

1 the restaurant.

2 Q. What did you say and what did he say?

3 A. I told him, We've been down this path
4 with Jim Junior as CEO. We all wanted him to
5 succeed. We all wanted him to take the reins and
6 lead the company forward but there were glaring
7 deficits. And I recounted to him how we formed
8 this committee, if you will, resolution committee
9 or conflicts committee, of which Tim Storey and
10 Doug McEachern were on for the Cotter siblings to
11 meet and talk. And McEachern told me that was --
12 didn't work that well.

13 Then we had Tim Storey acting as Jim
14 Junior's coach. And later Tim Storey was promoted
15 to ombudsman for this position and Tim got very
16 involved in working with Jim Junior and coaching
17 him. And Tim Storey was giving every month,
18 glowing, glowing reports about how good things were
19 going with Jim Junior.

20 And I disagreed with those reports and I
21 told both Ed Kane on the phone and I told Bill
22 Gould in person when I met him about that. And
23 then I told Bill Gould two concerns that I had.
24 The first concern was at some point, and I don't
25 remember the exact date, it could have been

1 December, it could have been January, but Jim
2 Junior had an analysis of movie theatres in
3 Australia and New Zealand and their margins in
4 Australia, and movie theatres in the USA, their
5 margins, and there was a gap. I don't remember the
6 precise gap but maybe it was -- the margin gap was
7 maybe 16, 18 percent.

8 And Junior showed me one time in his
9 office the spreadsheet and said, you know, Look at
10 the gap, This is terrible. If the USA theatres
11 operated there and had the same margins, think what
12 the impact that would be on our earnings,
13 et cetera, et cetera.

14 So there was a board meeting. I came in
15 early for the board meeting and I went into
16 Junior's office. In the board book, they laid out
17 the margins for Australia and the USA. And if you
18 adjusted the margins for the film rental in the USA
19 compared to the film rental in Australia and New
20 Zealand, two different markets, and you adjusted --
21 made adjustments for the rental, the lease rentals,
22 it wasn't a 16 or 18 percent gap. It was like a
23 2 percent gap.

24 And Jim Junior says, Yeah, well, I don't
25 care about that now. And this was something he was

1 really concerned about, I mean, for months. And
2 then he said, Well, I'm not worried about that now.
3 I'm concerned about the labor. The labor in
4 Australia and New Zealand is a lot less than labor
5 costs in the US. And I said, Well, I don't know
6 anything about that. You're going to have to look
7 into that.

8 So that was an hour before the board
9 meeting. We went to the board meeting and Jim
10 Junior brought up to the board this thing about the
11 labor costs. USA theatre labor costs versus
12 Australia and New Zealand labor costs.

13 And Ellen didn't really have an answer at
14 the time. She -- she said she'd look into it,
15 et cetera. And I thought, okay, we'll get to the
16 bottom of it.

17 And later that week or the next week or
18 the next week, I saw Andrzej Matyczynski, the
19 ex-CFO of the company, and I said, What is this
20 about the labor cost? Why is the labor cost so
21 high for theaters in Australia and New Zealand --
22 so low in Australia and New Zealand and so high
23 here? And Andrzej says, Well, that's easy. In the
24 USA they allocate the G and A down to the theatre
25 level so the theatre level labor cost looks high,

1 and in Australia and New Zealand, they allocate a
2 lot of the labor costs up to G and A so the labor
3 cost looks really low.

4 And I said, Does Jim Junior know this?
5 He says, Yes, I've told him this before. And I
6 said, We're looking at this and the board's -- he's
7 got the board concerned about this. And Andrzej
8 says, Yeah, I wish you all would have called me in.
9 I could explain that.

10 So I told Bill Gould that -- the
11 following: I like Jim Junior, I want him to
12 succeed as much as anyone, but it's clear, not
13 understanding the theatre margins, I questioned his
14 knowledge about the business he's managing and his
15 management style of bringing to the board this
16 problem about labor costs.

17 And he hadn't even, in my opinion,
18 properly investigated that himself. I was forming
19 the opinion or had formed the opinion that he
20 wasn't really learning the business and he wasn't
21 leading us forward. And I told Bill that. I said,
22 We've been working with Jim Junior all these months
23 and I don't see progress.

24 **Q. When did you tell Mr. Gould that?**

25 **A.** At this lunch meeting.

1 Q. The lunch meeting in April?

2 A. In April, yes.

3 Q. And this -- you told him in April about
4 this --

5 A. These two examples.

6 Q. These two examples that were raised at
7 the board meeting in December of '14 or January of
8 '15?

9 A. Yeah.

10 Q. And let me be clear. What you just
11 described, was that the two concerns you talked
12 about when you prefaced your lengthy answer?

13 MR. TAYBACK: Object to the -- object to the
14 form of the question to the extent it
15 mischaracterizes his testimony.

16 You can answer.

17 BY MR. KRUM:

18 Q. Let me ask it this way --

19 A. That's all --

20 Q. -- you used the term "two concerns" that
21 you described to Mr. Gould, or words to that
22 effect.

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Is there anything else that falls into
25 the category of two concerns beyond what you just

1 **described?**

2 A. There may have been one more concern that
3 I can recall was about the leadership of the
4 company and working on the budget. And Jim Junior
5 complained that Ellen and Margaret weren't getting
6 their budget in on a timely basis and whatnot.

7 I explained to Bill Gould that for the
8 CEO, getting the division's budget, that's income
9 they expect to receive and expenses they expect to
10 spend. But the vision of where we're going, how
11 we're going to lead -- where is our CEO leading our
12 company, I said, We haven't heard a whiff of this.
13 And I discussed this with Jim Junior several times
14 over the last three months prior to this, and he
15 said he's working on it. Nobody saw it; nobody
16 heard it.

17 And I told Bill Gould, you know, To be a
18 CEO, you have to lead. And I thought this was
19 another item that raised my concern. There may
20 have been other items we discussed over lunch
21 regarding this matter but I don't remember them at
22 this time.

23 **Q. And what did Mr. Gould say at that lunch?**

24 A. He said -- he agreed with me that Junior
25 wasn't progressing fast. He disagreed with me that

1 Tim Storey wasn't doing a good job. He thought Tim
2 Storey was doing a great job. He disagreed with me
3 that we should act. He told me let's wait. And I
4 said, Why are we waiting? He said, Well, let the
5 thing be adjudicated and we'll find out how it
6 turns out. And I said, That could take years. I
7 think we need to make a decision what's best for
8 the company now. And he says he wanted to wait.
9 And I said, Bill, you and I have a different
10 opinion about this.

11 Q. Did you ever tell Tim Storey you
12 disagreed with his glowing reports about Jim
13 Junior?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. When?

16 A. It was later on. Probably around March,
17 I would say, at a March meeting that -- along that
18 timeline. I don't remember a specific day. But
19 the --

20 Q. Was it at a board meeting?

21 A. Yeah, after a board meeting, yes.

22 Q. Okay. And what did you say and what did
23 he say, generally?

24 A. I said, Tim, I appreciate your efforts.
25 I know you're doing this with the best of

EXHIBIT 2

(Filed Separately Under Seal)

Exhibit 3

Exhibit 3

1 DISTRICT COURT
2 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
3
4 JAMES J. COTTER, JR., individually and)
5 derivatively on behalf of Reading)
6 International, Inc.,)
7 Plaintiff,)
8 vs.) No. A-15-719860-B
9 MARGARET COTTER, ELLEN COTTER, GUY) Coordinated with:
10 ADAMS, EDWARD KANE, DOUGLAS McEACHERN,) P-14-082942-E
11 TIMOTHY STOREY, WILLIAM GOULD, and)
12 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,)
13 Defendants.)
14 and)
15
16 READING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a)
17 Nevada corporation,)
18 Nominal Defendant.)
19
20 DEPOSITION OF TIMOTHY STOREY, a defendant herein,
21 noticed by LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP, at
22 1453 Third Street Promenade, Santa Monica,
23 California, at 9:28 a.m., on Friday, February 12,
24 2016, before Teckla T. Hollins, CSR 13125.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201
2202
2203

1 Q. Now having looking at this document, does that
2 refresh your recollection of whether there was any
3 discussion at the August 4, 2015 board meeting when
4 Ellen announced the members of the search -- CEO search
5 committee of whether there was any question or
6 discussion about whether she was or might be a
7 candidate?

8 A. I don't think there was.

9 Q. Would you have approved a candidate being a
10 member of a search committee?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Did you have or do you have any thoughts about
13 whether someone who is an interim CEO might be, likely
14 is, or almost certainly is a candidate?

15 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

16 MR. RHOW: Join.

17 THE WITNESS: I didn't have any view around that, I
18 don't think.

19 MR. KRUM:

20 Q. By the way, you recall at the August 4 board
21 meeting, there was a vote with respect to board minutes
22 from meeting in May and June?

23 A. Not specifically, no.

24 Q. Do you recall a board meeting at which you
25 abstained from the vote to approve board minutes?

1 A. Was that -- I thought I was in L.A. for that
2 meeting.

3 Q. I believe you were.

4 A. Okay. So was I at the meeting at August 4th?
5 Because I assumed I hadn't been.

6 Q. Well, you know --

7 A. Whichever meeting it was.

8 Q. Let me correct it. I do not know whether you
9 were there in person.

10 A. I recollect being at a board meeting in L.A.,
11 somewhere around here, where the issue of minutes was
12 discussed, I think.

13 Q. And what do you recall about that discussion
14 about that issue?

15 A. About the minutes? We received a series of
16 draft minutes quite well after the meetings that they
17 referred to, and that they were for discussion, as they
18 usually were. And my view was that it was impossible
19 for me to look at those meetings in detail -- I'm sorry
20 look at those minutes in detail, and make any meaningful
21 comment at the meeting.

22 I had been told, and it was apparent to me, that
23 the minutes had been carefully prepared and reviewed and
24 they were quite long, and it just seemed to me in the
25 circumstances very difficult for me to make any kind of

1 meaningful comment around changing them to make them
2 what I thought would accurately reflect of what was
3 said.

4 Q. So did you abstain from the vote?

5 A. So I abstained.

6 Q. We're done with that document. Thank you.

7 Mr. Storey, let me show you what the court reporter
8 has marked as Exhibit 31, and that's a document --
9 one-page document bearing production number TS 614.

10 A. I recognize the document.

11 (Whereupon the document referred to is marked by
12 the reporter as EXHIBIT 31 for identification.)

13 MR. KRUM:

14 Q. What do you recognize it to be?

15 A. It is an e-mail from me to Ellen Cotter, copied
16 to the board, asking for an update on the process to
17 select a CEO.

18 Q. So does that reflect that between August 4 and
19 September 9, you'd received no information?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Let me show you what the court reporter has
22 marked as Exhibit 32, a document bearing production
23 numbers TS 615 through 617.

24 A. Yes.

25 (Whereupon the document referred to is marked by

1 I, Teckla T. Hollins, CSR 13125, do hereby declare:

2 That, prior to being examined, the witness named in
3 the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn pursuant
4 to Section 30(f)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil
Procedure and the deposition is a true record of the
testimony given by the witness.

5 That said deposition was taken down by me in
6 shorthand at the time and place therein named and
thereafter reduced to text under my direction.

7 That the witness was requested to review the
8 transcript and make any changes to the
9 transcript as a result of that review
pursuant to Section 30(e) of the Federal
Rules of Civil Procedure.

10 No changes have been provided by the witness
11 during the period allowed.

12 The changes made by the witness are appended
13 to the transcript.


14 No request was made that the transcript be
15 reviewed pursuant to Section 30(e) of the
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

16 I further declare that I have no interest in the
17 event of the action.

18 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws
19 of the United States of America that the foregoing is
20 true and correct.

21 WITNESS my hand this 3rd day of

22 March, 2016.



23 Teckla T. Hollins, CSR 13125

Exhibit 4

Exhibit 4

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

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES J. COTTER, JR.,)	
derivatively on behalf of)	
Reading International, Inc.,)	
)	Case No.
Plaintiff,)	A-15-719860-B
)	
vs.)	
)	
MARGARET COTTER, ELLEN)	Case No.
COTTER, GUY ADAMS, EDWARD)	P-14-082942-E
KANE, DOUGLAS McEACHERN,)	
TIMOTHY STOREY, WILLIAM)	Related and
GOULD, and DOES 1 through)	Coordinated Cases
100, inclusive,)	
)	
Defendants,)	
and)	
)	
<u>READING INTERNATIONAL, INC.,</u>)	
a Nevada corporation,)	
)	
Nominal Defendant.)	
)	

Complete caption, next page.

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF GUY ADAMS

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 2016

VOLUME II

REPORTED BY: LORI RAYE, CSR NO. 7052

JOB NUMBER 305149

1 re-election?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Tell us about those communications,
4 please.

5 MR. TAYBACK: Object to the form of the
6 question.

7 You can answer.

8 THE WITNESS: She said they would not -- if we
9 nominated him, that she and Margaret would not vote
10 the shares for him to be elected.

11 BY MR. KRUM:

12 Q. And she said that to you and anybody
13 else, or was it just you?

14 A. To me before -- in the office, she
15 mentioned that to me.

16 Q. What was your response?

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. So --

19 A. I agreed with her.

20 Q. You said two or three weeks after the
21 call with Mr. Storey, I believe, that someone
22 suggested a candidate; is that right?

23 A. Maybe two, yeah.

24 Q. And who suggested who?

25 A. I think -- my recollection is, after

1 Ellen said she had someone in mind, she sent an
2 email with Judy Coddington's résumé around for us to
3 speak to and review and consider.

4 Q. Between the time the special committee
5 voted unanimously not to nominate Mr. Storey to
6 stand for re-election and the however many weeks
7 later Ellen Cotter sent an email with Judy
8 Coddington's résumé, what steps, if any, did the
9 special nominating committee take to identify
10 directorial candidates for the slot that was
11 vacated by the decision not to renominate
12 Mr. Storey?

13 MR. TAYBACK: Objection; form and foundation.

14 THE WITNESS: We talked about if we knew of
15 anyone. I said I didn't know anyone that would
16 serve on the company in these circumstances, being
17 sued, and who's going to ultimately vote the stock
18 and control it. No one would come aboard that I
19 knew.

20 And Ed Kane said he didn't know anyone.
21 Doug McEachern said he would think about it; he
22 might have an idea or two. And that's where we
23 were. And then Ellen said, I think I have a name
24 of somebody that will serve.
25 ///

1 BY MR. KRUM:

2 Q. Did McEachern ever suggest anyone?

3 A. I think -- my recollection is that Judy's
4 name came to us while Doug was in the process.

5 Q. So the answer is, you don't think he did
6 because you received a candidate from Ellen?

7 A. My answer is, I think he was in the
8 process and he stopped it when he got Judy
9 Coddington's résumé.

10 Q. Did you have any conversations with
11 either Ed Kane or Doug McEachern about a process or
12 trying to create a process to identify directorial
13 candidates?

14 A. Not at the nominating committee meeting,
15 we did not. It was after the nominating committee
16 we said we should consider this in advance and not
17 do this up against a time -- time constraint.

18 Q. Well, at the time, the shareholder
19 meeting, annual shareholders meeting had been
20 scheduled; right?

21 A. I believe so, yes.

22 Q. So as a practical matter, you did have a
23 time constraint, you had to have a nominee to
24 include in the proxy statement; correct?

