your bowels, your bladder, pretty much everything below there is just not going to work. So you're going to have accidents all the time. You're going to have a hard time walking. Your ability to connect with other humans, other people you love, is never going to be the same."

The testimony has been, honestly, completely one-sided on this issue. And we ask you, when you're filling out this jury verdict form -- I can tell you that if James Razo and Susan Weinmuller were asked to take that job with the full extent of the harm as it's been in this case, there's no way they'd take that job. No way. Nobody would.

But they weren't asked. They didn't have that option.

So when you get to that part of the jury verdict form and it asks for the damages suffered by James Razo, it's almost \$11 million for the medical expenses and the wages. In a normal case, two to three times the medical expenses and wages and the hard numbers is a reasonable amount. In this case, that's a big number. And if you calculate the job, \$60 an hour for the rest of his life, including when he's sleeping, because there's no relief there, this number comes to 33 million when you add that together

with the wages and expenses.

And of course that's a lot of money. But it's a lot of harm for a lot of damage for an entire life. A life that will never be the same. James is basically trapped in a body; it won't let him out.

You have a chance to do something for him in addition to the money, which is so important for the quality of life and for accountability, but hearing a jury tell him that Black Label Media and No Exit were responsible and that there is accountability is so important.

And you'll get to this part of it for Susan Weinmuller. We'll leave that to your discretion. Susan is the rock of that family. Thank God James has her in her life -- in his life. Her harm is massive. It's millions. You know what she goes through holding that family together. Holding that family together in a house full of people -- and I'll say this to Susan because she knows it -- but a whole lot of the time alone.

And it's rare in cases that juries have the opportunity to give punitive damages, but this is one of those cases. And the punitive damages -- when Trevor Fulks made the decision to ignore somebody saying what's safe, when the cumulative conduct from

Page 1317

Page 1318

beginning to end of Black Label Media shortcutting safety, cutting corners, and cutting budget, they were reckless.

"Reckless" means -- and you'll see this in the jury instructions -- disregard of a person's safety. Disregard of a person's safety. When you add all the conduct together, they did not account for safety. It was more important to please Claudio Miranda and Joseph Kosinski, the director, than it was for people to be safe. And they've come into this courtroom, and they said, "That's just the way it is in Hollywood."

Punitive damages is intended to deter conduct of others similarly situated.

You have a chance to tell Hollywood, that's not how we operate in New Mexico. If you want to come use our land, use our people, take advantage of our tax credits -- we paid them \$9 million of taxpayer money to film here -- make sure they know that they'd better bring safety, not just cameras.

On the punitive damages, they were paid \$10 million to -- or 9 million to do this set in New Mexico. We think they should pay that back plus interest. 15 million against Black Label Media.

And as to No Exit, use your discretion.

Do what you think is right and do what you think people will take notice of and listen to.

Thank you for your time.

Do I have at least two minutes left for rebuttal?

THE COURT: I'll give you two minutes for rebuttal.

MR. HUNT: Thank you, Judge. We appreciate you being here.

MR. TEBO: Your Honor, just before we start, may Mr. Hunt and I approach for just a second?

THE COURT: You may.

(A discussion was held off the record.) THE COURT: Mr. Tebo, you may proceed.

MR. TEBO: Thank you, Your Honor.

Well, for the third time, I'll say good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This is the third time I've had the chance to talk to you directly, and it's the last time I'm going to have a chance to talk to you directly.

If you remember, when jury selection was going on and I stood up and talked to you about what was happening and why you were called, it was about a controversy. And that's what we call it. And you've had a whole week to listen to the controversy.

But do you remember on Monday when I first talked to you in the opening and I said that there were really three themes running through this case? The first theme was background and experience. The second theme was responsibility. And the third theme was safety. I hope, throughout the entire week's testimony from both sides, you've seen those aspects come up through the presentations.

I'm a New Mexico lawyer. I've been a New Mexico lawyer my whole career. I've never worked on a film set. But about six years ago, I had the opportunity to become an extra on a film. "Independence Day II," which I've never seen, by the way. I spent 16 hours down at Albuquerque at Albuquerque Studios as an extra, in a crowd scene, listening to a speech so many times that, on the breaks, the person sitting next to me and I would make up what the speech should have been because, frankly, it wasn't a very good speech.

