F. Supp. 763 (D. Nev. 1980) .....	5, 11
3	<i>United States v. Brodie,</i>	
4	858 F.2d 492 (9th Cir. 1988) (overruled on other grounds) .....	7
5	<i>United States v. Curtis,</i>	
6	782 F.2d 593 (6th Cir. 1986) .....	7
7	<i>United States v. Filler,</i>	
8	210 F.3d 386 (9th Cir. 2000) .....	9
9	<i>VBenx Corp. v. Finnegan,</i>	
10	2016 WL 3961822 (Mass. Super. May 27, 2016).....	5
11	<i>White v. Ford Motor Co.,</i>	
12	312 F.3d 998 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	25
13	<i>Wrenn v. Nevada,</i>	
14	89 Nev. 71 (1973) .....	4

#### STATUTES

15	N.R.S. § 48.035(1) .....	4, 14
16	N.R.S. § 50.275 .....	3
17	N.R.S. § 78.120 .....	21
18	N.R.S. § 78.138 .....	9, 21
19	N.R.S. § 78.138(4) .....	20, 21
20	N.R.S. § 78.140 .....	8
21	NRCP 16.1 .....	28, 29
22	NRCP 26 .....	29

#### OTHER AUTHORITIES

23	Bodie, Zvi, Alex Kane, and Alan Marcus, <i>Investments</i> , Seventh Edition, Boston, MA:	
24	Irwin McGraw-Hill, 2008 .....	15
25	Damodaran, Aswath, <i>Investment Valuation</i> , Second Edition, New York, NY: John Wiley	
26	& Sons, Inc., 2002 .....	17
27	Duarte-Silva and Dolgoff, “Measure price impact with investors’ forward-looking	
28	information,” August 2014 .....	19



1 Duarte-Silva and Tripolski-Kimel, Testing Excess Returns on Event Days: Log Returns  
vs. Dollar Returns (February 28, 2014) ..... 19

2 Eugene F. Fama et al., *The Adjustment of Stock Prices to New Information*, 10 Int’l Econ.  
3 Rev. 1 (1969) ..... 15

4 Gujarati, *Essentials of Econometrics*, Second Ed., Irwin McGraw-Hill (1999)..... 19

5 MacKinlay, Craig, “Event Studies in Economics and Finance,” *Journal of Economic*  
6 *Literature* Vol. XXXV (1997) ..... 15

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

### I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff has disclosed three supposed expert witnesses—plus two additional “rebuttal” experts—to bolster his allegations against Defendants in this action. None of these experts’ testimony is admissible under Nevada law. These experts apply unsound methodologies, are unfamiliar with the factual record, and offer testimony far outside their purported areas of expertise. Perhaps most importantly, not one of these experts’ proposed testimony will assist the trier of fact in any way. In fact, just the opposite; the only possible impact of their proposed testimony is to cause severe prejudice and confusion.

**Myron T. Steele**, a former Chief Justice of the Delaware Supreme Court, has been designated to testify about how a Delaware court might apply Delaware law if the allegations in Plaintiff’s complaint were found to be true. In other words, Justice Steele does not even attempt to assist the trier of fact. Instead, he opines as to the application of Delaware law *if* the trier of fact were to reach certain conclusions. Allowing this testimony would of course be both confusing and prejudicial. First, it is the Court, not an expert witness, who should instruct the trier of fact on applicable law. Second, this is a case about a Nevada company being heard in a Nevada court; Delaware law, while perhaps instructive on certain particular issues, does not apply here. Third, Justice Steele’s opinion is based on assumptions—in particular, that the trier of fact finds against Defendants on virtually every factual issue—that are unfair to present to the trier of fact. It would be the very definition of prejudicial for the factfinder to hear from someone with the imprimatur of “expert” and “Chief Justice” about the consequences (in Delaware) to Defendants if they committed all the wrongdoing they are (falsely) accused of. As another court recently ruled in excluding Justice Steele’s proposed expert testimony, his opinions “provide a patina of substance to [the] claims when they actually say nothing about them.”

**Tiago Duarte-Silva**, a finance Ph.D., purports to testify about losses suffered by Reading since Plaintiff’s termination. However, his opinion is inadmissible for numerous reasons. Dr. Duarte-Silva has not reviewed a *single deposition* from this action, has reviewed *only one document produced in discovery*, and simply has no idea what the facts of this case are. Because

1 he has not made even a cursory effort to familiarize himself with the evidence in this case,  
2 Dr. Duarte-Silva cannot offer any useful opinion that would assist the trier of fact. Unsurprisingly,  
3 given his lack of knowledge about the evidence, Dr. Duarte-Silva's proposed testimony does not  
4 even suggest a causal link between the losses supposedly suffered by Reading and any action of  
5 any Defendant. So while Dr. Duarte-Silva wants to tell the trier of fact about the nine-figure losses  
6 he thinks Reading has suffered since Plaintiff was fired, he has no idea—and does not even purport  
7 to know, as his opinion is completely silent on this question—if a single dollar of those purported  
8 losses is tied to Defendants' alleged conduct. Proximate causation of damages to the company is  
9 an essential element of any derivative claim for breach of fiduciary duty; Dr. Duarte-Silva should  
10 not be permitted to present the trier of fact with a "damages" figure that has nothing to do with any  
11 of the misconduct alleged in the complaint. Even setting aside the failure to provide a causation  
12 analysis, Dr. Duarte-Silva's supposed methodology is unsound. He deviates dramatically from the  
13 well-known and widely-accepted approach to conducting stock price event studies, and does not  
14 cite to any authority—academic or otherwise—supporting his novel approach. This is in direct  
15 contrast to Defendants' expert, Dr. Richard Roll, who conducted a proper event study. The trier  
16 of fact should not be presented with a "battle of the experts" when only one side's expert has  
17 conducted a legitimate analysis.

18 Plaintiff's third expert is **Richard Spitz**, an attorney who seven years ago was an executive  
19 search consultant. Whether or not Mr. Spitz actually has expertise relevant to the CEO search  
20 process, he does not apply it in connection with his proposed testimony. Mr. Spitz claims he has  
21 been retained to evaluate whether Reading's CEO search was a "success" or a "failure," but never  
22 sets forth the standard that he (or anyone else) uses to make such an evaluation or the methodology  
23 he applies. Mr. Spitz calls the search a "failure" but does not define that term, explain how he  
24 reached his conclusion, or assess the performance of the chosen CEO. Instead, the bulk of Mr.  
25 Spitz's report is spent calling into question Defendants' credibility, characterizing their conduct as  
26 "vexing," and claiming that "one has to wonder" why Defendants acted the way they did. This is  
27 not even close to the specialized or scientific knowledge an expert is supposed to share with the  
28

1 trier of fact. Mr. Spitz's subjective reactions to the evidence in this action are completely irrelevant  
2 and are an improper effort to supplant the key role of the trier of fact in this case.

3 In addition, Plaintiff has disclosed two "rebuttal" experts whose testimony should be  
4 excluded. **Albert Nagy** was designated by Plaintiff to provide "rebuttal" testimony about  
5 Margaret Cotter's employment and the real estate business generally, topics that none of  
6 Defendants' experts have opined on. Mr. Nagy's proposed testimony is not a rebuttal at all.  
7 Instead, Plaintiff appears to think he can avoid Mr. Nagy's exclusion by calling him a "rebuttal"  
8 expert when in fact he should have been disclosed weeks ago. Moreover, Mr. Nagy, a real estate  
9 development consultant, is not qualified to give expert opinion testimony regarding the various  
10 broad topics for which he has been designated, including such complex topics as "how real estate  
11 development fits into Reading International, Inc.'s business." **John Finnerty**, also a purported  
12 rebuttal expert, intends to offer testimony about undefined "other statistical analyses and  
13 conclusions." To the extent such analyses and conclusions are not rebuttal testimony, they should  
14 not be allowed.

15 Defendants respectfully request that the proposed testimony of each of Plaintiff's disclosed  
16 experts be excluded in its entirety. In the alternative, Defendants respectfully request that the  
17 Court impose specific limits on the scope and subject matter of such proposed testimony in  
18 accordance with the points and authorities below.

## 19 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

20 In Nevada, expert testimony is governed by Nevada Revised Statute ("N.R.S.") 50.275,  
21 which provides: "If scientific, technical or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact  
22 to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by  
23 special knowledge, skill, experience, training or education may testify to matters within the scope  
24 of such knowledge." Admission of expert testimony lies within the sound discretion of the trial  
25 court. *Brown v. Nevada*, 110 Nev. 846, 852 (1994). The goal of expert testimony is "to provide  
26 the trier of fact a resource for ascertaining truth in relevant areas outside the ken of ordinarily  
27 laity." *Townsend v. Nevada*, 103 Nev. 113, 117 (1987). Moreover, expert testimony must also  
28



1 withstand the challenge to all relevant evidence—whether its probative value exceeds prejudicial  
2 effect. *See id.* at 117–18; *see also* N.R.S. 48.035(1).

3 Expert testimony should not be a “waste of time.” *Brown*, 110 Nev. at 852 (affirming  
4 exclusion of expert attorney witnesses because it did not assist the trier of fact who had first hand  
5 observations of counsel accused of ineffective assistance of counsel). Expert testimony is  
6 improper if it invades the fact-finding province of the jury. *See, e.g., Townsend*, 103 Nev. at 118  
7 (stating that expert testimony that identified the defendant as the perpetrator was improper “as it  
8 transcended the test of jury enlightenment and entered the realm of fact-finding that was well  
9 within the capacity of a lay jury”). The key, therefore, for admitting expert testimony is  
10 determining whether it will assist the trier of fact and whether it is outside of the realm of what an  
11 ordinary person may understand.

12 In Nevada, experts must be appropriately qualified in a certain area to offer opinions in that  
13 area. *See e.g., Lord v. Nevada*, 107 Nev. 28, 33 (1991) (finding that it was error to permit a law  
14 enforcement officer to testify on a medical issue because he was not qualified as a medical expert).  
15 Thus, a party must establish a proper foundation for expert testimony within a particular field. *See*  
16 *Porter v. Nevada*, 94 Nev. 142, 147 (1978) (affirming exclusion of expert testimony that did not  
17 have a viable foundation in terms of whether the type of expert testimony was within a recognized  
18 field of expertise). “[B]efore a witness may testify as to his or her expert opinion, the district court  
19 must first determine that the witness is indeed a qualified expert.” *Mulder v. Nevada*, 116 Nev. 1,  
20 13–14 (2000) (affirming finding of district court that fingerprint expert was not qualified because  
21 he had little or questionable expertise in the areas and rather, his expertise lay mostly in  
22 handwriting analysis). An expert’s testimony will assist the trier of fact only when it is relevant  
23 and the product of reliable methodology. *Hallmark v. Eldridge*, 124 Nev. 492, 500 (2008).

