

Merle Norman v. Clipper Magazine

THE CLIENT: Holland & Knight, LLP

THE CASE: This RICO and fraud case, heard at the US District Court in Islip, New York, involved a co-op advertising program that was conducted fraudulently by the defendant.

THE TRIAL: Due to the nature of the evidence, including contracts and advertisements, Holland & Knight decided to use court [technology](#) in their presentation of the case. Because their courtroom was not outfitted with evidence presentation technology, Holland & Knight turned to DOAR for technological [support](#). DOAR delivered flat panel monitors for counsel, the witness and judge, and two 42" plasma screens for the benefit of the jury. These screens allowed counsel to display key documents to members of the court simultaneously providing a clear view of the evidence to all participants. In addition, a DOAR technician handled all aspects of the technology enabling counsel to focus on building a rapport with jurors.

- Strategy and jury research findings were woven into courtroom [demonstratives](#) including exhibit boards, PowerPoint presentations and illustrative support for key witnesses. 17 exhibit boards were presented to jurors outlining critical issues of the case and facts of law that substantiated closing arguments. A blend of video/audio clips, digital presentations, static boards and trial presentation software (Sanction) resulted in a seamless, compelling case on behalf of our client.
- Attorneys for the plaintiff added a DOAR technician to their team during the trial. This addition of technical expertise allowed counsel to remain focused on the case and direct their full attention to the needs of their client. The DOAR technician orchestrated a seamless presentation while blending into the background. According to one juror on the case, "The entire jury absolutely loved him [DOAR technician] and I believe that his presence helped create an affinity between the jury and the plaintiff's team."

Is Norman Entitled to Reimbursement?			
Expenses	Paid By	Norman's Out-of-Pocket Expenses	
		Yes	No
Car Registration	KCDC/American Express	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Car Tax and Title	KCDC/American Express	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Re-registration	KCDC/American Express	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gas	KCDC/American Express	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Maintenance	KCDC/American Express	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Insurance	KCDC/American Express	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Out of Pocket Expenses = No Reimbursement

THE OUTCOME: The verdict was on behalf of the plaintiff. Compensatory damages of \$420,192.64 and a punitive award of \$7.5 million