

Hon. Stephen E. Haberfeld
JAMS
555 W. 5th St. , 32nd Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Tel: 213-253-9704
Fax: 213-620-0100

Arbitrator

JAMS

MARC J. RANDAZZA,

Claimant,

v.

EXCELSIOR MEDIA CORP., a Nevada
Corp.; LIBERTY MEDIA HOLDINGS, LLC,
a California limited liability company; and
JASON GIBSON, individually

Respondents.

) JAMS No. 1260002283

) INTERIM ARBITRATION AWARD

I, THE UNDERSIGNED ARBITRATOR --- in accordance with the arbitration provision in Section 8 of the Contract For Employment Agreement As General Counsel Between Marc J. Randazza and Excelsior Media Corp., dated June 6/10, 2009 ("employment agreement"), and based upon careful consideration of the evidence, the parties' written submissions and applicable law, and good cause appearing --- make the following findings, conclusions, determinations ("determinations") and this Interim Arbitration Award, as follows:

DETERMINATIONS

1. The determinations in this Interim Arbitration Award include factual determinations by the Arbitrator, which the Arbitrator has determined to be true and necessary to this award. To the extent that the Arbitrator's determinations differ from any party's positions, that is the result of determinations as to relevance, burden of proof considerations, and the weighing of the evidence.

2. The Arbitrator has jurisdiction over the subject matter and over the parties to the arbitration which are as follows: Claimant and Counter-Respondent Marc J. Randazza ("Mr. Randazza"), Respondents and Counterclaimants Excelsior Media Corp. ("Excelsior"), Liberty Media Holdings, LLC ("Liberty"), and Respondent Jason Gibson.¹

3. On February 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13, 2015, the Arbitrator held in-person evidentiary sessions on the merits of the parties' respective claims, counterclaims and contentions. All witnesses who testified did so under oath and subject to cross-examination. All offered exhibits were received in evidence.

4. This Interim Arbitration Award is timely rendered. See Order of June 1, 2015.

5. The following is a summary of the Arbitrator's principal merits determinations:

¹ Except as otherwise stated or indicated by context, "E/L" shall be used to reference Excelsior and Liberty, collectively and interchangeably for convenience in this Interim Arbitration Award, only. Nothing should be inferred or implied that there is any determination, or basis for any determination, that either or both of those entities are "alter egos" of Jason Gibson or of any person or entity. Mr. Randazza failed to sustain his burden of proof that either Excelsior or Liberty were or are "alter egos" of Respondent Jason Gideon or of any person or entity. Mr. Gideon will be dismissed as a party in this arbitration. See Interim Arbitration Award, Par. 9, at p. 29, *infra*.

A. Mr. Randazza voluntarily ended his employment by Excelsior and Liberty.

B. Mr. Randazza's employment by Excelsior and Liberty was not involuntarily terminated by Excelsior, Liberty or at all.²

C. Whether or not Mr. Randazza's employment by E/L was terminated voluntarily by Mr. Randazza or involuntarily by E/L, the principal proximate cause for the ending of Mr. Randazza's employment was Mr. Randazza's breaches of fiduciary duty and the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, implied in his employment agreement, as an employee, executive and general counsel of E/L. The precipitating events which led to the end of Mr. Randazza's employment was Mr. Gideon's having first learned on August 13, 2012 that Mr. Randazza had been involved in and successfully concluded negotiations for a bribe in the amount of \$75,000, to be paid to Mr. Randazza by the other side in connection with resolution of high-importance litigation, commonly referred to as the "Oron litigation," which had been initiated and pursued on behalf of E/L by Mr. Randazza, as E/L's counsel of record. The first indication of that was Mr. Gideon's noticing a provision included in an execution copy of an Oron settlement agreement, presented to him for signature by Mr. Randazza on that date, and Mr. Gideon's inquiring of Mr. Randazza about that provision.

After initial contacts with Mr. Randazza concerning what Mr. Gideon discovered in the Oron settlement agreement, communications and relations between Messrs. Gideon and Randazza noticeably chilled during Mr. Randazza's remaining employment, which ended on August 29, 2012.

² While not accepting Mr. Randazza's "core contentions" concerning the end of his employment by E/L, the Arbitrator agrees with Mr. Randazza's assertion that "The nature of Mr. Randazza's departure from Excelsior is central to several of his causes of action, and crucial to the defenses Respondents raise" --- including whether there was a breach of contract, wrongful termination, constructive termination and/or retaliatory termination. Reply at p. 7:12-15. As also stated elsewhere herein, none of those claims were proven.

The chilled relations, including greatly reduced communication, was in stark contrast with the custom and practice of Messrs. Gibson and Randazza, practically right up to August 13, 2012, being in regular, frequent, cordial and occasionally sexually-peppered communication with each other by face-to-face meetings, texting and emails.

That Mr. Gideon's reaction was not feigned or a pretext for anything asserted by Mr. Randazza in his competing narrative are shown by the following:

1. A sudden and significant reduction of those previously primarily electronic (i.e., email and text) communications --- beginning only after Mr. Gideon learned of the \$75,000 bribe --- with Mr. Randazza sending Mr. Gideon unresponded-to emails attempting to attempt to salvage and revive his communications and relationship with Mr. Gideon.
2. Mr. Randazza beat a hasty retreat, in an attempt to salvage the situation by offering to pay the bribe money over to E/L, when initially confronted by Mr. Gideon concerning the "bribe" provision in the Oron settlement agreement, presented for Mr. Gideon's signature.
3. Mr. Gideon did not timely sign the execution copy of the Oron settlement agreement, as negotiated and presented to him by Mr. Randazza.