24 Expert opinions should rest on facts and not assumptions. *See Wrenn v. Nevada*, 89 Nev.  
25 71, 73 (1973). “[E]xpert opinion may not be the result of guesswork or conjecture.” *Id.* (finding  
26 that expert testimony was properly precluded because the engineering calculations rested upon  
27 several assumptions that were not established as the actual facts of the case); *see also Jeep Corp.*  
28 *v. Murray*, 101 Nev. 640, 643 (1985) (finding that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in



1 admitting expert testimony because the expert's opinions were not based on mere speculation or  
2 conjecture); *Choat v. McDorman*, 96 Nev. 332, 335 (1970) (“Just because a witness may be  
3 qualified as an expert does not automatically qualify him to give an opinion necessarily based on  
4 facts beyond his knowledge even though the opinion may be within the range of his expertise.”).  
5 Where the opinion of an expert is based on erroneous assumptions of fact or law, the evidence is  
6 incompetent and insufficient to support a verdict and should be excluded. *United States v. 319.88*  
7 *Acres of Land, More or Less, Situated in Clark Cty., Nev.*, 498 F. Supp. 763, 766 (D. Nev. 1980).

### 8 **III. ARGUMENT**

#### 9 **A. The Legal Opinion of Justice Steele Regarding the Application of Delaware 10 Law to a Hypothetical Set of Facts Should Be Excluded In Its Entirety**

##### 11 **1. Justice Steele’s Delaware Legal Opinion Does Not Assist the Trier of Fact**

12 There is nothing in Justice Steele’s report that would remotely assist the trier of fact.<sup>1</sup> His  
13 legal opinion about what a Delaware court would do *if* a Delaware trier of fact made certain factual  
14 determinations is of no moment here. The trier of fact in this case does not need to know—and,  
15 in fact, would be deeply prejudiced by hearing—how Justice Steele believes Delaware law applies  
16 to various hypothetical scenarios. As another court wrote in a May 2016 order excluding Justice  
17 Steele’s proposed expert testimony: “although these broad, generalized opinions are undoubtedly  
18 correct, their capacity to confuse the factfinder is apparent. They could provide a patina of  
19 substance to [the] claims when they actually say nothing about them.” *VBenx Corp. v. Finnegan*,  
20 2016 WL 3961822, at \*2 (Mass. Super. May 27, 2016).

21 Justice Steele does not purport to provide testimony about whether the Director  
22 Defendants’ conduct was in accordance with the custom and practice for directors of public  
23 companies, or even whether the Director Defendants’ conduct satisfied their fiduciary duties under  
24 Nevada law. Instead, Justice Steele’s report offers four conclusions about Delaware law, each of  
25 which is based on the unproven premise that a finder of fact has already determined that Plaintiff’s  
26 allegations against Defendants are true:

---

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> A copy of Justice Steele’s report is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

1 Based on the facts as I understand them, it is my opinion that a court applying Delaware  
2 law<sup>219</sup> would conclude the following:

- 3 (i) Regarding the process used to terminate JJC,
- 4 a. if a finder of fact finds that a majority of the directors who were entitled to  
5 vote and voted to remove JJC were not disinterested and independent, then  
6 entire fairness would apply, and
- 7 b. if entire fairness applies, the Defendants, either as controlling stockholders or  
8 as directors who acquiesced to the wishes of the controlling stockholders,  
9 breached their duty of loyalty to the Company, given the procedural  
10 deficiencies in the process used to terminate JJC;
- 11 (ii) If a finder of fact finds that the EC Committee was repopulated and reactivated in  
12 order to minimize the involvement of JJC and the other directors who voted not to  
13 terminate JJC, then those actions likely constituted a breach of EC's and MC's  
14 duty of loyalty, as interested directors and as controlling stockholders, and of the  
15 other Defendants, who acquiesced to the controlling stockholders personal wishes;
- 16 (iii) If a finder of fact finds that the appointment of EC and MC to their respective  
17 current positions and the revised compensation and bonuses that they and Adams  
18 were given was not approved by an independent and disinterested majority, then  
19 entire fairness would apply and the Defendants, as controlling stockholders or  
20 those who acquiesced to the wishes of controlling stockholders, would be liable  
21 for a breach of loyalty if the finder of fact finds that the process used to grant the  
22 compensation and bonuses was not entirely fair; and
- 23 (iv) If a finder of fact finds that the Board's rejection of the Offer was not the product  
24 of an independent and disinterested majority, and was born out of the desire to  
25 keep EC and MC, the controlling stockholders, in office, then the rejection out of  
26 hand intentionally breached the duty of loyalty.

27 See Ex. A (Steele Rep.) at 33–34 (emphasis added). As is apparent from the face of Justice  
28 Steele's report and these supposed conclusions, his opinion does not assist the trier of fact, nor is

1 it meant to. There is no benefit or value to informing the trier of fact what a Delaware court  
2 might do if the trier of fact were to reach certain conclusions, the bases of which Justice Steele  
3 has not evaluated and are very much in dispute. Justice Steele's proposed testimony is an  
4 exercise in circular reasoning; he states that Defendants' conduct *would be* wrongful under  
5 Delaware law *if* the trier of fact determines that Defendants did something wrong. This makes  
6 no sense from a witness whose supposed role is to assist the trier of fact.  
7

8 It is well-settled that the judge instructs the jury in the law. *United States v. Brodie*, 858  
9 F.2d 492, 496 (9th Cir. 1988) (overruled on other grounds). Because the jury is instructed to apply  
10 the law as set forth by the judge, the testimony by an expert upon the law by definition cannot be  
11 of assistance to the jury. *Hangarter v. Provident Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 373 F.3d 998, 1016  
12 (9th Cir. 2004) (“[I]nstructing the jury as to the applicable law is the distinct and exclusive  
13 province of the court.”); *United States v. Curtis*, 782 F.2d 593, 599 (6th Cir. 1986) (“[Experts] do  
14 not testify about the law because the judge's special legal knowledge is presumed to be sufficient,  
15 and it is the judge's duty to inform the jury about the law that is relevant to their deliberations.”).  
16 An expert who renders opinions on the state of the law or merely expresses legal conclusions is  
17 usurping the court's function to instruct the jury on the law applicable to the case. The Nevada  
18 Supreme Court has stated that “opinion on the applicable law does not assist the [trier of fact],  
19 duty bound to apply the law as stated by the court, in understanding the evidence or determining a  
20 fact in issue.” *United States Fire Ins. Co. v. McClelland*, 105 Nev. 504, 509 (1989) (citing *Ashton*  
21 *v. Ashton*, 733 P.2d 147, 153 (Utah 1987); *see also Las Vegas Sun, Inc. v. Franklin*, 74 Nev. 282,  
22 294 (1958) (holding that the admission of testimony that was clearly utilized to establish the state  
23 of the law was prejudicial error). In *Ashton*, court explained: “testimonial opinion on the state of  
24 the law is to be excluded [because] [t]he function of an expert is to relate an opinion of *fact* to the  
25 jury.” *Ashton*, 733 P.2d at 153.

26 The only conceivable impact of allowing Justice Steele to present his legal opinions to a  
27 trier of fact would be extreme prejudice and confusion. Any trier of fact would be improperly  
28 swayed by hearing a former Delaware Chief Justice tell them that *if* Defendants committed the



1 various acts of wrongdoing they are accused of, a Delaware court would treat them harshly.  
2 Further, and as discussed below, Justice Steele appears to think it is within his purview to make  
3 his own findings of fact in this case. Justice Steele's opinion is effectively a closing argument on  
4 behalf of Plaintiff, with the only caveat being that Justice Steele applies Delaware instead of  
5 Nevada law. Nothing about such testimony assists the trier of fact; it must be excluded.

6 2. Justice Steele's Legal Opinion Purports to Apply Delaware Law Even  
7 Though There Is Nevada Law Directly On Point

8 Not only are Justice Steele's purported legal opinions inherently prejudicial, they are  
9 inaccurate and confusing to the trier of fact based on their reliance on Delaware law. Justice  
10 Steele's assumption that Delaware as opposed to Nevada law applies in this case is simply wrong.  
11 Though Nevada courts will look to Delaware corporate law for guidance when Nevada law is silent  
12 on a particular issue, that is not the case here. Nevada has extensive statutory and case law  
13 regarding the issues in this case, including the business judgment rule, director conflicts, and  
14 fiduciary duty. Yet for some reason Justice Steele asks the Court and the trier of fact to set that  
15 aside in favor of Delaware law.

16 For example, in the section of his report titled "Certain of the Directors May Not Be  
17 Independent," Justice Steele cites numerous Delaware cases regarding purported director conflicts  
18 of interest. *See* Ex. A (Steele Rep.) at 24. However, Justice Steele does not and cannot explain  
19 why he looks to Delaware law in this context and intentionally ignores the extensive and on-point  
20 Nevada authority. The term "interested director" is defined under Nevada law. *See* N.R.S. 78.140.  
21 Both the Nevada Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit, applying Nevada law, have issued detailed  
22 decisions regarding Nevada law in this area, but Justice Steele does not see fit to incorporate those  
23 into his opinion. *See Shoen v. SAC Holding Corp.*, 122 Nev. 621, 639–40, 137 P.3d 1171, 1183  
24 (2006) ("[T]o show interestedness, a shareholder must allege that a majority of the board members  
25 would be materially affected, either to their benefit or detriment, by a decision of the board, in a  
26 manner not shared by the corporation and the stockholders. Allegations of mere threats of liability  
27 through approval of the wrongdoing or other participation, however, do not show sufficient  
28 interestedness to excuse the demand requirement."); *Louisiana Mun. Police Employees' Ret. Sys.*

1 v. *Wynn*, No. 14-15695, 2016 WL 3878228, at \*6 (9th Cir. July 18, 2016) (“This test requires the  
2 shareholders to plead facts that would support the inference that because of the nature of a  
3 relationship or additional circumstances other than the interested director's stock ownership or  
4 voting power, the non-interested director would be more willing to risk his or her reputation than  
5 risk the relationship with the interested director.”) (internal citations and formatting omitted).  
6 Similarly, Justice Steele’s report omits any mention, let alone analysis, of NRS § 78.138, which  
7 articulates the scope of the business judgment rule under Nevada law and describes the various  
8 factors directors should consider in their decision-making. It is unclear from his report whether  
9 Justice Steele is even aware of this statute.

10 Justice Steele attempts to justify his unwavering reliance on Delaware law in a single  
11 footnote. *See* Ex. A (Steele Rep.) at 2, n.1. He says, “I expect that a Nevada court would look to  
12 Delaware law in interpreting these issues.” *Id.* Justice Steele is wholly unqualified to make that  
13 determination. Justice Steele has no idea what a Nevada court would do, nor does he have any  
14 basis for concluding that there is no relevant Nevada law, since he is not a Nevada law expert. In  
15 addition, though Justice Steele makes the generic and conclusory statement that Delaware law  
16 should apply to “these issues,” he never actually states what “these issues” are or articulates what  
17 specific issues he thinks Delaware law applies to (though, based on his report, it appears he thinks  
18 Delaware law may apply to every issue in the case). Justice Steele’s speculation is not a sufficient  
19 basis to ignore Nevada law and instead substitute an expert’s interpretation of Delaware law in its  
20 place. That Justice Steele has completely omitted any analysis of Nevada law, any comparison of  
21 Nevada and Delaware law, or any reasoning as to why this Court (or the trier of fact) should  
22 consider Delaware as opposed to Nevada law provides an additional basis for excluding his  
23 opinion. *See United States v. Filler*, 210 F.3d 386 (9th Cir. 2000) (affirming trial court’s exclusion  
24 of expert testimony regarding how “other law enforcement agencies do things differently” as  
25 irrelevant and speculative).



