

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID LILLIE,

Plaintiff,

v.

MANTECH INT'L. CORP., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-CV-02538-CAS-SSx

**SPECIAL VERDICT** 

1

2

# 3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

1112

# 13

1415

16

17

1819

20

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIAL VERDICT

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury:

Your verdict in this case will consist of answers to the questions stated below. All of you must agree to each question and be able to state when you return to the courtroom that your vote is expressed in the answer of the verdict form. As soon as all of you have agreed upon each answer as required by the directions, the Presiding Juror must sign and date this Special Verdict Form on the last page and notify the court clerk.

We, the jury in the above-entitled case, find as follows:

## **FALSE CLAIMS ACT**

### **QUESTION NO. 1.**

Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he engaged in lawful acts in furtherance of an action under the False Claims Act or in an effort to stop a violation of the False Claims Act?

Yes No

If you answered "Yes" to Question 1 please proceed to Question 2. If you answered "No" to Question 1, please proceed directly to Question 7.

## **QUESTION NO. 2.**

Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he had a good faith belief that ManTech was committing a fraud or falsehood against the government to obtain the payment of money?

✓ Yes No

If you answered "Yes" to Question 2 please proceed to Question 3. If you answered "No" to Question 2, please proceed to Question 7.

28

Case	2:17-cv-02538-CAS-SS Document 179 Filed 02/28/19 Page 4 of 15 Page ID #:3311
1	
2	QUESTION NO. 5.
3	If you answered "Yes" to Question 4.A, please proceed to Question 5A. If you
4	answered "No" to Question 4.A, please proceed to Question 5.B.
5	5.A. Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by a preponderance of the evidence that
6	ManTech made the decision to place Mr. Lillie on furlough because of that "protected
7	activity" of which ManTech was aware?
8	YesNo
9	Please proceed to Question 5.B.
10	
11	5.B. Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by a preponderance of the evidence that
12	ManTech made the decision to terminate Mr. Lillie's employment because of that
13	"protected activity" of which ManTech was aware?
14	Yes No
15	If you answered "Yes" to either Questions 5.A. or 5.B. please proceed to
16	Question 6. If you answered "No" to both Questions 5.A. and 5.B., please proceed to
17	Question 7.
18	
19	QUESTION NO. 6.
20	What are Plaintiff David Lillie's damages?
21	Past lost earnings: \$ 5Z, 983-00
22	Future lost earnings: \$ 337, 828.00
23	Past emotional distress: 321,875 \$
24	Future emotional distress: 321,875
25	TOTAL DAMAGES: \$ 1,605,561 \$ particles (1,505,561)
26	Please proceed to Question 7.
27	
28	

answered "No" to Question 9, please proceed to Question 13.

26

27

28

1	
2	QUESTION NO. 10.
3	10.A. Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by a preponderance of the evidence that
4	his protected disclosure was a contributing factor in ManTech's decision to place Mr.
5	Lillie on furlough?
6	YesNo
7	Please proceed to Question 10.B.
8	
9	10.B. Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by a preponderance of the evidence that
10	his protected disclosure was a contributing factor in ManTech's decision to terminate
11	Mr. Lillie's employment?
12	Yes No
13	If you answered "Yes" to either Questions 10.A. or 10.B. please proceed to
14	Question 11. If you answered "No" to both Questions 10.A. and 10.B., please proceed
15	to Question 13.
16	
17	QUESTION NO. 11.
18	If you answered "Yes" to Question 10.A, please proceed to Question 11A. If you
19	answered "No" to Question 10.A, please proceed to Question 11 B.
20	11.A. Did ManTech prove by clear and convincing evidence that it would have
21	furloughed Mr. Lillie exen if he had not made a protected disclosure?
22	YesŃo
23	Please proceed to Question 11.B.
24	
25	11.B. Did ManTech prove by clear and convincing evidence that it would have
26	terminated Mr. Lillie's employment even if he had not made a protected disclosure?
27	YesNo
28	If you answered "No" to either Questions 11.A. or 11.B. please proceed to
	Question 12. If you answered "Yes" to both Questions 11.A. and 11.B., please proceed

Case 2:17-cv-02538-CAS-SS Document 179 Filed 02/28/19 Page 6 of 15 Page ID #:3313