25 A. Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)SS:
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)


I, Lori Raye, a duly commissioned and
licensed court reporter for the State of
California, do hereby certify:

That I reported the taking of the deposition
of the witness, GUY ADAMS, commencing on Friday,
April 29, 2016 at 9:10 a.m.;

That prior to being examined, the witness was,
by me, placed under oath to testify to the truth;
that said deposition was taken down by me
stenographically and thereafter transcribed;
that said deposition is a complete, true and
accurate transcription of said stenographic notes.

I further certify that I am not a relative or
an employee of any party to said action, nor in
anywise interested in the outcome thereof; that a
request has been made to review the transcript.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto
subscribed my name this 2nd day of May 2016.



LORI RAYE
CSR No. 7052

Exhibit 5

Exhibit 5

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

Veritext Legal Solutions
866 299-5127

023

JA4485

1 Q. So by the time you were terminated, it's
2 not that -- you had not concluded that it was
3 wasteful for the company to have both Mr. Ellis
4 provide services as a general counsel and
5 Mr. Tompkins to be a consulting lawyer to the 11:54AM
6 company?

7 A. I do think there's a degree of waste
8 having, again, two high-powered lawyers serving as
9 counsel for the company.

10 And in fact, in terms of just going back to 11:54AM
11 my testimony, that is one of the things I would have
12 done, to have one general counsel representing the
13 interest of the company, not have two. It just was
14 a recipe for disaster.

15 Q. And by the time you were terminated, that 11:55AM
16 was something that, even though you thought it was
17 wasteful in your view, you hadn't undertaken to do;
18 correct?

19 A. Correct. I didn't think it was
20 inappropriate, given the timing and the situation. 11:55AM
21 Had we had different circumstances, I certainly
22 would have taken that ac- -- that step.

23 Q. One of the things you said that you
24 wouldn't -- would not have done is delay -- or use
25 outside lawyers to draft the minutes of board 11:55AM

Page 662

1 meetings and delay in their dissemination, and you
2 also said include fabricated information.

3 What information do you believe reflected
4 in the company's board minutes has been fabricated?

5 MR. KRUM: Object to the characterization 11:56AM
6 of the testimony.

7 THE WITNESS: I mean, there were examples
8 of draft minutes that were prepared by Bill Ellis,
9 who was functioning as corporate secretary, and in
10 the first draft he had a set of minutes. 11:56AM

11 And once it goes to Akin Gump, who was
12 representing the company or Ellen in terms of the --
13 in terms of my termination, and to Greenberg
14 Traurig, the minutes evolve into minutes that I
15 don't recognize and actions taken in the minutes 11:57AM
16 that I didn't believe reflected what actually
17 happened but that substantiated the positions that
18 Ellen and the company wanted to take.

19 BY MR. TAYBACK:

20 Q. And can you think of a single specific 11:57AM
21 statement that you recall seeing in a board minute
22 that you say, that's just false, that's untrue?

23 A. There were a number of examples that I had
24 related to the company with a number of the minutes.

25 Q. And when --

Page 663

1 A. So I can't tell you today specifically the
2 examples.
3 Q. When you say "related to the company," you
4 mean in written correspondence; correct?
5 You said you objected to the minutes in 11:57AM
6 some written form.
7 A. I think there were examples where I had. I
8 had also objected orally at the meetings, saying
9 these things didn't occur.
10 Like for example, I think we had discussed 11:58AM
11 at the last deposition where Ellen had said, hey,
12 let's move item No. 10 to item No. 1, and that was
13 just one example of something that did not occur.
14 Q. And when you made objections orally at
15 the -- to the minutes at the meeting at which those 11:58AM
16 minutes were presented, in fact, your objection was
17 recorded in the minutes; correct?
18 MR. KRUM: Objection, the document speaks
19 for itself.
20 You can answer if you know. 11:58AM
21 THE WITNESS: I can't specifically recall.
22 BY MR. TAYBACK:
23 Q. Did you ever have your counsel draft any
24 letters to the company objecting to the minutes that
25 were being disseminated? 11:58AM

Page 664

1 I, JANICE SCHUTZMAN, Certified Shorthand
2 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby
3 certify:

4 That the foregoing proceedings were taken
5 before me at the time and place herein set forth;
6 that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings,
7 prior to testifying, were placed under oath; that
8 the testimony of the witness and all objections made
9 by counsel at the time of the examination were
10 recorded stenographically by me, and were thereafter
11 transcribed under my direction and supervision; and
12 that the foregoing pages contain a full, true and
13 accurate record of all proceedings and testimony to
14 the best of my skill and ability.

15 I further certify that I am neither financially
16 interested in the action nor a relative or employee
17 of any attorney or any of the parties.

18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name
19 this 19th day of July, 2016.

20
21
22 
23

24 JANICE SCHUTZMAN

25 CSR No. 9509

Page 838

Exhibit 6

Exhibit 6

1 DISTRICT COURT
2 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
3
4 JAMES J. COTTER, JR., individually and)
5 derivatively on behalf of Reading)
6 International, Inc.,)
7 Plaintiff,)
8 vs.) No. A-15-719860-B
9 MARGARET COTTER, ELLEN COTTER, GUY) Coordinated with:
10 ADAMS, EDWARD KANE, DOUGLAS McEACHERN,) P-14-082942-E
11 TIMOTHY STOREY, WILLIAM GOULD, and)
12 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,)
13 Defendants.)
14 and)
15
16 READING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a)
17 Nevada corporation,)
18 Nominal Defendant.)
19
20 DEPOSITION OF TIMOTHY STOREY, a defendant herein,
21 noticed by LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP, at
22 1453 Third Street Promenade, Santa Monica,
23 California, at 9:28 a.m., on Friday, February 12,
24 2016, before Teckla T. Hollins, CSR 13125.
25
Job Number 291961

1 Q. Now having looking at this document, does that
2 refresh your recollection of whether there was any
3 discussion at the August 4, 2015 board meeting when
4 Ellen announced the members of the search -- CEO search
5 committee of whether there was any question or
6 discussion about whether she was or might be a
7 candidate?

8 A. I don't think there was.

9 Q. Would you have approved a candidate being a
10 member of a search committee?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Did you have or do you have any thoughts about
13 whether someone who is an interim CEO might be, likely
14 is, or almost certainly is a candidate?

15 MR. SEARCY: Objection. Vague.

16 MR. RHOW: Join.

17 THE WITNESS: I didn't have any view around that, I
18 don't think.

19 MR. KRUM:

20 Q. By the way, you recall at the August 4 board
21 meeting, there was a vote with respect to board minutes
22 from meeting in May and June?

23 A. Not specifically, no.

24 Q. Do you recall a board meeting at which you
25 abstained from the vote to approve board minutes?

1 A. Was that -- I thought I was in L.A. for that
2 meeting.

3 Q. I believe you were.

4 A. Okay. So was I at the meeting at August 4th?
5 Because I assumed I hadn't been.

6 Q. Well, you know --

7 A. Whichever meeting it was.

8 Q. Let me correct it. I do not know whether you
9 were there in person.

10 A. I recollect being at a board meeting in L.A.,
11 somewhere around here, where the issue of minutes was
12 discussed, I think.

13 Q. And what do you recall about that discussion
14 about that issue?

15 A. About the minutes? We received a series of
16 draft minutes quite well after the meetings that they
17 referred to, and that they were for discussion, as they
18 usually were. And my view was that it was impossible
19 for me to look at those meetings in detail -- I'm sorry
20 look at those minutes in detail, and make any meaningful
21 comment at the meeting.

22 I had been told, and it was apparent to me, that
23 the minutes had been carefully prepared and reviewed and
24 they were quite long, and it just seemed to me in the
25 circumstances very difficult for me to make any kind of

1 meaningful comment around changing them to make them
2 what I thought would accurately reflect of what was
3 said.

4 Q. So did you abstain from the vote?

5 A. So I abstained.

6 Q. We're done with that document. Thank you.

7 Mr. Storey, let me show you what the court reporter
8 has marked as Exhibit 31, and that's a document --
9 one-page document bearing production number TS 614.

10 A. I recognize the document.

11 (Whereupon the document referred to is marked by
12 the reporter as EXHIBIT 31 for identification.)

13 MR. KRUM:

14 Q. What do you recognize it to be?

15 A. It is an e-mail from me to Ellen Cotter, copied
16 to the board, asking for an update on the process to
17 select a CEO.

18 Q. So does that reflect that between August 4 and
19 September 9, you'd received no information?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Let me show you what the court reporter has
22 marked as Exhibit 32, a document bearing production
23 numbers TS 615 through 617.

24 A. Yes.

25 (Whereupon the document referred to is marked by

EXHIBIT 7

(Filed Separately Under Seal)

Exhibit 8

Exhibit 8

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 ROBERT MAYES
TAKEN ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2016

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

1 particular candidate?

2 A. There was a general consensus toward --
3 toward one -- one candidate in particular. But
4 there was not -- the feedback from the board was,
5 you know, "Now we think we might need more operating
6 company experience." There was a shift.

7 Q. Do you recall whether Korn Ferry
8 recommended Ellen Cotter for further assessment
9 along with any other candidates?

10 A. We did -- we rec- -- we encouraged Craig
11 Tomkins to run Ellen through the assessment process.

12 Q. Okay.

13 MS. LINDSAY: Can you please mark this
14 as 422.

15 (Whereupon the document referred
16 to was marked Defendants'
17 Exhibit 422 by the Certified
18 Shorthand Reporter and is attached
19 hereto.)

20 BY MS. LINDSAY:

21 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 422?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. What is it?

24 A. It is a candidate report.

25 Q. For Ellen Cotter?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. And what did you do to prepare this
3 candidate report, if you prepared it?

4 A. We did this at the behest of, I believe,
5 Craig Tomkins and formulated a resume from the
6 internet, did some basic internet research, and then
7 I wrote a brief assessment -- well, it's not an
8 assessment. I wrote a brief overview of her
9 candidacy based on my interaction with her as a
10 search committee member.

11 Q. So it was based partially on your
12 opinion of her?

13 A. Yeah. Starting with the professional
14 attributes on page three.

15 Q. Do you recall when this candidate report
16 was prepared?

17 A. I think it was just after the new year.

18 MR. KRUM: Excuse me. Taking Kara's
19 line here, does this document have a production
20 number?

21 MS. LINDSAY: It was produced by Korn
22 Ferry.

23 MR. KRUM: Okay. Thanks.

24 BY MS. LINDSAY:

25 Q. Directing your attention to -- I'm done

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, do hereby certify:

That I am a duly qualified Certified
Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California,
holder of Certificate Number 3400, which is in full
force and effect, and that I am authorized to
administer oaths and affirmations;

That the foregoing deposition testimony of
the herein named witness, to wit, ROBERT MAYES, was
taken before me at the time and place herein set
forth;

That prior to being examined, ROBERT MAYES
was duly sworn or affirmed by me to testify the truth,
the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;

That the testimony of the witness and all
objections made at the time of examination were
recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter
transcribed by me or under my direction and
supervision;

1 That the foregoing pages contain a full,
2 true and accurate record of the proceedings and
3 testimony to the best of my skill and ability;
4

5 I further certify that I am not a relative
6 or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the
7 parties, nor am I a relative or employee of such
8 attorney or counsel, nor am I financially interested
9 in the outcome of this action.

10

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my
12 name this 19th day of August, 2016.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400

EXHIBIT 9

(Filed Separately Under Seal)

Exhibit 10

Exhibit 10

8-K 1 rdi-20150618x8k.htm 8-K

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549**

FORM 8-K

Current Report
Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Date of Report (Date of Earliest Event Reported): June 12, 2015

READING INTERNATIONAL, INC.
(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in its Charter)

Nevada
(State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation)

1-8625
(Commission File Number)

95-3885184
(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

6100 Center Drive
Suite 900
Los Angeles, California
(Address of Principal Executive Offices)

90045
(Zip Code)

(213) 235-2240
(Registrant's Telephone Number, Including Area Code)

n/a
(Former Name or Former Address, if Changed Since Last Report)

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the registrant under any of the following provisions (see General Instruction A.2. below):

- ☐ Written communications pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425).
- ☐ Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 14a-12 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14a-12).
- ☐ Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 14d-2(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14d-2(b)).
- ☐ Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 13e-4(c) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13e-4(c)).

EXH 347
DATE 6-28-16
WIT Ellen
PATRICIA HUBBARD

048

1/5

5/4/2016

8K Press release Ellen CEO

049

<http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/716634/000071663415000021/rdf-20150618x8k.htm>

2/5

JA4505

ITEM 5.02 Departure of Directors or Certain Officers; Election of Directors; Appointment of Certain Officers; Compensatory Arrangements of Certain Officers

On June 12, 2015, the board of directors (the "Board") of Reading International, Inc. ("we," "our," "us," "Reading" or the "company") terminated the employment of James J. Cotter, Jr. as our President and Chief Executive Officer, effective immediately. The Company currently intends to engage the assistance of a leading executive search firm to identify a permanent President and Chief Executive Officer, which will consider both internal and external candidates.

On June 12, 2015, our Board appointed Ellen Marie Cotter, 49, Chairperson of the Board and the Chief Operating Officer of our Domestic Cinemas Division, to serve as our interim President and Chief Executive Officer. No new compensatory arrangements were entered into with Ms. Cotter in connection with her appointment as interim President and Chief Executive Officer.

Ellen Cotter has been a member of the Board since March 7, 2013, and on August 7, 2014 was appointed as its Chairperson. Prior to joining our company in 1998, Ms. Cotter spent four years in private practice as a corporate attorney with the law firm of White & Case in Manhattan. She is a graduate of Smith College and holds a Juris Doctorate from Georgetown Law School. Ms. Cotter is the sister of James J. Cotter, Jr. and Margaret Cotter.

Under Mr. Cotter, Jr.'s employment agreement with the company, he is entitled to the compensation and benefits he was receiving at the time of a termination without cause for a period of twelve months from notice of termination. At the time of termination, Mr. Cotter Jr.'s annual salary was \$335,000.

Under his employment agreement, Mr. Cotter, Jr. is required to tender his resignation as a director of our company immediately upon the termination of his employment. After a request to do so, Mr. Cotter, Jr. has not yet tendered his resignation. The company considers such refusal as a material breach of Mr. Cotter, Jr.'s employment agreement, and has given him thirty (30) days in which to resign. If he does not do so, the company will terminate further severance payments, as permitted under the employment agreement.

No new compensatory arrangements were entered into with Mr. Cotter, Jr. in connection with his termination.

ITEM 8.01 OTHER EVENTS

On June 12, 2015, Mr. Cotter, Jr. filed a lawsuit against us and each of our other directors in the District Court of the State of Nevada for Clark County, titled James J. Cotter, Jr., individually and derivatively on behalf of Reading International, Inc. vs. Margaret Cotter, et. al. The lawsuit alleges, among other allegations, that the other directors breached their fiduciary duties in taking the actions to terminate Mr. Cotter, Jr. as President and Chief Executive Officer of the company and that

050

5/4/2016

BK Press release Ellen CEO

051

JA4507

Margaret Cotter and Ellen Cotter aided and abetted the breach of such fiduciary duties of the other directors. The lawsuit seeks damages and other relief, including an injunctive order restraining and enjoining the defendants from taking further action to effectuate or implement the termination of Mr. Cotter, Jr. as President and Chief Executive Officer of the company and a determination that Mr. Cotter, Jr.'s termination as President and Chief Executive Officer is legally ineffectual and of no force or effect. The company believes that numerous of the factual allegations included in the complaint are inaccurate and untrue and intends to vigorously defend against the claims in this action. The company has been informed that the other directors intend to seek indemnification from the Company for any losses arising under the lawsuit, in which case the company will tender a claim under its director and officers liability insurance policy.