- 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

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15

- 16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

25  
26  
27  
28

- Justice Steele claims that the relationship between Director Kane and Ellen and Margaret Cotter includes “speaking frequently on the phone,” and, on that basis, Kane is not an independent director. *See id.* at 18. As support for this assertion, Justice Steele references deposition testimony about *calls relating to the Company* between Kane and Ellen Cotter (and does not reference any calls between Kane and Margaret Cotter). *Id.* at 18, n. 137 (citing the following Kane deposition testimony: “And Ellen is a bit like her father. She does like to work at night. So she’ll call me and I’ll see the number and I’ll call back.”).
- Justice Steele, when discussing the third-party expression of interest letter received by the Company in May 2016, refers to “the Board’s decision not to respond to the offer.” *Id.* at 32. There was no such decision; the Board *did respond to the letter*. *See Ex. F* (“[T]he Board of Directors determined that our stockholders would be better served by pursuing our independent, stand-alone strategic business plan and communicated this to the third party.”).

It is unclear the extent to which Justice Steele relies on his own interpretation of the facts to render his opinion, or whether his opinion is based entirely on the hypothetical scenario in which a finder of fact accepts all of Plaintiff’s allegations as true. However, to the extent Justice Steele purports to rely on the “facts” as stated in his report, his opinion must be excluded because its factual premise is simply false. An expert who has not familiarized himself with the factual record, let alone an expert who is wrong about the facts, cannot offer an expert opinion that would assist the factfinder. *United States v. 319.88 Acres of Land, More or Less, Situated in Clark Cty., Nev.*, 498 F. Supp. 763, 766 (D. Nev. 1980) (“Where the opinion of an expert is based on erroneous assumptions of fact or law, the evidence is incompetent and insufficient to support a verdict.”); *McGlinchy v. Shell Chemical Co.*, 845 F.2d 802, 807 (9th Cir. 1988) (upholding exclusion of conclusions in expert report with only “scant basis” in the record).

**B. The Opinion of Tiago Duarte-Silva Regarding Supposed Losses the Company Has Suffered Since Plaintiff’s Termination Should Be Excluded In Its Entirety**

**1. Dr. Duarte-Silva’s Analysis Fails to Offer Any Causal Connection Between Defendants’ Conduct and the Supposed Losses**

At first glance, the proposed testimony of Dr. Duarte-Silva appears to level significant allegations against Defendants regarding the damage caused by their alleged breaches of fiduciary

1 duty.<sup>3</sup> His report states that, [REDACTED]  
2 [REDACTED]  
3 [REDACTED]  
4 [REDACTED] Ex. B (Duarte-Silva Rep.), ¶ 39. Dr. Duarte-Silva also states  
5 that, [REDACTED]  
6 [REDACTED]  
7 [REDACTED]  
8 [REDACTED]  
9 [REDACTED] *Id.*, ¶ 27. Plaintiff intends to have Dr.  
10 Duarte-Silva present these figures to the trier of fact in support of his claimed damages. And yet,  
11 these are not “damages” at all; Dr. Duarte-Silva’s fails to remotely connect these supposed losses  
12 to Defendants’ alleged conduct.

13 There is not a single sentence in Dr. Duarte-Silva’s report that ties these supposed losses  
14 to Plaintiff’s termination, Ellen Cotter’s performance as CEO, or any one of the various fiduciary  
15 breaches alleged in the Second Amended Complaint. In other words, Dr. Duarte-Silva does not  
16 and cannot testify that a single dollar of supposed loss is attributable to Defendants’ alleged  
17 conduct. As revealed by Exhibit 2 to his report, Dr. Duarte-Silva has not reviewed a single  
18 deposition transcript from this case and has only looked at a single document produced in  
19 discovery (the unsolicited “offer” letter from May 2016). In other words, he has not made any  
20 attempt to connect the supposed “losses” outlined in his report to anything Defendants have done  
21 or not done.

22 Dr. Duarte-Silva does not know how, if it all, the direction or implementation of Reading’s  
23 corporate strategy changed after Plaintiff was terminated. He does not know if Plaintiff would  
24 have done anything differently than Ellen Cotter had he remained CEO. He does not know how,  
25 if at all, the Company has changed its approach to cinema exhibition or real estate since Plaintiff  
26 was fired. He does not know the extent to which EBITDA during Ellen Cotter’s CEO tenure has  
27

---

28 <sup>3</sup> A copy of Dr. Duarte-Silva’s report is attached hereto as Exhibit B.



1 been impacted by decisions made by Plaintiff when he was CEO, or how EBITDA when Plaintiff  
2 was CEO was impacted by his father's decision-making.<sup>4</sup> He does not know how firm-specific or  
3 industry-specific factors unrelated to the allegations affected Reading's performance. Tellingly,  
4 Dr. Duarte-Silva never even refers to the supposed losses described in his report as "damages,"  
5 presumably because he is aware that "damages" need to be tied to a defendant's conduct, which  
6 his numbers are not. Plaintiff should not be permitted to offer Dr. Duarte-Silva as a "damages"  
7 expert—or any other kind of expert—where he does not even opine as to damages, since there is  
8 no fact, evidence, or opinion linking the supposed losses Dr. Duarte-Silva opines about to any of  
9 the conduct described in the complaint.

10 A trier of fact would be confused and prejudiced were Dr. Duarte-Silva to testify at trial  
11 about his calculations. Allowing Dr. Duarte-Silva, a supposed expert, to testify that [REDACTED]  
12 [REDACTED] clearly suggests to the factfinder that  
13 such purported losses are actually attributable to Plaintiff's termination, when in reality not even  
14 Dr. Duarte-Silva suggests that is the case. Under Nevada law, a derivative breach of fiduciary  
15 duty claim requires a plaintiff to show damages to the company proximately caused by the alleged  
16 breach of fiduciary duty. *See Brown v. Kinross Gold U.S.A., Inc.*, 531 F. Supp. 2d 1234, 1245 (D.  
17 Nev. 2008); *Giles v. Gen. Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 494 F.3d 865, 880–81 (9th Cir. 2007)  
18 (applying Nevada law); *see also Clark v. Lubritz*, 113 Nev. 1089 (1997). Plaintiff apparently  
19 intends to use Dr. Duarte-Silva's testimony to skip over his obligation to show proximate causation  
20 and instead present the trier of fact with a "damages" figure that has no causal tie whatsoever to  
21 any of the breaches alleged by Plaintiff. The trier of fact would likely assume that some, if not all,  
22 of [REDACTED] Dr. Duarte-Silva describes are attributable to Defendants' conduct, even  
23

---

24 <sup>4</sup> Dr. Duarte-Silva's unorthodox approach shows a fundamental lack of understanding of  
25 basic business reality, as he assumes that the Company's performance during Plaintiff's brief  
26 tenure was in no way the product of good decisions made by his father over the more than twenty  
27 years that he ran the Company, and that the performance of the Company following his  
28 termination was in no way the product of poor decisions made by Plaintiff during his tenure as  
CEO. A business decision made today can have impact months and even years down the line, a  
basic fact ignored by Dr. Duarte-Silva's novel strategy of loss assessment.

1 though that is not actually part of Dr. Duarte-Silva's proposed testimony. Such testimony is far  
2 more prejudicial than probative—indeed, it is not probative at all—and on that basis should be  
3 excluded in its entirety. *Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Fitzgerald*, 94 Nev. 241, 243 (1978) (citing  
4 N.R.S. 48.035(1)) (A trial court has broad discretion to determine the admissibility of evidence  
5 and may exclude expert testimony where “its probative value is substantially outweighed by the  
6 danger of unfair prejudice, . . . confusion of the issues or . . . misleading the jury.”).

7 2. Dr. Duarte-Silva Does Not Use Any Standard or Commonly-Accepted  
8 Methodology In Evaluating Reading's Stock Performance from June 15,  
9 2015, to August 19, 2016

10 Dr. Duarte-Silva claims that because Reading's stock price has not kept pace with the  
11 industry market from June 2015 through his arbitrary measurement date of August 19, 2016, the  
12 Company [REDACTED]. See Ex. B (Duarte-Silva Rep.), ¶ 39. However, his conclusory and surface-  
13 level analysis fails to apply any recognized or well-accepted methodology used by experts who  
14 study the impact of various events on a company's stock. Nor does Dr. Duarte-Silva's analysis  
15 show what portion (if any) of the underperformance he calculates is attributable to the alleged  
16 wrongdoing as opposed to other factors impacting the industry and market. An expert's testimony  
17 will assist the trier of fact only when it is relevant and the product of reliable methodology.  
18 *Hallmark*, 124 Nev. at 500. In determining whether an expert's opinion is based upon reliable  
19 methodology, a district court should consider whether the opinion is “(1) within a recognized field  
20 of expertise; (2) testable and has been tested; (3) published and subjected to peer review; (4)  
21 generally accepted in the scientific community (not always determinative); and (5) based more on  
22 particularized facts rather than assumption, conjecture, or generalization.” *Id.* at 500–01 (internal  
23 citations omitted). Dr. Duarte-Silva's analysis does not meet this standard and his proposed  
24 testimony should be excluded on this basis.

25 (a) Dr. Duarte-Silva Did Not Perform an Event Study, a Standard  
26 Technique Used By Experts in the Field

27 It is well-recognized within this field that in order to relate the change in a company's  
28 stock price to the release of new information, an expert must disentangle the effects of the new



1 information from other information that is likely to affect stock prices marketwide. *See In re*  
2 *Omnicom Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 541 F. Supp. 2d 546, 554 (2008) (granting defendant's motion  
3 for summary judgment after plaintiff's expert failed to isolate the effect of certain identified  
4 disclosures on company's stock price from that of other market forces). Event studies are a  
5 commonly used statistical method of evaluating the price impact of new information after  
6 controlling for market, industry, and other factors. The price movements of a company's stock  
7 that are not explained by market, industry, or other factors modeled in the event study (*i.e.*, the  
8 "excess return") may be attributable to the disclosure of the specified information being tested.<sup>5</sup>  
9 The standard event study method was developed decades ago by Defendants' expert, Professor  
10 Richard Roll, and applied by him in this case.<sup>6</sup>

11 Here, Dr. Duarte-Silva did not perform an event study. For example, he does not define  
12 an event or a news announcement to be studied, nor does he define an "event window" or the  
13 period around the announcement to be examined, which are both hallmarks of event studies.<sup>7</sup>  
14 Because Dr. Duarte-Silva did not perform an event study, he cannot opine whether the release of  
15 any particular piece of information related to Defendants' alleged wrongdoings was associated  
16 with a negative impact on Reading's stock price. The supposed methodology employed by  
17 Dr. Duarte-Silva is rudimentary, unscientific, and not generally used by experts in the field, and  
18 should therefore be excluded. *See Hallmark*, 124 Nev. at 500; *Donaldson v. Cent. Illinois Pub.*

---

21 <sup>5</sup> Bodie, Zvi, Alex Kane, and Alan Marcus, *Investments*, Seventh Edition, Boston, MA:  
22 Irwin McGraw-Hill, 2008, p. 366; MacKinlay, Craig, "Event Studies in Economics and  
Finance," *Journal of Economic Literature* Vol. XXXV (1997): 18.