But the one thing that really jumped out at me is that there were hundreds of people on that set all doing very incredibly complex things and all engaged in what they were doing.

A film set is like a small factory. It's dangerous. If you think about the lighting

requirements, they need enormous generators. If you think about the power requirements for operating all of this equipment, they need those sources. If you think about the equipment that's used.

You had a chance to take a look at the photo of the Raptor. Just looking at the photo of that Raptor, you could tell that's a pretty specialized piece of equipment. It's not a golf cart. It is not a little ATV. It's something that's been created for a special purpose. And as a result, there's danger with that piece of equipment simply because someone like me who's an extra on the set for a day could be hurt by that equipment, by trying to operate it, by doing anything with it. A production assistant -- could be somebody just out of high school, could be just somebody a little bit older trying to get their break in the film industry -- if that person tried to operate that crane, a 3,000-pound crane sitting on top of a vehicle -- I mean, that's a Honda Civic, as Mr. Beauchamp eloquently described -- one wrong move and that piece of equipment can go in all sorts of directions, harm the operator, harm people near the equipment.

So what happens in Hollywood, what happens in the filmmaking industry, whether it's in

Page 1321

Page 1322

Hollywood, whether it's in New Mexico, whether it's in Iceland on a glacier, you bring incredibly technically savvy people in to operate these things.

Mr. Razo was one of those people, and you know that. You know that from the testimony of all of the people who came in to testify in the plaintiff's case. Mr. Datri. Mr. Datri was excited to be working with Mr. Razo. He came all the way from Austin to serve on a job with Mr. Razo because Mr. Razo was coming to Albuquerque.

Mr. Razo had made a very good living because his career was growing, doing the work he was doing. I mean, we saw his wage history.

Dr. McDonald had that available. \$200,000 a year.

Think of how much work, at \$60 an hour, Mr. Razo was doing in the five years prior to this accident. At \$60 an hour, he's making 200,000 a year. This is a highly sought-after, skilled -- skillful operator.

He can't get away from that.

Every single person that testified testified to the recognition that these Raptors, these Hydrascopes, need to be operated by people who are an elite group of people in the industry and are highly sought after, and that was Mr. Razo.

Mr. Datri's testimony was that Mr. Razo's

methodical. Ms. Weinmuller's testimony: He's a fixer. He takes care of things. He's thoughtful.

Mr. Mayelian's testimony -- do you remember Mr. Razo's friend? Called him Jimmy. They have known each other for 30 years? Nothing but great things to say about him.

And I believed every word of it.

And I believed every word of it. You know what I also believed? He said that Jimmy should have been an engineer. He was always thinking two steps ahead.

What does that tell you about Mr. Razo? It tells you why he was so good at his job, at what he did. His wheelhouse was narrow. But he was really good at it. And all the testimony you heard reinforces that point.

Yes, Mr. Razo and Mr. Datri are called day players. They're not day laborers. They're not someone that's just picked out of a line and asked to go work. They're not temps who come into an environment and have to be told what to do. I've done temp jobs. One of the great things about temp jobs is you get to work in all sorts of places. One of the less-than-great things about temp jobs is that you're not part of anything. Right? You come into a new environment. You don't know who anyone is. You

don't know what the culture is. You don't know what the people expect of you. You have to be told every single thing. I have great memory of being told, as a temp, how to put labels on files. There was a particular way to do it.

Mr. Razo's not like that. He can't be like that. He's the opposite of that. He is as skilled and as confident and has as much capabilities as the director of photography on this film in the director of photography's lane of travel. Mr. Razo's is different, but it doesn't make him any less of an expert in his field.

So, ladies and gentlemen, where did all that experience go on that morning of May -- of June 20th? Where was it? It was there with Mr. Razo when he loaded up that entire package in Los Angeles and drove it safely all the way to Albuquerque. It was there with him when he met with Mr. Datri in Albuquerque and drove up to Pajarito. You know, I might point out, there's been no evidence presented to suggest that Mr. Razo and Mr. Datri had any problems finding Pajarito. Well, how did they know to get there? They received the information. That's how.