D. The ending of Mr. Randazza's employment E/L was not --- as contended by Mr. Randazza --- (1) constructive discharge, proximately caused by Mr. Gibson becoming distant and out-of-communication with Mr. Randazza, which made it difficult or impossible for Mr. Randazza to get needed instructions or direction in his employment by E/L as their general counsel, leading to Mr. Randazza's August 29, 2012 email of resignation from employment, or (2) retaliatory termination, which was caused by Mr. Randazza's having "expressed his feelings" of having been "upset, betrayed, offended, and

stressed" anything of a sexual nature whatsoever --- including, as highlighted during hearing, a pornographic video shot in Mr. Randazza's office in April, 2012 or a homosexual oral copulation allegedly performed by Mr. Gideon and another E/L executive in the backseat of Mr. Randazza's car, which allegedly greatly upset Mr. Randazza while he was driving his passengers back from a party aboard Mr. Gideon's boat on August 9, 2012.

E. The immediately foregoing Determination's repeated use of the word "allegedly" is because it is not necessary to resolve a conflict of evidence as to whether the alleged sexual act in Mr. Randazza's car actually occurred or the degree of upset it caused Mr. Randazza, if it actually occurred. That is because the Arbitrator has determined that --- contrary to Mr. Randazza's central contentions in this arbitration --- the factual and legal cause of the end of Mr. Randazza's employment had nothing whatsoever to do with anything having to do with alleged sexual activity in Mr. Randazza's car --- alone or taken together with a pornographic shoot which, without dispute, occurred in his office, without prior notice to Mr. Randazza, but which the evidence shows did not occur as alleged, was not strongly or even negatively reacted to by Mr. Randazza as initially alleged and did not, as shot or shown, include a photograph of Mr. Randazza's family, as initially presented by Mr. Randazza.

The foregoing determination includes that anything relating to sex --- including in connection with a filmed video in Mr. Randazza's E/L office or in the back seat of his car --- had nothing whatsoever to do with any decision --- which the Arbitrator has determined was neither made or considered --- to terminate Mr. Randazza's E/L employment. 2012. There was no E/L contrived pretext or any retaliation by E/L in connection with the cessation of Mr. Randazza's E/L employment, which was entirely voluntary on

/////

/////

Mr. Randazza's part.³ For those reasons, the Arbitrator has determined that Mr. Randazza failed to sustain his burden of proof required to establish his claims of and relating to anything having to do with sex --- e.g., sexual harassment, hostile work environment, constructive termination, retaliatory termination, etc.

F. As stated above --- and as picked up and amplified later in the Determinations portion of this Award --- since the outset of the arbitration, Mr. Randazza made highly-charged, sexually-based "core allegations" and his claimed strong reactions to them in support of his statutory and contractual claims, which were in the main disproved or not proved. That failure of proof undermined and impaired Mr. Randazza's credibility concerning all of his

//////

//////

//////

testimony and his claims and related contentions.⁴ The evidence established at hearing was that Mr. Randazza intended that his allegations would induce

³ The same is true with respect to Mr. Randazza's contention(s) that Mr. Gideon's discovery of Mr. Randazza having been involved with and negotiating a \$75,000 "bribe" in connection with a settlement of the Oron litigation was a pretext for an earlier-formed intention by Mr. Gideon to end Mr. Randazza's E/L employment.

⁴ Mr. Randazza's credibility was also undermined by the variance between his testimony and positions at hearing and his written Nevada State Bar submission concerning the Oron litigation \$75,000 bribe --- including what, if anything, Mr. Gideon knew about it and when, and who solicited the bribe in the first instance.

Mr. Randazza's credibility was also undermined by the variance between his testimony and his EEOC submission. At hearing, Mr. Randazza admitted that the EEOC complaint contained errors, but tried to explain them away by saying that he did not prepare it. That is not a sufficient excuse or explanation, in the circumstances.

Resolving a credibility-related issue presented in the post-hearing briefs concerning asserted testimonial evasiveness implied by Mr. Randazza's body positioning and whether he had eye contact with the Arbitrator (as asserted by Mr. Randazza in his Reply), throughout his extensive testimony at hearing and primarily on cross-examination, the Arbitrator observed that Mr. Randazza sat sideways in his chair, relative to Claimant's counsel's table --- with his back to (i.e., 180 degrees away from) his own counsel and 90 degrees away from Respondent's counsel --- albeit with his seated body positioned toward the part of the wall behind and to Mr. Randazza's left from

Mr. Gideon to authorize a settlement financially favorable to Mr. Randazza, based on Mr. Randazza's belief at the time --- and ultimately proven incorrect --- that Mr. Gideon would so settle, rather than have to litigate true or false allegations relating to his own sexuality, sexual activity, and the pornographic nature of E/L's business. Mr. Randazza's miscalculation, as aforesaid, led to an

where the Arbitrator was seated. Mr. Randazza almost always listened to questions and answered in that position --- leaning well forward and looking down or straight ahead into "middle distance" in the direction of the wall behind where the Arbitrator was seated. Mr. Randazza rarely answered a question on cross-examination with sustained eye contact with either the questioning attorney or the Arbitrator.

The Arbitrator has determined, based on the evidence, that Mr. Randazza solicited the bribe in the first instance, attempted to negotiate with Oron's counsel ways and means whereby it would be concealed from and not become known by E/L, and disclosed it to E/L, per Mr. Gideon, for the first time only on August 13, 2012, when the settlement documentation prepared and presented for Mr. Gideon's signature on behalf of E/L by Oron's counsel surfaced a \$75,000 retainer payment to Mr. Randazza.

The Arbitrator has further determined that E/L never gave Mr. Randazza permission or consent to solicit, negotiate or accept the \$75,000 bribe,* or any bribe or any other payment other than payment of all proceeds being solely for the benefit of and deposited to the account of his clients/principals, E/L.

