

# Exhibit A

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

ROGER CLEVELAND GOLF	)	C/A No. 2:09-2119-MBS
COMPANY, INC.,	)	
	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
	)	
VERSUS	)	Columbia, SC
	)	March 8 & 9, 2011
	)	
CHRISTOPHER PRINCE, PRINCE	)	
DISTRIBUTION, LLC, and	)	
BRIGHT BUILDERS, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
-----	)	

EXCERPTS OF JURY TRIAL  
DISCUSSIONS RE JURY CHARGES AND MOTIONS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARGARET B. SEYMOUR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, and a jury.

Appearances:

For the Plaintiff:	JEFFREY S. PATTERSON, ESQ. JOHN C. MCELWAIN, ESQ. 151 Meeting Street, Sixth Floor Charleston, SC 29401
For Defendant Prince:	CHRISTOPHER D. LIZZI, ESQ. 36 Broad Street Charleston, SC 29401
For Defendant Bright Builders:	PAUL J. DOOLITTLE, ESQ. DOUGLAS M. FRASER, ESQ. P.O. Box 2579 Charleston, SC 29401

1           And number 12 now is removed?

2           THE COURT: I think -- is that the claim that was  
3 withdrawn? Unfair competition and false designation of origin,  
4 is that still an issue?

5           MR. PATTERSON: You had actually asked us if we  
6 withdrew our unfair competition claim under the South Carolina  
7 common law, which I said yes. This actually is unfair  
8 competition under federal law, the Lanham Act, which I think  
9 it's -- you know, the counterfeiting conduct we talked about is  
10 unfair competition, but we didn't actually withdraw that claim.

11          THE COURT: So, are there separate damages for this  
12 or is there a separate verdict on this particular issue --

13          MR. PATTERSON: No --

14          THE COURT: -- or is it part of the Lanham Act claim?

15          MR. PATTERSON: The way you have done the verdict  
16 form or the way we did it, it would include it, because it  
17 says, "trademark counterfeiting and infringement in violation  
18 of the Lanham Act." This would just be another type of  
19 violation of the Lanham Act.

20          THE COURT: So do we need instruction number 12?

21          MR. PATTERSON: No.

22          THE COURT: Okay. So we are going to delete that?

23          MR. DOOLITTLE: Yes, that would be agreeable with  
24 Bright Builders, and we have no objections to the remaining  
25 jury instructions.