## Exhibit B

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA CHARLESTON DIVISION


Roger Cleveland Golf Company, Inc.,			Company, Inc.,	) Civil Action No. 2:09-2119-MBS			
		Plaintiff,		)			
vs.							
Christopher Prince, Prince Distribution, LLC, and Bright Builders, Inc.,  Defendants.			rs, Inc.,	) ) ) ) _)			
			<u>VE</u>	RDI	CT FORM		
We, t	he jury,	find the fo	llowing:				
for tra	The Cademarl	Court has co k counterfe	oncluded that Chris iting and infringem	stopho ent is	er Prince and Prince Distribution, LLC are liab n violation of the Lanham Act.	ole	
1.	Was	Was Christopher Prince and/or Prince Distribution, LLC's conduct willful?					
	1	Yes	No				
	willfi	ıl, what am	ount of statutory da	amag	nd/or Prince Distribution LLC's conduct was es per mark do you assess against these and infringement? \$ 2,500.00	<u>15</u>	
	<u>not</u> w	illful, what	amount of statutor	y dar	nd/or Prince Distribution LLC's conduct was mages per mark do you assess against these and infringement? \$	ıs	
2.	Has Cleveland Golf proven by a preponderance of the evidence that <b>Bright Builders</b> , <b>Inc.</b> is liable for contributory or vicarious trademark counterfeiting and infringement?						
	$\checkmark$	Yes	No				

No

Yes

9. If the answer to question 7 is yes, was Bright Builders, Inc.'s conduct willful?

Yes No



Columbia, South Carolina March 10, 2011