

EXHIBIT 2

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

IN RE:)	
)	
COX ENTERPRISES, INC.,)	12-ML-02048-C
SET-TOP CABLE TELEVISION)	
BOX ANTITRUST LITIGATION)	
<hr/>)	
This document relates to:)	
)	
Richard Healy,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Cox Communications, Inc.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>)	

SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

We, the jury, unanimously find the following by a preponderance of the evidence:

(1) Are “Premium Cable” and set-top boxes separate and distinct products?

Circle one: YES NO

(2) Has Defendant sold “Premium Cable” in the Oklahoma City subsystem on the condition that Plaintiff also lease a set-top box from Defendant or has Defendant coerced Plaintiff into leasing a set-top box? [If the answer to either part of this question is yes, you should answer it yes.]

Circle one: YES NO

(3) Is “Premium Cable” a relevant product market and, if so, has Defendant had sufficient market power in the Oklahoma City subsystem in the market for “Premium Cable” to enable it to restrain trade in the market for set-top boxes?

Circle one: YES NO

(4) Has the alleged tying arrangement foreclosed a substantial volume of commerce in the Oklahoma City subsystem to other sellers or potential sellers of set-top boxes in the market for set-top boxes?

Circle one: YES NO

(5) Was Plaintiff monetarily injured because of the alleged tying arrangement?

Circle one: YES NO

If you answered “YES” to Questions 1–5, proceed to Question 6. If you answered “NO” to any of Questions 1–5, stop.

(6) What amount of damages, if any, is the Plaintiff class entitled to recover?

\$ _____