Case	2:17-cv-02538-CAS-SS Document 179 Filed 02/28/19 Page 7 of 15 Page ID #:3314
1	
2	to Question 13.
3	
4	QUESTION NO. 12.
5	If you designated damages in Question 7, please proceed to Question 13. If you
6	did not designate any damages in Question 7, please answer Question 12.
7	What are Plaintiff David Lillie's damages?
8	Past lost earnings: \$ 521,983.00
9	Future lost earnings: \$ 339, 828.00
10	Past emotional distress: \$ \( \text{OUNIGNEE} \) \( \text{SUBOUND} \) 321, 875. \( \text{co} \)
11	Past emotional distress: \$ OUSCATAGO 321,875.00  Future emotional distress: \$ OUSCATAGO 321,875.00  TOTAL DAMAGES: \$ OUSCATAGO 321,875.00
12	TOTAL DAMAGES: \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$
13	Please proceed to Question 13.
14	
15	RETALIATION UNDER CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTION 1102.5
16	
17	QUESTION NO. 13.
18	Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by a preponderance of the evidence that
19	ManTech knew that Mr. Lillie had disclosed to a government agency, a person with
20	authority over Mr. Lillie, or an employee with authority to investigate, discover, or
21	correct legal violations/noncompliance related to Mr. Lillie's refusal to participate in an
22	unlawful cover-up of a contractor being provided unlawful access to third party data?
23	Yes No
24	If you answered "Yes" to Question 13 please proceed to Question 14. If you
25	answered "No" to Question 13, please proceed to Question 19.
26	
27	
28	

## **QUESTION NO. 14.**

Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he had reasonable cause to believe that the access to third party data was a violation of a state/federal statute or a violation of or noncompliance with a local/state/federal rule or regulation?

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

If you answered "Yes" to Question 14 please proceed to Question 15. If you answered "No" to Question 15, please proceed to Question 19.

### **QUESTION NO. 15.**

15.A. Did Plaintiff David Lillie establish by a preponderance of the evidence that his disclosure of information was a contributing factor in ManTech's decision to place Plaintiff David Lillie on a furlough?

15.B. Did Plaintiff David Lillie establish by a preponderance of the evidence that his disclosure of information was a contributing factor in ManTech's decision to terminate his employment?

Yes No

If you answered "Yes" to either Question 15.A or 15.B please proceed to Question 16. If you answered "No" to both Questions 15.A and 15.B, please proceed to Question 19.

## **QUESTION NO. 16.**

Would ManTech have decided to place Plaintiff David Lillie on furlough and terminate his employment approximate, independent reasons?

Yes No

If you answered "Yes" to Question 16 please proceed to Question 19. If you answered "No" to Question 16, please proceed to Question 17.

## **QUESTION 16**

16.A. V	Would ManTech	have decide	to place	Plaintiff	David	Lillie o	)1.
furlough anyv	way, for legitimate	, independen	reasons?				
	Yes	No					
16.B. V	Would ManTech l	nave decided	to termina	ate Plainti	ff Davi	d Lillie	'§
employment a	anyway, for legitin	nate, indepen	dent reason	s?			
	Yes	No					
If you	answered "No" to	o either Que	stion 16.A	or 16.B p	lease p	roceed 1	to
Question 17.	If you answered	"Yes" to b	oth Questic	ons 16.A d	and 16.	B, pleas	зe
proceed to Qı	iestion 19.						

Case	2:17-cv-02538-CAS-SS Document 179 Filed 02/28/19 Page 10 of 15 Page ID #:3317							
1								
2	QUESTION NO. 17.							
3	Did Plaintiff David Lillie establish by a preponderance of the evidence that							
4	ManTech's conduct was a substantial factor in causing harm to Plaintiff David Lillie?							
5	Yes No							
6	If you answered "Yes" to Question 17, please proceed to Question 18. If you							
7	answered "No" to Question 17, please proceed to Question 19.							
8								
9	QUESTION NO. 18.							
10	If you designated damages in Questions 7 or 12, please proceed to Question 19.							
11	If you did not designate any damages in Questions 7 or 12, please answer Question 18.							
12	What are Plaintiff David Lillie's damages?							
13	(a) Past lost earnings: \$\\\521,783.00							
14	(b) Future lost earnings: \$\frac{339,828.00}{}							
15	(c) Past emotional distress: \$ \( \square \) \( \square \) \( \square \) \( \square \)							
16	(c) Past emotional distress: \$ \(\square\)							
17	(e) TOTAL DAMAGES: \$							
18	Please proceed to Question 19.							
19	CALLES CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE							
20	MITIGATION							
21	HOLDS CONTROL OF THE STATE OF T							
22	QUESTION NO. 19.							
23	If you designated an amount for damages for Mr. Lillie in Questions 7, 12, or 18,							
24	please proceed to Question 19. If you did not designate damages for Mr. Lillie in							
25	Questions 7, 12, or 18, please stop here, answer no further questions, and have the							
26	presiding juror sign and date this verdict form.							
27	Did Plaintiff David Lillie exercise reasonable diligence to locate and maintain a							
28	suitable job after his employment with ManTech?							
	Yes No							

