Trials. Not Errors.

Founded in the early 1980’s by pioneers in what was then the new business of trial consulting, Jury Research Institute is one of the oldest and most respected firms in the field. We rely upon science and experience to help you develop, test and implement winning trial strategies.

Trials. Not Errors.
Jury Research Institute can help you develop, pre-test and implement winning trial strategies. Our licensed psychologists and communication specialists know what it takes to help you refine your case strategy, enhance your settlement position and improve your trial success rate. As the leader in development of courtroom communication and persuasion techniques, we can give you powerful insights and a distinct advantage.
He has been providing consulting services to the legal community since 1981. Dr. Rice provides particular expertise in research design and statistical analysis related to jury selection and juror behavior, the evaluation and testing of case themes, witnesses and evidence in order to provide clients with an objective and realistic assessment of potential liability and damages. Through the use of focus groups, mock trials and surveys, Dr. Rice has been able to assist litigants in critical decisions related to discovery, settlement and trial strategy. He is a frequent guest speaker at chapters of the American Inns of Court, as well as other local, state and national legal organizations. As a result of his role in the OJ Simpson civil case, he has been a frequent guest on CNN’s Burden of Proof, as well as a regular commentator for KCBS and PBS.

Susan E. Jones, Ph.D.
Founder

Dr. Jones holds bachelor and doctoral degrees in psychology from St. Lawrence University and the University of Alabama and is the former Associate Editor for Law and Psychology Review. Dr. Jones is the founder of Jury Research Institute and has successfully assisted litigators in virtually every area of civil litigation for over 25 years. In addition to being a licensed psychologist and nationally recognized expert on juror behavior, Dr. Jones is also an active writer and researcher in the area of voir dire and jury selection. Since 1980, articles by Dr. Jones on social science in the courtroom have appeared in numerous legal and psychological journals. Dr. Jones is also a much sought after speaker, known for her lively, informative approach to teaching advocacy skills. She is a member of the faculty of the Professional Education Group which conducts training seminars across the country. She has been an invited speaker at literally hundreds of local, state and national bar association meetings across the country.
In reaching their verdicts, jurors rely on more than just the evidence presented to them. They incorporate their experiences, values and attitudes into their interpretation of the case facts. This results in a process of selective perception that affects jurors’ perceptions of the facts and often distorts their memory of testimony.

Our job is to uncover the belief systems that drive jurors’ perceptions of your case and to help you craft a persuasive argument strategy with the audience in mind.

Jury Research Institute has developed a full range of research methodologies and consulting services to identify case themes and plan effective presentation strategies.

In the field of trial consulting, the credentials and expertise of our professionals are unmatched. In testing, developing and presenting your client’s best case, you’ll receive the benefit of our experience and dedication. From early issue testing to suggestions for crafting the verdict form, we support you with solid, successful trial preparation.
Pre-Trial Services

Focus Groups & Mock Trials

Focus groups provide you with powerful insights into what matters most to jurors. This small group format has proven to be an excellent tool to put to work early in the litigation timeline. Insights gleaned from focus groups can help guide discovery, provide risk assessment data and where appropriate, suggest possible settlement strategies. Mock trials give you an opportunity to test drive the case. Mock trials give you the advantage of seeing and hearing dozens of jurors deliberate the issues—a powerful edge in testing and refining the case strategy.

Web & Video Surveys

Web surveys are an exciting new, cost-effective tool for quickly getting the thoughts and reactions of several hundred jury-eligible community residents. Community residents are recruited to log onto a secure website where they review an online trial. Jurors render a verdict and, if appropriate, award damages. You gain insights from hundreds of jurors as to the reasons behind their verdicts, and the range of damages they are inclined to award.

Video surveys are a research tool used to assess complex cases with a large sample size. Video statements summarizing the positions of the plaintiffs and the defendants are combined with appropriate demonstrative exhibits to create a video program which is then presented to large panels of jury eligible community residents. This exercise not only provides a powerful assessment of case themes, but provides data for use in jury selection.

Presentation Graphics

Well-crafted visuals can tip the scales in your client’s favor. In visual communications, the design of an exhibit may say as much as the content. JRI’s graphics consultants, designers and animators (through our Expert Visuals division) help you identify case themes and information needing visual support, and translate these ideas into powerful courtroom presentations. Today, achieving the best result for your client may mean making your strongest argument well before trial—at a hearing or during ADR. The skilled graphics consultants, designers and animators of our Expert Visuals division help you develop demonstratives that are clear, persuasive, powerful tools for presenting your case to every audience at every stage of your case. Our creative team consults with you to develop a convincing story in every medium, and then produces graphics and video to help you communicate that story to the visual learners in your audience.
Most witnesses are novices at giving courtroom testimony, and thus are often anxious, combative or simply ineffective communicators during depositions and on the witness stand. Jurors frequently misinterpret a witnesses’ anxiety as deception, and thus reject the testimony of a perfectly honest, but nervous witness. JRI’s Witness Workshops are tailored to help witnesses build upon their strengths and become comfortable in the courtroom setting. Witness Workshops typically involve three to four sessions, lasting between two to four hours each. Witnesses are given the tools to earn the trust of jurors and thus be viewed as credible, trustworthy and persuasive.

