

WHY BARTLIT BECK



Clients hire us for their most important matters because of the results we consistently deliver. Bartlit Beck has been credited by the national legal press with an "unparalleled record of success" (National Law Journal) and "unmatched results" (The American Lawyer). These accolades, and the client outcomes that drive them, are a result of our experience, focus, talent, approach, and fee arrangements that align our clients' interests with our own.

Experienced & Dedicated Teams

Our track record of success is due to our experienced and dedicated teams.

Our lawyers average 16 years of experience, and over 80% are partners. In every year of the last decade, about 80% of our lawyers have taken or defended depositions, two-thirds have argued substantive motions, and over half have gone to trial.

At Bartlit Beck, over one-third of our lawyers has first-chair trial experience in significant commercial litigation. In contrast, many firms have a star or two surrounded by supporting players and much of their trial experience is not in high-stakes commercial matters but instead was gained doing criminal/government work.

Our lawyers intensely focus on only a small number of cases at a time, allowing each team member to have command of the entire case. We believe our approach ensures better quality and results for our clients because each team member has a thorough understanding of the client's goals and the path to success. This is a stark difference from those firms that spread senior lawyers across a large number of matters, leaving important execution to less experienced, siloed colleagues.

Superior Talent

We hire immensely talented lawyers and retain them. We invest heavily in training our lawyers with the intention that they will spend their careers here (our annual attrition rate of ~1-2% stands in stark contrast to reported competitor rates as high as 25%), and we promote from within rather than hiring lateral partners. This

provides consistency to our clients and frees our lawyers to collaborate without sharp elbows, focusing on obtaining the best possible results.

Our firm is in a class by itself:

- The lion's share of our lawyers served as federal judicial clerks, and approximately 25% of the lawyers who joined the firm in the last 15 years served as clerks for Justices of the United States Supreme Court.
- Nearly all graduated close to the top of their law school class.
- More than half served as Law Review editors.
- Our ranks include lawyers who have been awarded Rhodes and Marshall Scholarships, Justice Department Honors Program participants, MBAs, and law school professors/lecturers.

Our Approach

We make complex things simple.

We focus on what matters and what makes a difference. We focus on the ultimate outcome. All the time.

We immediately identify key themes and focus on the "mountaintops," refining those themes as necessary when we learn more. We don't litigate for the sake of litigating. Our eye is toward trial, but without losing sight of summary judgement and settlement.

We approach discovery as a tool to help us understand the facts and make a convincing case at trial, not as an end to itself.

We win by showing the jury/judge the evidence, rather than telling them why they should come out our way. We help them reach the right decision on their own.

We use technology to find, filter, and present the key evidence. We use demonstratives and graphics to boil down the key concepts to a few memorable images, which become the anchors of our theory of the case.

We partner with our clients and any co-counsel as a unified team.

We establish ourselves with the judge and jury as the teacher, the reliable source of information. Our credibility is everything.

Success-Based Fees

Our approach to fees is simple. We believe our interests should be aligned with our clients' interests. We think we should get paid more if we win and less if we lose.

We do not bill by the hour. A law firm should not get paid more the longer it takes it to do something. Our fees do not depend on how long we can spend on a task or how many lawyers we can keep busy—they depend on our success. We are willing to share the risk with our clients and bet on our ability to deliver success because we know our model works. For over 25 years we have leveraged our superior talent, experienced and dedicated

teams, and innovative approach to achieve success.

We employ a variety of fee arrangements, including partial and pure contingency fees and flat monthly fees. We are flexible depending on our clients' needs. In all matters, our fees are fixed and certain, unlike the unpredictable hourly billing and the ever-changing and often-exceeded budgets provided by most firms.