Do you remember that call sheet exhibit?

You remember it had the map and then it had the safety bulletins attached to it? Remember that e-mail from the production? Well, that's information. How do I get to Pajarito? I don't know about you, but until this case -- I have to be honest -- I have never been to Pajarito, and if you would have asked me where it was, I couldn't have told you.

That's information. That's the kind of information someone who is coming all the way from California, someone who's got responsibility for an incredibly complex, expensive piece of equipment, that's the kind of information you need.

So the next morning, Monday morning, crew call is set for 5:30. If you want breakfast, you get there early. We heard testimony about that. Right? We don't pay people to eat breakfast, but we give them breakfast. It's a good deal. It's an appropriate deal. Because, remember -- you know, I use sort of the analogy that a film set is a small factory. It's also a small city. People eat lunch together. Their lunch is scheduled. And if there's a change in that schedule, there has to be justification for that. And why is that? Does it have to do with money? Of course it does.

Page 1325

Page 1326

But does it also have to do with the idea that we want to spend money doing the work that we're trying to do? We don't want to pay people to stand around. We don't want to pay people to eat breakfast. We want to pay them to work.

And everyone's on a scale, and everyone's protected by a union. And Mr. Razo was a part of that group of people. He's protected by a union. He's a member of two unions. He's a member of the camera union. He's a member of another union. His deal memo had those union terms. Remember the deal memo that he sent to Tammy?

Mr. Razo is part of this small city. But it's interesting, he is part of the small city, just like anyone else on this film. But he only has this specialized limited role. So does that make him less of a person in terms of the hierarchy of this production?

Well, you heard testimony from Ms. Schwartz -- I used the term "low man on the totem pole." She took issue with that. I understand why. Because that implies, again, that somehow Mr. Razo, that his concerns, if he had them, would not be considered because somehow his status made those concerns less worth of considering.

But we know that's not the case. We know that, unlike Mr. Sneesby, who -- you know, quite frankly, Mr. Sneesby acknowledged -- and I think that was very honest of him -- he and Trevor Fulks did not get along. And they had had problems in the week before on this film. I don't pretend to know what their relationship was.

I wish Mr. Fulks was here and had been able to give you the testimony. I mean, that's the one person who stars in this particular drama that we're all dealing with. And he can't talk one way or the other. I have no idea what his issues were with Mr. Sneesby, and I have no idea if what Mr. Sneesby told him was rejected.

But I did think that Mr. Franklin's point was interesting. When you're in charge, you get hit with a lot of different sources. And if you don't necessarily know where that information is coming from in terms of who's giving it to you, you might not give it equal weight. You might rely more on the people that you have longstanding relationships with. You might -- and I say this -- you might not take into account the things that some people say to you if you've had ongoing problems with that. I don't know.

1 2

I wish I could have asked Mr. Fulks that. I think you all would have enjoyed hearing from Mr. Fulks, one way or the other. But we can't. So we have to rely on Mr. Sneesby's relation of the events. You have to weigh that.

We also have to rely, again, though, on what Mr. Razo knows how to do. Okay? And the reason I say that is because, you know, Mr. Razo, this whole case has portrayed it as he was just caught up in this whirlwind of activity and he wasn't able to make the right decision because he wasn't given the right information.

Now, there's been a lot of discussion throughout this case, both indirectly and directly, that somehow the defense purpose in this case is to blame Mr. Razo for what happened to him. And that's not reality at all.

The defense position in this case is, the defense and the parties, No Exit and Black Label and their employees, were not responsible for Mr. Razo's injuries.

Do you remember I told you right up front that the defense was not going to present a case to try and counter Mr. Razo's injuries? Do you remember that? I told you, we are not going to even try to

take issue with the extent of the Mr. Razo's damages when it comes to his physical condition. It's horrible what happened here. There's no way around that

That's not what this case is about. I know it's the plaintiffs' case. So do you by now. But it's not the controversy. The case is not about how much pain, injury, suffering Mr. Razo has gone through since the day of this accident.

The case is about whether or not Black Label and No Exit caused that accident, contributed to that accident's occurrence. That's why the defense has put on the case that it has -- and I think you understand that -- because the only medical-related testimony that the defense even introduced was Dr. Davis's testimony.

