

inquired as to answering question #3 in the event their answer to either question #1 or #2 was in the affirmative. At that point, it clearly appeared that the jury found Plaintiff to have been discriminated against in his employment by Envirodyne Engineers, Inc. Subsequently, when the jury returned their verdict, the jury found the answers to interrogatories #1 and #2 to be in the negative and further answered questions #3, #4 and #5. These answers by the jury were in direct contradiction to the specific and clear instructions stated by the Court within the jury interrogatories that only required the answering of these questions in the event either questions #1 or #2 were answered by the jury in the affirmative. Thus, this Court should not rely upon the answers provided by the jury in the special jury interrogatories with regard to Plaintiff's claim of national origin discrimination that is pending before this Honorable Court.

In summation, the decision by this Court does not rest on a complicated legal analysis, but rather on a careful and scrutinizing review of the facts. These facts have been briefly reviewed herein. A summary of eight facts clearly indicate the discrimination that Plaintiff incurred and Defendant's attempted "cover-up" of this discrimination. These eight facts are:

1. Plaintiff's supervisor testified in Court that cyanide was rarely found, yet he later admitted in Court that Plaintiff