

Washington Post
Interview of Patricia Sibilialia(1)

Patricia Sibilialia: Hey, sorry about that. Sorry I was late.

Interviewer: Oh, no problem. I actually hadn't had it down that you were calling me up. I thought I was calling you.

Patricia Sibilialia: Okay.

Interviewer: So thanks for making the time. First up, do you mind if I record this conversation for note-taking purposes?

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah. No, that's fine.

Interviewer: So yeah, as I explained the other day, we basically working on a book, a biography of Trump. And my chapter includes the USFL. So I finished looking through the testimony that I had last night from the case which was interesting reading.

Patricia Sibilialia: I'm sure.

Interviewer: So I guess, first off, just tell me a little bit about yourself and how you ended up on that jury.

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah, sure. And also you had said that you were looking for other jurors, so I was curious if you found others because we actually got kind of close and then we drifted apart. So let me tell you about then and then you can answer this back.

I just happened to get called, and it was very interesting because going into the process there were hundreds and hundreds of people. I mean, and I had never been on jury duty ever before but I just knew that this was unusual. And the judge basically spoke to the group and said -- and then they handed out some papers that included a list of all of the possible witnesses. And the witness list was just incredible. I mean Mario Cuomo who didn't end up being on there, but, you know, and then Howard Cosell. And I was like, what is this about?

And pretty much he said, you know, this is going to be a lengthy trial. If you have any issues with serving for this length of time, and if you know any of these people, then you can be excused. So line up and I'll speak with everyone. So everybody got on the line and I'm like, well, you know, I was working at the time in a job where -- I guess I was like maybe I can't serve this length of time. I don't know, but I was sort of like, well, everyone else is getting on the line so I'll get on the line.

So everyone got on the line pretty much and went one by one to the judge. And the judge would say why can't you serve? And so when it came my turn, I said because I'm not sure that my job would allow me to serve for this length of time. And he said not an excuse. I'll call your boss and I'll explain the whole

thing. And you're going to have to serve. And I was like, okay.

So they were left with a considerably smaller group of people that they ended up pulling people out off. And when my name was called, I was like, oh, crap man, I can't believe this is happening. And you go through the *voir dire* process. And you know, I seemed to pass that *voir dire* process. I was a little surprised. On some others, as a matter of fact, the forewoman, the foreman, the forewoman person, one of the questions was have you worked for a company or been involved with any company that was ever involved in anti-trust. And she pretty much had stated earlier she worked for AT&T. And she answered the question, "No, I haven't." And the question was asked again. Do you work for AT&T and you were involved in, you know? And she said, "No," when she obviously was just not educated in that way, then she ended up being our forewoman.

I found out long after the trial, actually I dated a guy who had a friend. When he found out that I was on that trial he gets, "Oh my god, my friend did that trial," like he [indiscernible] did that trial, that they have consultants, psychological consultants that cues what kind of juror is best for the defense, or not necessarily the defense. In this case, it was for the USFL. And this woman fit the bill smack on. You know, they were looking for a woman, and you can tell because

the jury was made mostly of women, who had strong male influences in their life, who were into sports and who weren't particularly that intelligent. So I was like, wow, they see her right on the bill, like right next here.

Interviewer: I'm sorry, what was your background? What were you doing before?

Patricia Sibilialia: I worked for a brokerage company and was a technical person. I was in technology. I was a quality assurance person.

Interviewer: So one thing I'm obviously trying to do as I write through these trial scenes is be able sort of describe how the people look. What do you remember of the major players in this case, starting with Harvey Myerson --

Patricia Sibilialia: Oh, my god.

Interviewer: -- the lawyer of the USFL? How was he dressed? How did he carry himself?

Patricia Sibilialia: I'm not good with dress but I'll tell you how he carried himself. And it was funny because the day that you called me, I happened to go into the attic to look for something. And I came back out with a box of what I was looking for, opened it up, and in there was all my notes. And when there's a person who's on the stand, I have that name and then I have a little description underneath of what I thought they were like.

So Myerson was, oh my god, he was entertaining. He was definitely a showman and was very boisterous at times. And he, although I found him laughable myself, there were certain times where I just found he was this is ridiculous. You could tell with him as well as some of the people on the stand and the other lawyers that they played to particular jurors. So he would stand in front of a particular juror and he would pontificate - that's the right word for sure. And his style in questioning, particularly as he went against the defendants, was very argumentative and look-down-your-nose kind of stuff. He was definitely a character. I mean, he was entertaining to me. I loved to watch the man work. So yeah, he was a piece of work.

Interviewer: How did that contrast with Mr. Rothman, the lawyer for the NFL?