Our Reputation

We were recently recognized as the 2020 "Trial Firm of the Year" at the Benchmark Litigation U.S. Awards, and the firm was a finalist for The American Lawyer "National Specialty/Boutique Litigation Firm of the Year" in 2019. We are one of only three firms designated by Chambers USA as "Band 1" in the U.S. Product Liability & Mass Torts category, and we are also ranked in "Band 1" in Illinois and Colorado for General Commercial Litigation. In 2018, BTI named Bartlit Beck a "BTI Awesome Opponent" placing the firm among the top nine firms in the country that opposing general counsels fear the most. Many of our lawyers are also individually recognized by Chambers USA, Benchmark, and BTI.

Bartlit Beck is Our Competitive Advantage

"United Technologies' strong relationship with Bartlit Beck dates back to the firm's founding in 1993. Since then Bartlit Beck has been our lead trial counsel, handling virtually every single significant litigation matter we have had – with astonishing success! The firm has no peer in the departments of trial strategy, advocacy, productivity, speed, adaptability, and teamwork. Bartlit Beck works seamlessly and interchangeably with our in-house lawyers and with our other law firms. There is also never the need to specify which Bartlit Beck lawyers we would like assigned to our matters – because it doesn't matter as each and every lawyer at the firm is of the same unparalleled quality and temperament. Bartlit Beck is not just our trial counsel of choice – Bartlit Beck is our competitive advantage!"

Charles D. Gill

**Former Executive Vice President and General Counsel
United Technologies**

Smart, tough, creative and strategic thinkers

"In 20 years as in-house counsel, I have overseen big time litigation on numerous occasions and have been privileged to work with some of the finest law firms and lawyers around the world. None of them has surpassed Bartlit Beck in terms of litigation skills. The lawyers at Bartlit Beck were smart, tough, creative and strategic thinkers. They not only impressed me, they impressed my Board of Directors and my CEO, and that's hard to do. We are not just another case to them, they care about us as people and they care about our business. They are part of the team and are willing to lay it all on the line when the stakes are the highest. They know how to take a case to trial and win. From the very first moment they take the case their focus is on how best to present the case to the judge and to the jury, the stuff that really matters when you're going to trial. Their litigation planning and execution is superb, their counsel pragmatic and on target, and their work ethic second to none."

Sterling Miller
Former Executive Vice President and General Counsel
Sabre Holdings

Outstanding results in our most difficult matters

"Bartlit Beck's depth of exceptional legal talent, coupled with unparalleled experience, strategic thinking and technological sophistication has delivered outstanding results in our most difficult legal matters. They work seamlessly with our in-house lawyers, staff and business partners, and their trial preparation and courtroom skills are unmatched. They are our 'go-to' law firm in major cases, not only in Illinois, but across the country."

Jennifer Sherman
Chief Executive Officer (and former General Counsel)
Federal Signal

Decisive, responsive, incredibly experienced

"It is absolutely the best firm I've worked with – they are decisive, responsive, incredibly experienced and they groom their lawyers to be leaders. Their client service is excellent: they are efficient and always come to the client with solutions to complex problems."

Chambers USA Client Quote

Bartlit Beck's approach is a breath of fresh air

"Bartlit Beck's lawyers distinguish themselves by being more creative, more technology-savvy, more practical, and by being much better courtroom advocates. Bartlit Beck's approach to billing is a breath of fresh air . . . Bartlit Beck has consistently delivered. Any General Counsel with a significant litigation matter (so long as it's not against my company) would be derelict in not strongly considering Bartlit Beck."

Russ Strobel
Former Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer
Nicor

Put clients in a better position to win

"They're very flexible and able to react very quickly to new developments. They observe, orient, decide and act faster than the opponents and that usually puts the client in a better position to win. Bartlit Beck is by far the best litigation shop I have dealt with."

Chambers USA Client Quote

Tremendous credibility, excellent value

"Outstanding strategic thinking and execution. Tremendous credibility with court. Deliver excellent value for fees charged."

Ross F. Schmucki
Former Corporate Counsel
DuPont

Precisely how a case should be presented at trial

"As I watched the Bartlit Beck team at trial, I could not have imagined a more focused and professional effort. Every cross-examination was crisp and cutting. Every witness we presented told a story and defended it calmly. This was precisely how a case should be presented in trial."