[*On August 13, 2013, Mr. Gideon handwrote an arrow and "Who gets this" next to the \$75,000 payment provision in the copy of the execution copy of the Oron settlement agreement presented to him by Mr. Randazza. The Arbitrator credits that notation as being first notice to and genuine surprise expressed by Mr. Gideon about any Oron settlement payment not being made directly to E/L.

[That notation also was the genesis of a rapid unraveling of the theretofore close professional and personal relationship, symbolized by Mr. Gideon's sharply reducing communications with Mr. Randazza and Mr. Randazza's repeated and ultimately unsuccessful efforts to salvage his situation, by attempting to re-establish direct contact with Mr. Gideon. As previously stated, the Arbitrator has not accepted Mr. Randazza's central contention and narrative that this state of affairs, triggered on August 13, 2012, was manufactured by Mr. Gideon and served as a convenient or other pretext for an earlier-decided termination of Mr. Randazza's employment.]

The Arbitrator has not accepted that E/L's knowledge of or informed consent to any such situation can be implied by non-objection and silence in response to an unspecific, Delphic allusion in one of Mr. Randazza's emails prior to August 13, 2012 or to Mr. Randazza's after-the-fact, self-serving reference to alleged earlier communications, wherein Mr. Randazza claimed in the later email to have "fully disclosed...overtures about that."

In addition, except for admissions, anything which Mr. Randazza and his opposing counsel in the Oron litigation, Val Gurvitz, communicated to each other lacked credibility, because Mr. Randazza testified that he and Mr. Gurvitz routinely lied to each other in their settlement communications.

ultimately successful counterattack by E/L, via counterclaims in this arbitration, centering on ethical and legal challenges to Mr. Randazza's conduct as E/L's general counsel and litigation counsel during his employment by E/L. Mr. Randazza's alleged misconduct consisted of engaging in ethically-prohibited negotiations with adverse parties, including concerning monetary "bribes" to "conflict (Mr. Randazza) out" from future litigation, further damaging E/L's recovery in the Oron litigation by knowingly forwarding illegally "hacked" computer data to counsel for another company, without authorization and in contravention of an E/L settlement agreement, engaging in other prohibited conflicts of interest, including representing competitors of E/L, not disclosing and not obtaining informed written client consents from E/L where actual or potential conflicts of interest arose, working and not disclosing that he was working as a practicing lawyer on non-E/L matters during his employment significantly in excess of what was contractually permitted, spoliation of evidence to cover up the foregoing and his undisclosed intention to resign from E/L's employment, including via planning and causing the deletion of legal files and other relevant data from E/L-owned computers, taking control of client funds, in form of Oron litigation settlement proceeds, and refusing to unconditionally release the same to E/L.

G. As stated above, Mr. Randazza voluntarily ended his employment by E/L. The principal evidence of that consisted of (1) Mr. Randazza's August 29, 2012 email to Mr. Gideon, (2) days before sending Mr. Gideon his August 29 email, Mr. Randazza cleaned out his personal belongings from his office, (3) shortly after Noon on August 28 --- and more than 24 hours before sending his August 29 email to Mr. Gideon --- Mr. Randazza had his corporate laptop computer "wiped" the first of four times during his last week of employment, and (4) before that, Mr. Randazza was overheard to say "Fuck this shit, I quit," following a company "happy hour" event.

H. In his August 29, 2012 email to Mr. Gideon, Mr. Randazza stated that he could no longer represent the Company, i.e., E/L.⁵ In the circumstances then known, Mr. Gideon and other E/L executives with whom he consulted reasonably, and not hastily,⁶ concluded from their review of Mr. Randazza's August 29, 2012 email that Mr. Randazza had resigned from his employment. Their conclusion was proven accurate by facts which became known after Mr. Randazza's departure. Any actions taken by them based on that reasonable belief did not result in any involuntary termination of Mr. Randazza's E/L employment.

I. The lack of absolute, unquestionable, pristine clarity in Mr. Randazza's August 29, 2012 carefully worded and crafted email that he was resigning his employment was deliberate.

J. In addition to Mr. Randazza's disputed, disproved and unproved allegations of sexual conduct engaged in or authorized by is important evidence which established that Mr. Randazza was not either (1) a target of any discriminatory or conduct which created a hostile work environment, because of his being a heterosexual or "straight" male, or (2) offended by any of the sexually-related conduct of which he has complained.

K. Prior to and subsequent to agreeing to go "in house" as E/L's general counsel, Mr. Randazza was outside counsel to several companies engaged in Internet pornography, including videos and stills available on openly homosexual websites. Since at least the date of the commencement of his employment as E/L's inside general counsel through his last day of E/L employment, Mr. Randazza knew of and was not in any way uncomfortable with Mr. Gideon's gay sexual orientation --- which was also that of most, but not all,

⁵ Mr. Randazza also said he could "potentially" work to wind up his E/L pending matters. The Arbitrator interprets the inclusion of that to be part of Mr. Randazza's crafted effort to both resign and leave open his attempt to engage Mr. Gideon directly.

⁶ The Arbitrator has not accepted Mr. Randazza's assertion that "Respondents hastily decided to call that [August 29, 2012 email] a resignation." Mr. Randazza's Reply at p. 7:20-21.

in the back seat of his car on August 9, 2012 was not genuinely or deeply felt and was made primarily for tactical reasons. Therefore, the end of Mr. Randazza's employment was not and was not the product of anything retaliatory, in violation of public policy (e.g., engaging in protected activity), as a matter of law.