JRI provides you with the tools to obtain daily feedback about how well the jury is comprehending your case and how favorably your arguments and witnesses are being received. JRI recruits a small group of surrogate jurors who are selected to match the mix of demographic characteristics of the actual jury. Surrogate jurors attend trial each day and listen to the testimony. Jurors are interviewed extensively at the end of each day. You receive the benefits of this debriefing each evening, allowing you to make strategic decisions in your case. One of JRI’s highly experienced consultants can attend trial with you each day and monitor jurors’ reactions to the testimony, a task which is hard for you to do while you are focused on examining witnesses. Such feedback can help you make “real time” strategic decisions as you put on your case.

JRI’s graphics consultants, designers and animators (through our Expert Visuals division) help you identify case themes and information needing visual support, and translate these ideas into powerful courtroom presentations. Our creative team consults with you to develop a convincing story in every medium, and then produces graphics and video to help you communicate that story to the visual learners in your audience.
Additional Services

Post-Trial Interviews

JRI has conducted thousands of post-trial juror interviews to guide trial strategy for future cases or to probe for juror misconduct. Our one-on-one juror interviews produce in-depth, candid feedback about what happened in the deliberation room.

Change of Venue Study

In today’s media rich environment it is not uncommon for jurors to be exposed to information about your client or your case. In instances where you are concerned that pretrial publicity has harmed your client’s chances of obtaining an unbiased jury, JRI can undertake a change of venue survey. JRI researchers conduct a scientific public opinion survey to study your need for a change of venue. Our methodologies are designed to meet the highest scientific standards and to withstand challenges from cross-examination.

Value Added Technologies

Perception Analyzer
When the research exercise calls for it, JRI will put to use a valuable tool known as The Perception Analyzer. Perception Analyzers are wireless hand-held dials made by MS-Interactive. Mock jurors provide instant feedback as to whether they are responding favorably or unfavorably to your arguments or to a witness’ testimony. The moment-to-moment responses are processed by a central computer, and scrolling graphs are instantaneously displayed during the presentation for moderators and viewing clients.

Webcast of Research Exercises
The breadth of the internet now provides us with the capability of delivering a focus group or mock trial exercise directly to your personal computer. JRI can securely webcast a research exercise, allowing you and your client to control the costs associated with travel to the research location. Permitted parties log on to a secure server and observe a project in “real time” or upon demand.
## Corporate Clients

In testing, developing and presenting your client’s best case, you’ll want the benefit of our broad experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3Com Corporation</th>
<th>Delta Airlines, Inc.</th>
<th>PG&amp;E Corporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott Laboratories</td>
<td>Digital Equipment</td>
<td>Philip Morris Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Micro Devices (AMD)</td>
<td>Dow Chemical</td>
<td>Proctor &amp; Gamble Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Railroad</td>
<td>E&amp;J Gallo Winery</td>
<td>Recreational Equipment, Inc. (REI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Capital Management</td>
<td>Eastman Kodak Company</td>
<td>Regents of the University of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allstate Corporation</td>
<td>ExxonMobil Corporation</td>
<td>Rockwell Automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altria Group</td>
<td>Fireman’s Fund Insurance Companies</td>
<td>Schering-Plough Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Family Mutual</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
<td>Shell Oil Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Company</td>
<td>Foster Farms</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American International Group (AIG)</td>
<td>Gap, Inc.</td>
<td>State Farm Insurance Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple, Inc.</td>
<td>General Motors</td>
<td>State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong World Industries</td>
<td>Hilton Hotels Corporation</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T Inc.</td>
<td>Honda North America, Inc.</td>
<td>State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmel</td>
<td>IBM Corporation</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Corporation</td>
<td>Intel Corporation</td>
<td>State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BankOne Corporation</td>
<td>J.P. Morgan Chase &amp; Company</td>
<td>State Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayer Corporation</td>
<td>KPMG Peat Marwick</td>
<td>Texas Instruments, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Stearns &amp; Company, Inc.</td>
<td>Logitech</td>
<td>Time Warner, Inc. (AOL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bechtel Corporation</td>
<td>Longs Drug Stores Corporation</td>
<td>Toyota Motors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol-Meyers Squibb</td>
<td>Louisiana-Pacific Corporation</td>
<td>UAL Corporation (United Airlines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS Corporation</td>
<td>Major League Baseball</td>
<td>Union Bank of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cetus Corporation</td>
<td>MasterCard International</td>
<td>University of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Schwab &amp; Company Inc.</td>
<td>McKesson Corporation</td>
<td>Unocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron/Texaco Corporation</td>
<td>Microsoft Corporation</td>
<td>Varian Medical Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chubb Corporation</td>
<td>Motorola, Inc.</td>
<td>Warner Brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldwell Banker</td>
<td>National Union Fire</td>
<td>Washington Mutual, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Associates</td>
<td>Insurance Company</td>
<td>Wells Fargo &amp; Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costco-Wholesale Corporation</td>
<td>Oracle Corporation</td>
<td>Weyerhaeuser Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FORTUNE 500 highlighted in blue.**
Law Firm Clients

