

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

IN RE:)
URETHANE ANTITRUST LITIGATION) MDL No. 1616
) Case No. 04-1616-JWL
This document relates to:)
The Polyether Polyol Cases)
_____)

AMENDED JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

(x) **JURY VERDICT.** This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED pursuant to the Jury Verdict returned on February 20, 2013, and the Memorandum and Order filed on May 15, 2013, and the Memorandum and Order filed on July 26, 2013, that judgment is entered against defendant The Dow Chemical Company and in favor of Seegott Holdings, Inc., Industrial Polymers, Inc., Quabaug Corporation, and the Plaintiff Class (defined below) for purchases between November 24, 2000 and December 31, 2003, after trebling pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 15, and set off of prior settlements, in the amount of One Billion, Sixty Million, Eight Hundred Forty-Seven Thousand, One Hundred Seventeen dollars (\$1,060,847,117), with interest thereon at a rate of 0.11 percent as provided by law. The Plaintiff Class, to whom notice has been directed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2), includes the following (excepting those who have requested exclusion):

All persons and entities who purchased Polyether Polyol Products (defined below) directly from a defendant at any time from January 1, 1999 through December 31, 2003 in the United States and its territories (excluding all governmental entities, any defendants, their employees, and their respective parents, subsidiaries and affiliates). Polyether Polyol Products are: propylene oxide-based polyether polyols; monomeric or polymeric diphenylmethane diisocyanates (MMDI or PMDI – collectively, MDI); toluene diisocyanates (TDI); MDI-TDI blends; or propylene oxide-based polyether polyol systems (except those that also contain polyester polyols).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court's Order adopting and approving a Plan of Allocation, dated July 26, 2013, is hereby incorporated by reference into this amended judgment. Implementation of the Plan of Allocation shall be stayed until such time as the case is remanded to this Court from any appeal, or until after the expiration of time allowed for filing such appeal, if no appeal is filed within that time.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 26th day of July, 2013, in Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Sharon Scheurer
by Deputy Clerk
TIMOTHY M. O'BRIEN
Clerk of the District Court

Form approved this 26th day of July, 2013, in Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ John W. Lungstrum
John W. Lungstrum
United States District Judge