Moreover, the preponderance of the evidence is that Mr. Randazza had advance notice of the filming of a pornographic video in his office and that he did not either object or indicate that the noticed shoot was in any way objectionable or offensive to him. That evidence is the playful exchange of texts between Messrs. Randazza and Gideon concerning the intended shoot and the testimony of the director of the shoot, Chaz Vorrias, who testified that he advised Mr. Randazza of the shoot in advance and received no objection from Mr. Randazza.⁸

M. Contrary to the strong impression created by Mr. Randazza's pre-Arbitration Hearing narrative of allegations, there was no evidence that any photograph(s) of his wife or children or anything personal of or concerning Mr. Randazza or any member of his family, or in any way reasonably violative of their respective personal privacy, were used or visible in the video. The (possible) visibility of a painting on the wall of Mr. Randazza's office, which was painted by Mr. Randazza's wife, is not to the contrary.

In the circumstances, there was no action taken which was either statutorily offensive or hostile.

N. Mr. Randazza's California Labor Code-based claims --- for Excelsior's failure to (1) pay him his final wages in August 2012 (2nd Claim) or (2) reimburse and indemnify his for business expenses incurred by him in during 2012 (1st Claim) --- fail as a matter of law. The same is true for Mr. Randazza's

⁸ Mr. Vorrias testimony was not unfair surprise, Mr. Vorrias's admitted deletion of his emails with Mr. Randazza was done without knowledge of their significance in connection with the dispute underlying this arbitration and, in the event, is not attributable to either Excelsior or Liberty, because he was not a managing agent of either entity.

claim for payment of all of his wage-related claims --- including payment of raises, bonuses and repayment of his \$25,000 loan. That is because --- at all times relevant to those California Labor Code claims, since June 2011, Mr. Randazza worked and lived in Nevada, to which Mr. Randazza relocated, as did E/L, in order to continue as E/L's general counsel. As stated or indicated in a pretrial ruling bearing on the same issue, (1) the California Labor Code, presumptively, does not apply extraterritorially,⁹ and does not apply to the facts and circumstances of this case, and relatedly, (2) that determination, concerning Mr. Randazza's non-contractual claims, is unaffected by the California-as-governing-substantive-law provision of Mr. Randazza's employment agreement with Excelsior, which applies and controls only as to breach-of-contract claims and not, as in this instance, Mr. Randazza's statutory claims.¹⁰

In the event, Mr. Randazza was properly compensated for all services as to which he has asserted statutory and contractual claims.¹¹

O. Mr. Randazza's claim for unpaid wages and penalties under Nevada NRS Sec.608.050 (3rd Claim) fails as a matter of law, because there is no private right of action for enforcement of that statute. It is therefore not necessary to decide whether the a claim has been stated under that statute.

P. As to Mr. Randazza's contractual claims --- which are governed by the Employment Agreement, including the provision that California law governs its interpretation and enforcement, etc. --- (1) Mr. Randazza is not entitled to a contractual severance payment, because he voluntarily resigned his

⁹ Sullivan v. Oracle Corp., 51 Cal.4th 1191, 12016 (2011); Wright v. Adventures Rolling Cross Country, Inc., 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 104378 (N.D. Cal. 2012) (presumption against extraterritorial application of state law applies to unpaid wage claims under California Labor Code, plus "situs of the work" is the most important factor in determining extraterritoriality, trumping residency and where wages are paid).

¹⁰ See, e.g., Narayan v. EGL, Inc., 616 F.3d 895, 899 (9th Cir. 2010).

¹¹ For example, Mr. Randazza's bonuses were to be based on net and gross amounts (which he acknowledged prior to the end of his employment), claimed compensation raises were discretionary. Whatever Mr. Randazza was paid as compensation and bonuses is subject to the remedy of disgorgement.

employment,¹² (2) Mr. Randazza is not entitled to any payment for expenses in connection with the annual International Trademark Association Conference, which he did not attend, and (3) Mr. Randazza's bonuses were to be paid on "net" amount, not "gross" amounts, as contended by Mr. Randazza. In the event, E/L has been legally excused from any obligation to make any further contractual payment, by reason of Mr. Randazza's material breaches of contract with respect to the his obligations under the same contract, Mr. Randazza's employment agreement. That is so under contract law principles --- separate and apart from equitable principles, which are also applicable to contract claims, including the equitable doctrine of unclean hands, which is applicable to Mr. Randazza's contract claims.

Q. Turning to E/L's counterclaims, Mr. Randazza owed fiduciary duties to E/L, because he was their in-house general counsel and their attorney of record in judicial civil actions, and an E/L executive and employee. As such, Mr. Randazza owed E/L, as his clients, employers and principals, the highest duty of loyalty and honesty in the performance of his professional and executive obligations. That duty --- among other things --- included legal and ethical duties of acting honestly and solely for the benefit of his clients/employers/principals, avoiding acting inconsistently with those duties, and where actual or potential conflicts of interests existed to make full written disclosure of the same and to obtain informed written consents from his clients/principals as to each and every such conflict of interest. Each and all of Mr. Randazza's ethical duties owed to his principals/clients was a legal fiduciary duty owed to them. Mr. Randazza violated those fiduciary duties owed by him to E/L, as his principals/clients/employers --- including by the following:

¹² See Pars. 5(A), (B) and (G), supra, concerning Mr. Randazza's having voluntarily ended his E/L employment, including via and as evidenced by written and verbal and non-verbal conduct. Mr. Randazza was contractually entitled to payment equivalent to 12-week severance only if his employment was involuntarily terminated.

