



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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Skydive Arizona, Inc.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Cary Quattrochi, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV 05-2656-PHX-MHM

VERDICT FORM

VERDICT FORM

— As to Plaintiff Skydive Arizona's claim, that Defendants infringed their trademark in violation of Lanham Act § 32:

We, the jury, do find,

As to Cary Quattrocchi



in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant Cary Quattrocchi on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

OR



in favor of Defendant Cary Quattrocchi and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

As to Ben Butler



in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant Ben Butler on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

OR



in favor of Defendant Ben Butler and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

As to IGOVincent, Inc.



in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant IGOVincent, Inc., on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

OR



in favor of Defendant IGOVincent, Inc. and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

As to USSO, LLC

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant USSO, LLC on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

OR

in favor of Defendant USSO, LLC and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

As to CASC, Inc.

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant CASC, Inc. on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

OR

in favor of Defendant CASC, Inc. and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

As to Atlanta SC, Inc.

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant Atlanta SC, Inc. on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

OR

in favor of Defendant Atlanta SC, Inc. and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of trademark infringement.

— As to Plaintiff Skydive Arizona's allegation that Defendants Cary Quattrocchi and Ben Butler induced Defendants IGOVincent, Inc., USSO, LLC, and CASC, Inc. to infringe Plaintiff's trademark.

We, the jury, do find,

As to Cary Quattrocchi inducing IGOVincent, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Cary Quattrocchi inducing USSO, LLC

YES: OR NO:

As to Cary Quattrocchi inducing CASC, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Ben Butler inducing IGOVincent, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Ben Butler inducing USSO, LLC

YES: OR NO:

As to Ben Butler inducing CASC, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

— As to Plaintiff Skydive Arizona's allegation that Defendants Cary Quattrocchi, Ben Butler, and Atlanta SC Inc. aided and abetted Defendants IGOVincent, Inc., USSO, LLC, and CASC, Inc. infringement of Plaintiff's trademark.

We, the jury, do find,

As to Cary Quattrocchi aiding and abetting IGOVincent, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Cary Quattrocchi aiding and abetting USSO, LLC

YES: OR NO:

As to Cary Quattrocchi aiding and abetting CASC, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Ben Butler aiding and abetting IGOVincent, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Ben Butler aiding and abetting USSO, LLC

YES: OR NO:

As to Ben Butler aiding and abetting CASC, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Atlanta SC, Inc. aiding and abetting IGOVincent, Inc.

YES: _____ OR NO: X

As to Atlanta SC, Inc. aiding and abetting USSO, LLC

YES: X OR NO: _____

As to Atlanta SC, Inc. aiding and abetting CASC, Inc.

YES: X OR NO: _____

**IF YOU FOUND IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF ON ITS CLAIM
FOR TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT UNDER
LANHAM ACT § 32:**

You must decide the issue of actual damages:

We, the jury, do find,

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to actual damages, and do assess actual damages in the sum of \$ 2,500,000⁰⁰

~~2~~
2,500,000⁰⁰

OR

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona takes nothing.

**IF YOU FOUND IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF ON ITS CLAIM
FOR TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT UNDER
LANHAM ACT § 32:**

You must decide the issue of profits:

We, the jury, do find,

As to Cary Quattrocchi

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to profits, and do assess profits in the sum of

\$ ~~2,500,000~~ ^{UTG}

2,000,000⁰⁰

OR

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona takes nothing.

As to Ben Butler

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to profits, and do assess profits in the sum of

\$ 500,000⁰⁰.

OR

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona takes nothing.

As to IGOVincent, Inc.

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to profits, and do assess profits in the sum of \$ 1⁰⁰.

OR

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona takes nothing.

As to USSO, LLC

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to profits, and do assess profits in the sum of \$ 1⁰⁰.

OR

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona takes nothing.

As to CASC, Inc.

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to profits, and do assess profits in the sum of \$ 1⁰⁰.

OR

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona takes nothing.

As to Atlanta SC, Inc.

/X/ that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to profits, and do assess profits in the sum of \$ 1⁰⁰.