<b>QUESTI</b>	ON	21
---------------	----	----

<b>21.A.</b> Di	d Plaintiff	David L	Lillie	copy	ManTech's	and	its	customer's	files
which included	data from o	other third	l parti	es, w	nile he was e	mploy	yed	by ManTec	h?
<u></u>	es	_ No							

<b>21.B.</b> Die	l Plaintiff	David Lillie	copy	ManTec	h's a	nd its	customer'	s files,
which included	data from	other third pa	arties, a	after he	was fi	urloug	hed but be	fore he
was laid off by l	ManTech?	/						
was laid off by l	es <u> </u>	_ No						

Case	2:17-cv-02538-CAS-SS Document 179 Filed 02/28/19 Page 12 of 15 Page ID #:3319
1	
2	If you answered "No" to Question 19 please proceed to Question 20. If you
3	answered "Yes" to Question 20, please proceed to Question 21.
4	QVESTION 19 Z
5	QUESTION NO. 20.
6	What amount of money do you find Plaintiff David Lillie did/could have earned
7	had he returned to gainful employment as soon as it was reasonable for him to do so?
8	\$
9	Subtract this amount from the total amount set out in response to Questions 7, 13,
10	and/or 20 and put the difference here: \$
11	Please proceed to Question 21.
12	
13	AFTER ACQUIRED EVIDENCE
14	·
15	QUESTION NO. 21.
16	On what date do you find that Mr. Lillie copied ManTech's and its customer's
17	files, which included data from other third parties?
18	
19	Please proceed to Question 22.
20	
21	QUESTION NO. 22.
22	Did Plaintiff David Lillie retain copies of ManTech's and its customer's files,
23	which included data from third parties, for an authorized business purpose of ManTech?
24	Yes No
25	If you answered "No" to Question 22 please proceed to Question 23. If you
26	answered "Yes" to Question 22, please stop here, answer no further questions, and
27	have the presiding juror sign and date this verdict form.
28	
ì	A.

1	
2	QUESTION NO. 23.
3	On what date do you find that ManTech learned of Plaintiff David Lillie's
4	misconduct?
5	·
6	Please proceed to Question 24.
7	
8	QUESTION NO. 24.
9	Would ManTech have re-employed Mr. Lillie upon learning of Mr. Lillie's
10	copying its files for an unauthorized purpose?
11	Yes No
12	If you answered "No" to Question 24 please proceed to Question 25. If you
13	answered "Yes" to Question 24, please stop here, answer no further questions, and
14	have the presiding juror sign and date this verdict form.
15	
16	QUESTION NO. 25.
17	From the damages listed in Questions 7, 12, or 18, what amount of money do you
18	attribute to damages that were incurred by Plaintiff David Lillie after ManTech learned
19	that Mr. Lillie copied its files for an unauthorized purpose?
20	\$
21	Subtract this amount from the total amount set out in response to Questions 7, 12,
22	or 18 and put the difference here \$
23	
24	Please have the presiding juror sign and date this verdict form.
25	
26	-11-
27	Dated: $Z/Z7/19$
28	Presiding Juror

Case 2:17-cv-02538-CAS-SS Document 179 Filed 02/28/19 Page 13 of 15 Page ID #:3320

### **QUESTION 26**

Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by clear and convincing evidence that ManTech engaged in conduct with malice, oppression, or fraud?

Yes No

If you answered "Yes" to Question 26 please proceed to Question 27. If you answered "No" to Question 26, please stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this verdict form.

### **QUESTION 27**

27.A. Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct constituting malice, oppression, or fraud was committed by one or more officers, directors, or managing agents of ManTech, who acted on behalf of ManTech?

Yes No

If you answered "Yes" to Question 27.A. please stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this verdict form. If you answered "No" to Question 27.A., please proceed to Question 27.B.

**27.B.** Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct constituting malice, oppression, or fraud was authorized by one or more officers, directors, or managing agents of ManTech?

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

If you answered "Yes" to Question 27.B, please stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this verdict form. If you answered "No" to Question 27.B, please proceed to Question 27.C.

27.C. Did Plaintiff David Lillie prove by clear and convincing evidence that one or more officers, directors, or managing agents of ManTech knew of the conduct

constituting malice, oppression, or fraud and adopted or approved that conduct after it
occurred?
Yes No
Please have the presiding juror sign and date the verdict form.