EX-99.1 2 rdi-20150618ex991400879.htm EX-99.1

ITEM 9.01 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND EXHIBITS

(d) The following exhibit is included with this Report and incorporated herein by reference:

<u>Exhibit No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
99.1	Press release of Reading International, Inc. of June 15, 2015

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this Report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

Dated: June 18, 2015 READING INTERNATIONAL, INC.

By: /s/ William D.
Ellis

William D. Ellis

General Counsel and Secretary

Exhibit 99.1

Reading International Announces Appointment of Ellen Cotter as Interim Chief Executive Officer

Los Angeles, California, (Business Wire) June 15, 2015 – Reading International, Inc. (NASDAQ:RDI) announced today that its Board of Directors has appointed Ellen M. Cotter as interim President and Chief Executive Officer, succeeding James J. Cotter, Jr. The Company currently intends to engage the assistance of a leading executive search firm to identify a permanent President and Chief Executive Officer, which will consider both internal and external candidates.

Ms. Cotter is the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Company and has served as the senior operating officer of the Company's US cinemas operations for the past 14 years. In addition, Ms. Cotter is a significant stockholder in the Company.

Ms. Cotter commented, "James Cotter, Sr., who served as our Company's Chairman and Chief Executive Officer for over 20 years, grew Reading International, Inc. to a major international developer and operator of multiplex cinemas, live theaters and other commercial real estate assets. I look forward to continuing his vision and commitment to these businesses as we move forward to conduct our search for our next Chief Executive Officer. I will work diligently to ensure that this transition is seamless to all of our stakeholders."

The Company plans to report its second quarter financial results on or before August 10, 2015.

About Ellen Cotter

Ellen M. Cotter has been a member of our Company's Board of Directors since March 2013, and in August 2014 was appointed as Chairman of the Board. She joined Reading International, Inc. in 1998 and brings to the position her 17 years of experience working in our Company's cinema operations, both in the United States and Australia. For the past 14 years, she has served as the senior operating officer of our Company's domestic cinema operations. Ms. Cotter is a graduate of Smith College and holds a Juris Doctorate from Georgetown Law School. Prior to joining our Company, Ms. Cotter was a corporate attorney with the law firm of White & Case in New York, New York.

About Reading International, Inc.

Reading International (<http://www.readingrdi.com>) is in the business of owning and operating cinemas and developing, owning and operating real estate assets. Our business consists primarily of:

- the development, ownership and operation of multiplex cinemas in the United States, Australia and New Zealand; and
- the development, ownership, and operation of retail and commercial real estate in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, including entertainment-themed retail centers ("ETRC") in Australia and New Zealand and live theater assets in Manhattan and Chicago in the United States.

Reading manages its worldwide business under various different brands:

054

5/4/2016

8K Press release Ellen CEO Exhibit 991

055

<http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/716634/000071663415000021/rdf-20150618ex991400879.htm>

3/4

JA4511

Exhibit 99.1

- in the United States, under the
 - o Reading brand (<http://www.readingcinemasus.com>);
 - o Angelika Film Center brand (<http://www.angelikafilmcenter.com>);
 - o Consolidated Theatres brand (<http://www.consolidatedtheatres.com>);
 - o City Cinemas brand (<http://www.citycinemas.com>);
 - o Beekman Theatre brand (<http://www.beekmantheatre.com>);
 - o The Paris Theatre brand (<http://www.theparistheatre.com>);
 - o Liberty Theatres brand (<http://libertytheatresusa.com/>); and
 - o Village East Cinema brand (<http://villageeastcinema.com>)
- in Australia, under the
 - o Reading brand (<http://www.readingcinemas.com.au>); and
 - o Newmarket brand (<http://readingnewmarket.com.au>)
 - o Red Yard Entertainment Centre (<http://www.redyard.com.au>)
- in New Zealand, under the
 - o Reading brand (<http://www.readingcinemas.co.nz>);
 - o Rialto brand (<http://www.rialto.co.nz>);
 - o Reading Properties brand (<http://readingproperties.co.nz>);
 - o Courtenay Central brand (<http://www.readingcourtenay.co.nz>);
 - o Steer n' Beer restaurant brand (<http://steernbeer.co.nz>);

Media Contact:
Andrzej Matyczynski
Tel: 213-235-2240

Exhibit 11

Exhibit 11

From: Susan Villeda
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 2:06 PM
To: US Cinema General Managers; US Projectionists; MarketingGroup; Rod Tengan; Jennifer Deering; ccm@readingcinemas.com.au; ccm@readingcinemas.co.nz; cinemas@readingcinemas.com.au; cinemas@readingcinemas.co.nz; Ellen Cotter; Margaret Cotter; James Cotter (jcotterprivate@gmail.com); Guy Adams; Kane; M.Wrotniak@Aminco.biz; judycodding@gmail.com; 'McEachern, Doug (US - Retired)'; Andrzej Matyczynski; Craig Tompkins; Crystal Huang; Dev Ghose; Doug Hawkins; Erin Shull; Gabriela Sanchez; Gilbert Avanes; John Goeddel; John Sittig; Jorge E. Alvarez; Josie M. Castilho; Ken Gillich; Ken Lee; Kenneth Tucker; Kristine Ngo; Laura Batista; Marcelo Axarlian; Mike Conroy; Robert Carnatz; Susan Villeda; Tara King; Terri Moore; Toni Camacho; Victor Albizures; William Boggan; William Ellis; Andrew Smoker; Denise Hughes; Kate Bost; Kelley Anderson; Linda Hogarty; Rita Samlalsingh; Robert Smerling; Scott Rosemann; Woody Brunson; Ben Deighton; David Orbach; Dominica Walsh; Grace Donald; Jason Griffiths; John Cerrone; Kevin Rispin; Kim Olney; Mark Douglas; Martin Appleby; Matthew Bourke; Ryan Fox; Shane McLaren (Cinema); Wayne Smith; Ajay Ranchord; Anita Parsot; Chris Owen; Colin Urquhart; David O'Hagan; Dawn Logan; Freeman Tong; Ginny Seo; Hadyn Bell-Norris; Jennifer Acabado; Joanne Robinson; Jonathan Rowe; Jonathan Tay; Katie Park; Lindsey Tang; Maria Florendo; Mark Kendrick; Michelle Lai; Paul Mansfield; Ricky Pillai; Robert Provoost; Ryan Santoso; Sarah Carpenter; Sonia Smith; Steve Lucas
Cc: 'wgould@troygould.com'
Subject: Appointment of President and Chief Executive Officer
Attachments: image001.jpg; Letter from Bill Gould to Employees re Appointment of President and CEO dtd 1-11-2016.pdf


Reading Directors, Management and Employees,

Sent on behalf of William D. Gould, the Company's Lead Independent Director, please see the attached letter regarding the Appointment of Ellen M. Cotter as the Company's President and Chief Executive Officer.

Regards,
Susan Villeda
Executive Assistant to CFO
6100 Center Drive, Suite 900, Los Angeles, CA. 90045
O: (213) 235-2245 | F: (213) 235-2229
E: susan.villeda@readingrdi.com



EXH 390
DATE 6-29-16
WIT Gould
PATRICIA HUBBARD



READING
INTERNATIONAL

RDI0042976

058

JA4515



January 11, 2016

Re: Appointment of President & CEO

Ladies & Gentlemen:

I am very happy to announce, on behalf of the Board of Directors of Reading International, that Ellen Cotter has been appointed as our Company's permanent President and Chief Executive Officer.

Ellen has been a part of our Company for 18 years, and has served as the senior operating officer of our Company's domestic cinema operations for more than a decade. She spent a year on our behalf in Australia helping us acquire what are now some of our key assets in that country. And, since June 12, 2015, she has served as our Company's interim Chief Executive Officer.

Ellen is well known and respected in the cinema business. In 2015, Ellen was awarded a Gotham Award at the Independent Filmmaker Project Gotham Awards for her contributions to the independent film industry. She was also inducted into the ShowEast Hall of Fame.

Additionally, while serving as COO of our domestic cinemas, Ellen gained substantial hands-on real estate experience, dealing with landlords and developers while expanding our domestic cinema chain.

Over the past six months, she has effectively managed the disparate elements of our multi-national company, displaying her leadership and commitment to Reading. Furthermore, as a result of her sizable equity interest in our Company, her interests and those of our stockholders are well-aligned. Reading is her passion and her life. She is, in the view of the Board, clearly the best person to take on the duties and responsibilities of our Company's President and Chief Executive Officer.

Please join me in congratulating Ellen on her appointment.

Best,

Bill Gould
Lead Director

Reading International, Inc.
9100 Center Drive, Suite 900
Los Angeles, California 90045
E 213.235.2240 F 213.235.2229

059

www.readingintl.com

RDI0042977

JA4516

EXHIBIT 12

(Filed Separately Under Seal)



CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **RPLY**
2 **COHEN|JOHNSON|PARKER|EDWARDS**
3 **H. STAN JOHNSON, ESQ.**
4 Nevada Bar No. 00265
5 sjohnson@cohenjohnson.com
6 255 East Warm Springs Road, Suite 100
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
8 Telephone: (702) 823-3500
9 Facsimile: (702) 823-3400

6 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**
7 **CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK, ESQ.**
8 California Bar No. 145532, *pro hac vice*
9 christayback@quinnemanuel.com
10 **MARSHALL M. SEARCY, ESQ.**
11 California Bar No. 169269, *pro hac vice*
12 marshallsearcy@quinnemanuel.com
13 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
14 Los Angeles, CA 90017
15 Telephone: (213) 443-3000

16 Attorneys for Defendants Margaret Cotter,
17 Ellen Cotter, Douglas McEachern, Guy Adams, and Edward Kane

18 **EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

19 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

15 JAMES J. COTTER, JR. individually and
16 derivatively on behalf of Reading
17 International, Inc.,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 MARGARET COTTER, ELLEN COTTER,
21 GUY ADAMS, EDWARD KANE, DOUGLAS
22 McEACHERN, WILLIAM GOULD, JUDY
23 CODDING, MICHAEL WROTONIAK, and
24 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

25 Defendants.

26 AND

27 READING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Nevada
28 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

**INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT (NO. 1) ON
PLAINTIFF'S TERMINATION AND
REINSTATEMENT CLAIMS**

Judge: Hon. Elizabeth Gonzalez
Date of Hearing: October 27, 2016
Time of Hearing: 1:00 p.m.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ARGUMENT	2
A.	Plaintiff’s Termination Cannot Support a Breach of Fiduciary Duty Claim	2
B.	Even If the Termination of an Employee Could Constitute a Breach of Fiduciary Duty, Plaintiff’s Claims Fail as a Matter of Law	6
1.	Under Nevada Law, the Business Judgment Rule Applies in the Context of an Employee Termination.....	7
2.	The Board’s Termination of Plaintiff Was Fair	9
3.	RDI Was Not Damaged by Plaintiff’s Termination	17
4.	Plaintiff Cannot Show That His Termination Involved Intentional Misconduct, Fraud, or a Knowing Violation of the Law	19
C.	Plaintiff’s Reinstatement Demand Is Unsupportable and Untenable	20
D.	Even If the Termination of an Employee Could Constitute a Breach of Fiduciary Duty, Plaintiff Lacks Standing to Maintain His Derivative Action.....	21
III.	CONCLUSION.....	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

<i>In re Amerco Deriv. Litig.</i> , 127 Nev. 196 (2011)	17
<i>Berman v. Physical Med. Ass'n, Ltd.</i> , 225 F.3d 429 (4th Cir. 2000)	5
<i>CCWIPP v. Alden</i> , No. Civ. A. 1184, 2006 WL 456786 (Del. Ch. Feb. 22, 2006)	21
<i>Centaur Partners, IV v. Nat'l Intergroup, Inc.</i> , 582 A.2d 923 (Del. 1990)	3
<i>Chonwdhry v. NLVH, Inc.</i> , 111 Nev. 560 (1995)	21
<i>Cinerama, Inc. v. Technicolor, Inc.</i> , 643 A.2d 345 (Del. 1993)	17
<i>In re Comverge, Inc. S'holders Litig.</i> , Civ. A. No. 7368-VCP, 2013 WL 1455827 (Del. Ch. Apr. 10, 2013)	12
<i>Dweck v. Nassar</i> , No. 1353-N, 2005 WL 5756499 (Del. Ch. Nov. 23, 2005)	5
<i>In re Eagle Corp.</i> , 484 B.R. 640 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2012)	5, 6
<i>Energytec, Inc. v. Proctor</i> , Nos. 3:06-cv-0871 <i>et al.</i> , 2008 WL 4131257 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 29, 2008)	23
<i>In re Fuqua Indus., Inc. S'holder Litig.</i> , Civ. A. No. 11974, 1997 WL 257460 (Del. Ch. May 13, 1997)	10
<i>Goldstein v. Lincoln Nat'l Convertible Sec. Fund, Inc.</i> , 140 F. Supp. 2d 424 (E.D. Pa. 2001), <i>vacated on other grounds</i> , 2003 WL 1846095 (3d Cir. Apr. 2, 2003)	6
<i>Kasper v. LinuxMall.com, Inc.</i> , No. Civ. A. 00-2019, 2001 WL 230494 (D. Minn. Feb. 23, 2001)	6
<i>Kendall v. Henry Mountain Mines, Inc.</i> , 78 Nev. 408 (1962)	17
<i>Khanna v. McMinn</i> , No. Civ. A. 20545-NC, 2006 WL 1388744 (Del. Ch. May 9, 2006)	22
<i>Klein v. Freedom Strategic Partners, LLC</i> , 595 F. Supp. 2d 1152 (D. Nev. 2009)	17

1	<i>Love v. Wilson</i> ,	
2	No. CV 06-06148, 2007 WL 4928035 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 15, 2007).....	23
3	<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> ,	
4	504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	21
5	<i>Morgan v. AXT, Inc.</i> ,	
6	No. C 04-4362, 2005 WL 2347125 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2005)	18
7	<i>Nahass v. Harrison</i> ,	
8	C.A. No. 15-12354, 2016 WL 4771059 (D. Mass. Sept. 13, 2016)	6, 8
9	<i>In re Numoda Corp. S'holders Litig.</i> ,	
10	C.A. No. 9163-VCN, 2015 WL 402265 (Del. Ch. Jan. 30, 2015).....	12
11	<i>Olvera v. Shafer</i> ,	
12	No. 2:14-cv-01298, 2015 WL 7566682 (D. Nev. Nov. 24, 2015).....	17
13	<i>OptimisCorp. v. Waite</i> ,	
14	C.A. No. 8773-VCP, 2015 WL 5147038 (Del. Ch. Aug. 26, 2015).....	11
15	<i>Polk v. State</i> ,	
16	126 Nev. 180 (2010)	21
17	<i>Quadrant Structured Prod. Co., Ltd. v. Vertin</i> ,	
18	C.A. No. 6990-VCL, 2014 WL 5465535 (Del. Ch. Oct. 28, 2014).....	6
19	<i>Riblet Prods. Corp. v. Nagy</i> ,	
20	683 A.2d 37 (Del. 1996)	6
21	<i>Shoen v. SAC Holding Corp.</i> ,	
22	122 Nev. 621 (2006)	3, 20
23	<i>Smith v. Ayres</i> ,	
24	977 F.2d 946 (5th Cir. 1992)	23
25	<i>South v. Baker</i> ,	
26	62 A.3d 1 (Del. Ch. 2012).....	19
27	<i>Stalk v. Mushkin</i> ,	
28	125 Nev. 21 (2009)	18
	<i>Vanderminden v. Vanderminden</i> ,	
	226 A.D.2d 1037 (App. Div., 3d Dep't, 1996)	19
	<i>Wall St. Sys., Inc. v. Lemence</i> ,	
	No. 04 Civ. 5299, 2005 WL 2143330 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 2, 2005)	5
	<u>Other Authorities</u>	
	2 Fletcher Cyc. Corp. § 363 (2015)	6, 11
	2 Fletcher Cyc. Corp. § 357.20 (2015)	11

1	18A Am. Jur. 2d <i>Corporations</i> § 253 (2016).....	4
2	NRS 78.037.....	8
3	NRS 78.060.....	3
4	NRS 78.120.....	3, 8
5	NRS 78.130.....	1
6	NRS 78.135.....	3, 8
7	NRS 78.138.....	7, 8, 20
8	NRS 78.139.....	8
9	NRS 78.140.....	2, 8, 9, 16
10	NRS 78.751.....	8
11	NRS 78.7502.....	8

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 As a matter of law and undisputed facts, the Individual Defendants are entitled to
4 summary judgment on Plaintiff's claims arising from his termination as President and CEO of
5 Reading International, Inc. ("RDI" or "the Company").