You know what the purpose of that was? It wasn't to argue that Mr. Razo isn't entitled to future care. I think, based on his injuries, anybody would recognize, Mr. Razo is going to need care for the rest of his life. Dr. Davis's whole point was to make sure you understood that the life care plan developed by Ms. Cook was incomplete. It did not take into account some very relevant things.

One thing, it relied on a life expectancy

Page 1329

package that is related to any person, regardless of what their physical condition is. And this is a tough issue because it makes it sound like what I'm suggesting is the way to do a life care plan is to plan for the person you're doing a life care plan to die earlier than they otherwise would. Well, that's not the case.

The point of doing a life care plan is to use all of the information available, recognizing that some of us are not going to live as long as that statistical average. Some of us will live longer. But certainly, somebody with a spinal cord injury is not going to live as long as someone without a spinal cord injury. That's the purpose of Dr. Davis's testimony, to point out that there's a range.

And, you know, that's not suggesting
Mr. Razo is not entitled to good, future medical
care. But it's also a recognition that,
unfortunately, we live in a country where we have to
buy our own medical care. We have to shop around for
medical care. Quite frankly, some people think that
that's really a terrible situation. I have to be
honest with you: I would agree. I still can't get
in to see my primary care physician. But that's the

Page 1330

So when you pick one number, 6 million and change, what you're doing is you're not acknowledging the reality of how you pay for future medical care.

Now, you've seen a lot of exhibits. Okay? And I'm not going to show you an exhibit. Here's what I'm going to show you, because I think it's incredibly helpful for you just to get an idea of the layout of the ski area. Okay? This ski area is utilized in the winter for all sorts of winter sports, and it's utilized in the summer for mountain biking, hiking, all sorts of activities. And it's a very large area. And I just -- I want you to be aware of that -- can you see that okay? Can you all see that? Okay.

I want you to keep that in mind, that this is a huge piece of wilderness that's been groomed in a lot of ways. It's got far more roads in it than a wilderness area. It's got some towers.

But I want you to remember -- because you saw this in the testimony. I want you to keep in mind how long of a route. Here's the parking area right here, and here's the road that Mr. Razo was led up by Mr. Datri. All the way up this road. Do you remember the lake, the pond? It's in all the photos.

That's right about where the accident happened, just past that area.

But I think it was a little over 11,000 feet. That's more -- it's just about two miles. Two miles of driving up with Mr. Datri, Mr. Razo being led by Mr. Santos. So one of the big themes in this case, it's been presented that Mr. Razo asked to scout the route; was denied. We'll talk about that in a second.

One of the other things I think is important is Mr. Razo didn't need to scout the route. He was led up by Mr. Santos without incident to a certain point.

And where was that point? What is that, the last 90 feet of their trip? I think I said in opening, 96 percent. It might be closer to 99 percent.

And, yes, there was an alternative route. And you've heard about that. And you've heard Mr. Beauchamp talk about that. In Mr. Beauchamp's opinion, had Mr. Razo taken that alternative route, the rollover probably would not have happened.

Okay. So we know that the plaintiffs are telling you that the reason he didn't take that alternative route was because he wasn't allowed to

because Mr. Fulks was on the radio saying, "Get up here as fast as you can. I don't care. You take that steep route."

But does that hold up with Mr. Razo's experience, background and training, and excellent work in this industry? Does that really hold up?

You remember, I asked Mr. Santos if anyone had asked him to take a 30-second drive down that alternative route, down that fork in the road? No, nobody did.

I asked Mr. Datri, "Did you take a trip down that little road?"

"No."

Mr. Razo, we know, didn't do that. But they stopped. Mr. Razo, Mr. Datri stopped at the fork in the road. Why did they stop at the fork in the road? Because the hill in front of them looked really, really steep. They did exactly what you or I -- Mr. Beauchamp talked about it -- we're out in the wilderness, we're hiking, we're snowshoeing, we're riding a mountain bike, we're walking, and we get ourselves into a place where we look ahead and our senses tell us, I need to take it cautiously. I need to make a call. Should I go? Should I find an alternative? Should I turn around and do something

Page 1333

Page 1334

different?