OR

/ / that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona takes nothing.

**IF YOU FOUND IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF ON ITS CLAIM
FOR TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT UNDER
LANHAM ACT § 32**

**You must decide if the Plaintiff has proven by clear and convincing evidence
that the infringement was willful:**

We, the jury, do find,

As to Cary Quattrocchi

YES: OR NO:

As to Ben Butler

YES: OR NO:

As to IGO Vincent, LLC

YES: OR NO:

As to USSO, LLC

YES: OR NO:

As to CASC, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Atlanta SC, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

— As to Plaintiff Skydive Arizona’s claim, that Defendants engaged in acts of unfair competition (cybersquatting) in violation of Lanham Act § 43(d)

We, the jury, do find,

As to Cary Quattrocchi

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant Cary Quattrocchi on Plaintiff’s claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

OR

in favor of Defendant Cary Quattrocchi and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff’s claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

As to Ben Butler

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant Ben Butler on Plaintiff’s claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

OR

in favor of Defendant Ben Butler and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff’s claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

As to IGOVincent, Inc.

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant IGOVincent, Inc., on Plaintiff’s claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

OR

in favor of Defendant IGOVincent, Inc. and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff’s claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

As to USSO, LLC

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant USSO, LLC on Plaintiff's claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

OR

in favor of Defendant USSO, LLC and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

As to CASC, Inc.

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant CASC, Inc. on Plaintiff's claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

OR

in favor of Defendant CASC, Inc. and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

As to Atlanta SC, Inc.

in favor of Plaintiff Skydive Arizona and against Defendant Atlanta SC, Inc. on Plaintiff's claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

OR

in favor of Defendant Atlanta SC, Inc. and against Plaintiff Skydive Arizona on Plaintiff's claim of unfair competition (cybersquatting).

**IF YOU FOUND IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF ON
ITS CLAIM FOR UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER
LANHAM ACT § 43(d) (cybersquatting):**

You must decide the issue of statutory damages.

Please fill in the chart below as to each domain name for which you found a Defendant or Defendants responsible for committing an act of unfair competition (cybersquatting). Next to each domain name, please list the Defendant or Defendants you hold liable as to that particular domain name, and the amount of damages you believe are appropriate for that particular violation consistent with the instructions on statutory damages.

Domain Name(s)	Defendant(s)	Damages
• arizonaskydive.net	CARY QUATTROCHI BEN BUTLER	80,000 20,000
• arizona-skydiving.com	CARY QUATTROCHI BEN BUTLER	80,000 20,000
• skydivingarizona.com	CARY QUATTROCHI BEN BUTLER	80,000 20,000
• skydivingaz.com	CARY QUATTROCHI BEN BUTLER	80,000 20,000
• skydivearizona.net	CARY QUATTROCHI BEN BUTLER	80,000 20,000
• arizonaskydive.com	CARY QUATTROCHI BEN BUTLER	80,000 20,000

**CONCERNING PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM FOR FALSE
DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN AND UNFAIR COMPETITION
UNDER LANHAM ACT § 43(a) (FALSE ADVERTISING):**

You must determine the amount of actual damages:

We, the jury, do find,

~~/X/~~

that Plaintiff Skydive Arizona is entitled to damages in the sum of
\$ 1,000,000.

**CONCERNING PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM FOR FALSE
DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN AND UNFAIR COMPETITION
UNDER LANHAM ACT § 43(a) (FALSE ADVERTISING):**

**You must decide if the Plaintiff has proven by clear and convincing evidence
that the Defendants acted willfully when engaging in false designation of origin
and unfair competition (false advertising)**

We, the jury, do find,

As to Cary Quattrocchi

YES: OR NO:

As to Ben Butler

YES: OR NO:

As to IGOVincent, LLC

YES: OR NO:

As to USSO, LLC

YES: OR NO:

As to CASC, Inc.

YES: OR NO:

As to Atlanta SC, Inc.

YES: _____ OR NO: X

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure that it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The jury foreperson should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below.

#8

Foreperson's

10/2/2009

Date

Signature & Jury Number