6 First, there is no basis in law or fact to find that the termination of Plaintiff as an officer
7 was, or could have been, a breach of fiduciary duty. Plaintiff has not identified a single case in
8 any jurisdiction—let alone Nevada—in which a board's decision to terminate an officer was
9 subjected to any "fairness" review, or in which the firing of an officer has ever been determined
10 to be a breach of fiduciary duty, or in which a former CEO has been reinstated as a remedy for a
11 purported breach of fiduciary duty. There are no such cases. To the contrary, courts uniformly
12 bar breach of fiduciary duty claims against directors arising from their decision to terminate an
13 officer—even where, as here, those claims were asserted by the officer and stockholders. Their
14 reasoning is clear: *the termination of an executive by a board is a purely operational decision*
15 *that does not implicate its fiduciary duties*. Thus, Nevada's corporate statutes vest broad
16 discretion in RDI's Board to determine the course of the Company, and allow "removal before
17 the expiration" of an officer's term whenever "prescribed by the bylaws." NRS 78.130(3)-(4).
18 RDI's Bylaws, which are the contract between its stockholders, similarly provide that Plaintiff
19 could "be removed at any time, with or without cause, by the Board of Directors by a vote of not
20 less than a majority of the entire Board at any meeting thereof." Indeed, Nevada law provides
21 for broad application of the business judgment rule to all business matters, such as decisions on
22 hiring and firing of executives. NRS 78.138(3). Not surprisingly, Plaintiff has simply avoided
23 Nevada law, RDI's Bylaws, and the majority vote of the entire Board in favor of his removal in
24 both his motion and opposition on the issue of his termination. The law and undisputed facts are
25 fatal to his claims.

26 Second, even assuming the termination of an executive could be actionable as a breach of
27 directors' fiduciary duties in Nevada (even under the law as Plaintiff wishes it was), Plaintiff has
28 woefully failed to establish the elements of such a claim. Although there is no basis for

1 evaluating the “fairness” of the process of the decision to terminate, the undisputed evidence
2 compels a conclusion it was fair—to RDI foremost (the actual “derivative plaintiff”), *cf.* NRS
3 78.140(2)(d) (Nevada’s only “fairness” test, which analyzes whether an interested director
4 transaction was “fair to the corporation” before potentially voiding it), but also to Plaintiff. After
5 a period of difficult and abrasive management requiring extensive intervention by Board
6 members (individually and collectively), the Board made a decision after extensive debate and
7 with Board members (now Defendants) freely voting on each side. In an act of classic fairness
8 (and consistent with RDI’s Bylaws), the majority ruled—and decided—to terminate Plaintiff.
9 These same undisputed facts establish that, even if there was a fiduciary breach stemming from
10 the Board’s decision, the Individual Defendants would not be liable because there is *no evidence*
11 that the breach involved “intentional misconduct, fraud or a knowing violation of law,” as
12 required by NRS 78.138(7). Finally, Plaintiff has proffered no evidence of damages to RDI or
13 proximate causation. Indeed, to the extent his “damages” consist of the fact of termination and
14 he seeks reinstatement, such a remedy is unavailable.

15 Third, even if the termination of an employee could theoretically constitute the breach of
16 a fiduciary duty (which it cannot), and Plaintiff could establish the required elements of such a
17 claim (which he cannot), Plaintiff lacks standing to derivatively assert breach of fiduciary duty
18 claims against the director Defendants arising from his termination. After over a year of
19 discovery, he has failed to identify a single stockholder of RDI (other than himself) that supports
20 his wrongful termination claims and demand for reinstatement. Plaintiff’s pursuit of a purely
21 personal claim makes him inadequate to sue derivatively on the claim.

22 With no legal or factual support for Plaintiff’s termination claims and reinstatement
23 demand, the Individual Defendants are entitled to summary judgment.

24 **II. ARGUMENT**

25 **A. Plaintiff’s Termination Cannot Support a Breach of Fiduciary Duty Claim**

26 Despite 50 pages of briefing, Plaintiff has failed to come forward with evidence to
27 establish disputed facts supporting his claim. Moreover, he cites no law to support a breach of
28

1 fiduciary duty claim arising from an executive's termination. Plaintiff does not identify any
2 case, anywhere, that has recognized the viability of such a claim.¹ Indeed, the law and facts belie
3 such a claim. As the Individual Defendants argued in their opening brief, Plaintiff cannot assert
4 a viable breach of fiduciary duty claim arising from his termination given RDI's clear Bylaws
5 and the broad latitude afforded decisions by a board of directors under Nevada law. (Defs.' MSJ
6 No. 1 at 14-17.) Plaintiff, in both his motion and his opposition, has *entirely ignored this issue*,
7 which is dispositive of his termination claim and reinstatement demand.

8 Plaintiff does not dispute that a Nevada corporation is a product of statutory and contract
9 law. The statute is NRS Chapter 78: Private Corporations. The charter and bylaws are the
10 contracts among the stockholders of a corporation. *See* NRS 78.060, 78.120, 78.135; *see also*
11 *Centaur Partners, IV v. Nat'l Intergroup, Inc.*, 582 A.2d 923, 928 (Del. 1990) (same). "[U]nder
12 Nevada's corporations laws, a corporation's board of directors has full control over the affairs of
13 the corporation." *Shoen v. SAC Holding Corp.*, 122 Nev. 621, 632 (2006) (citation and internal
14 quotation marks omitted); *see also* NRS 78.120(1) ("Subject only to such limitations as may be
15 provided by this chapter, or the articles of the corporation, the board of directors has full control
16 over the affairs of the corporation.").

17 Under Nevada law—ignored by Plaintiff—corporate officers such as a CEO or President
18 have no vested right to remain in their position. Rather, officers serve only "for such terms and
19 have such powers and duties as may be prescribed by the bylaws or determined by the board of
20 directors," and an officer may be subject to "removal before the expiration of his or her term."
21 NRS 78.130(3)-(4). RDI's Bylaws mirror NRS 78.130, and expressly provide that Plaintiff
22 served solely "at the pleasure of the Board of Directors," such that he could "be removed at any
23 time, with or without cause, by the Board of Directors by a vote of not less than a majority of the
24

25 ¹ As noted in the Individual Defendants' opposition, Plaintiff relies entirely on Delaware
26 authority about general fiduciary duties arising under Delaware law, and inferences drawn from
27 Delaware cases addressing where a board is alleged to have breached its duties when faced with
28 a corporate merger or sale, or where there is an accusation that corporate assets have been
misused. Noticeably absent is any case law in which the termination of an officer's employment
is the subject of a fiduciary duty claim. (Defs.' Opp'n at 14 (collecting cases cited by Plaintiff).)

1 entire Board at any meeting thereof.” (HD#1 Ex. 19 Art. IV § 10.)² Not surprisingly, Plaintiff’s
2 Employment Contract was consistent with RDI’s Bylaws, as it similarly recognized that the
3 Board had an undiminished right to terminate him “with cause,” in which event he was owed no
4 relief, or “without cause,” in which case he was due a specified sum. (HD#1 Ex. 20 § 10.)

5 Plaintiff makes no showing how the Individual Defendants breached a contract with
6 RDI’s stockholders and abrogated any of their fiduciary duties if the Company’s Bylaws and his
7 employment contract *specifically allowed the Board to terminate Plaintiff at any time, for any*
8 *reason, and a majority of the entire Board voted to do so*—which is what indisputably occurred.³
9 Indeed, numerous courts have held that a plaintiff cannot use “an appeal to general fiduciary
10 law” to transform a case involving the dismissal of an officer into a claim that a company’s
11 directors “breached a fiduciary duty as corporate officers,” and have found arguments identical
12 to those asserted by Plaintiff to be “novel” and with “no case in support.” (See Defs.’ MSJ No. 1
13 at 14-16 (collecting cases).) In short, a board’s decision to fire (or hire) an officer is an
14 operational function that does not implicate its fiduciary duties.

17 ² Citations to “HD#1” refer to exhibits attached to the Declaration of Noah S. Helpert in
18 Support of the Individual Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment No. 1; citations to
19 “HD#2” refer to exhibits attached to the Helpert Declaration in Support of the Individual
20 Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment No. 2; and citations to “HDO” refer to any new
21 exhibits attached to the Helpert Declaration in Support of the Individual Defendants’ Opposition
22 to Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. Any exhibits cited by Plaintiff in his
opposition but not already included in the Individual Defendants’ previous filings will be
referred to using Plaintiff’s “Appendix.” No new factual evidence is attached to this reply brief.

23 ³ The Board’s January 15, 2015 resolution—in which all five non-Cotter directors agreed
24 that in order to terminate “the CEO” (and/or Ellen and Margaret Cotter), a majority of the *non-*
25 *Cotter* directors would be required to vote in favor of doing so—is beside the point. Not only is
26 it black-letter law that bylaws trump board resolutions, *see* 18A Am. Jur. 2d *Corporations* § 253
27 (2016), a majority of the non-Cotter directors in fact voted to remove Plaintiff as RDI’s CEO and
28 President. Although that should be the end of the issue, as explained in the briefing relating to
the Individual Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (No. 2) re: the Issue of Director
Independence, each of these non-Cotter directors also were disinterested in the decision before
them and therefore “independent.” Indeed, directors voted on both sides of the issue, remained
directors for some time thereafter (and Mr. Gould even to the present), and nonetheless are
Defendants in this lawsuit.

1 Rather than attempting to distinguish these decisions (which he cannot, because they also
2 address situations in which the plaintiff was both an officer and a stockholder, as here),
3 Plaintiff's only response is "[t]his is a different version of the same argument the Court rejected
4 previously in denying the motion to stay this case and compel arbitration." (Pl.'s Opp'n at 18;
5 *see also id.* at 24-25 (same).) Not so. Plaintiff's argument misrepresents the issues involved in
6 RDI's Motion to Compel Arbitration, and the Court's denial thereof. That motion was
7 predicated on RDI's argument that "the Employment Agreement is a valid and existing contract
8 with an agreement to arbitrate disputes thereunder, and all of Mr. Cotter's claims arise from or
9 relate to the Employment Agreement." (RDI's Mot. to Compel Arbitration (Aug. 10, 2015)
10 at 5.) In denying RDI's motion, the Court merely recognized that, to the extent that Plaintiff may
11 have derivative claims as an RDI stockholder, rather than as an employee, they do not "arise
12 from or relate to" his Employment Contract and are thus not issues subject to arbitration. (*See*
13 Sept. 1, 2015 Hr'g Tr. at 9:21-10:1 ("While the issue related to employment is a factor important
14 to both Mr. Cotter and the Intervenors, it does not preclude them from pursuing this litigation,
15 rather than going through arbitration, for preservation of their rights as shareholders.")).

16 That Plaintiff's alleged derivative claims fall outside the corners of his Employment
17 Contract is a far different issue than whether the causes of action he asserts as a stockholder are
18 actually valid as a matter of law. With respect to his termination claim, they are not—based on
19 the law of *every* jurisdiction to consider it. *See, e.g., Berman v. Physical Med. Ass'n, Ltd.*, 225
20 F.3d 429, 433 (4th Cir. 2000) (affirming dismissal of fiduciary duty claim that directors did not
21 follow fair procedures in deciding to terminate stockholder/doctor's employment because "any
22 injury caused by the termination decision itself would be an injury to his interests as an
23 employee, not as a stockholder"); *In re Eagle Corp.*, 484 B.R. at 654 (a stockholder "who is also
24 an employee cannot recover on a breach of fiduciary duty claim when the claim is grounded
25 solely in an employment dispute"); *Wall St. Sys., Inc. v. Lemence*, No. 04 Civ. 5299, 2005 WL
26 2143330, at *8 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 2, 2005) (dismissing third-party claims against directors because
27 "they are essentially employment disputes that cannot sustain a claim of fiduciary breach under
28 Delaware law"); *Dweck v. Nassar*, No. 1353-N, 2005 WL 5756499, at *5 (Del. Ch. Nov. 23,

2005) (“[the shareholder’s] allegations of wrongdoing in connection with her termination as President and CEO” by the Board of Directors “are insufficient to support a claim for breach of fiduciary duty”); *Nahass v. Harrison*, C.A. No. 15-12354, 2016 WL 4771059, at *6 (D. Mass. Sept. 13, 2016) (terminated officer could not maintain a breach of fiduciary duty claim where his termination was authorized under “the Bylaws”); *In re Eagle Corp.*, 484 B.R. 640, 654 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2012) (removal of officer and director could not be a breach of fiduciary duty where “Delaware General Corporation Law provides for removal . . . with or without cause”); *Goldstein v. Lincoln Nat’l Convertible Sec. Fund, Inc.*, 140 F. Supp. 2d 424, 438 (E.D. Pa. 2001) (plaintiff could not maintain fiduciary duty claim “[g]iven the express statutory authorization for the Board’s action”), *vacated on other grounds*, 2003 WL 1846095 (3d Cir. Apr. 2, 2003); *Quadrant Structured Prod. Co., Ltd. v. Vertin*, C.A. No. 6990-VCL, 2014 WL 5465535, at *3 (Del. Ch. Oct. 28, 2014) (dismissing action where the “governing documents authorized” the challenged “strategy”); *see also* 2 Fletcher Cyc. Corp. § 363 (2015) (“where a bylaw provided that any officer might be removed by a majority vote of the entire board whenever the best interests of the company require it, it was for the directors to determine what was in the best interests of the company; the courts will not interfere unless for fraud or illegality”).

Plaintiff cannot distinguish or avoid this authority. In fact, even “under Delaware law,” which Plaintiff maintains is the “persuasive authority” on which he relies (Pl.’s Mot. at 22 n.6), courts are emphatic that “there can be no breach of fiduciary duty stemming from the termination of [an officer’s] employment.” *Kasper v. LinuxMall.com, Inc.*, No. Civ. A. 00-2019, 2001 WL 230494, at *3 (D. Minn. Feb. 23, 2001) (applying Delaware law in termination of president); *see also* *Riblet Prods. Corp. v. Nagy*, 683 A.2d 37, 39-40 (Del. 1996) (no breach of fiduciary duty where stockholder/plaintiff was “an employee of the corporation under an employment contract with respect to issues involving that employment”). Simply put, his claim is meritless.