Bill Brennan
Former Vice President - General Counsel and Secretary
BISSELL

Truly understand the businesses they are working with

"There are two things that in my mind differentiate Bartlit Beck: the constant, direct partner level attention to our transactions and the desire by their team to truly understand the businesses they are working with. I witnessed the Bartlit Beck team gain significant proficiency in new industries to guarantee the high level of service they are committed to delivering."

Alex T. Krueger
President and CEO (former Managing Director)
First Reserve Corporation

Diversity & Inclusion

Bartlit Beck is committed to fostering inclusion and diversity within the legal profession. The firm places a high priority on hiring, promoting, and retaining diverse lawyers and staff. Over the last decade, about half of our new associates are diverse. Likewise, over the last decade, about half of our new partners are diverse.

We seek qualified, diverse candidates in our hiring process and make affirmative outreach with faculty, administration, and student organizations at law schools to identify top diverse talent. We also leverage our relationships with judges and other government officials to assist us in identifying diverse candidates who may be interested in our practice. We established the Bartlit Beck Diversity Fellowship, awarded to third-year law students who have demonstrated a commitment to diversity in the legal profession and have secured a federal clerkship. We view this fellowship both as a critical component of our recruiting strategy and as a means of advancing diversity and inclusion in the legal profession. [Learn more here.](#)

We proudly supported the American Bar Association's Resolution 113 "Promoting Diversity in the Legal Profession." In addition, the firm has sponsored many initiatives and organizations that support diversity and inclusion in the legal profession, such as Leadership Council on Legal Diversity, Minority Corporate Counsel Association, Just the Beginning Foundation, Future Leaders of Chicago, and other minority counsel networks and law school student organizations. Many of the firm's lawyers also contribute personally to organizations and initiatives that foster diversity and inclusion of all kinds within law schools and within the legal profession more broadly.

Bartlit Beck lawyers are leaders in the community through pro bono work, charitable initiatives, community service, and leadership on various boards. We serve on the boards of hospitals, pro bono legal services organizations, housing authorities, universities, and organizations addressing issues such as gender equality, racial diversity, educational inequalities, civic leadership, arts, civil rights, and religious organizations.

Big Wins

Since our founding, Bartlit Beck has been a leader in the legal industry, innovating the business of law, amassing unparalleled talent and experience, and establishing an impressive record of winning significant cases.

Bartlit Beck's victories come in a wide variety of cases, including: Antitrust, Class Action, False Claims Act and Government Contracts, General Commercial Litigation, Hedge Fund, Private Equity, and Financial Institution Litigation, Intellectual Property, Product Liability, Accountants and Professional Liability Litigation, Securities and Financial Fraud, and Toxic Tort.

United States v. United Technologies

Represented United Technologies in 10-week bench trial of False Claims Act case brought by the Department of Justice. Government sought \$624 million, alleging price inflation on jet engine sales by UTC division Pratt & Whitney to the Air Force. Trial court's judgment rejected the government's \$624 million damages claim, held that the government suffered no actual damages, and imposed statutory penalties of \$7 million. UTC appealed after a subsequent remand ruling in which the district court reversed its trial ruling and awarded \$664 million. The Sixth Circuit reversed the damages award, held that the government had suffered no actual damages, and remanded to the trial court again. On the second remand, the government finally abandoned its \$600 million damages theory, and the trial court entered final judgment of \$1.2 million with interest of \$2.8 million (plus the \$7.1 million penalty).

In re Whirlpool Corp. Front-Loading Washer Products Liability Litigation

Represented Whirlpool in N.D. Ohio bellwether consumer class action trial of plaintiffs' claims of design defect and breach of implied warranty. After four-week jury trial, jury deliberated fewer than two hours before returning complete defense verdict.