In testing, developing and presenting your client’s best case, you’ll want the benefit of our broad experience.

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis
Alston & Bird
Arnall Golden Gregory
Bingham McCutchen
Bullivant Houser Bailey
Clausen Miller
Clifford Chance
Cole, Schotz, Meisel, Forman & Leonard
Connell Foley
Covington & Burling
Cozen O’Connor
Davis Graham & Stubbs
Davis Polk & Wardwell
Dechert
Dewey & Leboeuf
Dinsmore & Shohl
DLA Piper
Duane Morris
Epstein Becker & Green,
Fenwick & West
Fish & Richardson
Fisher & Phillips
Fox Rothschild
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
Gordon & Rees
Greenberg Traurig
Hanson, Bridget, Marcus, Vlahos & Rudy
Heller Ehrman
Hinshaw & Culbertson
Holland & Knight
Howard Rice Nemerovski Canady Falk & Rabkin
Hunton & Williams
Jackson Lewis
Jenner & Block
Jones Day
Kasowitz, Benson, Torrès & Friedman
Kelley Drye & Warren
Kenyon & Kenyon
King & Spalding
Kirkland & Ellis
Lane Powell
Latham & Watkins
Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgaard & Smith
Littler Mendelson,
Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell
Lovells
Mayer Brown
McDonough Holland & Allen
McKenna Long & Aldridge
Meyers Nave
Michael Best & Friedrich
Miller Nash
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius
Morrison & Foerster
Nixon Peabody
O’Melveny & Meyers
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe
Patton Boggs
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison
Perkins Coie
Perkins Coie Brown & Bain
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges
Reed Smith
Ropers, Majeski, Kohn & Bentley
Schiff Hardin
Schulte Roth & Zabel
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt
Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold
Seifarth Shaw
Shearman & Sterling
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton
Shook, Hardy & Bacon
Sidley Austin
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom
Snell & Wilmer
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
Stinson Morrison Hecker
Thacher Proffitt & Wood
Thelen Reid Brown
Raysman & Steiner
Thompson Hine
Townsend and Townsend and Crew
Tucker Ellis & West
Warner Norcross & Judd
Weil, Gotshal & Manges
White & Case
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr
Wilson Elser Moskowitz Edelman & Dicker
Winston & Strawn

THE AMLAW 200 highlighted in blue.
Notable Cases

In testing, developing and presenting your client’s best case, you’ll want the benefit of our broad experience.

Gredd v. Bear, Stearns Securities Corp.
Bankruptcy action: Failure to conduct diligent inquiry into fraud perpetrated by Manhattan Investment Fund. Claim for $141 million.
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

In Re: JDS Uniphase Securities Litigation
Securities class action: Misrepresentation and insider trading. Claim for $20 billion.
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

In Re: Visa Check/Mastermoney Antitrust Litigation
Antitrust. Claim for $75 billion.
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: settlement

Lamken v. Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe
Employment: wrongful termination
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Florida State Board of Administration v. Alliance Capital Management
Breach of contract. Claim for $300 million.
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Davis v. Louisiana-Pacific Corp.
Class action: product liability
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Kendall-Jackson Winery v. E&J Gallo Winery
Trade dress
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Workmen’s Auto Insurance Co. v. Guy Carpenter Insurance et al.
Breach of reinsurance contract
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Stapper v. Genie Corporation
Product liability
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

STPUD v. Exxon
Toxic tort: MTBE groundwater contamination
- Our client: Defendant Exxon
- Verdict: settlement Exxon, verdict for plaintiff against remaining defendants

Henday v. 3Com Corporation
Employment: age discrimination
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