B. Even If the Termination of an Employee Could Constitute a Breach of Fiduciary Duty, Plaintiff’s Claims Fail as a Matter of Law

Even assuming *arguendo* that the termination of an employee could ever support a breach of fiduciary duty claim in Nevada, Plaintiff cannot establish an actionable breach of fiduciary in

1 this case with respect to the Board's termination decision because (1) the Board's decision was
2 protected by the business judgment rule, which always applies to employment decisions under
3 Nevada law; (2) the decision to terminate Plaintiff based on the undisputed facts was fair to the
4 Company and its stockholders (and, although irrelevant for these claims under Nevada law, fair
5 to Plaintiff); (3) Plaintiff cannot show that the Board's termination decision involved "intentional
6 misconduct, fraud, or a knowing violation of the law," as is required for individual liability under
7 Nevada law; and (4) Plaintiff has no evidence of any damages to RDI proximately caused by his
8 termination.

9 **1. Under Nevada Law, the Business Judgment Rule Applies in the**
10 **Context of an Employee Termination**

11 Plaintiff does not contest that if the business judgment rule were to apply, his fiduciary
12 duty claims arising out of his termination would fail as a matter of law. (See Pl.'s Opp'n at 10-
13 18.) Instead, he expresses surprise in his opposition brief that the Individual Defendants'
14 opening brief "makes no mention" of *Delaware's* "entire fairness" standard, which Plaintiff
15 claims applies to the Board's termination decision given his allegations regarding the
16 interestedness or lack of independence of certain Board members. (Opp'n at 15.)

17 There is no justification for Plaintiff's purported shock. Plaintiff has failed to identify *a*
18 *single case* in which *any court* (let alone a Nevada court) has subjected a board's decision to
19 terminate an officer to Delaware's "entire fairness" test.⁴ More importantly, *Nevada law*—not
20 Delaware law—governs Plaintiff's termination claim.⁵ Nevada's business judgment rule,
21 codified by statute, provides that "[d]irectors and officers, in deciding upon *matters of business*,
22 *are presumed to act in good faith*, on an informed basis and with a view to the interests of the
23 corporation." NRS 78.138(3) (emphasis added). Nevada's corporate law identifies only two
24 situations where the business judgment presumption may be disturbed: (1) where directors take

25 ⁴ Nor, as RDI points out in its concurrently-filed reply brief, does it make sense to apply a
26 Delaware test focused on "fair price" to an employment termination situation where price is not
27 an issue. (See RDI Reply in Support of Ind. Defs.' MSJ No. 1 § I.)

28 ⁵ While Nevada courts may take into consideration Delaware precedents, such consideration
is unnecessary here where there exists Nevada law.

1 certain actions to resist “a change or potential change in control of the corporation,” NRS
2 78.139(1)(b), 2-4; and (2) in an “interested director transaction,” which may involve “self-
3 dealing” between a director and a corporation, NRS 78.140. In his opposition, Plaintiff concedes
4 that, “[b]y their terms, on their face, those two statutory provisions do not speak to circumstances
5 other than those described” and are therefore not relevant to his termination claims. (Pl.’s Opp’n
6 at 15 n.4.) The Individual Defendants agree. But Plaintiff has not identified any Nevada statute
7 or legal decision that has disturbed the application of the business judgment rule outside of these
8 two situations. And he cannot identify a single case subjecting a board’s decision to terminate an
9 officer to *any* “fairness” review (under Nevada law or elsewhere).

10 The conclusion is simple: the RDI Board’s business decision to remove a CEO was a
11 purely operational decision that is one of those “matters of business” always entitled to the
12 Nevada statutory presumption of reasonable business judgment under NRS 78.138(3). *See*
13 *Nahass*, 2016 WL 4771059, at *5 (questioning how the “entire fairness” doctrine ever “would
14 apply to employment decisions,” and rejecting fiduciary duty claim by officer terminated by
15 company’s directors).⁶ This is fully consistent with the wide discretion afforded to corporate
16 boards under Nevada law on matters that determine the course of the company, *see* NRS 78.120,
17 78.135, 78.138, whether or not to sell the company, *see* NRS 78.139, and the limitations on
18 liability, *see* NRS 78.037, 78.751, 78.7502. As Nevada corporate policy, these statutes are
19 designed to vest decision-making in the board, and to protect directors who are called upon to
20 make these decisions (usually working on a part-time basis, sometimes with less-than-perfect
21 knowledge, and typically for not much money). *See also* NRS 78.138(7) (providing additional
22 legal protections to directors with respect to potential personal liability).⁷

23
24 ⁶ In short, in Nevada, there is a marked contrast between “operational decisions,” such as
25 removing an officer or changing a marketing strategy, and “transactional decisions,” such as
26 where a director can be on both sides of a particular transaction. It defies logic to imply a more
27 stringent standard for operational decisions like the termination of an executive (*i.e.*, Delaware’s
“entire fairness” test) than there is under existing Nevada statutes where a director sits on both
sides of a specific transaction (*i.e.*, the NRS 78.140 “fair as to the corporation” analysis).

28 ⁷ The only other basis upon which Plaintiff challenges this Board decision relies on
allegations of “lack of independence” by certain Board members. Even if the disinterestedness

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
80
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

2
3
4
5
6
7
8

8

1 McEachern testified, Plaintiff “knew that his position as CEO was in jeopardy for a longer period
2 of time than just May 21,” (HD#1 Ex. 7 at 176:1-9), and Plaintiff conceded at deposition that he
3 was aware that there was “the possibility of getting an interim CEO . . . as early as October
4 2014.” (HD#1 Ex. 11 at 528:9-529:20.)

5 Plaintiff objects that the ombudsman process did not continue until the end of June 2016
6 (Pl.’s Opp’n at 7 n.2), and asserts that agenda items distributed by Ellen Cotter two days in
7 advance of the Board’s May 21, 2015 meeting—which listed “status of President and CEO” as
8 an item for discussion (HD#1 Ex. 39)—were vague and unexpected. (Pl.’s Opp’n at 5.) But
9 neither complaint is valid. Regardless of what certain Directors may have preferred (or Plaintiff
10 himself may have wanted), the Board “never set a date of June 30 for our intervention” and
11 Director Kane and others felt that “there was no reason for us to wait until June 30” without
12 progress, as protecting stockholder value needed to be considered paramount to Plaintiff’s self-
13 interested desire to remain CEO and President. (HD#1 Ex. 6 at 532:12-533:15.) Plaintiff’s
14 claim that Ellen Cotter’s agenda item was ambiguous is contradicted by the presence of
15 Plaintiff’s current litigation counsel at the May 21, 2015 Board meeting (HD#1 Ex. 29 at 1), and
16 the fact that, in the days prior, both Plaintiff and his counsel threatened to sue each director “and
17 ruin them financially” if they voted for his removal. (HD#1 Ex. 3 at 426:19-427:9; HD#1 Ex. 7
18 at 78:14-79:2.)⁹ Plaintiff was well aware that the Board was going to discuss his potential
19 removal on May 21, 2015.

20

21

22 Plaintiff merely suggests that Storey not only cautioned that a removal could involve Plaintiff, it
23 could involve Ellen and/or Margaret Cotter as well—a fact that is irrelevant to whether the
process involving Plaintiff’s removal was fair. (Pl.’s Opp’n at 5.)

24

25 ⁹ While Plaintiff makes vague allusion to “entrenchment” in his opposition (Pl.’s Opp’n
26 at 15), there is no evidence that his termination was about entrenchment of any director. On its
27 face, none of the non-Cotter directors had a stake in the outcome of the vote, and Plaintiff
28 proffers no evidence that any director was more or less likely to remain on the Board based on
how they voted. Entrenchment is “engaging in [an] action which had the effect of protecting
their tenure” and being “motivated primarily or solely for the purpose of achieving that effect”—
the very definition of “entrenchment,” *In re Fuqua Indus., Inc. S’holder Litig.*, Civ. A. No.
11974, 1997 WL 257460, at *11 (Del. Ch. May 13, 1997). The only evidence of entrenchment
as a motive is from Plaintiff’s threats to “ruin” board members “financially” through a lawsuit if

1 Plaintiff's related insinuation that he was not provided sufficient notice of his potential
2 removal prior to the May 21, 2015 Board meeting is similarly flawed. Not only was Plaintiff
3 aware for months that his job was in jeopardy, and given specific notice that his status would be
4 debated at a formal Board meeting two days prior to its occurrence (both of which factually
5 disprove Plaintiff's argument), Plaintiff ignores the clear authority collected by the Individual
6 Defendants in their opening brief (Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 21) establishing that directors need not
7 give a CEO *any* advance notice of a plan to remove him or her.¹⁰ RDI's Bylaws contain no such
8 requirement, and instead provide that Plaintiff could "be removed at any time." (HD#1 Ex. 19
9 Art. IV § 10.) As such, Plaintiff's notice and timing objections are baseless.

10 Plaintiff's characterization of communications between Board members leading up to the
11 May 21, 2015 Board meeting as "consist[ing] of secret machinations and agreements" is also a
12 product of his own imagination. (Pl.'s Opp'n at 17.) None of the evidence he cites supports his
13 depiction. (*See id.* at 7.) Rather, as various directors independently contemplated Plaintiff's
14 removal over the weeks leading up to May 21, 2015, they began a series of emails, meetings, and
15 informal straw polls as to a potential termination vote, and commenced discussing what to do on
16 an interim basis in the event that Plaintiff was fired. (HDO Ex. 9 at 175:17-179:7; HDO Ex. 3
17 at 98:8-99:22; HDO Ex. 4 at 366:14-373:2.) None of this was improper, as Plaintiff suggests.
18 Rather, the Board had to determine if it was even worthwhile to formally discuss Plaintiff's
19 employment status during a Board meeting, and it had an obligation to plan ahead if he was
20 ultimately removed.

21 Directors holding informal discussions in advance of a meeting as to how they might vote
22 on an important matter, and contemplating what steps to take should a vote go a certain way, is

23 _____
24 they dared to exercise their fiduciary duties and debate the merits of his continued tenure.
(HD#1 Ex. 3 at 426:19-427:9; HD#1 Ex. 7 at 78:14-79:2.)

25 ¹⁰ Plaintiff does not cite a single case for the proposition that any notice is required. Other
26 authority is clear that notice is not necessary. *See OptimisCorp. v. Waite*, C.A. No. 8773-VCP,
27 2015 WL 5147038, at *66-67 (Del. Ch. Aug. 26, 2015) (rejecting argument that directors
28 "breached their duty of loyalty by not advising [CEO] in advance of his potential termination");
2 Fletcher Cyc. Corp. § 357.20 (2015) (a board's failure to give CEO advance notice of a plan to
remove him as CEO does "not invalidate his termination").

1 exactly what diligent board members should do. Moreover, there is “a difference between
2 corporate acts and informal intentions or discussions.” *In re Numoda Corp. S’holders Litig.*,
3 C.A. No. 9163-VCN, 2015 WL 402265, at *9 (Del. Ch. Jan. 30, 2015). “Corporate acts are
4 driven by board meetings, at which directors make formal decisions,” and courts look “to
5 organizational documents, official minutes, duly adopted resolutions, and a stock ledger, for
6 example, for evidence of corporate acts.” *Id.* Conversations and even “conversational
7 agreements” are not “corporate acts” and do not provide the basis for any liability. *Id.*

8 Finally, once the formal Board review process began, there was no “kangaroo court,” as
9 Plaintiff misleadingly claims. (Pl.’s Opp’n at 7, 14, 17.) The only emails cited by Plaintiff in
10 support of this point pre-date the Board’s May 21, 2015 meeting, and merely evince Director
11 Storey’s disagreement with the “apparent view” of certain directors “that no discussion is
12 necessary” and a simple vote on Plaintiff’s employment would suffice once a motion to
13 terminate was raised and seconded. (*See, e.g.*, HDO Ex. 14.) Storey instead wanted to “define
14 and address the issue, discuss it, and come to a conclusion,” which was “a separate issue [as] to
15 the merits of the decision before us.” (HDO Ex. 1 at 134:9-135:1; HDO Ex. 13 at 1-2.)

16 What Plaintiff leaves out is that the RDI Board took Storey’s advice, engaged outside
17 counsel to assist it in its fiduciary duties,¹¹ and vigorously debated the merits of Plaintiff’s

18
19 ¹¹ Citing no legal precedent in support, Plaintiff asserts that the Individual Defendants’
20 factual statement that they engaged the services of outside counsel when discussing Plaintiff’s
21 potential termination (and their related suggestion that such engagement is indicative of a board
22 acting responsibly) is somehow equivalent to “asserting reliance on counsel” as an affirmative
23 defense. (Pl.’s Opp’n at 16 n.6.) Plaintiff is wrong as a matter of law. Acknowledging receipt
24 of advice from an attorney is different and distinct from asserting an advice of counsel
25 affirmative defense (which the Individual Defendants have not done and are not doing, as they
26 are not claiming that they cannot be held liable *because* they relied in good faith on the informed
27 advice of counsel in taking a specific action—*i.e.*, to terminate Plaintiff). *See In re Converge,*
28 *Inc. S’holders Litig.*, Civ. A. No. 7368-VCP, 2013 WL 1455827, at *1, *3-4 (Del. Ch. Apr. 10,
2013) (finding no waiver of privilege and no invocation of advice of counsel defense; holding
that “it is the existence of legal advice that is material to the question of whether the board acted
with due care, not the substance of that advice”). Plaintiff cannot have it both ways—he cannot
proclaim there was a “kangaroo court” and then seek to prevent the Individual Defendants from
noting steps taken to show that no procedural improprieties occurred. Regardless, had the RDI
Board not engaged outside counsel, the procedure it employed in deciding whether to terminate
Plaintiff would still have been procedurally fair.

1 termination in three different Board meetings held over a three-week period that lasted a
2 combined 13 hours. (*See* Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 8-12; Defs.' Opp'n at 10-14.) The Board gave
3 Plaintiff the opportunity to speak "at length" regarding his tenure, and the chance to present a
4 business plan (which he was unable to do). His response was nothing more than an appeal to
5 nepotism (*see* HD#1 Ex. 30 at 3 (plaintiff asserting "that it was the intention of his father . . . that
6 he run the Company and the Board should observe his wishes")) and an attempt to intimidate the
7 Board by again threatening a lawsuit. (HD#1 Ex. 3 at 426:19-427:9.) The Board properly
8 deferred a final termination decision when it appeared that Plaintiff agreed to a revised
9 management structure, which would have created oversight over his responsibilities and had the
10 potential to end his adversarial relationship with his sisters, who were key RDI employees and
11 also sat on the Board. (*See* HD#1 Ex. 30 at 3-4 (Minutes of the May 29, 2015 Board meeting);
12 HD#1 Ex. 40 (May 27, 2015 version of agreement-in-principle); HDO Ex. 16 (June 3, 2015
13 revision).) And the Board gave Plaintiff three separate chances to stay on as President under a
14 new CEO so that he could better learn the business and gain the management skills he so sorely
15 lacked. (HD#1 Ex. 29 at 4; HD#1 Ex. 30 at 1.) The extensive reasoned review process utilized
16 by the Board went far above any "fair procedure" requirement.