Metropolitan Mortgage & Securities Litigation

Represented Ernst & Young in federal securities class action suit and related arbitrations surrounding the collapse and bankruptcy of Metropolitan Mortgage & Securities Co., a \$2 billion investment, real estate, and insurance conglomerate. Plaintiffs alleged accountants' negligence relating to audit work. Won back-to-back complete defense verdicts in separate trials involving claims for hundreds of millions in investment losses

brought by Metropolitan's insurance subsidiary and the bankrupt estate. Class action case settled favorably shortly before trial.

Vioxx® Litigation

Represented Merck in product liability suits alleging that Merck's drug Vioxx® caused heart attacks and strokes. Merck lost its first handful of jury trials awarding hundreds of millions of dollars. In the federal MDL in New Orleans, Merck was facing five bellwether jury trials in less than twelve months. Merck retained us to try the federal cases. We tried all five cases, winning outright defense verdicts in four of five trials. These results were widely credited with making possible the eventual settlement of tens of thousands of claims.

TicoFrut v. DuPont

Represented DuPont in Miami state jury trial of product liability claims involving the fungicide Benlate®. TicoFrut, the main citrus grower and processor in Costa Rica, sued DuPont claiming that Benlate® hurt the production of orange trees in Costa Rica. TicoFrut sought \$172 million compensatory damages and an undisclosed amount of punitive damages. After six-week trial, jury deliberated five hours before returning a verdict for DuPont.

U.S. Airways v. Sabre

Represent Sabre in antitrust action in S.D.N.Y. relating to contract between U.S. Airways and Sabre concerning Sabre's Global Distribution System. Won motions to dismiss monopolization and declaratory judgment claims. Won summary judgment on claim for injunctive relief, and on damages representing a reduction of over 75% of plaintiff's damages claim. Won \$6 million costs/attorneys' fees award. Two-month jury trial resulting in defense verdict on one claim and damages of 1% of what plaintiff had sought on second claim. Also won denial of declaratory and injunctive relief. The Second Circuit subsequently vacated the jury's liability finding and remanded the case for a new trial.

Rolls-Royce PLC v. United Technologies

Represented United Technologies and its Pratt & Whitney division in a multi-billion-dollar patent case that Rolls-Royce brought in E.D. Virginia. Rolls-Royce sought almost \$4 billion (before trebling) in damages and an injunction preventing further sales of the accused engines. Court struck Rolls-Royce's damages theory and also granted summary judgment in United Technologies' favor finding that United Technologies' engine did not infringe the Rolls-Royce patent.

Pelvic Mesh Product Liability Litigation

Represent Ethicon/Johnson & Johnson in defense of lawsuits alleging personal injuries caused by pelvic mesh medical devices. Designated trial counsel in a number of matters set for trial, both in state court and in federal cases remanded by the MDL court for trials around the country. In this capacity, lead trial counsel and secured a complete defense verdict after a three-week jury trial in the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas.

Hewlett-Packard v. Oracle

Represented Hewlett-Packard in litigation related to Oracle's decision to no longer develop new Oracle software products for HP's Itanium processor-based line of mission critical servers. The first phase, a bench trial in Superior Court for Santa Clara County, California, resulted in a declaratory judgment in favor of HP and against Oracle on all matters before the court, and established a contractual obligation to continue developing software

products for the Itanium line of servers. In the second phase the jury returned a \$3 billion verdict in favor of HP and rejected Oracle's counterclaims.

Baycol® Litigation

Represented Bayer in product liability suits alleging that Bayer's drug Baycol® caused a rare muscle disorder. Bayer faced tens of thousands of claims in a federal MDL and in individual state cases. Won a critical defense verdict in the first bellwether case where plaintiff sought \$560 million.

Gadeco v. Grynberg

Represent shareholders and board members of privately held oil and gas companies in jury trial in district court in Arapahoe County, Colorado involving claims for breach of contract and breach of fiduciary duty brought by the founder following his removal as President and Chairman. Plaintiff sought injunctive relief and \$800 million in damages. After two-week jury trial, won a complete defense verdict for our clients. Then represented defendants in bench trial involving remaining equitable claims for unjust enrichment and quantum meruit. Plaintiff sought \$400 million. Won defense verdict again. Both verdicts were affirmed in their entirety by the Colorado Court of Appeals.