23 <sup>6</sup> Dr. Richard Roll his co-authors, including Nobel Prize winner Dr. Eugene Fama, were  
24 among the first economists to apply this now widely-used methodology. Eugene F. Fama et al.,  
25 *The Adjustment of Stock Prices to New Information*, 10 Int'l Econ. Rev. 1 (1969). Their seminal  
26 work has been tested, published by the International Economic Review, and has been widely  
accepted in the scientific community. A. Craig MacKinlay, *Event Studies in Economics and*  
*Finance*, 35 J. Econ. Lit. 13, 14 (1997) ("... Eugene Fama et al. (1969) introduced the  
methodology that is essentially the same as that which is in use today.").

27 <sup>7</sup> MacKinlay, Craig, "Event Studies in Economics and Finance," *Journal of Economic*  
28 *Literature* Vol. XXXV (1997): 18, pp. 14-15.

1 *Serv. Co.*, 313 Ill. App. 3d 1061, 1072 (2000) (affirming trial court's exclusion of expert  
2 testimony that was not commonly accepted in that particular scientific community).

3 In contrast, Defendants' expert Dr. Richard Roll conducted an event study of Reading's  
4 stock pursuant to scientific and academic best practices to measure the stock price change, after  
5 controlling for market and industry factors, associated with the announcement of Plaintiffs'  
6 termination. Following accepted financial economics methodology, Dr. Roll identified the event  
7 to be examined (*i.e.*, the announcement of Plaintiffs' termination). Dr. Roll's calibrated  
8 Reading's returns and benchmark returns during a period prior to the disclosure of Plaintiff's  
9 termination. Professor Roll then calculated the excess returns on the dates surrounding  
10 Plaintiff's announced termination (*i.e.*, the "event window"). Dr. Roll then performed a  
11 standard statistical analysis that is part of the event study methodology to assess whether the  
12 excess returns were statistically different from zero. They were not, demonstrating that  
13 Reading's stock price returns were statistically indistinguishable from its normal day-to-day  
14 movements over the first three trading days (June 12, June, 15, and June 16 2015) following the  
15 announcement of Plaintiff's termination.<sup>8</sup> These results support Dr. Roll's conclusion that public  
16 disclosure of Plaintiff's termination did not have an adverse effect on Reading's stock price.

17 (b) Dr. Duarte-Silva's Methodology For Analyzing the Long-Run  
18 Performance of Reading's Stock Is Far Out of Line With Other  
Experts in This Field

19 While Dr. Duarte-Silva failed to perform an event study, he purports to measure the so-  
20 called "expected returns" of Reading stock since Plaintiff's termination in June 2015 through  
21 Duarte-Silva's "Measurement Date" of August 19, 2016 in order to demonstrate losses to the  
22 Company. And while he contends that his approach is a "commonly accepted statistical approach  
23 to calculating a stock's expected returns," *he does not cite to a single study or piece of academic*  
24 *literature* that supports his approach. *See* Duarte-Silva Rep., ¶ 35. Indeed, the standard approach  
25 in this field to measure whether a company's stock "performed in line with the market and its peer  
26

---

27 <sup>8</sup> While Reading did not announce Plaintiff's termination until June, 15, 2015, Plaintiff  
28 filed a lawsuit on June 12, 2015 that disclosed this information.

1 companies” over an extended period of time is to calculate the “alpha” of the company’s stock.  
2 “Alpha” provides a measure of whether an investment in question earned a return greater than or  
3 less than its expected return, given market and/or industry performance, as well as the investment’s  
4 risk characteristics.<sup>9</sup> Calculating a stock’s “alpha” allows an expert to determine whether a stock  
5 generated returns that are greater or less than its expected returns over a particular period of time.  
6 Here, Dr. Duarte-Silva has not performed such an analysis. Instead, he calculated a so-called series  
7 of “expected” daily returns over a period spanning approximately a year and two months in an  
8 unorthodox manner. Dr. Duarte-Silva’s nonstandard approach is inappropriate for analyzing  
9 whether Reading’s “alpha” or whether the Company “performed in line with the market and its  
10 peer companies” in a manner consistent with standard industry practice.<sup>10</sup> Further, Dr. Duarte-  
11 Silva’s analysis does not show what portion of the supposed underperformance, which changes  
12 every day, is attributable to the alleged wrongdoing.<sup>11</sup>

13 In contrast to Dr. Duarte-Silva’s unorthodox approach, Defendants’ expert Dr. Richard  
14 Roll calculated the alpha for Reading’s stock over the period June 15, 2015 to June 30, 2016, using  
15 regression analysis, Reading’s stock price returns, a set of risk factors, and industry-specific  
16 benchmarks consistent with standard financial practice.<sup>12</sup> After conducting his analysis of  
17  
18  
19  
20

---

21 <sup>9</sup> See, e.g., Damodaran, Aswath, *Investment Valuation*, Second Edition, New York, NY:  
22 John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2002, p. 183.

23 <sup>10</sup> In particular, Dr. Silva’s calculation involves using a separate regression model to  
24 estimate an “expected” daily return for each day from June 15, 2015 to his Measurement Date of  
August 19, 2016.

25 <sup>11</sup> Reading’s underperformance is calculated by taking the difference between columns V  
26 and R on Exhibit 8 to the Duarte-Silva Report. Dr. Duarte-Silva provides no analysis that  
explains the causes of these changes and whether they were due to any allegedly wrongful  
actions taken by the Defendants.

27 <sup>12</sup> June 30, 2016 was the most recent date for which information used by Dr. Roll to  
28 calculate Reading’s alpha was available.



1 Reading's alpha, Dr. Roll concluded that his results do not support a conclusion that RDI's stock  
2 price underperformed expectations on a risk-adjusted basis following Plaintiff's termination.<sup>13</sup>

3 (c) Dr. Duarte-Silva's Results Are Not Statistically Significant

4 Notwithstanding that Dr. Duarte-Silva uses a non-standard and unreliable method to  
5 measure Reading's stock performance, he also fails to provide a statistical confidence interval for  
6 his supposed "expected return." A "confidence interval" accounts for the uncertainty associated  
7 with any statistical estimate, such as Dr. Duarte-Silva's "expected return," that is derived from a  
8 regression analysis.<sup>14</sup> The "confidence interval" would provide a range within which the true value  
9 being estimated could conceivably fall. If, for the sake of argument, one were to accept Dr. Duarte-  
10 Silva's non-standard methodology, his analysis actually indicates that the Reading's performance  
11 during the measurement period was *within* the confidence interval range for Reading's cumulative  
12 expected returns. Based on the standard errors demonstrated in Exhibit 8 to the Duarte-Silva  
13 Report, [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]  
15 [REDACTED] In other words, Dr. Duarte-Silva's report fails to show underperformance (or a loss to  
16 Reading) that is statistically significantly different from zero.

17 That Dr. Duarte-Silva fails to even attempt to demonstrate the statistical significance of his  
18 supposed findings is notable given his position, taken in previously-published papers, that any  
19 study of stock performance must take into consideration statistical significance. According to Dr.  
20 Duarte-Silva: "If the excess return analyzed exceeds a threshold based on typical return  
21 fluctuations, it is considered statistically significant. When this is the case, the economic expert is  
22 likely to opine that the excess return is due to potentially identifiable news rather than to [market]  
23 noise. If the excess return does not exceed that threshold, the expert *cannot determine* that the

24  
25 <sup>13</sup> Dr. Roll also evaluated RDI's alpha from June 15, 2015 to the three-, six-, and nine-  
26 month periods following James Cotter, Jr.'s termination (*i.e.*, September 14, 2015, December 14,  
2015, and March 14, 2016, respectively) and found similar results.

27 <sup>14</sup> See, *e.g.*, Gujarati, *Essentials of Econometrics*, Second Ed., Irwin McGraw-Hill  
28 (1999), pp. 157, 165.

1 price changed for a reason other than [market] noise.”<sup>15</sup> In another paper, Dr. Duarte-Silva wrote,  
2 “The literature on event studies has long established the properties of excess returns and tests of  
3 their statistical significance.”<sup>16</sup> Despite this, the Duarte-Silva Report is silent on the supposed  
4 statistical significance of his own findings. That Dr. Duarte-Silva’s analysis does not even meet  
5 *his own standards* of how such analysis should be conducted constitutes further basis for excusing  
6 his proposed testimony.

7 3. Dr. Duarte-Silva Has No Basis to Offer An Opinion Regarding the “Offer”

8 Dr. Duarte-Silva devotes the final section of his report to the unsolicited third-party “offer”  
9 received by the Company in May 2016. *See* Ex. B (Duarte-Silva Rep.), ¶¶ 40-45. Dr. Duarte-  
10 Silva opines that, by not accepting the “offer” at face value or entering in to negotiations, [REDACTED]  
11 [REDACTED]  
12 [REDACTED] *Id.*, ¶ 43. Dr. Duarte-Silva is not qualified to offer any  
13 opinion about the supposed impact of the “offer” and applies no scientific or academic  
14 methodology whatsoever to his purported analysis. Any proposed testimony on this topic should  
15 be excluded.

16 *First*, Dr. Duarte-Silva is not an expert in corporate acquisitions, negotiations, mergers, or  
17 unsolicited offers. He is not an expert in the valuation of public companies, and is not in a position  
18 to say whether the “offer,” even if it had been binding and fully funded, was an adequate or  
19 inadequate price for the Company. As a finance Ph.D. working in economic analysis, Dr. Duarte-  
20 Silva has presented no basis on which the Court can or should determine that he is in any position  
21 to assist the trier of fact in assessing the evidence regarding the unsolicited third-party indication  
22 of interest and the Board’s response thereto.

23  
24  
25 <sup>15</sup> Duarte-Silva and Dolgoff, “Measure price impact with investors’ forward-looking  
26 information,” August 2014, *available at* <http://www.crai.com/sites/default/files/publications/FM-Insights-Event-Studies-and-Forward-Looking-Information-August-2014.pdf>

27 <sup>16</sup> Duarte-Silva and Tripolski-Kimel, Testing Excess Returns on Event Days: Log  
28 Returns vs. Dollar Returns (February 28, 2014), *available at* <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2416990>



1 Dr. Duarte-Silva's lack of experience or expertise in this area is evidenced by his proposed  
2 testimony, which fails to demonstrate that he has anything to say on this topic beyond what an  
3 ordinary factfinder could discern. For example, Dr. Duarte-Silva opines that "negotiation can  
4 increase offer price." *Id.*, ¶ 44. This truism is not the result of any specialized knowledge and  
5 expertise. Dr. Duarte-Silva goes on to opine that "in corporate acquisition settings, after a first bid  
6 announcement, the target is in play and it is possible that other bidders will compete to acquire the  
7 target firm and such multiple bid auction usually leads to higher control premiums than when the  
8 initial bid is successful." *Id.*, ¶ 45. This opinion appears to be based on a false premise that the  
9 Board was somehow obligated to put the Company on the auction block as soon as any buyer  
10 showed potential interest. Dr. Duarte-Silva offers no authority for such assertion because none  
11 exists. *See* N.R.S. § 78.138(4)(d) (directors, in connection with corporate decision-making, may  
12 consider "[t]he long-term as well as short-term interests of the corporation and its stockholders,  
13 including the possibility that these interests may be best served by the continued independence of  
14 the corporation); *see also* *Ivanhoe Partners v. Newmont Min. Corp.*, 535 A.2d 1334, 1338 (Del.  
15 1987) ("Newmont was not for sale. Thus, there was no duty of its directors to maximize the  
16 company's value at a sale for the stockholders' benefit.") (internal quotations omitted); *Revlon,*  
17 *Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings Inc.*, 506 A.2d 173, 182 (1986) (only after the board  
18 authorized management to negotiate a merger or buy out did its duty change from preservation of  
19 the corporate entity to maximization of the company's value at a sale for the stockholders' benefit).  
20 Simply put, when it comes to corporate acquisition offers, Dr. Duarte-Silva is no expert.