17 **(b) The Decision to Terminate Plaintiff Was Fair on the Merits**

18 The decision to terminate Plaintiff also was unquestionably fair on the merits with respect
19 to RDI (and, although not required, also to Plaintiff). (*See* Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 18-20; Opp'n
20 at 27-28.) After over a year of discovery, Plaintiff has not been able to meet the minimum proof
21 thresholds required to create a triable issue of fact as to whether his termination was fair on the
22 merits. Instead it is beyond reasonable dispute that:

23 • **Plaintiff Lacked Significant Experience in Areas Critical to RDI**: There is no
24 evidence in the record that Plaintiff's background would enable him to be an effective CEO or
25 President. Instead, the Individual Defendants have established (and Plaintiff has not contested)
26 (*see* Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 5-6; Defs.' Opp'n at 5) that Plaintiff lacked noteworthy experience in
27 numerous areas critical to RDI. Director McEachern recognized that Plaintiff "had no real estate
28 experience, no international experience, no management experience, no cinema experience and

1 no live theater experience”—virtually all of the business areas relevant to RDI’s operations.
2 (HD#1 Ex. 7 at 49:25-50:7.) Director Adams was similarly worried that Plaintiff “was young”
3 and “didn’t have that much experience” (HD#1 Ex. 4 at 462:14-25), while Director Storey
4 believed that “if his last name wasn’t Cotter, he wouldn’t be CEO.” (HD#1 Ex. 4 at 460:12-24.)
5 Given this undisputed absence of experience, Plaintiff’s eventual termination due to performance
6 issues—which arose, in part, because he was not yet ready to be CEO—was more than fair.¹²

7 • Teamwork and Morale Was Poor Under Plaintiff’s Abusive Leadership: As the
8 Individual Defendants have established (and Plaintiff has not contested) (*see* Defs.’ MSJ No. 1
9 at 7; Defs.’ Opp’n at 5-6), the Board was troubled by Plaintiff’s “behavior,” “temperament,” and
10 “anger issues” (HD#1 Ex. 15 at 55:21-57:5), and some Directors considered sending Plaintiff to
11 a “psychologist or psychiatrist” or to anger management classes in early 2015. (HD#1 Ex. 6
12 at 529:22-530:2; HD#1 Ex. 35 at 3.) As Director Storey recognized, under Plaintiff, “morale”
13 within RDI was “poor and needs to be improved,” Plaintiff “need[ed] to establish teamwork,”
14 and he required hand-holding “to lead/develop leadership role.” (HD#1 Ex. 33 at 3.)

15 • Plaintiff Lacked an Understanding of Key Components of RDI’s Business: The
16 Individual Defendants have established that Plaintiff demonstrated a lack of understanding with
17 respect to costs and margins highly critical to RDI’s cinema business. (*See* Defs.’ MSJ No. 1
18 at 7; Defs.’ Opp’n at 6-7.) Plaintiff has offered no evidence in response. (*See* Pl.’s Opp’n.)

19 • Plaintiff Could Not Work With Key RDI Executives: Plaintiff does not dispute that
20 his sisters, Ellen and Margaret Cotter, were key executives within RDI. Nor does he dispute that
21 he could not work well with them, as established by the Individual Defendants. (*See* Defs.’ MSJ
22 No. 1 at 6-7; Defs.’ Opp’n at 7-9.) And he does not contest that, due to this inability, Director
23 Gould and others determined that RDI was faced with “a dysfunctional management team” in
24

25 ¹² Plaintiff’s only counter is that—five-and-a-half years *before* his election as CEO—his
26 father authored a memo suggesting that he intended Plaintiff to succeed him. (Pl.’s Opp’n at 4.)
27 Not only is this memo irrelevant to the issue of whether Plaintiff did or did not have significant
28 experience in areas critical to RDI (and it actually proves true Director Storey’s worry about
nepotism), the intent of the late James J. Cotter, Sr. in 2009 has no bearing on whether the
termination of his son years later was fair to the Company and its stockholders.

1 which there was “‘thermonuclear’ hostility” between the Cotters. (HD#1 Ex. 35 at 2-3.) In fact,
2 Plaintiff testified that the tensions between him and his sisters had become so intense by 2015
3 that RDI was unable to function, such that drastic reform in behavior or potential termination(s)
4 were required to get beyond the current paralysis. (HD#1 Ex. 12 at 696:22-700:3, 704:7-22.)

5 Each of these issues, which were articulated and considered by the Individual Defendants
6 prior to rendering their termination vote, is separately sufficient to justify Plaintiff’s removal as
7 CEO and President. Taken together, they render the fairness of the Board’s termination decision
8 beyond dispute.¹³ But Plaintiff’s evidentiary failures do not end here. There is no evidence in
9 the record that continuing Plaintiff as CEO and/or President would have been in the best interests
10 of RDI. Nor is there any evidence in the record that returning him to office would be in the best
11 interests of the Company. As McEachern testified, “from August of 2014 until [Plaintiff’s]
12 termination, I cannot tell you one thing that we did that created value for the company, one thing
13 that Jim Cotter, Jr. managed to do. Nothing.” (HD#1 Ex. 7 at 292:2-5.) Given the absence of
14 record evidence, apparently Plaintiff cannot as well. At the summary judgment stage, this is fatal
15 to Plaintiff’s challenge to the fairness of his termination, as he cannot show that his removal was
16 in any way “unfair” to RDI—the actual derivative plaintiff in this action.

17
18
19 ¹³ With respect to the above-deficiencies, Plaintiff’s asserts—with absolutely no support—
20 that the substantial testimony and documentary evidence collected by the Individual Defendants
21 is “flimsy”; his one factual response is to claim that Director Kane, at least, did not actually share
22 these concerns. (Pl.’s Opp’n at 4.) A reference to the evidence collected by the Individual
23 Defendants belies any suggestion that it is “flimsy,” and such naming-calling, of course, falls
24 well short of Plaintiff’s obligation to muster contrary evidence at the summary judgment stage.
25 Moreover, Plaintiff’s single reference to an early June 2015 email chain with Director Kane is
26 itself “flimsy” and perplexing. If Plaintiff believes that Kane wanted him to remain CEO in
27 early June 2015, it disproves his theory that there was a conspiracy amongst the Individual
28 Defendants to remove him from office with no debate in mid-May 2015. In reality, the emails
cited by Plaintiff regarding Kane, whom Plaintiff had begged to help him “broker” a deal with
Ellen and Margaret Cotter (*see* Defs.’ Opp’n at 12-13), merely show Kane using flattery in an
attempt to reason with Plaintiff, forestall his firing, and advocate for a negotiated resolution of
the myriad of management problems plaguing Plaintiff’s tenure. (*See* Pl.’s Appendix Ex. 2.)
None of these actions by Kane, which were attempting to avert the prevent, costly corporate
battle, were in any way improper.

1 Despite this, Plaintiff still maintains that his termination was unfair because the Board
2 engaged in “attempted extortion and execution on the extortion threat” when it delayed his
3 potential termination on May 29, 2015 after a potential negotiated settlement between the Cotters
4 was agreed to in principle, and when it ultimately terminated him on June 12, 2015 when that
5 settlement fell through. (*See* Pl.’s Opp’n at 6, 17-18.) There are two fatal problems to this
6 argument. First, it relates only to fairness as it applies to Plaintiff—not RDI. But, in a derivative
7 action, whether or not an action was fair vis-à-vis Plaintiff is irrelevant as to whether it was fair
8 to RDI, the actual plaintiff on whose behalf this lawsuit is (purportedly) being brought. Indeed,
9 to the extent that Nevada has a “fairness review,” it analyzes whether an action is “fair as to the
10 corporation,” not the individual involved. NRS 78.140(2)(d).

11 Second, Plaintiff’s pejoratives are unfounded. (*See* Defs.’ MSJ No. 1 at 10-11, 20; Defs.’
12 Opp’n at 12-14, 28.) The Board’s support for and consideration of a potential compromise
13 between the Cotter siblings was far from “extortion”; rather, affording respect to the potential
14 deal made business sense because it could have alleviated the admitted “dysfunction” within the
15 management ranks that was clearly affecting the Company and stockholder value; rectified some
16 of the otherwise-terminal problems in Plaintiff’s CEO tenure; and ameliorated Plaintiff’s
17 managerial deficiencies by providing him with an Executive Committee structure under which he
18 would have operated as CEO going forward, which could have allowed him the chance to grow
19 and gain needed experience. (*See* HD#1 Ex. 30 at 3-4; HD#1 Ex. 40.)

20 Once that agreement fell through, the Board was left with the same intractable problems
21 as before—which Plaintiff does not dispute. As *both* Storey (who voted against termination) and
22 Kane (who voted for termination) testified, the Individual Defendants felt that “things should be
23 dealt with now,” “[t]hey had come to a head and there was no point in delaying,” “the current
24 disharmony within the business was untenable going forward,” “[t]here was a polarization in the
25 office among the employees, and it had to be resolved one way or another.” (HD#1 Ex. 1
26 at 119:25-120:12, 154:2-14; HD#2 Ex. 5 at 331:11-332:17.) Given that the Board was faced
27 with a CEO that could not perform adequately, lacked experience and expertise, required close
28

1 supervision, did not process the requisite leadership skills, and could not work well with various
2 directors or executives, its decision to terminate Plaintiff was objectively fair.

3 **3. RDI Was Not Damaged by Plaintiff's Termination**

4 Even if Plaintiff's termination was somehow "unfair" to RDI (which it was not),
5 Plaintiff's fiduciary duty claims arising from his removal must fail because he has not shown any
6 damages to RDI resulting from his firing, nor has he provided evidence that any such damages
7 were proximately caused by the Board's June 12, 2015 decision. (*See* Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 22-
8 23; Defs.' Opp'n at 19-20.)

9 Plaintiff, in his opposition, spends pages on a convoluted argument suggesting that he is
10 not required to actually prove *any* damages to RDI in order to establish his breach of fiduciary
11 duty claims against the Individual Defendants. (*See* Pl.'s Opp'n at 19-21.) In fact, he labels
12 such a requirement "imaginary." (*Id.* at 20.) But not once does Plaintiff cite applicable Nevada
13 law.¹⁴ In fact, Nevada precedent is clear that damages and proximate causation are both
14 *elements* of a breach of fiduciary claim (and any related aiding and abetting claim). *See Olvera*
15 *v. Shafer*, No. 2:14-cv-01298, 2015 WL 7566682, at *2 (D. Nev. Nov. 24, 2015) ("A claim for
16 breach of fiduciary duty under Nevada law requires a plaintiff to demonstrate a fiduciary duty
17 exists, that duty was breached, and the breach proximately caused the damages."); *Klein v.*
18 *Freedom Strategic Partners, LLC*, 595 F. Supp. 2d 1152, 1162 (D. Nev. 2009) (same, applying
19 Nevada law); *In re Amerco Deriv. Litig.*, 127 Nev. 196, 225 (2011) (adopting standard for
20 "aiding and abetting a breach of a fiduciary duty," for which one of the "four elements" is "the

21
22 ¹⁴ *Kendall v. Henry Mountain Mines, Inc.*, 78 Nev. 408 (1962), the one Nevada case that
23 Plaintiff cites for the proposition that corporations may void the challenged transactions of
24 interested directors (Pl.'s Opp'n at 20), says nothing about the elements of a fiduciary duty claim
25 or whether damages are a required showing. Similarly, *Cinerama, Inc. v. Technicolor, Inc.*, 643
26 A.2d 345 (Del. 1993), a Delaware case, does not support Plaintiff's argument. While that case
27 states that "[t]o require proof of injury as a component of proof necessary to rebut the business
28 judgment presumption would be to convert the burden shifting process from a threshold
determination of the appropriate standard of a review to a dispositive adjudication on the merits,"
id. at 371, this quote does not stand for the proposition that *no proof* of injury is required at all—
instead, it merely establishes *the timing as to when* proof of injury is required. In fact, the court
went on to state that "injury or damages becomes a proper focus only after a transaction is
determined *not* to be entirely fair." *Id.* (emphasis in original).

1 breach of the fiduciary relationship resulted in damages”); *see also Stalk v. Mushkin*, 125 Nev.
2 21, 28 (2009) (“a breach of fiduciary duty claim seeks damages for injuries that result from the
3 tortious conduct of one who owes a duty to another by virtue of the fiduciary relationship”).

4 In contrast to his motion (where he did not discuss damages at all), Plaintiff in his
5 opposition contends that he “has produced evidence of damages.” (Defs.’ Opp’n at 21.) But
6 nothing Plaintiff cites constitutes economic harm to RDI proximately “caused by” his
7 termination. To the extent that Plaintiff identifies certain corporate actions taken after his firing
8 as “waste,” such as “monies paid to third-party consultants” (*id.*), he introduces no proof that this
9 alleged conduct was wasteful, nor does he introduce evidence showing that *his termination* was
10 the proximate cause of such waste. Indeed, Plaintiff still sits on RDI’s Board, and his failure to
11 prevent the conduct of which he complains undermines any causal connection to his removal (as
12 it apparently would have occurred irrespective of his firing).¹⁵

13 Plaintiff also baldly asserts—without citation—that RDI’s stock price suffered a
14 “diminution” in “the days following disclosure of” Plaintiff’s termination. (*Id.*) As an initial
15 matter, this is not actually true. On June 18, 2015, the day that RDI filed a Form 8-K
16 announcing Plaintiff’s removal (HD#1 Ex. 25), RDI’s stock price closed at \$13.53/share, up
17 from \$13.45/share the day before.¹⁶ By June 30, 2015, the Company’s stock price was
18 \$13.85/share, and it reached \$14.00/share on July 1, 2015. Even if RDI’s stock price had not
19 risen, a mere drop in share price is insufficient to satisfy the required causation. *See Morgan v.*
20 *AXT, Inc.*, No. C 04-4362, 2005 WL 2347125, at *16 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2005) (that share price
21 dropped after disclosure revealed prior misrepresentations is insufficient to constitute causation).
22 And, of course, a “decline” in “stock price is not even a derivative injury” and cannot support the
23

24
25 ¹⁵ Plaintiff also asserts that the Individual Defendants “have wrongfully insisted that
26 Plaintiff resign as Company director.” (Pl.’s Opp’n at 8.) While this allegation has absolutely
27 no relevance to whether or not Plaintiff’s termination was a fiduciary breach, Plaintiff in fact did
28 not resign and instead remains a Board member to this day—meaning that neither he nor RDI
could have suffered any damages from this purportedly wrongful conduct.

¹⁶ *See* <http://www.nasdaq.com/symbol/rdi/historical>.

1 required causation in the context of Plaintiff's purported derivative action. *South v. Baker*, 62
2 A.3d 1, 25 (Del. Ch. 2012).

3 Plaintiff is left with an assertion, based on a single twenty-year-old New York case, that a
4 shift in the "control of the company" may "be viewed as irreparable injury." *Vanderminden v.*
5 *Vanderminden*, 226 A.D.2d 1037, 1041 (App. Div., 3d Dep't, 1996). But "control" of RDI did
6 not shift with Plaintiff's termination: Ellen and Margaret Cotter, as trustees of the Estate of
7 James J. Cotter, Sr. (recognized by this Court), controlled the majority of RDI's shares both
8 *before and after Plaintiff's termination*. Moreover, the *Vanderminden* case does not involve a
9 derivative claim; rather, it addresses an inapposite situation, where rival shareholders were
10 battling for control of a trust (and thus a shift in voting power was irreparable harm to one
11 plaintiff). *See id.* In contrast, this action is brought by Plaintiff in a derivative capacity, as a
12 representative of the Company itself; he must show harm to RDI, not himself. But there is no
13 such evidence. Uncontroverted testimony and documentary evidence from within RDI indicates
14 that Plaintiff "was very weak as a C.E.O. or as a manager," and "wasn't really leading the
15 business and he wasn't leading us forward." (Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 22 (citations omitted)).
16 Similarly, RDI's major unaffiliated investors have indicated that it would not "make much
17 difference" to the Company's stockholders if Plaintiff was CEO, and that the overall
18 performance of the RDI, along with its business plan, have remained entirely consistent and
19 appropriate since Plaintiff's termination. (*Id.* at 22-23 (citations omitted).)