(1) engaging in negotiations for monetary bribes to be paid to him --- including the "Oron \$75,000" which Mr. Gideon noticed, without Mr. Randazza's affirmative disclosure of it ---- which would result in his being "conflicted out" of future litigation or any disputes with parties then and/or in the future with

//////

//////

//////

interests adverse to E/L's interests (e.g., Oron, TNA),¹³ (2) taking control for his personal benefit of, and refusing to relinquish control over, Oron settlement funds --- all of which ought to have been for the benefit and under the direction and control of his principals/clients E/L, before and after the end of his employment and representations on behalf of E/L --- (3) Mr. Randazza's ordering and causing the deliberate "wiping" of his and legal assistant's corporate laptops, as an integral part of his planned resignation as E/L's General

¹³ It is irrelevant that none of Mr. Randazza's negotiations concerning bribes --- including the Oron bribe --- resulted in an actual bribe payment. See Mr. Randazza's Reply at pp.4:24-5:1: "Yet despite years of discovery in this matter, Respondents have not been able to point to a single 'bribe' paid to Mr. Randazza, or a single consummated deal between him and the opposing party."* The Arbitrator has accepted, as an admission by Mr. Randazza that "he repeatedly engaged in these 'bribe' negotiations," but the Arbitrator has not accepted Mr. Randazza's testimony and further contention that he did so "because they were par for the course in dealing with counsel for infringers and because engaging in them was the best way to soften up the other side and get more money for respondents." Id., at p. 5:2-5.

In this arbitration, Mr. Randazza has established a virtually unbroken pattern of asserting a legal/fiduciary variant of the sports cliché, "No harm, no foul." The Arbitrator has not accepted those assertions --- including, for example, a professional or fiduciary duty has been violated, whether spoliation has been committed, etc.

Counsel and outside counsel of record, and (4) Mr. Randazza's continuing and undisclosed (and thus unconsented-to) legal work for clients (e.g., Bang Bros., XVideos, XNXX, Porn Garian, Titan Media, Kink), whose interests were actually and potentially adverse to E/L's interests.¹⁴

R. The Arbitrator respectfully disagrees with Mr. Randazza's expert witnesses, who respectively testified that, under both Nevada and California rules of ethics and/or professional responsibility, there were no violations of fiduciary duty, if and because they concluded that there was no resulting harm.

The "fact of damage" or proximate cause is not an essential element of either "duty" or "breach of duty" --- but rather a separate element of a claim or cause of The Arbitrator's disagreement with Mr. Randazza's expert witnesses centers

Whether or not Mr. Randazza's breaches of fiduciary duty proximately resulted in damages sustained by Excelsior, Liberty or both of them --- as a matter of sound public policy --- Mr. Randazza should not be allowed to retain any pecuniary or legal benefit resulting from or closely connected to those breaches.

For example, Mr. Randazza has included in his defense of his admitted deletion of files and other legal information via multiple wipings of company-owned computers the assertion that Respondents have not been able to show any damage resulting from those multiple wipings. This is another of Mr. Randazza's assertions in this arbitration of "No harm, no foul" --- which the Arbitrator has not accepted, primarily because of the violations of duties constituting and/or including fiduciary duties. Ethical and other violations of

¹⁴ Mr. Randazza's legal work for non-E/L clients --- independent of the violations of Mr. Randazza's ethical and fiduciary duties --- were significantly beyond the contractually-permitted scope under his employment agreement. The Arbitrator may award the equivalent to amounts of funds ordered to be immediately turned over by Mr. Randazza to E/L. See Interim Arbitration Award, Par.

fiduciary duties do not require "fact of harm" to be shown by a preponderance of the evidence or otherwise.

Moreover, in the circumstances of (1) multiple ethical violations having been shown to have been committed by Mr. Randazza --- including negotiating for and in the instance of the Oron settlement agreeing to a "bribe" to be conflicted out of future litigation with adverse settling parties and other conflicts of interest --- and (2) Mr. Randazza's ethical challenges shown in this arbitration, there should be a presumption of "fact of harm" caused to E/L by Mr. Randazza's conduct and, additionally, a presumption of Mr. Randazza's intention to harm his clients by wiping everything off of his and his legal assistant's company-owned computers.

As E/L's inside general counsel and employee, Mr. Randazza had a legal and fiduciary duty --- no later than when his employment ceased, regardless of whether or not with or without cause and/or by whom ended --- to deliver every file and other piece of data and/or information --- complete, intact and undeleted, unmodified and immediately accessible and usable by E/L. That included all files and data stored on the computers entrusted to Mr. Randazza and his legal assistant Erika Dillon for their use by and on behalf of E/L. Because of his noncompliance, indeed resistance to compliance with those duties, they continued and continue to the day of the rendering of this award --- including beyond Mr. Randazza's belated and resisted turnover of one of the laptop computers --- because another laptop entrusted to Mr. Randazza remains unreturned. Those continuing fiduciary duties owed by him to E/L exist, including by reason of his exclusive control over the computers and thus superior knowledge of what was on each computer's hard drive before and after he had everything on the returned laptops completely and multiply deleted --- including prior and in contemplation of his planned resignation on August 29, 2012.

In the circumstances, Mr. Randazza's generalized and unspecified claims of privacy --- in attempted justification of his ordered complete and multiple wipings of company-owned computers --- cannot be accorded weight or credibility. By the same token, that ordered conduct raises an inference that whatever was deleted was known and intended by Mr. Randazza to be harmful to him and any claims and contentions which he might make in any dispute with E/L --- i.e., deliberate spoliation, in addition to conversion.

Mr. Randazza cannot escape liability for spoliation or conversion --- or, additionally, violation of his fiduciary duties as an employee, executive and general counsel of E/L, by reason of the same conduct --- by claiming, as he has, that Respondents have not shown any specific or tangible injury by reason of his conduct in causing company-owned computers to be completely wiped of all data prior to their resisted and belated return. In the circumstances --- and paraphrasing former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld --- neither Respondent should bear any burden or responsibility to come forward with any evidence of damage, when they do not know what they do not know. As stated above --- with his actual exclusive knowledge of what was on the computers' hard drives, before and because he ordered them to be completely wiped and, in the instance of his returned laptop, multiply wiped before ultimate return --- Mr. Randazza committed spoliation of evidence, as well as improper conversion of his employer's files, data and equipment and, in so doing, also violated his fiduciary duties owed to E/L.