21 *Second*, Dr. Duarte-Silva's analysis with respect to Board's response to the third-party  
22 "offer" is not grounded in any standard or widely-accepted methodology, nor does it even purport  
23 to be. Dr. Duarte-Silva opines that the "offer premium was not low relative to similar recent  
24 transactions," but provides no citation or reference to any authority supporting his apparent  
25 position that the quality of third-party buyout offer, and a corporate board's response, should be  
26 measured according to initial "offer premium." *Id.*, ¶ 42. Dr. Duarte-Silva seems to approach his  
27 potential buyout analysis from the perspective that any deal with a "not low" offer premium must  
28 be a good one, regardless of the board's determination of the company's strategy or earnings

1 potential. Neither the law nor any academic literature is in accord with this approach, and Dr.  
2 Duarte-Silva cites no sources. *C.f.*, N.R.S. § 78.138(4)(d).

3 Dr. Duarte-Silva then claims that because the Board did not pursue a deal with the offerors,

4 [REDACTED]  
5 [REDACTED] See Ex. B (Duarte-Silva Rep.), ¶ 43. Again,  
6 Dr. Duarte-Silva sets forth this opinion without providing any legal or academic basis, let alone  
7 one that is widely-used or accepted in *any* field of expertise. His methodology makes no sense.  
8 The rudimentary approach Dr. Duarte-Silva has taken is, in essence, that any time a company turns  
9 down an offer above the then-current stock price, they are improperly foregoing a one-time  
10 opportunity to increase value. Under such a scheme, every company would constantly be on the  
11 auction block and the role of corporate directors would shift from being long-term protectors of  
12 the stockholders' best interests to short-term auctioneers. Of course, Nevada law expressly permits  
13 and encourages corporate directors to do better than simply trying to generate short-term gains.  
14 See, e.g., N.R.S. §§ 78.120, 78.138. On the other hand, if Dr. Duarte-Silva's baseless analysis  
15 were accepted, a Board would be liable for damages to stockholders any time it failed to pursue a  
16 deal even 1% above the trading price of their company. This proposition is absurd, and Dr. Duarte-  
17 Silva should not be given the opportunity to present it to the trier of fact.

18 **C. The Opinion of Richard Spitz Regarding the CEO Search Should Be**  
19 **Excluded In Its Entirety Because Mr. Spitz Fails to Apply Any Methodology**  
20 **and Instead Simply Offers His Own Subjective Fact Interpretation**

21 1. Mr. Spitz, A Supposed Executive Search Expert, Actually Seeks to Offer  
22 Testimony About His Personal Reaction to Various Facts and Does Not  
23 Apply Any Legitimate or Recognized Methodology

24 Plaintiff offers Richard Spitz as a supposed expert on conducting executive searches.<sup>17</sup> In  
25 Mr. Spitz's own words: "I have been asked to evaluate the executive search undertaken during  
26 2015 to find the Chief Executive Officer of Reading International, Inc." Ex. C (Spitz Rep.), ¶ 7.  
27 Mr. Spitz is an attorney who formerly worked at the executive search firm Korn Ferry, the firm  
28 that conducted Reading's CEO search, though he left that company in 2009. *Id.*, ¶ 4. Mr. Spitz

---

<sup>17</sup> A copy of Mr. Spitz's report is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

1 summarizes his opinion as follows: “I have considered the search process and concluded that the  
2 execution of the search through its conclusion (i.e., the hiring of Ellen Cotter as Chief Executive  
3 Officer) was not conducted properly by the RDI Board of Directors (the “Board”) or its CEO  
4 search committee (the “Search Committee”), and therefore the search failed.” *Id.*, ¶ 8. Mr. Spitz's  
5 proposed testimony should be excluded.

6 As a preliminary matter, this case is not about whether the CEO search was “conducted  
7 properly” or whether it “failed.” The trier of fact must determine whether members of Reading’s  
8 Board of Directors breached their fiduciary duties by selecting Ellen Cotter as the Company’s  
9 CEO. As Plaintiff is well aware, a Board member’s fulfillment of his fiduciary duties is not judged  
10 by whether something was a “success” or “failure.” *Even if* the CEO search was a failure according  
11 to whatever unidentified standards Mr. Spitz applies, that does not demonstrate or even suggest a  
12 breach of fiduciary duty by any Defendant or any injury to the Company resulting from such  
13 “failure.” This proposed testimony is wholly irrelevant and on that basis should be excluded. *See,*  
14 *e.g., Schwartz v. Estate of Greenspun*, 110 Nev. 1042, 1046–47 (1994) (affirming exclusion of  
15 irrelevant expert testimony); *Brown v. State*, 110 Nev. 846, 852 (1994) (upholding exclusion of  
16 expert testimony when it would be of no use to the trier of fact).

17 Beyond being irrelevant, the proposed testimony of Mr. Spitz does not even approach the  
18 standards required for a legitimate and admissible expert opinion. Mr. Spitz fails to describe any  
19 methodology he used to determine whether or not the Company’s CEO search was a success or  
20 failure. He does not describe any standard bases by which an executive search can or should be  
21 judged. Indeed, Mr. Spitz’s proposed testimony does not convey anything that is outside or beyond  
22 the understanding of an ordinary person and is not actually an “expert” opinion at all. *See*  
23 *Townsend v. Nevada*, 103 Nev. 113, 117 (1987) (“The goal, of [expert testimony], is to provide  
24 the trier of fact a resource for ascertaining truth in relevant areas outside the ken of ordinary  
25 laity.”). The process of looking for and hiring an executive is not so mysterious to the layperson  
26 that Plaintiff needs Mr. Spitz share his opinions with the factfinder. The trier of fact is well  
27 equipped to make a determination about the process by which Reading’s Board identified Ellen  
28 Cotter as a CEO candidate and her qualifications for that position.



1           Beyond purporting to offer an opinion about the CEO search's success or failure, Mr. Spitz  
2 seems primarily interested in sharing with the factfinder his subjective observations about various  
3 facts and evidence, essentially taking on the factfinder role himself. Mr. Spitz's supposed  
4 “opinion” includes, for example, a comparison of Ellen Cotter’s background to the potential CEO  
5 qualifications identified by Korn Ferry; stating that Reading’s directors have been dishonest; and  
6 determining the long-term business strategy that Reading should be following. *See id.*, ¶¶ 9-12,  
7 35, 37, 39. Throughout his report, Mr. Spitz, under the guise of offering an “expert opinion,”  
8 attempts to substitute his own subjective determinations about witness credibility and weight of  
9 evidence for those of the trier of fact.

10           For example, several Defendants have testified at deposition that one of the motivations  
11 for terminating the Korn Ferry CEO search was to save money. In response, Mr. Spitz opines that  
12 “[i]t is difficult to imagine that relatively minor costs and expenses were driving the Search  
13 Committee decision to halt Korn Ferry’s activities.” *Id.*, ¶ 32. The role of an expert is to assist  
14 the trier of fact, not to opine about whether or not he believes certain testimony to be credible or  
15 that something is “difficult to imagine.” Mr. Spitz repeats this approach throughout his report,  
16 casting aspersions at Defendants by referring to their conduct as “vexing,” stating that “one has to  
17 wonder” about why certain actions were taken, and otherwise attempting to substitute his own  
18 subjective reaction to evidence for that of the tier of fact. *Id.*, ¶¶, 46. Mr. Spitz proposes to testify  
19 that:

- 20           • “It seems clear that there was no disagreement between the entire Search  
21 Committee and Ellen Cotter on her lack of relevant real estate experience.” *Id.*, ¶  
22 36.
- 23           • “[O]nly one of the above considerations explains a specific reason why the Search  
24 Committee decided not to present any of the external candidates to be interviewed  
25 by the entire Board . . . So it appears at least in part this consideration is not to be  
26 true [sic].” *Id.*, ¶ 37.
- 27           • “The Search Committee’s stated consideration on this matter of compensation is  
28 suspect and not convincing.” *Id.*, ¶ 39.
- “These considerations are vexing in that Ellen Cotter and the Search Committee  
did not manage the search process as if there was an urgency or need for stability.”  
*Id.*, ¶ 40.

- “Equally as vexing about these considerations is that urgency and stability were not among the specific the [sic] reasons given during deposition by the Search Committee members Gould and McEachern in support of their voting to nominate Ellen Cotter and deciding not to follow the search process approved by the Board.” *Id.*, ¶40.
- “If unlocking the intrinsic value of the Company’s real estate holdings was not the company’s objective for conducting the search process, one has to wonder why did the Board (or the Search Committee) authorize and undertake the following [activities].” *Id.*, ¶ 46.

This does not remotely resemble a legitimate expert opinion; these are just Mr. Spitz’s personal musings on the facts and on witness credibility and do not reflect any reasonable methodology, let alone a methodology or approach to executive searches that is widely accepted. Mr. Spitz’s supposed “expertise” in the process for conducting executive searches does not give him license to opine on witness credibility, general business issues, the qualifications the Company needed or desired in a CEO, or basic facts about which the trier of fact will hear testimony. *See Lickey v. State*, 108 Nev. 191, 196 (1992) (stating that “[a]n expert may not comment on the veracity of a witness”); *Townsend v. State*, 103 Nev. 113, 118–19 (1987) (noting that expert opinion that invaded the jury’s province, such as testimony concerning the victim’s credibility and weighing of the evidence, was improper); *Dawson v. State*, 84 Nev. 260, 439 P.2d 462 (1968) (excluding certain expert testimony, and noting that “[a]n expert witness may state his conclusions on matters within his expert knowledge provided the conclusion is one laymen would not be capable of drawing for themselves.”).

Even Mr. Spitz’s ultimate conclusion fails to assist the trier of fact in any way. Mr. Spitz opines, “Basically, Ellen Cotter was in a position to ensure that the search for external candidates would not succeed” and “[t]he conduct of Ellen Cotter with respect to her service on the Search Committee undermines the confidence one should have that the search process was properly directed and completed.” *Id.*, ¶ 44. In other words, this purported executive search expert’s conclusion is that Ms. Cotter was “*in a position*” to manipulate the search process, which “undermines the confidence” Mr. Spitz has in the CEO search process. The trier of fact does not need to hear from Mr. Spitz to determine that Ms. Cotter *could have possibly* manipulated the CEO



1 search; that is exactly what Plaintiff alleges in this case, and it is up to Plaintiff to prove it. Mr.  
2 Spitz's suspicions about what may or may not have happened are meaningless, and only serve to  
3 confuse and prejudice the trier of fact. Moreover, the trier of fact is not tasked with determining  
4 whether an outside observer should have "confidence" in how the CEO search was conducted.  
5 They must determine whether there was a breach of fiduciary duty. Because Mr. Spitz does not  
6 identify or use any legitimate or recognized methodology to evaluate the CEO search process, and  
7 because he attempts to substitute his own opinions for the trier of fact, his supposed expert opinion  
8 does not assist the trier of fact in any way and should be excluded in its entirety.

