UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION; AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION AMERICA; HSUAN BIN CHEN, aka H.B. CHEN; HUI HSIUNG, aka KUMA; LAI-JUH CHEN, aka L.J. CHEN; SHIU LUNG LEUNG, aka CHAO-LUNG LIANG and STEVEN LEUNG; TSANNRONG LEE, aka TSAN-JUNG LEE and HUBERT LEE, Defendants.	No. CR-09-0110 SI **SPECIAL VERDICT FORM**

WE, THE JURY, in the above-entitled case, unanimously find the answer to the following questions:

PART A

AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION

1. Do you find that defendant, AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, violated the Sherman Act as charged?

✓ Yes, guilty _____No, not guilty

AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION AMERICA

2. Do you find that defendant, AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION AMERICA, violated the Sherman Act as charged?

✓ Yes, guilty _____No, not guilty

(continued)

HSUAN BIN "H.B." CHEN

3. Do you find that the defendant, HSUAN BIN CHEN, also known as H.B. CHEN, violated the Sherman Act as charged?

_✓_ Yes, guilty _____No, not guilty

HUI HSIUNG ("KUMA")

4. Do you find that the defendant HUI HSIUNG, also known as KUMA, violated the Sherman Act as charged?

_✓_ Yes, guilty _____No, not guilty

LAI-JUH "L.J." CHEN

5. Do you find that the defendant LAI-JUH CHEN, also known as L.J. CHEN, violated the Sherman Act as charged?

_____ Yes, guilty _✓_No, not guilty

SHIU LUNG "STEVEN" LEUNG

6. Do you find that the defendant, SHIU LUNG LEUNG, also known as CHAO-LUNG LIANG and STEVEN LEUNG, violated the Sherman Act as charged?

_____ Yes, guilty _____No, not guilty

TSANNRONG "HUBERT" LEE

7. Do you find that the defendant, TSANNRONG LEE, also known as TSAN-JUNG LEE and HUBERT LEE, violated the Sherman Act as charged?

_____ Yes, guilty _✓_No, not guilty

If the answer to either question 1 or question 2, above as to AUO or AUOA, is "Yes, guilty," proceed to Part B below. If the answer to both question 1 and question 2, above, is "No, not guilty," proceed directly to the conclusion and skip Part B.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

PART B

GROSS GAIN FROM THE OFFENSE

8. Did the participants in the conspiracy derive gains from the conspiracy?

✓ Yes _____No

If the answer to question 8 is "Yes," proceed to question 9. If the answer to question 8 is "No," proceed directly to the conclusion and skip questions 9 and 10.

9. Was the amount of combined gross gains derived from the conspiracy by all the participants in the conspiracy, including AU Optronics Corporation ("AUO"), AU Optronics Corporation America ("AUOA"), LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd. ("LG"), Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. ("Samsung"), Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd. ("CPT"), Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation ("CMO"), and HannStar Display Corporation ("HannStar"), $500 million or more?

✓ Yes _____No

If the answer to question 9 is "Yes," proceed directly to the conclusion and skip question 10. If the answer to question 9 is "No," answer question 10.

10 What was the amount of combined gross gains derived from the conspiracy by all the participants in the conspiracy, including AUO, AUOA, LG, Samsung, CPT, CMO, and HannStar: (fill in the amount) $_____.

CONCLUSION

Once you have finished answering the questions unanimously, please have the foreperson sign and date this form. Then contact the deputy or marshal to inform him or her that you have completed your deliberations.

Dated:

_____

Foreperson