

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

---

**RICHARD F. MILLER,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**PHILIPP HOLZMANN, *et al.*,**

**Defendants.**

---

**Civil Action No. 95-1231 (RCL)**

**ORDER**

The Court has considered defendants’ post-trial motions [893-901, 904], plaintiffs’ oppositions [908-915], defendants’ replies [919, 921-927], the entire record herein, and the applicable law. For the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum opinion, it is hereby:

ORDERED that E. Roy Anderson’s (“Anderson”) Post-Judgment Motion [893] is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. To the extent Anderson’s motion seeks amendment of the Judgment to afford him a proportionate credit based on payments the government received from settling co-defendants, his motion is GRANTED, and the Judgment [883] shall be amended to reflect his post-credit liability of \$131,051.70. In all other respects, his motion is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that Harbert International, Inc.’s (“HII”) Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law [894] is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that Harbert Corporation’s (“HC”) Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law [895] is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that Bill Harbert International Construction, Inc. (“BHIC”) and Harbert Construction Services (U.K.) Ltd.’s (“HUK”) Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law [896] is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that HII and HC’s Motion for a New Trial as to All Claims [897] is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that Bilhar International Establishment’s Motion for Post-Trial Judgment as a Matter of Law, or in the Alternative, for a New Trial [898] is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that BHIC and HUK’s Motion to Alter, Amend, or Vacate the Judgment [899, 901] is DENIED. And it is further

ORDERED that BHIC and HUK’s Motion for New Trial [900, 904] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Signed by Royce C. Lamberth, Chief Judge, June 23, 2008.