Meso Scale Diagnostics v. Roche Diagnostics

Represented Meso Scale, the maker of medical diagnostic equipment, in a patent infringement case in D. Delaware. After a six-day trial and fewer than two hours of deliberation, jury returned verdict of \$137 million, finding that Roche willfully infringed all of the asserted Meso Scale patents.

Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation v. United States

Represented Sikorsky in two related actions by the Department of Justice in which the government asserted claims of more than \$100 million. Government alleged that Sikorsky overcharged for military aircraft and parts in violation of government contracts and Cost Accounting Standards. Won first trial and affirmed on appeal. In the follow-on related action, won motion for judgment on the pleadings, dismissing government's claims and awarding Sikorsky costs.

Trasylol® Litigation

Represented Bayer in defense of lawsuits claiming personal injuries caused by Trasylol®, a drug used to reduce bleeding during open-heart surgery. The litigation involved an MDL in Florida as well as cases in several state courts. Significant victories in the litigation included: prevailing on a *Daubert* challenge that effectively precluded plaintiffs' regulatory expert from testifying at trial; excluding any evidence regarding plaintiffs' claim that Bayer withheld from the FDA results from a study regarding the safety of Trasylol®; and winning summary judgment in two bellwether cases (one of which plaintiffs hand-picked as one of their top cases) and defending these judgments on appeal to the 11th Circuit.

Massachusetts Mutual Life Ins. Co. Residential Mortgage-Backed Securities Litigation

Represented MassMutual in actions in D. Massachusetts under the Massachusetts Uniform Securities Act, against underwriters Credit Suisse and Goldman Sachs, arising from their sales of residential mortgage-backed securities to MassMutual. Credit Suisse settled after four weeks of trial, taking an additional \$79.5 million charge to earnings because of the settlement payment. Goldman Sachs settled shortly thereafter.

In re Teflon® Product Liability Litigation

Represented DuPont in an MDL in S.D. Iowa comprised of 23 alleged class actions brought on behalf of consumers who claimed to have purchased cookware coated with Teflon® and other non-stick coatings manufactured by DuPont. Class certification denied in all matters. Affirmed on appeal. Cases voluntarily dismissed with prejudice.

Ortho Diagnostics, Inc. v. Miles, Inc.

Represented Miles in a patent action concerning blood testing devices. The four-week S.D.N.Y. jury trial resulted in a verdict in our client's favor, including a judgment of both non-infringement and invalidity for all patents in suit. This case was identified as a *The National Law Journal* Top Defense Verdict.

DuPont v. Unifrax

Represented DuPont in a patent infringement matter in D. Delaware relating to DuPont's patent covering thermal acoustic blankets for use in commercial aircraft. Won jury verdict of validity and infringement. Won damages and a permanent injunction preventing Unifrax from selling its infringing product. Affirmed on appeal.

Gillette v. ShaveLogic

Represented ShaveLogic and individually-named defendants in Massachusetts state court, who were accused of misappropriating trade secrets and confidential information from Gillette. ShaveLogic counterclaimed for tortious interference. Won summary judgment, dismissing all Gillette's claims with prejudice. Won denial of Gillette's motion for summary judgment on ShaveLogic's counterclaims. Case settled thereafter.

Foreign Trade Corp. v. Otter Products

Represented OtterBox in D. Colorado cases brought by former distributors alleging antitrust, trade secret misappropriation, and Lanham Act violations. Plaintiffs sought approximately \$100 million in damages. Won motion to dismiss all antitrust claims. Favorable settlement of remaining claims immediately before trial.

EEOC v. Texas Roadhouse

Represented Texas Roadhouse in landmark pattern or practice age discrimination claim brought by EEOC. After three-week jury trial in the D. Massachusetts, case ended in a mistrial because jury was deadlocked after deliberating for one week. Case settled prior to retrial.