That's human nature. We don't just go blindly charging in. We're not cows. We're not sheep. We're not deer. We have the capacity to look ahead and recognize there might be something of danger ahead. There might be something to be cautious about ahead.

And that's exactly what Mr. Razo did. He paused. He took that time.

He testified -- do you remember what he said? He thought he could make it up that road.

That's his prerogative to make that choice. Because he's the expert in control of the Raptor. But to suggest that somehow either employees of No Exit made Mr. Razo drive up that hill is just incorrect.

That's not what happened. And then to suggest that Mr. Razo did not have the tools he needed to drive an alternative route is also not correct.

You know what you didn't hear in this case? You heard repeatedly the refrain that Mr. Razo wasn't allowed to scout the route. He wasn't allowed to scout the route.

You know what you didn't hear? That he made that request when he paused at the fork in the road. That's because it's not evidence in this case.

That's because no one has testified to that. We know he paused. We know he assessed. And we know he decided, as he said himself, to drive up that steep slope because he believed he could do so safely. And this is the person who knows more about this piece of complex equipment than anyone else on that set that day. How could anyone else direct him to drive up that road if he didn't think he could do it safely? And the answer is nobody.

And that's not blaming Mr. Razo. That's acknowledging reality. All right? That's just calling it for what it is. That's owning it.

And, you know, I appreciated the testimony -- and I hope you did too -- of Mr. Razo's psychologist, Dr. D'Angelo. Do you remember I asked her, "Has Mr. Razo accepted some responsibility?" "Are you providing treatment for him about any guilt associated, feelings associated with his role in the accident."

And she took great exception to that. And she was here as his provider. She was advocating for her patient. She sounds fantastic, as somebody who cares about her patient. She truly does.

But her reaction to the idea that Mr. Razo might have any responsibility for this --

well, do you remember she used two analogies? Mr. Razo is a soldier who has no choice. He's found in a battlefield environment. He comes back with severe emotional issues. That soldier had no choice, was her point.

Well, as a veteran myself, I understand that. Sometimes soldiers don't have a choice. Sometimes soldiers are put in positions no human being would ever want to be in.

She also used the analogy that he was like a -- the survivor of sexual assault. Somehow, by pointing out his role in this accident, we're trying to shame him in some way.

No, we're not. And here's why.

All we're pointing out is that people have responsibility for their actions. Sometimes people are put in harm's way, and they have absolutely no ability to control that. Certainly in the context of a soldier. Certainly in the context of an abuse -- a survivor of abuse or assault.

But that's not -- that's not Mr. Razo's situation.

And certainly in the context of being an employee of an entity, sometimes employees are forced to do things that put them in harm's way.

That's not Mr. Razo either.

Mr. Razo has to own what happened, as distasteful as the outcome is for him personally. He's got to step up and own what happened. He made a mistake. He thought he could do it. Of all the witnesses that presented testimony in this case, only Mr. Razo himself acknowledged that he thought he could do it, and he was wrong.

We all make mistakes. We all have regrets. This is a case about that.

It's not a case about an employer or a corporation putting someone in harm's way. That's not what the case is about.

The outcome, in this case, for Mr. Razo is terrible.

But the road -- well, we can blame the road, but we can't recover from the road. And the equipment -- we can blame the equipment, except there's been no evidence in this case there was anything wrong with the equipment.

But there was some evidence, in this case -- and I think you remember it -- you know, I -- I was so impressed with the block of wood. I mean, Mr. Beauchamp took a concept about center of gravity, and he boiled it down into such a great way of

Page 1337

Page 1338

understanding it. And speaking as a -- someone with a nonscientific background, I actually learned something every time I talked to him. And the ability to describe the center of gravity on this vehicle -- do you remember that one chart, where the center of gravity, the 3,000 pounds, is pointing down on that pedestal and the gap between the center of gravity and the vehicle's ability to take a slope was so narrow?

Well, who would be the one that you would rely on to know these things? Mr. Razo. Nobody else. And so if he said, as he did, that he thought he could drive up that road safely, then it doesn't matter what anyone else said.

