

Appendix 8

The *quantum* (Latin for damages) that derives from the loss of the CGI opportunity I and my company Intelligent Images Research Inc. had in the late 1980s¹ was assessed by the coalition to be \$5 billion.

As is stated in Chapter 6:

That Steve Jobs had just bought PIXAR and turned that opportunity into a \$5 billion plus empire, which meant I would have been able to prove those kinds of damages for the tort of interference with economic relations. The coalition agreed and ratified the sum of \$5 billion as what I was entitled from triangle operators. Consequently, the number 5 reminded them of this massive civil liability.

Disney buys Pixar

House of Mouse is teaming up with Pixar in a \$7.4 billion deal. Steve Jobs to become board member at Disney.

By Paul R. La Monica

CNNMoney.com²

January 25, 2006

NEW YORK - Walt Disney has announced that it is buying Pixar, the animated studio led by Apple head Steve Jobs, in a deal worth \$7.4 billion.

This ratification occurred literally well over fifteen hundred³ times since early 2006; demonstrating how resolved coalition partners were to ensuring justice was more than seen to be done - that it was done, and it served as a major and historic deterrent to other rogue and Western governments that sought to replicate what was experienced over a multi-decade period of time. The message they sent loud and clear was if political leaders, military commanders, intelligence chiefs and their co-conspirators engage in this kind of abdominal practice there are heavy costs for doing so.

¹ As described in Chapter 1

² http://money.cnn.com/2006/01/24/news/companies/disney_pixar_deal

³ Documentations in chapters 6 and 9

Anybody hearing this kind of money is involved would naturally ask the question “How is that possible?” and opine “That cannot be!!!”. For those trained in law and have practiced for a considerable period of time, the principles of civil law totally justify this kind of award; for the courts look at the evidence and if it fits within the standard principles of law and the assessment of damages then judges are required to grant the relief sought by the plaintiff.

Nature of the Tort of Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage⁴

The elements of that tort of are: '(1) an economic relationship between [the plaintiff and some third person] containing the probability of future economic benefit to the [plaintiff], (2) knowledge by the defendant of the existence of the relationship, (3) intentional acts on the part of the defendant designed to disrupt the relationship, (4) actual disruption of the relationship, [and] (5) damages to the plaintiff proximately caused by the acts of the defendant.' (*Buckaloo v. Johnson* (1975) 14 Cal.3d 815, 827.)

[...]

As a matter of law, there is a threshold causation requirement in order to establish the tort of intentional interference with prospective economic advantage. What is required is 'proof that it is reasonably probable that the lost economic advantage would have been realized but for the defendant's interference. (*Youst v. Longo* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 64, 71.) 'Over the past several decades, California courts analyzing the tort of interference with prospective economic advantage have required such a threshold determination. In *Buckaloo v. Johnson* . . . , where we set out the five elements of the intentional form of the tort, we stated that the first element requires 'the probability of future economic benefit.' Although varying language has been used to express this threshold requirement, the cases generally agree it must be reasonably probable that the prospective economic adv

The early financial data combined with PIXAR’s economic success satisfies the evidentiary burden on damages, for it was not just probable, it is demonstrable with absolute certainty that “the prospective economic advantage would have been realized but for the defendant’s interference”.

⁴ <http://www.lectlaw.com/def/i084.htm>