Confidential Arbitration

Represented a Fortune 100 client in arbitration of a multi-billion-dollar contract dispute. The confidential, two-week arbitration hearing in Phoenix included testimony from numerous senior executives and expert witnesses. Panel rendered complete victory for our client.

Milo & Gabby v. Amazon.com

Represented Amazon in patent and copyright infringement case in W.D. Washington. Case concerned whether Amazon was liable for infringement when third-party sellers offer and sell infringing products on Amazon.com. Won summary judgment on copyright infringement. Won jury verdict on patent infringement. Affirmed on appeal.

Gordon, et al. v. Sabre

Represented Sabre in S.D.N.Y. case brought as putative antitrust class action by purchasers of airline tickets. Plaintiffs claimed Sabre conspired with its competitor "global distribution services" operators, Amadeus and Travelport, to require certain terms in their contracts with airlines, which allegedly caused plaintiffs to overpay for their airline tickets. Won a motion to dismiss 100% of plaintiffs' claimed damages. Defeated class certification. Achieved individual settlements with the handful of former class representatives.

Applied Medical Resources Corp. v. United States Surgical

Represented U.S. Surgical in C.D. California in patent infringement suit. Applied Medical alleged that U.S. Surgical infringed a medical device patent and sought up to \$300 million in damages and an injunction. Won non-infringement jury verdict after five-week trial.

Lexmark v. Static Control

Represented Static Control in E.D. Kentucky case alleging false advertising under the Lanham Act. District court had held that Static Control lacked standing. Sixth Circuit reversed. Won unanimous favorable decision before the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled that Static Control adequately pleaded a viable false advertising claim against Lexmark. Supreme Court adopted Static Control's suggested zone-of-interests approach and clarified the law with regard to standing and proximate cause for all federal statutes.

City of Milwaukee v. NL Industries

Represented NL in Milwaukee circuit court suit seeking a declaration that lead paint throughout Milwaukee was a public nuisance and seeking to hold NL liable for costs of the city's lead poisoning program. Won complete defense verdict for NL.

Honeywell v. Hamilton Sundstrand

Represented Hamilton Sundstrand in two patent infringement suits in D. Delaware relating to technology used in auxiliary power units ("APUs") used on large commercial airplanes. In the first case, won complete defense judgment and reversal of prior \$46.5 million jury verdict. Affirmed on appeal. In second case, Honeywell claimed \$135 million in damages relating to alleged infringement of APU patents. Won complete defense verdict of non-infringement and invalidity.

Rago, et al. v. Federal Signal

Represented Federal Signal in five-week jury trial in circuit court in Chicago of product liability claims brought by 27 Chicago firefighters. Plaintiffs alleged that Federal Signal sirens caused permanent hearing loss. Jury verdict for Federal Signal on all claims of all plaintiffs.

Bayer v. Schein Pharmaceutical, et al.; Bayer v. Carlsbad Technology

Defended Bayer's patent on the antibiotic Cipro against attacks by generic pharmaceutical manufacturers. In D. New Jersey, won summary judgment defeating attempt to invalidate the patent for failure to disclose the best mode. Affirmed on appeal. In S.D. California, won bench trial defeating attempt to invalidate the patent on obviousness grounds.

State of Rhode Island v. Lead Industries Association

Represented NL and seven other companies sued by Attorney General of Rhode Island in state court in Rhode Island. AG sought to declare past sale of lead paint a "public nuisance" throughout the State of Rhode Island.

Jury voted 4-2 for the defense when it deadlocked after a two-month trial. Retrial resulted initially in a deadlock (4-2 for defense) and ultimately a verdict for the State. Supreme Court of Rhode Island unanimously reversed the trial verdict, requiring complete dismissal of the State's lawsuit.

SuperHelechos, et al. v. DuPont

Represented DuPont in ten-week Miami jury trial of product liability claims involving Benlate fungicide. Plaintiffs, twenty-seven Costa Rican farms, claimed \$396 million in damages. Trial court entered directed verdicts for DuPont on all claims of the largest plaintiffs (constituting 60% of plaintiffs' total claimed damages). Jury awarded other plaintiffs a small fraction of amounts sought. Florida Court of Appeals (1) affirmed directed verdicts for DuPont on claims of the largest plaintiffs, and (2) reversed all jury verdicts for other plaintiffs due to numerous trial court errors.