You know, there's this -- I think what's really important, being -- I know you've heard it. It's very easy to just globally say, "Well, that's just Hollywood." You know, every -- every movie about Hollywood that you see, there's always somebody doing something wrong. You know, the Hollywood of the 1920s and '30s and '40s and even '50s up into the '60s was probably not that great of a place to work. Excuse me.

But this isn't that Hollywood. This isn't that film industry any longer.

And there have been some tragic accidents that have occurred in the film industry. Is anyone old enough to remember the "Twilight Zone" issue back from in the 1980s? That was a lapse in safety. Well, guess what happened after that? The unions, which are the most powerful presence in the film industry because they're made up of all the people that make these things happen, got themselves together and said, "We're going to put in standards, and every production is going to use it so that when our members show up on a film in Iceland or New Mexico or Timbuktu or downtown Los Angeles, they're going to know what the safety requirements are." And those are those policies that get set up. You know, they're not just pro forma. They're not just, we attach them to an e-mail so we can check off that box.

They're sent out.

Because here's the other thing, you remember that long list of e-mails? I think it was, like, two and a half pages. No one knows what the capabilities and experience is of any particular individual; so you cover them all, and you send out the safety memos. And the key message, on all of the safety memos, is that safety is not sacrificed for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

expediency.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Tebo, as requested, you have ten minutes.

MR. TEBO: Thank you, Your Honor. And there's a reason for that. Because who, making a film, wants an accident on their film or wants to have a situation that allows an accident to occur? It's the antithesis of making a call sheet and setting up a schedule and defining when things have to take place. That's what throws things out of whack.

The testimony, in this case, is that, somehow, that morning, there was all sorts of mayhem and disorganization. You had a director that changed his mind. All of these things.

And yet, ladies and gentlemen, there was no hectic rush. The crew showed up at 5:30. The first shot was scheduled with the Raptor because it said it on our call sheet that the Raptor would be used for that first scene that was going to be shot, 7:30 start time.

So in all that time, what was Mr. Razo doing? Well, you heard the testimony of Mr. Franklin, Mr. Razo was not asking for information. That's clear. He didn't send

22 23 24

25

Page 1341

production. He was paid for this work. And he had deductions taken out just like anybody else working for this production as an employee.

So I know this is always a hard thing. And I appreciate that there's a suggestion both in the opening and in the closing that Mr. Razo's liability here should be 25 percent or 20 percent. I told you at the beginning I was going to be straight with you about what the defense was going to present. And I told you that I believe that, after you heard all of the evidence in this case, that would be an inverse. It would be flipped over.

If you want to find liability relates to the defendants -- and I have to be honest with you in the sense that I don't feel that there's liability, but I don't have to make that call. Thank goodness, I don't. But the thing is, is Mr. Razo bears the overwhelming majority of liability for this accident. And it's not an indictment of who he is as a person. It's a recognition he made a mistake. We can't unwind that. But for you to place the fault for that mistake disproportionally on my clients is ignoring the reality of the situation. And I don't think, as a jury, you should be in the position of ignoring reality.

Mr. Datri -- who seemed more like his assistant than his copilot -- he didn't send Mr. Datri off to the transportation department to get the details -because we know there's a whole department devoted to moving things around. Mr. Razo didn't do that.

I don't know what was going on. I don't know why they were feeling like they were running late. But the claim is they felt like they were running late because they weren't given the info they needed. And I just don't think that that holds up when we're talking about the people we're talking about: Highly skilled experts.

So from the perspective of whether or not Mr. Razo was an employee, ladies and gentlemen, I just want you to keep in mind a couple of things. He was paid wages for this particular production by No Exit. He had deductions taken out of his paycheck related to the hours that he was working on this production. He didn't get a lump sum payment like you would pay an independent contractor. He sent a deal memo with terms that were taken and put on the corporate deal memo. And the corporate deal memo is a form that got sent to Cast & Crew. Why? So Mr. Razo could get paid. And he was paid. That's -that's acknowledged. He was paid for this

Page 1342

Page 1340

On behalf of myself and Mr. Schmehl and Andrew Bernard, who I think you heard some testimony from, and Black Label and No Exit, all I can say is thank you. I apologize. Having a hard time breathing. All I can say is thank you for being here. You know, we have to be here because of the jobs we play; you're here because of the purpose you play. And it's the only way to resolve this.