9 2. Mr. Spitz's Proposed Testimony Regarding Margaret Cotter's New York  
10 Real Estate Position Is Well Outside His Supposed Area of Expertise

11 Mr. Spitz presents himself as an expert in conducting executive searches. Yet his proposed  
12 testimony veers well outside the realm of anything relating to such searches. In particular, Mr.  
13 Spitz purports to testify about Margaret Cotter's hiring, in March 2016, as Executive Vice  
14 President—Real Estate Management and Development—NYC. *Id.*, ¶ 42. Given that this position  
15 was filled without the assistance of an executive search firm, and has nothing to do with whether  
16 or not Reading's CEO search was a "success" or "failure," there is no reason Mr. Spitz should be  
17 allowed to offer his opinion about Margaret Cotter's hiring. He is simply not qualified to do so.  
18 *See White v. Ford Motor Co.*, 312 F.3d 998, 1008–09 (9th Cir. 2002) ("A layman, which is what  
19 an expert witness is when testifying outside his area of expertise, ought not to be anointed with  
20 ersatz authority as a court-approved expert witness for what is essentially a lay opinion.").

21 Beyond being outside his area of expertise, Mr. Spitz's proposed testimony about Margaret  
22 Cotter's hiring is confusing, prejudicial, and has zero probative value. Mr. Spitz, for example,  
23 states that "Margaret Cotter has little real estate investment or development experience, none of  
24 which satisfies the minimum requirements of the Position Specification." *Id.*, ¶ 42. This is a *non*  
25 *sequitur*; the Position Specification Mr. Spitz refers to is for the CEO position. Mr. Spitz does not  
26 explain, nor can he, why he is judging and evaluating the hiring of an EVP against the  
27 specifications developed for a CEO search. This bizarre analysis is nonsensical, yet Mr. Spitz  
28 seems intent on using it again and again: "I am aware that the Company's later public filings

1 disclose additional real estate activities undertaken by Margaret Cotter. These materials, however,  
2 do not alter my conclusion because none of them approach the level of experience or  
3 accomplishment required by the Position Specification.” *Id.*, ¶ 42. In other words, Mr. Spitz’s  
4 “conclusion” seems to be that Margaret Cotter, when she was hired as an EVP, did not meet certain  
5 of the qualifications that the Company was looking for in a CEO. Mr. Spitz, supposedly an expert  
6 in executive searches, should know better; this appears to be a blatant attempt to mislead the trier  
7 of fact. Not only that, but the trier of fact is well-equipped to evaluate Margaret Cotter’s  
8 qualifications for the job. They do not need the “help” of Mr. Spitz’s misleading conclusions  
9 disguised as expert opinion.

10 3. Mr. Spitz Is Unqualified to Offer Any Purported Expert Opinion  
11 Regarding Reading’s Stock Price or “Strategic Imperative”

12 Mr. Spitz also exceeds the scope of his supposed expertise and proposed area of testimony  
13 when he opines, repeatedly and at length, about Reading’s business strategy generally, including  
14 the company’s “strategic imperative” to pursue additional real estate opportunities. For example,  
15 Mr. Spitz states that, “As a result of the maturing of the cinema business and the missed  
16 opportunity by the Company to capture the increase in market values of its real estate holdings,  
17 the stock price of the Company was depressed.” *Id.*, ¶ 11. Based on his own unqualified  
18 determination that Reading’s stock price was depressed, an online article about Reading from  
19 2013, and a statement by James Cotter, Sr. that Reading’s real estate activities were, per dollar  
20 invested, more profitable than cinema activities, Mr. Spitz determines that building its real estate  
21 activities is Reading’s primary “strategic imperative.” Mr. Spitz then goes on to premise his entire  
22 opinion on his own determination of Reading’s “strategic imperative.” *Id.*, ¶ 23.

23 Mr. Spitz, an attorney and former executive search consultant, should not be permitted to  
24 opine before the trier of fact about what he concludes is or was Reading’s “strategic imperative.”  
25 In doing so, he is substituting his own judgment for that of the Board of Directors, who are far  
26 more informed than Mr. Spitz about Reading’s strategy, plans, and goals. Mr. Spitz’s “strategic  
27 imperative” conclusion in fact directly contradicts the two pronged business strategy laid out in  
28 the Company’s various SEC filings, including those signed by Plaintiff himself. *See, e.g.*, RDI

1 March 17, 2015 10-K (describing the Company’s “two business segments” and stating that they  
2 “complement one another, as the comparatively consistent cash flows generated by our cinema  
3 operations allow us to be opportunistic in acquiring and holding real estate assets, and can be used  
4 not only to grow and develop our cinema business but also to help fund the front-end cash demands  
5 of our real estate development business”).<sup>18</sup> Mr. Spitz provides no basis or qualifications as to  
6 why he, and he alone, is vested with the ability to determine Reading’s strategic imperative, a  
7 conclusion he appears to base primarily on a single article from the Internet. Mr. Spitz, a lawyer  
8 and former executive search professional, does not apply or explain any methodology for his  
9 conclusion that the single most important “strategic imperative” for Reading was to build its real  
10 estate business. Accordingly, Mr. Spitz should not be permitted to testify to the trier of fact about  
11 what he believes Reading’s key “strategic imperative” is or was.

12 To the extent other parts of Mr. Spitz’s opinion and proposed testimony rely on his  
13 determination of a “strategic imperative,” such testimony should be excluded as well. For  
14 example, Mr. Spitz opines, “Even if the Search Committee’s reference to Ellen Cotter’s real estate  
15 development experience was accurate, this consideration is deficient. Together with all the other  
16 considerations, this consideration does not begin to address the needs of the Company’s strategic  
17 imperative.” *Id.*, ¶ 35. This is typical of the proposed testimony outlined in Mr. Spitz’s report.  
18 He, without any basis or qualifications, has defined what he personally considers to be Reading’s  
19 “strategic imperative.” He then appears to judge the Company’s selection of CEO against his  
20 opinion of the “strategic imperative.” *Id.* This is far outside Mr. Spitz’s supposed expert scope,  
21 *i.e.*, whether the CEO search was a success for failure (whatever that means). Mr. Spitz seems to  
22 believe he is well-suited to opine generally about what is or is not best for Reading. He is not  
23 remotely qualified to do so, and all opinion and testimony relating to or relying on his “strategic  
24 imperative” determination should be excluded.

---

25  
26  
27 <sup>18</sup> Available at  
28 <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/716634/000156276215000083/rdi-20141231x10k.htm>



### 1. Mr. Nagy Is Not a “Rebuttal” Expert

The Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure explicitly prohibit parties from using “rebuttal” disclosures to designate a new expert who should have previously been disclosed. Rule 16.1(a)(2)(C)(ii), which governs rebuttal disclosures, states: “If the evidence is intended solely to contradict or rebut evidence on the same subject matter identified by another party under paragraph (2)(B), the disclosures shall be made within 30 days after the disclosure made by the other party.”

<sup>19</sup> Indeed, the *only expert* whose proposed testimony covers these topics is Richard Spitz, one of Plaintiff's own previously-disclosed experts. It is Mr. Spitz's initial report that purports to address Margaret Cotter's qualifications for her position, how real estate development fits into Reading's business, and the qualifications and competencies of senior real estate executives.

1 This later disclosure deadline does not apply to any party's witness whose purpose is to contradict  
2 a portion of another party's case in chief that should have been expected and anticipated by the  
3 disclosing party, or to present any opinions outside of the scope of another party's disclosure."  
4 Here, none of Defendants' experts have offered proposed testimony about the topics Mr. Nagy  
5 intends to cover. Instead, it appears that Plaintiff decided, after the deadline for disclosure, that he  
6 wanted to add a new expert, and decided this was his best chance of doing so. Nevada courts has  
7 long held that rebuttal evidence "tends to contradict *new* matters raised by the adverse party."  
8 *Andrews v. Harley Davidson, Inc.*, 106 Nev. 533, 539, 769 P.2d 1092, 1096 (1990) (emphasis in  
9 original). In addition,

10 [u]nder Rule 26(a)(2)(C)'s disclosure mechanism, a party may designate additional  
11 experts thirty days after initial expert disclosures, with one caveat: the additional  
12 experts' testimony is limited to rebutting or contradicting the expert testimony  
13 initially designated by the opposing party. The supplemental or "rebuttal" experts  
14 cannot put forth their own theories; they must restrict their testimony to attacking  
15 the theories offered by the adversary's experts. In this respect, a party can control  
16 the scope of the testimony of its Adversary's rebuttal experts by limiting its own  
17 experts' testimony to a given subject matter. A party who forgoes designating  
18 experts on the initial disclosure date will thus find itself in a purely reactive mode,  
19 greatly restricted in its ability to offer expert testimony.

20 *International Business Machines Corporation v. Fasco Industries, Inc.*, No. C-93-20326 RPA,  
21 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22533 at \*7-8 (N.D. Cal. March 15, 1995).<sup>20</sup> When a party attempts to  
22 introduce "rebuttal" evidence that does not meet the definition of rebuttal evidence, then the trial  
23 court should exclude it. *Andrews*, 106 Nev. at 529. (holding that "the court correctly excluded" a  
24 "rebuttal" witness whose testimony did not address any new matters).

## 25 2. Mr. Nagy Is Not Qualified

26 In addition, Mr. Nagy is not qualified to offer testimony regarding the topics for which he  
27 is designated. The "specific qualifications and competencies of Margaret Cotter" are readily  
28 ascertainable to the trier of fact and do not require any specialized expertise to discern. Mr. Nagy

---

29 <sup>20</sup> NRCP 16.1 tracks the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for disclosure of expert  
witnesses and testimony, including rebuttal experts and opinions; therefore, federal precedent  
provides persuasive authority on the issue.



1 does not appear to have any significant experience working in or studying executive compensation,  
2 yet he purports to testify about the “compensation of Margaret Cotter in her role as a senior  
3 Reading International, Inc. executive.” *See* Ex. D. Mr. Nagy also lacks the experience or expertise  
4 to testify about “how real estate development fits into Reading International, Inc.’s business.” *See*  
5 *id.* Nothing in his *CV* demonstrates that Mr. Nagy is in a position to provide an expert opinion  
6 about the strategy and direction of an international cinema exhibition and real estate company  
7 traded on the NASDAQ exchange and a market capitalization of hundreds of millions of dollars.  
8 Indeed, Mr. Nagy has previously testified under oath that he is *unqualified* to analyze financial  
9 statements, let alone the vast operations of a company such as Reading. *See* Exhibit G (Nagy Dep.  
10 Tr.) at 123. That Mr. Nagy is cloaked as a “rebuttal” expert does not allow him to avoid the  
11 scrutiny that an expert would normally be given.