20 Because Plaintiff does not have evidence of any "economic harm" flowing to RDI
21 following his termination, let alone evidence that his firing was the "proximate cause" of such
22 harm, he cannot establish an actionable breach of fiduciary claim.

23 **4. Plaintiff Cannot Show That His Termination Involved Intentional**
24 **Misconduct, Fraud, or a Knowing Violation of the Law**

25 Finally, even if Plaintiff's termination was somehow unfair (it was not) and proximately
26 caused damages to RDI (which it did not), the Individual Defendants are statutorily immune
27 from individual liability where, as here, any "breach" did not involve intentional misconduct,
28 fraud, or a knowing violation of law. (*See* Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 14, 18; Defs.' Opp'n at 28-29.)

1 Nevada's corporate law provides "a director or officer is not individually liable to the
2 corporation or its stockholders or creditors for any damages as a result of any act or failure to act
3 in his or her capacity as a director unless it is proven that . . . the breach of those duties involved
4 intentional misconduct, fraud or a knowing violation of law." NRS 78.138(7). There can be no
5 "knowing violation" or "intentional misconduct" where the RDI Board weighed the propriety of
6 Plaintiff's termination over several meetings, considered his attempted defense of his tenure,
7 engaged outside counsel to assist it in exercising its fiduciary duties, and articulated a wide
8 variety of business-specific reasons motivating its removal decision. Even the Directors that
9 voted not to terminate Plaintiff on June 12, 2015 recognized significant problems with his
10 performance, and objected more to the timing of his removal than to the underlying basis. (*See*
11 *Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 8-12, 19.*) Plaintiff has not identified a single case anywhere in which
12 directors have been held liable for breaching their fiduciary duties in the context of an employee
13 termination, let alone under the strict requirements set forth in NRS 78.138(7).

14 Plaintiff's only response is to cite Delaware law, and argue that "the exculpatory statute"
15 does not apply where, as here, he has asserted "duty of loyalty" claims. (*Pl.'s Opp'n at 16 n.5.*)
16 Once again, Plaintiff's reliance on Delaware law—as opposed to Nevada law—is flawed. In
17 contrast to whatever Delaware may hold, the Nevada Supreme Court has made clear that under
18 Nevada law, "directors and officers may only be found personally liable for *breaching their*
19 *fiduciary duty of loyalty* if that breach involves intentional misconduct, fraud, or a knowing
20 violation of the law." *Shoen*, 122 Nev. at 640 (citing NRS 78.138(7) (emphasis added)).
21 Because Plaintiff cannot meet this requirement (nor has he even attempted to), his claims fail as
22 a matter of law.

23 **C. Plaintiff's Reinstatement Demand Is Unsupportable and Untenable**

24 As the Individual Defendants emphasized in their opening brief, even if the Board's
25 removal of Plaintiff somehow constituted a breach of fiduciary duty, the reinstatement relief
26 demanded by Plaintiff is untenable as a matter of law and practice. (*Defs.' MSJ No. 1 at 28-30;*
27 *Defs.' Opp'n at 29-30.*) Perhaps for this reason Plaintiff has not identified a single case in any
28 jurisdiction in which the firing of a corporate officer was reversed following a breach of

1 fiduciary duty claim. (*See id.*) The Individual Defendants identified six reasons such a remedy
2 is precluded. (*See Ind. Defs.’ MSJ No. 1 at 28-30.*) Plaintiff does not address *any* of them.
3 Failure to make a responsive argument in the first instance constitutes a waiver. *Chonwdhry v.*
4 *NLVH, Inc.*, 111 Nev. 560, 563 (1995); *see also Polk v. State*, 126 Nev. 180, 185 (2010) (failure
5 to address or dispute argument is “a confession of error on this issue”). Notwithstanding
6 Plaintiff’s waiver, the numerous problems associated with any reinstatement of Plaintiff as CEO
7 and President of RDI render that relief untenable. Such a request, which is unsupported by law,
8 contradicted by the terms of Plaintiff’s Employment Contract, and operationally problematic,
9 should be denied.

10 **D. Even If the Termination of an Employee Could Constitute a Breach of**
11 **Fiduciary Duty, Plaintiff Lacks Standing to Maintain His Derivative Action**

12 Finally, Plaintiff’s termination claim fails as a matter of law for yet another independent
13 reason: Plaintiff lacks standing to derivatively assert breach of fiduciary duty claims against the
14 Individual Defendants arising out of his termination.

15 Plaintiff’s main response is that an attack on his derivative standing “has been rejected by
16 the Court previously.” (Defs.’ Opp’n at 22.) This is misleading at best. Elements of standing
17 are not merely pleading requirements, but are also an “indispensable part of the plaintiff’s case”
18 on which “the plaintiff bears the burden of proof” at each of “the successive stages of the
19 litigation.” *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 561 (1992); *see also CCWIPP v.*
20 *Alden*, No. Civ. A. 1184, 2006 WL 456786, at *10 (Del. Ch. Feb. 22, 2006) (“discovery” and
21 “[f]urther development of the facts” may prove a plaintiff is “an inadequate derivative plaintiff”).
22 At the motion to dismiss stage, the Court was required to accept Plaintiff’s mere allegations as
23 true, and afford him any and all reasonable inferences warranted on the pleadings alone. But
24 Plaintiff cannot meet his burden now that discovery has occurred and he must provide *actual*
25 *evidence* to support standing with respect to his ability to derivatively assert his termination
26 claim and his demand for reinstatement.¹⁷

27
28 ¹⁷ In his opposition, Plaintiff points to purported “substantial evidence of self-dealing”
conduct by the Individual Defendants with respect to their approval of both a stock option and

1 In their opening brief, the Individual Defendants’ established why Plaintiff lacks
2 derivative standing with respect to his termination claim and reinstatement demand: clear
3 economic antagonisms exist between Plaintiff and other shareholders and the remedy sought by
4 Plaintiff is entirely personal. (Defs.’ MSJ No. 1 at 24-27.) Plaintiff’s responses to these
5 arguments are, at best, unsatisfactory on their face: he cites no cases in support of any of his
6 points, and distinguishes none of the authority collected by the Individual Defendants. (See Pl.’s
7 Opp’n at 23-24.)

8 But it is indisputable that Plaintiff lacks derivative standing for one simple reason: after
9 over a year of discovery, he has failed to identify a single RDI stockholder (other than himself)
10 who supports his derivative action with respect to his termination claim or his demanded
11 reinstatement. This alone is fatal to Plaintiff’s attempted derivative standing. See *Khanna v.*
12 *McMinn*, No. Civ. A. 20545-NC, 2006 WL 1388744, at *41 (Del. Ch. May 9, 2006) (“the
13 inadequacy of a plaintiff may be concluded from a strong showing of only one factor” if that
14 factor involves “some conflict of interest between the derivative plaintiff and the class”).
15 Instead, several notable third-party shareholders have gone on the record to actively *oppose*
16 Plaintiff’s termination and reinstatement claims. (See Defs.’ MSJ No. 1 at 28 (individuals who
17 control over 1 million shares of RDI’s Class A stock and over a thousand Class B shares have
18 rejected the idea of reinstating Plaintiff because “the well has been poisoned” with respect to
19 Plaintiff as CEO, his reinstatement would perpetuate a “divided company,” Plaintiff is not “the
20 single best qualified person to run” RDI, and his advancement was the product of “nepotism”).)

21 Plaintiff’s only response is a naked assertion that this “claim is inaccurate, as reflected by
22 the objections to the T2 Plaintiffs’ request for court approval of their settlement.” (Pl.’s Opp’n
23 at 24.) But Plaintiff does not actually cite to or quote what these objections say, for good
24 reason—they have nothing to do with Plaintiff’s termination claim and reinstatement

25
26 the nominations of new directors to justify his standing as a derivative plaintiff. (Defs.’ Opp’n
27 at 22.) While the Individual Defendants do not challenge Plaintiff’s theoretical ability to
28 derivatively assert claims relating to those types of corporate actions, that “evidence”—which is,
in fact, nonexistent—is entirely irrelevant to Plaintiff’s derivative standing *with respect to his*
separate termination claim and reinstatement demand—the subject of this motion.

1 demand. (*See* Objs. of Diamond A. Partners, L.P. and Diamond A. Invs., L.P., to Settlement
2 at 3-6 (objecting to the settlement because it “provides no tangible benefit to shareholders” and
3 “the General Release of all possible claims against Defendants and others is quite valuable and
4 overbroad”); Obj. of Mark Cuban to Settlement at 4-6 (same, focusing on an argument that the
5 settlement “releases any unknown claims Reading may bring”).) Nowhere do the objecting
6 stockholders provide any indication that they explicitly support Plaintiff’s termination claim or
7 are actively in favor of his demand for reinstatement as CEO and President of RDI. (*See id.*)

8 This resounding “lack of support” for Plaintiff’s termination and reinstatement claims by
9 relevant “non-defendant shareholders” is fatal to Plaintiff’s standing. *Love v. Wilson*, No. CV
10 06-06148, 2007 WL 4928035, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 15, 2007) (rejecting derivative standing);
11 *see also Smith v. Ayres*, 977 F.2d 946, 948 (5th Cir. 1992) (lack of “cooperation” or support from
12 other shareholders undermined attempted derivative action); *Energytec, Inc. v. Proctor*, Nos.
13 3:06-cv-0871 *et al.*, 2008 WL 4131257, at *7 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 29, 2008) (applying Nevada law
14 and rejecting derivative standing of former CEO because other stockholders do not “share” an
15 interest in his “regain[ing] control” of the company). Because Plaintiff lacks standing to pursue
16 a derivative action seeking relief on his termination and reinstatement claims, summary
17 judgment is entirely appropriate.

18 **III. CONCLUSION**

19 For the foregoing reasons, the Individual Defendants respectfully request that the Court
20 grant both their Motion for Summary Judgment (No. 1) re: Plaintiff’s Termination and
21 Reinstatement Claims and provide such other and further relief as the Court may deem necessary
22 and proper.

23 ///

24 ///

25

26

27

28

1 Dated: October 21, 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 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
13 SULLIVAN, LLP**

14 CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK, ESQ.

15 California Bar No. 145532, *pro hac vice*

16 christayback@quinnemanuel.com

17 MARSHALL M. SEARCY, ESQ.

18 California Bar No. 169269, *pro hac vice*

19 marshallsearcy@quinnemanuel.com

20 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor

21 Los Angeles, CA 90017

22 Telephone: (213) 443-3000

23 *Attorneys for Defendants Margaret Cotter, Ellen*
24 *Cotter, Douglas McEachern, Guy Adams, and*
25 *Edward Kane*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on October 21, 2016, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (NO. 1) ON PLAINTIFF'S TERMINATION AND REINSTATEMENT CLAIMS** to be served on all interested parties, as registered with the Court's E-Filing and E-Service System.


Bird Marella		
Contact	Email	
Bora Lee	blee@birdmarella.com	
Docket	Docket@BirdMarella.com	
Hernan E. Vera	hgv@birdmarella.com	
Karen Minutelli	kmm@birdmarella.com	
Shoshana E. Bannett	seb@birdmarella.com	
Chubb		
Contact	Email	
Allison Rose	allisonrose@chubb.com	
Cohen Johnson Parker Edwards		
Contact	Email	
C.J. Barnabi	cj@cohenjohnson.com	
H. Stan Johnson, Esq.	calendar@cohenjohnson.com	
Sarah Gondek	sgondek@cohenjohnson.com	
Fish & Richardson PC		
Contact	Email	
Andrea Sager	sager@fr.com	
Rebekah Graham	rgraham@fr.com	
Scott C. Thomas, Esq.	sthomas@fr.com	
Thomas M. Melsheimer, Esq.	tmelsheimer@fr.com	
Greenberg Traurig, LLP		
Contact	Email	
6085 Joyce Heilich	heilichj@gtlaw.com	
7132 Andrea Rosehill	rosehilla@gtlaw.com	
IOM Mark Ferrario	lvitdock@gtlaw.com	
KBD Kara Hendricks	hendricksk@gtlaw.com	
LVGTDocketing	lvitdock@gtlaw.com	
MNQ Megan Sheffield	sheffieldm@gtlaw.com	
WTM Tami Cowden	cowdent@gtlaw.com	
ZCE Lee Hutcherson	hutcherson@gtlaw.com	
Laxalt & Nomura, Ltd.		
Contact	Email	
James E. Murphy, Esq.	jmurphy@laxalt-nomura.com	
Mike Bale	mbale@laxalt-nomura.com	
Nancy Rozan	nrozan@laxalt-nomura.com	

1	Lewis Roca Rothgerber	
2	Contact	Email
3	Judy Estrada	Jestrada@lrrlaw.com
4	Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie	
5	Contact	Email
6	Mark Krum	mkrum@lrrc.com
7	Stephanie Sodorff	ssodorff@lrrc.com
8	Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP	
9	Contact	Email
10	Jessie Helm	jhelm@lrrc.com
11	Kirsten Story	kstory@lrrc.com
12	Luz Horvath	LHorvath@lrrc.com
13	Maupin, Cox & LeGoy	
14	Contact	Email
15	Carolyn K. Renner	crenner@mclawfirm.com
16	Donald A. Lattin	dlattin@mclawfirm.com
17	Jennifer Salisbury	jsalisbury@mclawfirm.com
18	Karen Bernhardt	kbernhardt@mclawfirm.com
19	Katie Arnold	karnold@mclawfirm.com
20	McDonald Carano Wilson	
21	Contact	Email
22	Aaron D. Shipley	ashipley@mcwlaw.com
23	Leah Jennings	ljennings@mcdonaldcarano.com
24	Patti Sgro Lewis & Roger	
25	Contact	Email
26	Andrew D. Sedlock	asedlock@pslrfirm.com
27	Nelson Achaval	nachaval@pslrfirm.com
28	Stephen Lewis	slewis@pattisgrolewis.com
29	Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP	
30	Contact	Email
31	Christopher Tayback	christayback@quinnemanuel.com
32	Lauren Laiolo	laurenlaiolo@quinnemanuel.com
33	Mario Gutierrez	mariogutierrez@quinnemanuel.com
34	Marshall M. Searcy III	marshallsearcy@quinnemanuel.com
35	Noah Helpen	noahhelpen@quinnemanuel.com
36	Reading International	
37	Contact	Email
38	Craig Tompkins	craig.tompkins@readingrdi.com
39	Ellen Cotter	Ellen.Cotter@readingrdi.com
40	Kenneth Tucker	Kenneth.Tucker@readingrdi.com
41	Margaret Cotter	margaret.cotter@readingrdi.com
42	Susan Villeda	susan.villeda@readingrdi.com
43	Royal & Miles LLP	

1	Contact	Email
2	Ashley Andrew	aandrew@royalmilesllaw.com
3	Santoro Whitmire	
4	Contact	Email
5	Asmeen Olila-Stoilov	astoilov@santoronevada.com
6	James M. Jimmerson	jjimmerson@santoronevada.com
7	Jason D. Smith	jsmith@santoronevada.com
8	Kristen Capella	kcapella@santoronevada.com
9	Nicholas J. Santoro	nsantoro@santoronevada.com
10	Rachel Jenkins	rjenkins@santoronevada.com
11	Shepard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP	
12	Contact	Email
13	Adam Streisand	astreisand@sheppardmullin.com
14	Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP	
15	Contact	Email
16	Dolores Gameros	dgameros@sheppardmullin.com
17	SOLOMON DWIGGINS & FREER, LTD.	
18	Contact	Email
19	Alan D. Freer, Esq.	afreer@sdfnlaw.com
20	Troy Gould	
21	Contact	Email
22	William Gould	wgould@troygould.com

Dated this 21st day of October, 2016.

