28

SHARTSIS FRIESE LLP ONE MARITIME PLAZA EIGHTEENTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 1. Based on the jury verdicts after the trials in 2005 and 2012, the Fed. R. Civ. P. 52 Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law re Restitution filed on November 21, 2005 (Dkt. No. 3494), which are hereby reinstated, the Ninth Circuit opinion filed on August 25, 2008, the Final Pretrial Conference Order that was signed by all parties and lodged with the Court on September 20, 2012 (Dkt. No. 4173), and the Order re Restitution Award filed herein on February 26, 2013 (Dkt. No. 4330), it is hereby ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the Judgment for restitution entered on February 13, 2006 (Dkt. No. 3573), which was vacated with leave to reinstate by the Ninth Circuit, is reinstated *nunc pro tunc* as of the date that prior Judgment was originally entered, i.e., February 13, 2006. Accordingly, it is further ORDERED and ADJUDGED that, effective as of February 13, 2006, judgment is entered for the Plaintiff, California Insurance Commissioner, as Conservator, Liquidator, and Rehabilitator of the Estate of Executive Life Insurance Company, and against defendant Artemis S.A., as stated in the prior Judgment, for a total judgment of \$241,092,020.
- 2. It is further ORDERED and ADJUDGED that, as stated in the prior Judgment, given the unusual history of this case, especially the verdicts returned by the jury, neither Artemis S.A. nor the California Insurance Commissioner, as Conservator, Liquidator, and Rehabilitator of the Estate of Executive Life Insurance Company, shall be deemed the "prevailing party" as to the claims between them, and neither such party shall be awarded costs against the other.
- 3. It is further ORDERED and ADJUDGED that, as stated in the prior Judgment, Artemis S.A. is responsible to pay to the California Insurance Commissioner, as Conservator, Liquidator, and Rehabilitator of the Estate of Executive Life Insurance Company, the sum of \$131,092,020 (the "Net Artemis Judgment Obligation"), which is equal to the Judgment of \$241,092,020 entered above less a credit of \$110,000,000 reflecting the payment to the Commissioner made pursuant to the Court's Amended Order Approving Payment Instructions for

Transfer to the California Insurance Commissioner, in his Capacity as Conservator, Rehabilitator, and Liquidator of Executive Life Insurance Company of California, of \$110,000,000 Contributed by Defendant Artemis S.A. Pursuant to Its Final Settlement Agreement with the United States, dated May 5, 2004 (Dkt. No. 1726). The Net Artemis Judgment Obligation is for restitution and does not include any punitive damages component. Post-judgment interest shall accrue on the Net Artemis Judgment Obligation, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961, from the date of the prior Judgment of restitution, *i.e.*, February 13, 2006.

- 4. As stated in the prior Judgment, at such time as this Judgment becomes final and not subject to further appeal, any portion of this Judgment that remains unsatisfied may be satisfied, to the extent necessary or possible, with the funds then in the USAO/Artemis Settlement Account, in accordance with the terms of the Final Settlement Agreement Between the United States Attorney's Office and Artemis S.A., Francois Pinault, Patricia Barbizet, Marie-Christine de Percin, and Emmanuel Cueff, dated December 15, 2003 (the "USAO/Artemis Settlement Agreement"). Nothing in this Judgment shall be deemed to modify or abrogate any of the terms of the USAO/Artemis Settlement Agreement.
- 5. The Net Artemis Judgment Obligation is the several and individual obligation of Artemis S.A. and, as previously ruled in the Order Denying Motion of the Artemis Defendants for an Offset dated February 1, 2006 (Dkt. No. 3554), is not subject to any offset for any amount heretofore or hereafter recovered by the Commissioner from any other Defendant in this action or any other entity, whether by way of settlement or otherwise.

Dated:			

The Honorable R. Gary Klausner United States District Judge

- 2 -

	Case	2:99-cv-02829-RGK-CW Document 4331- #:19432	2 Filed 03/05/13 Page 4 of 5 Page ID		
	1		Respectfully submitted,		
	2	DATED: March 5, 2013	SHARTSIS FRIESE LLP		
	3				
	4		By: /s/Charles R. Rice CHARLES R. RICE		
	5 6		Attorneys for Plaintiff INSURANCE COMMISSIONER		
	7	DATED Manual 5 2012	ROTHGERBER, JOHNSON & LYONS LLP		
	8	DATED: March 5, 2013	LLP		
	9				
SHARTSIS FRIESE LLP ONE MARITIME PLAZA EIGHTEENTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111	10		By: /s/Franklin D. O'Loughlin FRANKLIN D. O'LOUGHLIN		
	11		Attorneys for Intervenors NOLHGA and CLHIGA		
	12		NOLHOA and CLHIGA		
	13				
	14	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
	15				
	16				
	17				
	18		в		
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25				
	26				
	27				
	28				
			- 3 -		
	Case No. 99-02829 [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT RGK (CWx)				

	#.13433				
		2			
7040	1		Respectfully submitted,		
	2	DATED: March 5, 2013	SHARTSIS FRIESE LLP		
	3	DATED. Water 3, 2013	DIPACIDID I RIEDE EDI		
	4		By:		
	5	÷	CHARLES R. RICE		
	6		Attorneys for Plaintiff INSURANCE COMMISSIONER		
	7	DATED: March 5, 2013	ROTHGERBER, JOHNSON & LYONS LLP		
	8	ž			
SHARTSIS FRIESE LLP ONE MARITIME PLAZA ELGHTEENTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111	9		By: Trank O'Loughlin FRANKLIN D. O'LOUGHLIN		
	10	*			
	11		Attorneys for Intervenors NOLHGA and CLHIGA		
	12	7805\001\1881153.5			
	13				
	14				
	15				
	16	189			
	17				
	18		5		
	19		1		
	20   21				
	22				
	23				
	24	SW1			
	25				
	26				
	27				
	28				
	20		- 3 -		
		Case No. 99-02829 [PROPOSEI RGK (CWx)	OJ JUDGMENT		