12 **E. The Proposed Testimony of John Finnerty Should Be Excluded to the Extent**  
13 **Dr. Finnerty Does Not Intend to Provide Purely Rebuttal Testimony**

14 Plaintiff has disclosed Dr. John Finnerty as a rebuttal expert to “analyze and respond to the  
15 conclusions and the analyses proffered in the expert report of Dr. Richard W. Roll, Ph.D., dated  
16 August 25, 2016, including, but not limited to, Dr. Roll’s event study **and other statistical**  
17 **analyses and conclusions.**” *See* Ex. D (emphasis added). To the extent Dr. Finnerty’s “other  
18 statistical analyses and conclusions” are not a direct rebuttal to Dr. Roll, such testimony should be  
19 excluded. Plaintiff should not be allowed to utilize Dr. Finnerty to set forward new damages  
20 theories on “rebuttal” as part of these unspecified “conclusions.”

21 **IV. CONCLUSION**

22 WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing, the Moving Defendants respectfully request the  
23 Court grant this Motion and enter an order excluding the proposed testimony of Myron Steele,  
24 Tiago Duarte-Silva, Albert Nagy, and John Finnerty.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 DATED THIS 23RD DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2016.

2  
3 **COHEN|JOHNSON|PARKER|EDWARDS**

4 By: /s/ H. Stan Johnson  
5 H. Stan Johnson, Esq.  
6 Nevada Bar No.: 0265  
7 255 E. Warm Springs Rd., Suite 100  
8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

9 Marshall M. Searcy  
10 QUINN EMANUEL  
11 URQUHART & SULLIVAN,  
12 LLP

13 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
14 *Margaret Cotter, Ellen Cotter,*  
15 *Douglas McEachern, Guy Adams,*  
16 *Edward Kane, Judy Coddling, and*  
17 *Michael Wrotniak*

# Exhibit A

**REDACTED**

# Exhibit A

# Exhibit B

**REDACTED**

# Exhibit B



# Exhibit C

**REDACTED**

# Exhibit C

# Exhibit D

# Exhibit D

**MOT**

Mark G. Krum (SBN 10913)  
Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP  
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996  
Tel: 702-949-8200  
Fax: 702-949-8398  
E-mail: mkrum@lrrc.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
*James J. Cotter, Jr.*

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR., derivatively on behalf  
of Reading International, Inc.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MARGARET COTTER, ELLEN COTTER,  
GUY ADAMS, EDWARD KANE, DOUGLAS  
McEACHERN, TIMOTHY STOREY,  
WILLIAM GOULD, and DOES 1 through 100,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

and

READING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a  
Nevada corporation,

Nominal Defendant.

CASE NO.: A-15-719860-B  
DEPT. NO. XI

Coordinated with:

Case No. P-14-082942-E  
Dept. No. XI

Jointly Administered

**Business Court**

**PLAINTIFF JAMES J. COTTER, JR.'S  
REBUTTAL EXPERT  
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Plaintiff James J. Cotter, Jr., ("Plaintiff") through his attorneys Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP, and pursuant to N.R.C.P. 16.1(a)(2), hereby submit this list of rebuttal expert witnesses as follows in the above-captioned matter, and reserves the right to call any witness identified and elected by any other party in this action. Plaintiff also reserves the right to amend and/or supplement this disclosure as discovery proceeds and/or as further information is obtained. Plaintiff further reserves the right to make supplemental designations.

1. Myron T. Steele, Esq.  
c/o Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP  
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

Justice Steele (Ret.) is the former Chief Justice of the Delaware Supreme Court. He will offer expert testimony, including as summarized in his rebuttal report on or before September 28, 2016, in response to the reports and testimony of Alfred E. Osborne, Jr., Ph.D. and Michael Klausner, including insofar as they address matters relating to the fiduciary duties of the individual defendants. A copy of Chief Justice Steele's curriculum vitae, a list of cases he has testified in the last four years, fee amount, and documents considered in providing his report, were provided previously and are incorporated herein by reference. He has agreed to testify at the trial of this matter and will be sufficiently familiar with the pending action to submit to deposition regarding the testimony he is expected to give at trial.

2. Tiago Duarte-Silva, Charles River Associate  
c/o Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP  
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

Dr. Tiago Duarte-Silva is a principal at Charles River Associates. He will offer expert testimony, including as summarized in his rebuttal report to be provided on or before September 28, 2016 in response to the report and testimony of Richard W. Roll, Ph.D., including regarding Reading's earnings and stock performance and the response of Reading's board of directors to an acquisition offer made in late May 2016. A copy of Dr. Duarte-Silva's curriculum vitae, a list of cases he has testified in the last four years, fee amount, and documents considered in providing his report, were provided previously and are incorporated herein by reference. He has agreed to testify at the trial of this matter and will be sufficiently familiar with the pending action to submit to deposition regarding the testimony he is expected to give at trial.

3. Richard Spitz  
c/o Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP  
3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169



Richard Spitz is an attorney and business executive with extensive experience in recruiting senior executives. He will offer expert testimony, including as provided in any rebuttal report to be provided on or before September 28, 2016 regarding the opinions, if any, of Alfred E. Osborne, Jr., Ph.D. regarding the subject of the CEO search which was a subject of Mr. Spitz' original report. A copy of Mr. Spitz's curriculum vitae, a list of cases he has testified in the last four years, fee amount, and documents considered in providing his report, were provided previously and are incorporated herein by reference. He has agreed to testify at the trial of this matter and will be sufficiently familiar with the pending action to submit to deposition regarding the testimony he is expected to give at trial.

4. Albert S. Nagy  
Realty Capital Solutions  
32152 Calle Los Elegantes  
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

Albert S. Nagy is a real estate professional and consultant and real estate subject matter expert with, among other qualifications, 45± years of experience in real estate investment and development, real estate executive compensation, development management and various other aspects of real estate development. Mr. Nagy's curriculum vitae is attached as **Exhibit A**. He has agreed to testify at the trial of this matter and will be sufficiently familiar with the pending action to submit to deposition regarding the testimony he is expected to give at trial.

Mr. Nagy will offer expert testimony, including as summarized in his rebuttal report to be provided on or before September 28, 2016 regarding certain opinions pertaining to Margaret Cotter and real estate development management expressed by Alfred E. Osborne, Jr., Ph.D. in his expert report dated August 25, 2016, and testimony including regarding the qualifications and competences typically found in individuals who hold positions as senior real estate executives who manage development projects, the specific qualifications and competences of Margaret Cotter, the compensation of Margaret Cotter in her role as a senior Reading International, Inc. executive with

responsibility for the firm's real estate development activities and how real estate development fits into Reading International, Inc.'s business.

5. John D. Finnerty  
AlixPartners  
909 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

Dr. John D. Finnerty Dr. Finnerty is a Managing Director in the Financial Advisory Services Group at AlixPartners, LLP. He specializes in securities class actions, business valuation, securities valuation, derivatives valuation, solvency analysis, calculation of damages, and litigation support for matters involving valuation disputes, securities fraud, solvency, fairness, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, broker raiding, commercial disputes, and employment disputes involving the valuation of employee stock options. Dr. Finnerty is also a Professor of Finance at Fordham University's Gabelli School of Business where he was the founding Director of the Master of Science in Quantitative Finance Program. He will offer expert testimony, including as summarized in his rebuttal report on or before September 28, 2016, and will analyze and respond to the conclusions and the analyses proffered in the expert report of Richard W. Roll, Ph.D., dated August 25, 2016, including, but not limited to, Dr. Roll's event study and other statistical analyses and conclusions. A copy of Dr. Finnerty's curriculum vitae is attached as **Exhibit B**. He has agreed to testify at the trial of this matter and will be sufficiently familiar with the pending action to submit to deposition regarding the testimony he is expected to give at trial.

Dated this 19th day of September, 2016.

Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP

By: /s/ Mark G. Krum  
Mark G. Krum (SBN 10913)  
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, NV 89169-5958  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
James J. Cotter, Jr.

- 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

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

7  
8

9  
10

11

12

13

14

# EXHIBIT A



**Albert S. Nagy**  
Litigation Consultant and Testifying Expert Witness

Albert S. Nagy is a veteran business executive with experience in property management, real estate development and investment management, homebuilding, mortgage banking, real estate asset management. He has over forty years of experience in corporate operations and finance, having served fifteen years as a Chief Executive Officer or Chief Operating Officer. Mr. Nagy is the Founder and Managing Director of The Nagy Group, a business consultancy, and is a principal in Ferrell Nagy & Associates ("FNA") and Realty Capital Solutions ("RCS"). In addition, he and his RCS colleagues often team with Charles River Associates' ("CRA") economists and specialists to provide expanded resources to larger and more complicated engagements or when real estate subject matter knowledge is required.

In addition to his decades of real estate experience, he has served on the boards of both public and private companies, and he has been a member of various compensation committees. He has served as a court appointed receiver and expert witness in numerous disputes, many involving property ownership, development, property management and operations and leasing.

**San Juan Capistrano, CA** Since December 1991, Mr. Nagy has worked as an independent real estate consultant, loan workout specialist and as a consulting and testifying expert witness through FNA, RCS, CRA and The Nagy Group. Selected examples of engagements and the content of executive positions follow:

- Expert Witness and/or litigation consultant for real estate operations, homebuilding, leases, finance and partnership issues.
- Testifying expert witness and litigation consultant for a sibling in a family dispute involving the fees and profits being paid to a brother from more than forty real estate development projects owned and sponsored by the family construction company,.
- Key advisor to The Olson Company, a southern California development company, in the area of equity and debt structure at both the corporate and project level. Manager of \$250 million equity investor relationship and the company's project debt relationship with a national money center bank. Member of the Olson Board of Directors.
- Served as Chairman of the Compensation Committee, of SM&A.
- Serves on the Board and the Compensation Committee of Mark IV Capital, a family owned real estate investment and development company
- Served on the International (German) Board of ThyssenKrupp elevator, the largest elevator company in North America.
- Tenant representation in restructuring leases, consolidation, expansion and relocation.
- Representing three restaurant chains in their corporate planning and location selection. In addition, he was responsible for the restaurant chains' leasing and lease management.
- Turn-around operation of a premier full service 499 unit RV Resort.
- Court appointed receiverships for the RTC and financial institutions for over \$100,000,000 of foreclosures, many being development projects.
- Corporate restructuring and strategic and financial planning for companies, in the fields of real estate, homebuilding, asset management, hospitality, and food service.
- Served as the due diligence director for the acquisition of twenty-five resort hotels.
- Assisted as the real estate subject matter expert on an inter-disciplinary international, consulting team to provide market research, strategy and tactical advice to Dar Al-Arkan (<http://www.alarkan.com/Default.aspx?lang=en>), the largest residential developer and master planned community developer in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.



**Birtcher Investments**, From September 1983 to November 1991, Mr. Nagy founded and managed Birtcher Investments in Orange County, California. In this capacity he raised \$240 million in public partnerships that acquired and operated leased income property, created a consulting company that handled over \$750 million of work-out situations, created a pension advisory company and built a national property management company that leased, managed and operated over 16 million square feet in 13 states.

