

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  
26  
27  
28

**ROME & ASSOCIATES, A.P.C.**  
Eugene Rome (SBN 232780)  
erome@romeandassociates.com  
Jerl B. Leutz (SBN 253229)  
jleutz@romeandassociates.com  
2029 Century Park East, Suite 1040  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 282-0690  
Facsimile: (310) 282-0691

JS-6

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
MATTHEW HETLAND

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MATTHEW HETLAND, an individual,

Plaintiff,  
vs.

TRAVIS BEAUCHESNE, an individual,  
iCLICK PROMOTIONS, LLC, a Utah  
limited liability company, PLAYA  
NEGRA ENTERPRISES, a Costa Rica  
entity of unknown origin, and DOES 1  
through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 8:13-CV-00936-DOC-AN

**JUDGMENT ON GENERAL  
VERDICT**

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  
26  
27  
28

This action came on regularly for trial on February 5, 2015, in Department 9D of the United States District Court, the Honorable David O. Carter Judge presiding. Plaintiff Matthew Hetland (“Plaintiff”) was represented by Eugene Rome and Jerl B. Leutz of Rome & Associates, and Defendants Travis Beauchesne, iClick Promotions, LLC and Play Negra Enterprises (“Defendants”) were represented by Richard Armstrong of Kirton McConkie.

A jury of 8 persons was impaneled and sworn. Witnesses were sworn and testified. After hearing the evidence and arguments of counsel, and after the jury was instructed by the Court, the claims were submitted to the jury with instructions to return a general verdict. The jury deliberated and, on February 5, 2015, returned its verdict by way of answers to the questions propounded to it as follows:

**Breach of Partnership Agreement (Breach of Contract)**

- 1. On plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for breach of partnership agreement,  
 We find in favor of Hetland and against Beauchesne.  
 We find in favor of Beauchesne and against Hetland.

**Breach of Fiduciary Duty**

- 2. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for breach of fiduciary duty,  
 We find in favor of Hetland and against Beauchesne.  
 We find in favor of Beauchesne and against Hetland.

**Conversion**

- 3. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for conversion against Defendant Travis Beauchesne,  
 We find in favor of Hetland and against Beauchesne.  
 We find in favor of Beauchesne and against Hetland.

1           4. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for conversion against Defendant  
2 iClick Promotions, LLC,

3            We find in favor of Hetland and against iClick Promotions, LLC.

4            We find in favor of iClick Promotions, LLC and against Hetland.

5  
6           5. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for conversion against Defendant  
7 Playa Negra Enterprises,

8            We find in favor of Hetland and against Playa Negra Enterprises.

9            We find in favor of Playa Negra Enterprises and against Hetland.

10

11           **Fraud**

12           6. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for fraud by intentional  
13 misrepresentation,

14            We find in favor of Hetland and against Beauchesne.

15            We find in favor of Beauchesne and against Hetland.

16

17           7. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for fraud by concealment,

18            We find in favor of Hetland and against Beauchesne.

19            We find in favor of Beauchesne and against Hetland.

20

21           **Money Had and Received**

22           8. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for money had and received against  
23 Defendant Travis Beauchesne,

24            We find in favor of Hetland and against Beauchesne.

25            We find in favor of Beauchesne and against Hetland.

26

27

28

1           9. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for money had and received against  
2 Defendant iClick Promotions, LLC,

3             We find in favor of Hetland and against iClick Promotions, LLC.

4             We find in favor of iClick Promotions, LLC and against Hetland.

5  
6           10. On Plaintiff Matthew Hetland’s claim for money had and received against  
7 Defendant Playa Negra Enterprises,

8             We find in favor of Hetland and against Playa Negra Enterprises.

9             We find in favor of Playa Negra Enterprises and against Hetland.

10

11           THEREAFTER, as a result of the findings in Questions 1-10, the jury  
12 awarded damages and punitive damages as follows:

13

14           **Damages:**

15           11. We award Plaintiff Matthew Hetland the following damages:

16            \$731,465.80

17

18           **Punitive Damages:**

19           12. Did Defendant Travis Beauchesne engage in the conduct with malice,  
20 oppression, or fraud?

21             Yes            No

22           If your answer to Question 12 is yes, then proceed to Question 13.

23           If your answer to Question 12 is no, **stop here**, answer no further questions,  
24 and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

25

26

27

28

1           13. What amount of punitive damages, if any, do you award Plaintiff Matthew  
2 Hetland?

3                   \$1,450,000.00

4  
5 Dated: February 5, 2015

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
FOREPERSON

6  
7           NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND  
8 DECREED that Plaintiff Matthew Hetland shall be deemed to be the prevailing  
9 party as a matter of law and shall recover **\$731,465.80** in damages as against the  
10 Defendants Travis Beauchesne, iClick Promotions, LLC and Playa Negra  
11 Enterprises. Further, Plaintiff Matthew Hetland shall recover punitive damages in  
12 the amount of **\$1,450,000.00** as against Defendant Travis Beauchesne.

13           Post-judgment interest will accrue as set forth in 28 U.S.C. §1961, all such  
14 post-judgment interest to run until the Judgment against Defendants Travis  
15 Beauchesne, iClick Promotions, LLC and Playa Negra Enterprises is paid in full.

16  
17  
18 Dated: February 12, 2015



\_\_\_\_\_  
Judge David O. Carter  
United States District Court

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28