Las Vegas Hepatitis C Litigation

Represented UnitedHealthcare in litigation in Clark County, Nevada encompassing over forty individual cases, pending before twenty different judges. Plaintiffs were individuals who claimed to have contracted Hepatitis C during endoscopy procedures performed at clinics that were on defendants' networks of approved healthcare providers. Defendants were health plans and other entities affiliated with UnitedHealthcare. Tried one case (*Martin v. PacifiCare of Nevada, et al.*), resulting in a favorable jury verdict and subsequent settlement of half of the pending cases. Began trying a second case (*Paul v. Health Plan of Nevada, et al.*), which settled one month into trial, along with the other remaining cases.

State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Khan et al.

Represented defendants in C.D. California RICO action seeking over \$100 million in damages arising out of alleged medical billing fraud. Won summary judgment.

RealNetworks Inc. v. Microsoft

Represented RealNetworks in antitrust suit in N.D. California concerning digital media and operating system markets. Resulted in \$761 million settlement for RealNetworks.

Treasurer of the State of Conn. v. Forstmann Little, et al.

Represented Forstmann Little in litigation brought by the State of Connecticut, alleging breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, and violations of securities laws. Connecticut sought approximately \$1 billion in damages. After five-week trial in the Superior Court in Connecticut, the jury rendered a complete defense verdict.

Naftali, et al. v. DuPont

Represented DuPont in New Jersey state court lawsuit brought by 1,600 plaintiffs alleging community-wide environmental contamination by DuPont blasting cap plant. After ten-week trial on ten plaintiffs' claims, court dismissed punitive damages claims, and jury awarded no damages to seven of ten plaintiffs. Jury verdict for three plaintiffs of damages totaling less than \$500,000.

Residential Funding (GMAC) v. DeGeorge Financial

Represented Residential Funding in D. Connecticut jury trial of lender liability case involving purchases of home construction loans. DeGeorge sought \$390 million plus punitive damages. Residential Funding sought \$96 million by counterclaim. Jury verdict for Residential Funding on all issues. Jury awarded Residential Funding \$96 million in damages.

In re Factor VIII or IX Concentrate Blood Products

Represented Alpha Therapeutic in wrongful death and personal injury suits throughout the country claiming that hemophiliac plaintiffs contracted HIV virus through use of Alpha's blood clotting medicine. Alpha Therapeutics asked Bartlit Beck to try three of the bellwether cases in this litigation. Won all three cases—two of them following jury verdicts in favor of Alpha Therapeutics on all claims, and one following successful motion for summary judgment. These victories enabled negotiation of global resolution of remaining claims.

SK Handtools v. Dresser Industries

Represented Dresser in Chicago Cook County fraud case in which a different law firm lost \$4 million in compensatory and \$50 million in punitive damages. Won appeal, reversing damages verdict and remanding for new trial. After three-week retrial, jury awarded \$1 in nominal damages.

Murphy v. United Technologies

Represented United Technologies in state court in West Palm Beach, Florida in a fraud and breach of contract case involving the sale of a business. Won jury verdict for United Technologies.

Chromalloy Gas Turbine v. United Technologies & Pratt & Whitney

Represented Pratt & Whitney in suit brought by world's largest independent engine-repair company for alleged monopolization. Chromalloy sought \$600 million in trebled damages. After a four-month jury trial in district court of Bexar County in Texas, the jury returned a verdict for Pratt & Whitney of no damages. Affirmed on appeal.

Wagner v. NL Industries

Represented NL Industries in class action in Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas on behalf of 7,500 neighborhood residents seeking several hundred million dollars in personal injury and property damages due to emissions of lead from factory over a thirty-five-year period. Won jury verdict on all issues following ten-week trial. Affirmed on appeal.