So thank you very much. I appreciate your attention, and I appreciate your time. And, quite honestly, I look forward to you deliberating, rendering a decision, and going home. Thank you.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Tebo. And, Mr. Hunt, I can give you a couple minutes.

MR. HUNT: Thank you, sir.

Thank you, Jury. I think I heard two things. I heard "We're not here to blame James," and I heard 45 minutes of blaming James and taking no responsibility for their own actions and telling you there was some bad accidents way back in the Twilight Zone, but Hollywood is better now.

Is that your experience? Is that what you've seen? Or do you get a chance to tell them

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what's expected?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then, of course, you were very, very briefly -- I mean, they've almost, in my view, given up on the idea of the employment issue. You heard about 30 seconds of it. And I frankly think that when Ellen Schwartz got presented with this letter -it's Exhibit 31 in plaintiffs' -- where she's completely disavowing James Razo, completely not accepting, certainly, any responsibility for his actions, saying, "He wasn't our guy. You gave him to us. You sent him on it. You pay us \$6,000 back" --\$65 million film and they wanted \$6,000 back because Susan had to go stay in a hotel while James was in the ICU -- I frankly think it's appalling that this letter was sent in September of 2016. And I frankly think it tells you everything you need to know about what No Exit and Black Label Media values, and it's not human life.

What I ask you for now is your courage. Your job is not easy in any way. Two weeks ago, none of you had no idea you would be sitting on a case with this kind of gravity with a chance to do something special, with a chance to send a message to frankly an industry that needs it. Chances like this don't come around very often. For all of us in this

courtroom, every single one of us, a chance like this may never happen again.

When you write down your verdict, make it a verdict you can be proud of because I'll guarantee you, none of us, none of us, however it comes out, are ever going to forget today. Be proud of the work that you've done. We've trusted you from the beginning. James and Susan and Dari were willing to say, "You know what? We're going to trust a Santa Fe jury. We believe in this system. Our story needs to be heard."

They didn't want to report it to OSHA and tried to sweep it up the rug. But, thank God, we can come into a courtroom in America and present this case to 12 people from Santa Fe, New Mexico, to get to hear this case. And you get to decide the outcome.

And the last thing I'll leave you with --I don't think you can see this real good. It will -anyway, this is the movie poster from No Exit -- I'm sorry -- from "Only the Brave." And it says, "It's not what stands in front of you; it's who stands beside you."

I saw this about three weeks ago when I was getting ready for this case, and I sent it to

Page 1345

James. I'm sorry. And I said, "I'll stand beside you, James."

But I don't have the power to do anything. You do. You have a chance today knowing what stands in front of James, which is a lifetime of walking through that fire, you have a chance to say, "We stood beside him because he was worthy of our verdict and because Black Label and No Exit were wrong and they need to be accountable."

Thank you for being here. Respect each others's opinions and be brave.

THE COURT: All right.

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the jury, it's now time for you to retire to the jury room and to render a verdict in this case. I'm going to provide you with the final instructions that I read to you as well as the special verdict form and the exhibits that were introduced into evidence.

Mr. Raymond, you were our alternate. So when the other 12 members of the jury retire to the jury room, I'm going to ask that you remain in the courtroom, and I'll have some additional instructions for you.

> JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Okay.

Page 1346 All rise for the jury.

(Jury exits courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. Parties may be seated. All right.

So, Mr. Raymond, first of all, let me just say -- and I know I'm speaking on behalf of the parties and the attorneys -- thank you for your time. I know that your time is precious. I know you sat through this whole trial. But without alternates, we probably wouldn't get to the end. As you saw, we lost three alternates for various reasons. A couple of them, I think, got sick.

So first of all, thank you for your time. The system would not work without people like you citizens. We've been relying on citizens such as yourself for 200 years to make these difficult situations. If you need a letter, an employer letter, my bailiff will provide that to you. Please remember to continue to check in with jury services.

Now, someone may contact you and ask to speak to you about this case for whatever reason. At this point, you're free to talk to anyone about this case if you choose to. So if you want to speak to this particular -- any person that contacts you and wishes to speak with you, you're free to do so.