| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK | V |
|--|-----------------------------|
| JENNIFER SHARKEY, | : 10cv3824 (DLC) |
| Plaintiff, | : SPECIAL VERDICT : FORM |
| V | : |
| J.P. MORGAN CHASE & CO., JOE KENNEY, ADAM GREEN, and LESLIE LASSITER, in their official and individual capacities, | COURT EXHIBIT |
| Defendants. | 11-7-17 |
| | · X |
| PLEASE CHECK ($$) YO | OUR ANSWER |
| Joe Kenney: | |
| A. Did Jennifer Sharkey prove her re Joe Kenney by a preponderance of | |
| YES NO | _ |
| [Proceed to Question B only if you ans A.] | swered "Yes" to Question |
| B. Did Joe Kenney prove by clear and he would have discharged Jennifer at J.P. Morgan in the absence of | Sharkey from employment |
| YES NO | <u> </u> |
| Adam Green: | |
| | |
| A. Did Jennifer Sharkey prove her re Adam Green by a preponderance of | |
| YES NO V | _ |
| [Proceed to Question B only if you ans | wered "Yes" to Question |

| B. Did Adam Green prove by clear and convincing evidence that he would have discharged Jennifer Sharkey from employment at J.P. Morgan in the absence of her protected activity? | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| YES NO | | | | | |
| Leslie Lassiter: | | | | | |
| A. Did Jennifer Sharkey prove her retaliation claim against Leslie Lassiter by a preponderance of the evidence? | | | | | |
| YES NO | | | | | |
| [Proceed to Question B only if you answered "Yes" to Question A.] | | | | | |
| B. Did Leslie Lassiter prove by clear and convincing evidence that she would have discharged Jennifer Sharkey from employment at J.P. Morgan in the absence of her protected activity? YES NO | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.: | | | | | |
| A. Did Jennifer Sharkey prove her retaliation claim against J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. by a preponderance of the evidence? | | | | | |
| YESNO | | | | | |
| [Proceed to Question B only if you answered "Yes" to Question A.] | | | | | |
| B. Did J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. prove by clear and convincing evidence that it would have discharged Jennifer Sharkey from her employment in the absence of her protected activity? | | | | | |
| YES NO | | | | | |

[If you have answered "Yes" to any Question A, and answered "No" with respect to its corresponding Question B, then answer the following Questions. Otherwise, proceed to page 4 and sign the form.]

II. Damages

| C. | Did | Jenn | ifer : | Shark | ey establi | sh by | a | preponderance | of | the |
|----|-----|-------|--------|-------|------------|-------|-----|---------------|----|-----|
| | evi | dence | that | she | is entitle | d to | bac | k pay? | | |
| | | | YES | | NO | | | | | |

[Answer Questions D and E only if you answered "Yes" to Question C.]

D. Have defendants shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Jennifer Sharkey failed to mitigate her back pay damages?

YES ____ NO ___

If "yes," up to what date is Jennifer Sharkey entitled to receive back pay damages?

E. Based upon your answers to Questions C and D, how much back pay is Jennifer Sharkey entitled to receive?

\$ 563 000

F. Did Jennifer Sharkey establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to emotional distress damages?

YES NO ____

If "yes," in what amount? \$563,000

[Answer Question G only if you answered "No" to Question C and Question F.]

| _ | tled to \$1 in nominal damages? |
|---|---------------------------------|
| YES | NO L |
| | |
| After completing the form, eac verdict must sign below: | h juror who agrees with this |
| alee M. Clary Foreperson | de Rabanlla |
| Jachyu DeRoso | Lithas |
| Erica Dulm | Jal (=) |
| Duri Putl | Ty Mesardo |