S. The closure of the Nevada State Bar's file on the grievance filed by E/L has not been given any weight in this arbitration. The reasons for that are manifold, several of the most significant of which include the following: (1) the State Bar did not reach the merits of E/L's grievance, (2) even if it would have, the standard of evaluation would have been "clear and convincing evidence," rather than the standard applicable in this arbitration of "preponderance of the evidence," (3) Mr. Randazza's response to E/L's grievance contained at least one

material misrepresentation acknowledged during an evidentiary session in this arbitration (that he stopped representing XVideos in 2009), (4) the Nevada State Bar closed its file with an express statement that it has "no authority to take any action which could affect the outcome of any civil disputes or litigation, (5) many of the issues and much of the evidence presented in this arbitration (identities of represented entities, retainer and billing records, emails, etc.) was not available to be presented by E/L in support of its grievance (e.g., Mr. Randazza's assisting Datatech, including via forwarding fruits of a disclosed (unnamed) computer "hacker").

T. E/L was damaged in at least the amount of \$275,000, by reason of the Oron resettlement, as a direct and proximate result of events being set in motion by Mr. Randazza's violations of fiduciary duty and other duties, by his having secretly negotiated a \$75,000 bribe to conflict himself out from suing Oron in the future.

U. Mr. Randazza was unjustly enriched in the amount of \$60,000. Of that amount, \$55,000 was paid to and received by Mr. Randazza's law firm, rather than E/L, in connection with (1) Mr. Randazza's ostensibly pro bono representation in connection with the so-called "Righthaven cases," of which E/L was generally aware and consented to (A) with the understanding and on the condition that Mr. Randazza was acting as a faithful, compensated E/L employee, including in compliance with his employment agreement, with costs of the representation advanced by E/L, including compensation as employees of Mr. Randazza and his legal assistant Erika Dillon, and (2) unaware that compensation was to be or actually paid to Mr. Randazza, via his law firm, until after the fact, indeed after Mr. Randazza's resignation from E/L employment.¹⁵ Mr. Randazza also received \$5,000 from James Grady, in connection with E/L's Oron litigation. Although Mr. Randazza testified, without corroboration, that

¹⁵ Of the \$60,000 paid and received, (A) \$55,000 was court-awarded attorneys' fees, which were paid to Mr. Randazza's law firm, and (B) \$5,000 was paid by James Grady.

Mr. Grady's payment was used for Oron litigation expenses, Mr. Randazza did not disclose the receipt of the Grady \$5,000 payment to E/L. In the circumstances, and under principles of unjust enrichment, all compensation paid to or for the benefit of Mr. Randazza should have been paid directly to E/L or turned over to E/L by Mr. Randazza --- neither of which was done, immediately or ever.

V. Mr. Randazza materially breached his employment agreement with Excelsior by (1) acting as an attorney in connection with the TNAFlix litigation and the MegaUpload case, his concurrent representation of XVideos and/or XNXX during his employment by Excelsior and (2) spending significantly excessive time on non-Excelsior/Liberty matters beyond contractually-permitted time under his employment agreement with Excelsior and by failing to wind down his non-Excelsior/Liberty legal activities, as also provided in Mr. Randazza's employment agreement.¹⁶

The extent of Mr. Randazza's contractual material breaches made them also breaches of fiduciary duty --- regardless of whether or not those breaches of fiduciary duty were conflicts of interests, as some were.

W. Disgorgement of compensation paid by E/L to Mr. Randazza is an available remedy, which is appropriate in the circumstances of Mr. Randazza's clear and serious violations of fiduciary duty owed to E/L, and within the Arbitrator's discretion, based on the evidence in this arbitration.¹⁷

¹⁶ Mr. Randazza materially breached his employment agreement with Excelsior by maintaining a private law practice, with billed hours shown to be in excess of that permitted by that agreement, performing non-E/L legal services during the time he could and should have been performing services as E/L's General Counsel, and by failing or refusing, consistent with ethical duties and requirements, to reduce and taper off to zero his professional services for clients other than his employer, E/L.

The extent of Mr. Randazza's contractual material breaches made them also breaches of fiduciary duty --- regardless of whether or not those breaches of fiduciary duty were conflicts of interests, as some were.

¹⁷ See Burrow v. Arce, 997 S.W.2d 229 (Tex. 1999) ("Burrow") (remedy of forfeiture/disgorgement upheld, including court discretion to determine whether some or all compensation paid to attorney who breached fiduciary duty of loyalty owed to

//////

//////

//////

There is no requirement that causation or "fact of damage" be shown.¹⁸ There is no valid reason to distinguish between an executive who is "in house" general

client to be forfeited or disgorged, where clear and serious violation(s) of fiduciary duty shown).

¹⁸ That is because, among other reasons, one of the primary purposes of a remedy like forfeiture/disgorgement for breaches of fiduciary duty is to deter, not reward and to remove incentives of fiduciary disloyalty --- including by denying the benefits of disloyalty, regardless of provable or even actual harm to the principal, including after payment of compensation. As the Texas Supreme Court pertinently stated in Burrow in connection with the remedy of forfeiture/disgorgement as a deterrent and disincentive for an attorney or other agent to breach of fiduciary duty:

"Pragmatically, the possibility of forfeiture of compensation discourages an agent from taking personal advantage of his position of trust in every situation, no matter the circumstances, whether the principal may be injured or not.

