

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

IN RE: URETHANE ANTITRUST LITIGATION )

Plaintiff(s), )

vs. )

Case No. 04-1616 )

Defendant(s). )

QUESTION FROM THE JURY

YOUR HONOR,

Was the question (#23) predicated  
in finding collusion existed prior to  
November 24, 2000? i.e. if we found no conspiracy in 1999  
but we found conspiracy and concealment after Nov 24, 2000

Dated at Weds on February 20<sup>th</sup>, Time 12:34

[Redacted Signature]  
Signature of Presiding Juror

ANSWER OF THE JUDGE,

(See attached)

Dated at kc, ks on 2/20/13, Time 1:10 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Judge

You only get to the issue of fraudulent concealment, the subject of instruction #23, if you find that a conspiracy involving Dow caused Class Plaintiffs to pay more for urethane chemicals than they would have paid absent a conspiracy at a time prior to November 24, 2000. Put another way, with reference to the Verdict Form, you only answer question #4 if you have answered questions #1, #2 and #3 all yes.

2/20/13

John W. Sungstrom