- Raised \$240 Million in public and private limited partnerships and was the managing fiduciary of these investment entities. This included being responsible for all leasing and any lease disputes in the portfolio.
- Built and led a national property management company overseeing 16,000,000 square feet of leased income property and 2,600 leased residential units.
- Built a national property acquisition staff and supervised acquisition of 40 properties in 13 states, including industrial, office and shopping centers.
- Created a consulting company that handled over \$750,000,000 of work-out situations for financial institutions, including real estate developments, hotels and vacant land.
- Established a pension advisory company in joint venture with Smith Barney that included a commercial multi-property fund and individual investments in multi-family residential housing.

**Heitman Financial Services, Ltd.** From April 1973 to September 1983 Mr. Nagy was an officer and Director of Heitman rising to the level of Senior Vice President. Heitman was a national real estate finance organization involved in commercial mortgage banking for large commercial projects and acts as a fiduciary and investment advisor to pension funds.

- Arranged debt and equity placements involving 200 properties and developments located throughout the U.S. totaling \$1.5 Billion.

**Ralph C. Sutro Company** Mr. Nagy began his professional career as an Assistant Vice President at Sutro in October of 1971. Ralph C. Sutro was a residential and commercial mortgage banking company. Mr. Nagy worked as a Loan Officer in both divisions.

#### **Education**

- Denison University, Cum Laude, BA in Political Science, 1968
- Denison University, Departmental Fellow, 1966-1968
- Claremont Graduate University, National Defense Act Fellow, MA in International Relations, 1971
- UCLA, Economics and Real Estate, 1972
- Northwestern University School of Mortgage Banking, 1972
- Instruction in Real Estate Finance, West Los Angeles College, 1973
- Instructor in Real Estate Finance and Appraisal, Pierce College
- Guest Lecturer in Real Estate Finance at UCLA

#### **Corporate Board Affiliations (current and past)**

- Mark IV Capital, family firm with various investments including extensive real estate investments and development projects.
- PFMG Solar, distributed energy generation for public agencies and schools.
- SM&A, proposal services company in RFP structured competitions, primarily defense oriented.
- The Olson Company, homebuilder and developer operating throughout California
- Thyssen Krupp Elevator, Germany, global elevator and People Mover Company. Over 16 acquisitions in the US including Dover Elevator. Mr. Nagy served on their international Board of Directors.

**Professional Designations**

- Certified Real Estate Instructor in the State of California
- Certified Review Appraiser
- California Real Estate Salesperson

**Professional Affiliations**

- L3
- World Presidents' Organization
- National Association of Review Appraisers

**Community Involvement**

- Board of Trustees, Center for Early Education, Los Angeles, California, 1982-84
- Board of Trustees, St. Margaret's School, San Juan Capistrano, California, 1984-1990, President, 1990
- State of California, Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education, 1996-1997.

Mr. Nagy can be reached:

949-525-6135 cell

[anagy@realcapsolutions.com](mailto:anagy@realcapsolutions.com)

[www.realcapsolutions.com](http://www.realcapsolutions.com)

# EXHIBIT B



**JOHN D. FINNERTY, Ph.D.**

**Managing Director, AlixPartners, LLP**

**Professor of Finance, Gabelli School of Business, Fordham University**

Phone: (212) 845-4090  
Fax: (646) 746-2490  
Cell: (347) 882-8756

909 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Email: [jfinnerty@alixpartners.com](mailto:jfinnerty@alixpartners.com)

Dr. Finnerty is a Managing Director in the Financial Advisory Services Group at AlixPartners, LLP. He specializes in securities class actions, business valuation, securities valuation, derivatives valuation, solvency analysis, calculation of damages, and litigation support for matters involving valuation disputes, securities fraud, solvency, fairness, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, broker raiding, commercial disputes, and employment disputes involving the valuation of employee stock options. He has testified as an expert in valuation, broker raiding, and securities and other financial matters in federal and state court and in arbitration and mediation proceedings. He has also testified as an expert in bankruptcy court concerning the fairness of proposed plans of reorganization.

Dr. Finnerty is also a Professor of Finance at Fordham University's Gabelli School of Business where he was the founding Director of the Master of Science in Quantitative Finance Program. He has taught for more than 28 years, including corporate finance, investment banking, fixed income securities, fixed income portfolio management, and bankruptcy restructuring. His teaching and research interests include hedge fund and private equity fund management, structure, and performance.

Dr. Finnerty has published 15 books, including *Corporate Financial Management*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., *Project Financing: Asset-Based Financial Engineering*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., *Principles of Financial Management*, and *Debt Management*, and more than 100 articles and professional papers in corporate finance, business and securities valuation, and other areas of finance. His writings and teaching have focused on the analysis and valuation of securities, especially fixed income instruments and complex derivative products, and mortgage-backed and other asset-backed securities. Dr. Finnerty is a former editor of *Financial Management*, one of the leading academic finance journals, and a former editor of *FMA Online*. He is an associate editor of the *Journal of*



*Applied Finance* and a member of the editorial advisory boards of the *Journal of Portfolio Management* and the *International Journal of Portfolio Analysis & Management*.

Dr. Finnerty worked for more than 20 years as an investment banker. He worked on more than 50 public and private financings, and served as financial advisor in connection with several mergers and several project financings.

Dr. Finnerty is a Trustee and a former Chair of the Trustees and a former President and Director of the Eastern Finance Association, a former Director of the Financial Management Association, and a former President and Director of the Fixed Income Analysts Society. He served as a member of FASB's Option Valuation Group in connection with the revision of FAS 123. He was inducted into the *Fixed Income Analysts Society Hall of Fame* in 2011.

## EDUCATION

1977	Ph.D. in Operations Research, Naval Postgraduate School
1973	B.A. and M.A. in Economics, Cambridge University; Marshall Scholar
1971	A.B. in Mathematics, Williams College; magna cum laude with highest honors in Mathematics; Rice Prize in Mathematics; Phi Beta Kappa

## BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

2013 – Present	<b>AlixPartners, LLP, New York, NY</b> Managing Director, Financial Advisory Services Group
2003 – 2013	<b>Finnerty Economic Consulting, LLC, New York, NY</b> Managing Principal
2001 - 2003	<b>Analysis Group, Inc., New York, NY</b> Managing Principal
1997 - 2001	<b>PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP, New York, NY</b> Partner, Financial Advisory Services Group Dispute Analysis & Investigations securities litigation practice
1995 - 1997	<b>Houlihan Lokey Howard &amp; Zukin, New York, NY</b> Director
1989 - 1995	<b>McFarland Dewey &amp; Co., New York, NY</b> General Partner

1986 - 1989	<b>College Savings Bank, Princeton, NJ</b> Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer, Secretary, and Director
1982 - 1986	<b>Lazard Frères &amp; Company, New York, NY</b> Vice President, Corporate Finance Department
1977 - 1982	<b>Morgan Stanley &amp; Co. Inc., New York, NY</b> Associate, Corporate Finance Department

## ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

1987 - Present	<b>Fordham University Gabelli School of Business, New York, NY</b> Professor of Finance and founding Director of the Master of Science in Quantitative Finance Program. Received tenure in September 1991. Gladys and Henry Crown Award for Faculty Excellence, 1997.
1976 - 1977	<b>Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA</b> Adjunct Professor, Department of Administrative Sciences
1973 - 1976	<b>United States Naval Reserve</b> Instructor, Naval Postgraduate School. Promoted to Lieutenant, USNR.

## PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Chair of the Trustees, Eastern Finance Association (2009-2010), Trustee (2008-Present), President (2007-2008), and Director (2005-2008)

President, Fixed Income Analysts Society (2006-2007), and Director (2001-2009)

Director, Financial Management Association (1991-1999, 2005-2007, 2011-2013)

Editor, *Financial Management* (1993-1999)

Editor, *FMA Online* (2001-2010)

Associate Editor, *Journal of Derivatives Accounting* (2003-2005)

Associate Editor, *Journal of Applied Finance* (2000-2007, 2012-Present)

Associate Editor, *Journal of Financial Engineering* (1992-1999)

Member, Editorial Advisory Boards, *The Financier* (1995-2003), *Journal of Portfolio Management* (1995-Present), and *International Journal of Portfolio Analysis & Management* (2011-Present)

Globe Business Publishing Ltd., London, U.K., Globe Law and Business Reader Panel

## **OTHER ACTIVITIES**

Leadership Giving Co-Chair, Williams College Class of 1971

Co-chairman, New Jersey Special Gifts Program, Williams College Third Century Campaign

Member, Special Gifts Committee, New York City Area for Williams College Third Century Campaign

Vice Chairman, Williams College Class of 1971 25th Reunion Gift Committee

Treasurer and Trustee, Spring Lake Bath and Tennis Club, and Co-Chair, Finance Committee

## **AWARDS**

Marshall Scholar, 1971

Gladys and Henry Crown Award for Faculty Excellence, Fordham Business School, 1997

Best Investments Paper, Southern Finance Association, 2001

Best Corporate Finance Paper, Southern Finance Association, 2006

Bene Merenti Medal, Fordham University, 2007

Fixed Income Analysts Society Hall of Fame, 2011

Achievements in Excellence Team Award, AlixPartners, LLP, 2014



## EXPERT TESTIMONY IN LAST FOUR YEARS

<i>Clients</i>	<i>Case</i>	<i>Description of Testimony</i>
Brune & Richard	MBIA Insurance v. Patriarch Partners VIII and LD Investments U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York Case No. 09 Civ. 3255 (RWS)	Responded to an expert damages report in a breach of contract matter, which calculated damages based on the value of a class of subordinated notes. Testified at deposition and at trial.
Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd	Eric Silverman v. Motorola, Inc., et al. U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois Case No. 1:07-cv-04507	Prepared an expert report on loss causation and a rebuttal report in connection with a securities class action. Testified at deposition.
Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young	Warren Klein, et al., v. Oppenheimer & Co. Inc. U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania Civil Action No. 2:10-CV-06743	Prepared an expert rebuttal report describing auction rate securities (ARS), the market for ARS, the events surrounding the collapse of the market for ARS in February 2008, and addressing the plaintiffs' alleged damages. Testified at deposition.
Abbey Spanier Rodd & Abrams	In Re IMAX Corporation Securities Litigation U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York Case No. 06 Civ. 6128 (NRB)	Prepared an expert report on loss causation in connection with a securities class action. Testified at deposition.
Figari & Davenport	Hillwood Investment Properties, et al. v. Radical Mavericks Management, et al. District Court, 192 <sup>nd</sup> Judicial District, Dallas County, Texas Cause No. 10-05639	Assessed the solvency of a professional sports franchise. Testified at deposition.
Securities and Exchange Commission	Securities and Exchange Commission v. William Betta, Jr., et al. U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida Case No. 09-80803-Civ-MARRA/JOHNSON	Prepared an expert report describing the features and risk-return characteristics of various complex collateralized mortgage obligation classes and assessed their suitability for a set of investors. Testified at trial.
Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd	In Re Par Pharmaceutical Securities Litigation U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey Master File No. 2:06-cv-03226-PGS-ES	Prepared an expert report on market efficiency in connection with a securities class action. Testified at deposition.
Internal Revenue Service	The Markell Company, Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue United States Tax Court Houston, TX Docket No. 20551-08	Prepared an expert report and a rebuttal expert report concerning the reasonableness of profit expectation for a strategy involving a spread call option strategy. Testified at trial.