The remedy of forfeiture removes any incentive for an agent to stray from his duty of loyalty based on the possibility that the principal will be unharmed or may have difficulty proving the existence of amount of damages."

The California cases cited by Claimant are distinguishable. Frye v. Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc., 38 Cal.4th 23 (2006) ("Frye"), Slovensky v. Friedman, 142 Cal.App. 4th 1518 (2006) ("Slovensky"). The appellate court's conclusion in Slovensky was based on its misreading and/or misstatement of the Supreme Court's holding and the basis and reasoning for its holding in Frye --- which was, in effect, a "one-off" opinion strongly driven by the facts and public policy considerations articulated and emphasized by the Supreme Court in the opinion. The Slovensky court's mistake is highlighted by its reliance on what it called the "Frye rule" --- which was no such thing, or at least not as stated and relied on by the court in Slovensky.

There would be little or no reason for the remedy of disgorgement, if there was a so-called "Frye rule" as misstated by the Slovensky court and urged by Mr. Randazza. If fact of damage and extent of damages must be proven by a preponderance of the evidence, in order to obtain disgorgement, that remedy would be rendered duplicative of the remedy of compensatory damages, except in name only. Moreover, the strong public policy to deter and remove any incentive for clear and serious violations of fiduciary duty - where injury to the client or other principal might be difficult or impossible to prove, as a matter of compensable damages - would be severely undermined.

In Frye, the California Supreme Court appears to have been offended by the plaintiff/client's overreach in the circumstances. The Court determined not that the remedy of disgorgement was legally unavailable but, rather, that its application --- in the

counsel and other corporate executives with respect to the availability of the remedy of forfeiture/disgorgement of compensation for breaches of fiduciary duty.¹⁹ While it might be less easy to determine the appropriate amount of disgorgement --- because, for example, the compensation paid is not a fixed percentage, as in an all-or-nothing legal or brokerage contingency fee arrangement, contractual hourly arrangements, etc. --- that is not a disqualifying factor or consideration. Considerations of proportionality and non-overlap with an award under other remedies are applicable.

Disgorgement will be applied to E/L-paid compensation received by Mr. Randazza in connection with litigation and other engagements on behalf of non-E/L clients --- in material breach of contract, while employed by E/L and beyond the significantly limited scope of his employment agreement (in terms of subject matter and time) and/or, in all events, in violation of his professional and fiduciary duties owed to his principal/client/employer, E/L. See Par. 1(V), above.

None of the expert witnesses who testified concerning breaches of legal ethics and fiduciary duties by attorneys and remedies for such breaches opined that disgorgement is unavailable in all instances. The Arbitrator had the

special context of a technical failure to properly register for the practice of law by a public interest non-profit organization, engaged in what the Court considered to be important, worthy public interest work, expressly supported by the Court (including by affirming very substantial statutory attorneys' fees awards, as stated in that opinion) --- was "grossly disproportionate to the wrongdoings" of the defendant there and therefore "would constitute a totally unwarranted windfall" to the plaintiff there. 38 Cal.4th, at p. 50. Frye, therefore, is distinguishable from the facts of this case.

Because the basis for its opinion was wrong, Slovensky is distinguishable or, more aptly, inapplicable to Mr. Randazza's proven clear and serious ethical and fiduciary breaches in this case.

¹⁹ See Zakibe v. Ahrens & McCarron, Inc., 28 S.W.3d 373, 385-386 (Mo. Ct. App. 2000) (executive's breaches of fiduciary duty resulted affirmed forfeiture of his right to "all compensation, including bonuses and severance pay to which he may have been entitled"); Riggs Investment Management Corp. v. Columbia Partners, LLC, 966 F. Supp. 1250, 1266-1267 (DDC 1997) (former chairman and CEO of corporation forfeited all salary, bonuses and other compensation paid from the time disloyal action began, as determined by the appellate court, to date of end of employment six months later).

sense, however, that Mr. Joseph Garin came close to opining that causation and/or "fact of damage" caused by an assumed breach of an ethical/fiduciary duty is or should be a prerequisite to the imposition of disgorgement, with which opinion the Arbitrator respectfully disagrees (if that is Mr. Garin's opinion).²⁰ In so opining, Mr. Garin (as did Mr. Randazza's California expert witness, Ms. Ellen Peck) testified that --- based on information provided by Mr. Randazza --- there was not a single instance of an ethical violation, with which the Arbitrator also respectfully agrees, based on all of the evidence adduced at hearing.

See Burrow v. Arce, 997 S.W.2d 229 (Tex. 1999) and Restatement of Agency 3d, Sec. 8.01 comment d(2).

X. While Mr. Randazza's obtaining Mr. Gideon's signature on the promissory note for Mr. Randazza's \$25,000 loan to E/L for Hong Kong legal fees was rife with ethical infirmities, in the exercise of the Arbitrator's discretion, the Arbitrator will not void the underlying loan. However --- again in the exercise of the Arbitrator's discretion --- the Arbitrator will limit the benefit of that decision to allowing Mr. Randazza to assert an offset, under this paragraph, to any and all amounts awarded on E/L's counterclaims, up to a maximum amount of \$25,000 (i.e., no interest) --- which right of offset shall be conditional upon Claimant's transfer to Respondent Liberty of all Oron settlement-related and other E/L funds held in Claimant's attorney trust account,²¹ plus interest at the legal rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from August 29, 2012.

Y. E/L are the prevailing parties in this arbitration. As such one or both of Respondents is or may be entitled to contractual attorneys fees under the employment agreement.²²

²⁰ Mr. Garin conceded, on cross-examination, that Section 37 of the Restatement 3rd of The Law Governing Lawyers does not say that a showing of actual monetary loss is required for disgorgement of attorney compensation.