/s/ C.J. Barnabi
An employee of Cohen|Johnson|Parker|Edwards



CLERK OF THE COURT

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, 10th 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, ELLEN COTTER,
GUY ADAMS, EDWARD KANE, DOUGLAS
McEACHERN, WILLIAM GOULD, JUDY
CODDINGTON, MICHAEL WROTONIAK, 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

Case No.: P-14-082942-E
Dept. No.: XI

Related and Coordinated Cases

BUSINESS COURT

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF INDIVIDUAL
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT (NO. 2) RE:
THE ISSUE OF DIRECTOR
INDEPENDENCE**

Judge: Hon. Elizabeth Gonzalez
Date of Hearing: Oct. 27, 2016
Time of Hearing: 1:00 P.M.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. ARGUMENT2

 A. Summary Judgment is Appropriate on This Record.....2

 B. RDI Directors McEachern, Kane, Coddling, Wrotniak, and Adams are
 Independent as a Matter of Law.....4

 1. Douglas McEachern4

 2. Edward Kane5

 3. Judy Coddling7

 4. Michael Wrotniak.....8

 5. Guy Adams9

 C. Generalized Allegations of “Entrenchment” Cannot Establish a Lack of
 Independence11

III. CONCLUSION.....12

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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Aronson v. Lewis,
473 A.2d 805 (Del. 1984) 9

Aviation Ventures, Inc. v. Joan Morris, Inc.,
121 Nev. 113 (2005) 3

Beam ex rel Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia, Inc. v. Stewart,
845 A.2d 1040 (Del. 2004) 2, 3, 5, 7

Brehm v. Eisner,
746 A.2d 244 (Del. 2000) 9

Choy v. Ameristar Casinos, Inc.,
127 Nev. 870 (2011) 4

Drobbin v. Nicolet Instrument Corp.,
631 F. Supp. 860 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) 3

eBay Domestic Holdings, Inc. v. Newmark,
16 A.3d 1 (Del. Ch. 2010)..... 12

Gearhart Indus., Inc. v. Smith Int’l, Inc.,
741 F.2d 707 (5th Cir. 1984) 3

In re Amerco Derivative Litig.,
127 Nev. 196 (2011) 5

In re Facebook, Inc., IPO Sec. & Derivative Litig.,
922 F. Supp. 2d 445 (S.D.N.Y. 2013)..... 3

In re Finisar Corp. Derivative Litig.,
542 F. Supp. 2d 980 (N.D. Cal. 2008) 3

In re Fuqua Indus., Inc. S’holder Litig.,
No. CIV.A. 11974, 1997 WL 257460 (Del. Ch. May 13, 1997) 12

In re Gaylord Container Corp. S’holders Litig.,
753 A.2d 462 (Del. Ch. 2000)..... 3

In re MFW S’holders Litig.,
67 A.3d 496 (Del. Ch. 2013)..... 9

In re Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc.,
954 A.2d 346 (Del. Ch. 2008)..... 3

Kahn v. M & F Worldwide Corp.,
88 A.3d 635 (Del. 2014) 3

1	<i>La. Mun. Police Emps. ' Ret. Sys. v. Wynn,</i>	
2	No. 2:12-CV-509 JCM GWF, 2014 WL 994616 (D. Nev. Mar. 13, 2014).....	10
3	<i>Patrick v. Allen,</i>	
4	355 F. Supp. 2d 704 (S.D.N.Y. 2005).....	3-4
5	<i>Posadas v. City of Reno,</i>	
6	109 Nev. 448 (1993)	4
7	<i>Rales v. Blasband,</i>	
8	634 A.2d 927 (Del. 1993)	8
9	<i>SEPTA v. Volgenau,</i>	
10	C.A. No. 6354-VCN, 2013 WL 4009193 (Del. Ch. Aug. 5,2013).....	3
11	<i>Shuck v. Signature Flight Support of Nev., Inc.,</i>	
12	126 Nev. 434 (2010)	4-5
13	<i>Teamsters Union 25 Health Servs. & Ins. Plan v. Baiera,</i>	
14	119 A.3d 44 (Del. Ch. 2015).....	3

STATUTES

15	N.R.S. 78.138(7)	2, 12
16	NASDAQ Rule 5615	11
17	Nev. R. Civ. P. 56	3, 4

OTHER AUTHORITIES

18	U.S. Census Bureau, Distribution of Household Wealth in the U.S.: 2000 to 2011,	
19	available at http://www.census.gov/people/wealth/files/Wealth%20distribution%	
20	202000%20to%202011.pdf	10

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Plaintiff's arguments against granting summary judgment on the issue of the Individual
3 Defendants' independence with respect to the litany of Board actions about which Plaintiff
4 complains misapprehend the law and rely on speculation rather than facts.

5 First, Plaintiff wrongly asserts that the independence of board members with respect to a
6 specific action is a factual question inappropriate for summary judgment. Not so. Courts
7 regularly decide the issue of director independence as a matter of law at the summary judgment
8 stage—and even earlier, on motions to dismiss.

9 Second, Plaintiff attempts to twist and complicate the facts to fit his favored narrative—
10 without regard to the evidence—of a board willing to do whatever the Cotter sisters might ask.
11 Plaintiff ignores the dearth of facts supporting this view. Plaintiff refuses to concede that
12 Douglas McEachern (“McEachern”) is independent but provides nothing to rebut Plaintiff's
13 admission to the contrary at his deposition. He believes that Edward Kane (“Kane”) favors Ellen
14 and Margaret Cotter and is biased against him based on Kane's prior friendship with their father;
15 Judy Coddington (“Coddington”) favors them due to her friendship with their mother; and Michael
16 Wrotniak (“Wrotniak”) favors Margaret Cotter because of her friendship with his wife. Case
17 law, however, is starkly to the contrary: mere friendship does not make a director biased—
18 *especially* when that friendship is with someone else entirely and not the director him- or herself.
19 Plaintiff points to payments to Guy Adams (“Adams”) by Ellen and Margaret Cotter as reason
20 for Adams' purported lack of independence. The undisputed facts, however, are that (i) Adams
21 earned those payments from preexisting business deals with James Cotter, Sr.; (ii) there is no
22 certainty that his position on the Board or relationship with Reading is assured by “supporting”
23 the sisters because future control of Cotter, Sr.'s Estate is disputed in a separate lawsuit and may
24 ultimately rest with Plaintiff; and (iii) the compensation Adams receives is not material to his
25 overall finances. In short, Plaintiff's allegations of second-hand friendships and nominal
26 business ties are too remote as a matter of law to show a lack of independence with respect to
27 any board action.

1 Third, Plaintiff does not present any evidence to show that any specific board action by
2 any individual director defendant was actually compromised by the bias that he argues exists.
3 Rather than point to specific self-dealing transactions (which do not exist) as would be typical in
4 a challenge to director independence on an issue, he relies on the meaningless phrases
5 “usurpation” and “entrenchment” as the goal. Generalized “usurpation” and “entrenchment” is
6 insufficient to establish breach-of-fiduciary-duty claims against directors in Nevada; rather,
7 Plaintiff must have *evidence* that *specific* board actions were affected by *specific* bias or lack of
8 independence by *specific directors* rising to the level required by NRS 78.138(7)(a) (requiring
9 intentional misconduct, fraud or knowing violation of the law for liability of individual
10 directors). He does not, and accordingly his claims based on alleged lack of independence of
11 individual directors should be summarily adjudicated against him.¹

12 **II. ARGUMENT**

13 **A. Summary Judgment is Appropriate on This Record**

14 Utterly misreading the authority he cites, Plaintiff argues that because director
15 independence is a “fact-specific determination,” summary judgment is inappropriate. (Opp. at
16 11-12.) Plaintiff relies on *Beam ex rel Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia, Inc. v. Stewart*, 845
17 A.2d 1040, 1049 (Del. 2004), but the court in *Beam* actually granted the director defendants’
18 motion to dismiss upon holding that the plaintiff’s factual allegations did not show a lack of
19 independence. *Id.* at 1049-54. If director independence can appropriately be determined on a
20

21 ¹ At least the following board actions arguably comprise the claims Plaintiff contends are
22 tainted by alleged director bias, and are covered by this summary judgment motion: (1)
23 discussions about terminating Plaintiff (*id.* ¶ 2); (2) terminating Plaintiff (*id.* ¶ 3); (3) reactivating
24 the Executive Committee (*id.* ¶ 99); (4) electing Coddington to RDI’s board of directors (*id.* ¶ 11);
25 (5) electing Wrotniak to RDI’s board of directors (*id.* ¶ 12); (6) approving the Estate’s exercise
26 of an option for 100,000 Class B shares in September 2015 (*id.* ¶ 10); (7) manipulating the CEO
27 search (*id.* ¶¶ 137-147); (8) selecting Ellen Cotter as RDI’s CEO (*id.* ¶ 146); (9) setting Ellen
28 Cotter’s salary as CEO (*id.* ¶ 152); (10) selecting Margaret Cotter for her New York real-estate
position (*id.* ¶ 149); (11) setting Margaret Cotter’s salary in that position (*id.* ¶ 150); (12) making
a \$200,000 payment to Margaret Cotter when she became an RDI employee (*id.* ¶ 151); (13)
making a \$50,000 payment to Guy Adams for his board service (*id.* ¶ 153); (14) deciding not to
pursue a third-party’s indication of interest in purchasing RDI (*id.* ¶¶ 154-162); and (15) making
purportedly misleading public statements in press releases and SEC filings (*id.* ¶¶ 101, 135, 136).

1 motion to dismiss, it can certainly be determined with the factual record present at summary
2 judgment. According to Plaintiff, determining director independence as a matter of law would
3 “ignore[] the clear teaching from Delaware’s highest court.” (Opp. at 11-12 (citing *Beam*, 845
4 A.2d at 1049).) Putting aside that Nevada law applies here, the Delaware Supreme Court has
5 noted that “Delaware courts have often decided director independence as a matter of law at the
6 summary judgment stage.” *Kahn v. M & F Worldwide Corp.*, 88 A.3d 635, 649 (Del. 2014)
7 (citing *In re Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc.*, 954 A.2d 346, 369-70 (Del. Ch. 2008) and *In re*
8 *Gaylord Container Corp. S’holders Litig.*, 753 A.2d 462, 465 (Del. Ch. 2000)); *see also SEPTA*
9 *v. Volgenau*, C.A. No. 6354-VCN, 2013 WL 4009193, at *12-21 (Del. Ch. Aug. 5, 2013)
10 (holding, on summary judgment, that directors on the special committee were disinterested and
11 independent).²

12 Plaintiff also appears to suggest that summary judgment would be improper because,
13 under Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f), the Court may grant a party opposing summary
14 judgment additional time to conduct further discovery. (Opp. at 10-11.) However, Plaintiff does
15 not explicitly request such relief and would not be entitled to it even if he did. Plaintiff makes no
16 effort to identify (by affidavit or otherwise) any further evidence that he needs to collect to
17 oppose the motion, as is required by the rule. *Aviation Ventures, Inc. v. Joan Morris, Inc.*, 121
18 Nev. 113, 118 (2005) (noting that a continuance under NRCP 56(f) is “appropriate only when the
19 movant expresses how further discovery will lead to the creation of a genuine issue of material
20

21 ² The other out-of-state authorities cited by Plaintiff on this point also do not hold that it is
22 improper to determine director independence at summary judgment. *See In re Facebook, Inc.,*
23 *IPO Sec. & Derivative Litig.*, 922 F. Supp. 2d 445, 468 (S.D.N.Y. 2013) (granting motion to
24 dismiss due to plaintiff’s failure to allege lack of independence or disinterestedness); *In re*
25 *Finisar Corp. Derivative Litig.*, 542 F. Supp. 2d 980, 988 (N.D. Cal. 2008) (same); *Teamsters*
26 *Union 25 Health Servs. & Ins. Plan v. Baiera*, 119 A.3d 44, 61 (Del. Ch. 2015) (same); *Gearhart*
27 *Indus., Inc. v. Smith Int’l, Inc.*, 741 F.2d 707, 719 (5th Cir. 1984) (affirming lower court’s
28 decision to deny injunction where there was no evidence of directors’ self-interest and no
fiduciary duty was breached); *Drobbin v. Nicolet Instrument Corp.*, 631 F. Supp. 860, 880
(S.D.N.Y. 1986) (preliminary injunction appropriate where court found that directors were not
disinterested and had not show that transaction was fair); *Patrick v. Allen*, 355 F. Supp. 2d 704,
712 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) (denying motion to dismiss where plaintiffs sufficiently alleged that
defendants were not disinterested directors).

1 fact”); *Choy v. Ameristar Casinos, Inc.*, 127 Nev. 870, 871 (2011) (party opposing summary
2 judgment is required by NRCP 56(f) to “provide an affidavit stating the reasons why denial or
3 continuance of the motion for summary judgment is necessary to allow the opposing party to
4 obtain further affidavits or discovery”). Given that trial is scheduled to start in only a few weeks,
5 the Court should not grant any further time for discovery.

6 **B. RDI Directors McEachern, Kane, Coddington, Wrotniak, and Adams are**
7 **Independent as a Matter of Law**

8 *1. Douglas McEachern*

9 Plaintiff inexplicably contends that while he “does not concede that McEachern was
10 disinterested and/or independent,” he somehow “can prevail on this Motion without showing
11 McEachern to have lacked disinterestedness or independence” and therefore “chooses not to
12 address McEachern.” (Opp. at 16 n.3.) As was noted in the Motion, Plaintiff admitted at his
13 deposition that McEachern is independent. (Mot. at 5, 15, 23.) When asked “Mr. McEachern, is
14 he independent, in your view?” Plaintiff answered “Yes. I mean, he’s – I mean, again, he’s
15 independent. He’s got no relationship with Ellen and Margaret or, you know, no business
16 relationship with Ellen and Margaret.” (HD#2³ Ex. 7 at 84:21-85:1.) When pressed as to
17 whether, “in your view, Mr. McEachern is independent and has always been independent,”
18 Plaintiff responded “Okay. Yes.” (*Id.* at 85:6-86:4.) Given that the Motion seeks summary
19 judgment on the issue of independence as to each of the Individual Defendants except for Ellen
20 and Margaret Cotter,⁴ Plaintiff has not met his burden of identifying “admissible evidence”
21 showing “a genuine issue for trial” regarding McEachern's independence with respect to any
22 board action. *Posadas v. City of Reno*, 109 Nev. 448, 452 (1993); *Shuck v. Signature Flight*
23 *Support of Nev., Inc.*, 126 Nev. 434, 436 (2010) (“bald allegations without supporting facts” are
24 insufficient).

25
26 ³ “HD#2” refers to the Declaration of Noah Helpert filed in support of the Individual
27 Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (No. 2) Re: the Issue of Director
Independence.

28 ⁴ Solely for purposes of this Motion, the Individual Defendants do not contest the
independence of Ellen and Margaret Cotter. (See Mot. at 14 n.2.)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

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

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

28