TA Instruments v. PerkinElmer Corp.
Patent infringement
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

MGE UPS Systems v. General Electric/PMI et al.
Copyright infringement
- Our client: Plaintiff
- Verdict: $5 million for the plaintiff

ING Bank N.V. v. J.P. Morgan Chase Bank et al.
Breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud.
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: settlement

Thrush v. Inland Container
Employment: wrongful termination
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Smith v. Church & Dwight
Product liability
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Betty Pi v. IBM
Race discrimination/sexual harassment
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Fraud
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant
### Notable Cases

In testing, developing and presenting your client’s best case, you’ll want the benefit of our broad experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Description</th>
<th>Plaintiff/Defendant</th>
<th>Verdict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Elhertani v. Level One Communications (Intel)**  
Employment  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Hoy v. City of Concord**  
Dangerous roadway/death  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **CAL X-TRA v. Phoenix Holdings**  
Aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty.  
Claim for $210 million compensatory damages plus punitive.  
- Our client: **Plaintiff**  
- Verdict: **$360 million for the plaintiff ($210 million compensatory plus $150 million punitive damages)** | | |
| **Ilse Eng v. Santa Clara Valley Water District**  
Race discrimination  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Knott v. State of California (CHP)**  
Wrongful death  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **LoGuercio v. United Airlines**  
Employment  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Tucker v. REI Equipment**  
Product liability  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **DeRosa v. Digital Equipment Corp.**  
Product liability  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **California Housing v. KPMG Peat Marwick**  
Accounting malpractice  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Chua v. AT&T**  
Race discrimination/sexual harassment  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Story v. Unocal**  
Employment: wrongful termination  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Ligon v. Northwestern University**  
Medical malpractice  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Agere v. Atmel**  
Patent infringement  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Unisys v. Accenture**  
Breach of contract  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **settlement** | | |
| **Isuzu Motors v. Consumers Union**  
Libel  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Kelly v. Sierra-at-Tahoe**  
Personal injury  
- Our client: **Defendant**  
- Verdict: **for the defendant** | | |
| **Park Electrochemical/Nelco Technology v. Delco Electronics/Delphi**  
Breach of contract  
- Our client: **Plaintiff**  
- Verdict: **$30 Million for the plaintiff** | | |
Notable Cases

In testing, developing and presenting your client’s best case, you’ll want the benefit of our broad experience.

Val King v. Shell Oil Company
Premises liability: toxic exposure
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: settlement

Estate of Nicole Brown Simpson v. O.J. Simpson
Wrongful death
- Our client: Plaintiff: children of Nicole Brown Simpson
- Verdict: $34.5 million for the plaintiff

Atmel v. St Paul Fire and Marine
Insurance bad faith
- Our client: Plaintiff
- Verdict: settlement

Studdard v. State of California
Dangerous roadway
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Shell Trademark Management v. Canadian American Oil Co.
Trademark
- Our client: Plaintiff
- Verdict: settlement

Tridelta Industries & Pitco Frialator v. Frymaster Corp.
Patent infringement
- Our client: Plaintiff
- Verdict: for the plaintiff

Quadrant Corporation v. First Interstate Bank of California
Breach of Contract
- Our client: Plaintiff
- Verdict: $15,250,000 for the plaintiff

Montano v. CalTrans
Dangerous condition of roadway
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Visser v. D&W Food Centers
Employment: sexual harassment
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Lloyds TSB Bank PLC v. Bank One, N.A. et al.
Breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, fraud
- Our client: Defendant (JPMorgan Chase)
- Verdict: settlement

In Re: Joint Defense Brand Name PDA Litigation
Antitrust
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Varian Medical Systems v. Delfino and Day
Internet libel
- Our client: Plaintiff
- Verdict: $775,000 for the plaintiff

Maghrabi v. Advanced Micro Devices (AMD)
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defense

Securities
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant

Stull v. Bank of America
Unfair business practices/Professional negligence
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: settlement

Mosten Management Co. v. Zurich American
Insurance coverage
- Our client: Plaintiff
- Verdict: $20 million for the plaintiff

Acree v. General Motors Acceptance Corporation
Professional negligence: malpractice
- Our client: Defendant
- Verdict: for the defendant
For immediate support, call our toll-free number:  
800.233.5879

or contact a consultant directly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph A. Rice, Ph.D.</td>
<td>925.932.6944</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrice@juryresearchinstitute.com">jrice@juryresearchinstitute.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Jones, Ph.D.</td>
<td>541.734.9268</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjones@juryresearchinstitute.com">sjones@juryresearchinstitute.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>925.932.5663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>