²¹ See Interim Arbitration Award, Pars. 4 & 5, at p. 28, infra.

²² See Interim Arbitration Award, Pars. 8 at pp. 28-29, infra.

INTERIM ARBITRATION AWARD

Based upon careful consideration of the evidence, the applicable law, the parties' written submissions, the Determinations hereinabove set forth, and good cause appearing, the Interim Arbitration Award in this arbitration is as follows:

1. Claimant and Counter-Respondent Marc J. Randazza ("Claimant") shall take nothing by any of his claims set forth in his Amended Arbitration Demand.

2. Claimant shall pay Respondent(s) the following sums and amounts, as and for monetary damages in connection with Respondents' counterclaims. Said amounts are exclusive and non-duplicative of any amount separately and additionally awarded to Respondents as part of the remedy of disgorgement. See below.

Said amount includes the amount of \$275,000, plus pre-award interest from August 13, 2012, at the legal rate of ten percent (10%) per annum, as and for monetary damages in connection with the resettlement of the Oron litigation, as a direct and proximate result of Claimant's violations of fiduciary duty in connection with his negotiating for a \$75,000 "bribe" (to conflict him out of future representation against Oron) as part of the resolution of the Oron litigation.

Said amount will include the amount of \$60,000, by which amount Claimant was unjustly enriched --- in that Claimant (via his law firm), rather than either Respondent received (A) \$60,000 in connection with Claimant's ostensibly pro bono representation in connection with the Righthaven cases, while compensated for Claimant's time spent on the representation as employee, in the course of his employment, as to which representation the costs were advanced by Claimant's employer, and (B) received from James Grady in connection with the Oron litigation.

Said amount will include the amount of \$3,215.98 --- as and for Respondents' expenses reasonably incurred in connection with QUIVX forensic

examination and attempted restoration of data on employer-owned laptop computers and an iPhone used and returned, as applicable, by Claimant and Erika Dillon. In addition, an amount yet to be determined, in the exercise of the Arbitrator's discretion, will be awarded for Claimant's spoliation and conversion of Excelsior's and Liberty's files and other data contained on employer-owned laptop computers entrusted to Claimant and Erika Dillon during their employment by Respondents or either of them. The additional amount awarded will be set forth in a further and/or amended interim arbitration award and/or in the final arbitration award.

3. Claimant shall pay Respondent Excelsior the amount of \$197,000.00 --- as and for disgorgement of an appropriate amount of Claimant's employment compensation (including salary and bonuses) paid under his employment agreement).

The awarded amount under this paragraph is non-duplicative of and does not overlap with any amount award as monetary damages under any other paragraph of this Interim Award.

The amount awarded under this paragraph does not include disgorgement based on Claimant's post-employment violations of fiduciary duty. That is because it appears to the Arbitrator that they are instances of Respondents having rights without a remedy --- as the limits of case law on disgorgement do not extend to post-employment violations of fiduciary duty.

Disgorgement shall be based on Claimant's violations of fiduciary duty ---including as acting as an attorney in connection with the TNAFlix litigation and the MegaUpload case, Claimant's concurrent representation of XVideos and/or XNXX during his employment by Excelsior and spending excessive, undisclosed, time on non-Excelsior/Liberty matters far beyond contractually-permitted time under his employment agreement.

4. Claimant is hereby ordered forthwith (i.e., within ten (10) days of the date of the issuance of this Interim Arbitration Award) to turn over to

Respondents all Oron-related funds and, further, an additional \$30,000 of non-Oron-related client funds of Respondents --- which funds have been held in Claimant's attorney trust account --- plus pre-award interest at the legal rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from August 29, 2012.

5. An accounting of Claimant's attorney trust account is hereby ordered --- including to ensure compliance with Paragraph 4 hereof. The accounting shall be performed by a qualified third-party accountant and/or accounting firm appointed and/or approved by the Arbitrator. The cost and expense of which shall be borne solely by Claimant --- although Respondents may advance the funds necessary for the accounting, subject to ordered reimbursement by Claimant. Claimant is hereby ordered to cooperate fully with the ordered accounting.

6. Claimant is hereby ordered to return the as-yet-unreturned company-owned laptop to Respondents' counsel forthwith --- and in no event later than ten (10) days from the date of the issuance of this Interim Arbitration Award.

7. Respondent shall be awarded as damages or costs reasonably incurred with this litigation, expenses reasonably incurred by QVIX or similarly qualified expert vendor --- up to a maximum of \$3,500 --- in connection with the vendor's performance of successful and/or attempted retrieval of data a report to the Arbitrator of what, if anything was deleted from the computer and when.

8. Respondents and Counterclaimants Excelsior Media Corp. and Liberty Media Holdings, LLC shall be afforded the right in this arbitration to establish their rights --- if any, and according to proof --- to contractual attorney's fees and costs.

Counsel for the parties are ordered to immediately commence and diligently conduct and conclude meet-and-confer communications and to submit to the Arbitrator within ten (10) days of the issuance of this Interim Arbitration

Award an emailed proposed briefing and hearing schedule for any application for contractual attorney's fees and costs.

9. Respondent Jason Gideon will be dismissed as a party to this arbitration.

Subject to further order and/or a further and/or amended interim arbitration award, and the Final Arbitration Award, this Interim Arbitration Award, including the Determinations hereinabove set forth, is intended to be in full settlement of all claims, issues, allegations and contentions, on the merits, submitted by any party against any adverse party in this arbitration. Subject to the immediately preceding sentence, claims and requests for relief not expressly granted in this Interim Arbitration Award are hereby denied.

Dated: June 3, 2015

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'S. Haberfeld', is written over a horizontal line.

STEPHEN E. HABERFELD
Arbitrator