Patricia Sibilialia: Oh, Mr. Rothman was what you would call the gentlemen's gentleman. He was much more soft-spoken, much more old-school. Definitely what you would call a money lawyer. He was the type of person who will show a little humility when approaching a witness, kind of do it much less -- much more quietly and not at all brashfully. So they were exact opposites, definitely opposites. He would often give the jury that shy, quiet smile. They play to the jurors so much but in such different ways.

Interviewer: And in terms of other major characters, Judge Leisure -- how do you pronounce the name?

Patricia Sibilialia: Leisure.

Interviewer: That's Leisure. How did he conduct himself, handled what I imagine would have been a circus at times.

Patricia Sibilialia: He was very, very good. I found that he kept things in line and the whole when people object, when a lawyer objects and stuff, I found he was always, you know, in my mind, he was fair. He did actually, at the very beginning of the trial, say to us that you're going to see a lot of famous people. You need to use your judgments and see what you think of what they're saying. So take a look at them and don't think of them as famous people. Just judge them yourselves because you're going to have to judge what they're saying.

And he actually, when things get a little circus-y, he usually shut it right down. But I found it really -- I thought this was kind of interesting that he would cut off witnesses who are being showmanships, with the exception of Howard Cosell. He just sat there and just -- he let Cosell go on. Cosell, it was really -- because Cosell was definitely one of those witnesses. I was like, oh, he must really have a soft spot for Cosell because he -- with the others he just cut it off and keep it -- it was very business with him.

And he kept also the point of the length of the trial, he would always keep people on task. It's like he was cognizant of trying to keep to the time that was allotted for the trial and not have that be extended. So he was very good in terms of really keeping things on task.

Interviewer: So it's hard for me, and I'm 32 years old, so this is before I was aware of current events obviously. It's hard for me to kind of create in a curve in terms of who were the most famous people at that time. I mean, in present tense, Trump would -- I guess it would be Trump or Cosell who'd be the most I would think a famous person who tried before that jury. Is that correct? Are there people who back then --?

Patricia Sibilialia: Oh, there are others. There were definitely others. Wait, do you want to hold on a second? I just want to grab my notes.

Interviewer: Sure.

Patricia Sibilialia: Because there is, in my notes, there is some list of witnesses and I think -- or potential witnesses. Hold on. [Pause]

Sorry, I just had it and now I'm looking for it. There's the panel questions. Oh, here it is, it's inside. I would tell you as I look through the list. These were potential witnesses: Howard Cosell, Mario Coumo, Senator Alfonse D'Amato. And then you have the names of some of the members of the owners, so some

of those are here. Senator Al Gore was on the potential. He did not -- I knew Leon Hess just from life, so his name was on the list. Edward Koch, the mayor, was on the list. He did not do that. I knew the names of the Maras, Tim Mara, Wellington Mara when I saw that. Obviously, Pete Rozelle was always a big figure in life. Rooney Arledge who ran CBS Sports so everybody kind of knew his name.

Interviewer: So I've actually been in the southern district in New York recently. I went up for one of the Deflategate hearings between Tom Brady and the NFL. It was a relatively small courtroom. Was that about the same -- I don't know if it's the same building as it was back in '86.

Patricia Sibiliala: Yeah, it's the same building, basically the same building, yeah. The courtroom wasn't very large, no. And there was constantly seated in the courtroom was a good portion of the NFL owners were -- and some USFL owners pretty much every day right in the front rows.

Interviewer: Which NFL owners do you remember? I assume the Maras were probably there those days because it's their home court. Were they?

Patricia Sibiliala: Yeah, I have to -- I don't actually recall. I don't actually recall. But I do recall, you know, who specifically. But, yeah, I mean there was definitely a representation of at least like five or six, but I can't recall.

Interviewer: How about press?

Patricia Sibilialia: Press was there all the time, all the time.

Interviewer: How big kind of people were, you know --

Patricia Sibilialia: So when we would walk in around into the building, so they weren't allowed obviously to talk to us but they would follow you. And I would be followed by three or four but I would say at least 10 people.

Interviewer: Was there anything -- was there any hubub outside the courtroom or not really to your knowledge?

Patricia Sibilialia: Oh, there was hubbub outside the courtroom. Yes, there was always -- it was definitely one of those trials where there was a lot of going on. So yes, as you walk through, the jurors has to go in a different way, but you have to walk through an area there were always people hanging out beforehand and quipping back and forth.

Interviewer: So I mean looking back on the court transcripts and the coverage, it seems in retrospect that the real pivotal moment of the trial outside of the opening arguments were the Trump and Rozelle testimony. Is that incorrect or were there any other moments that stick out to you?

Patricia Sibilialia: Let me just think on this a second and take a look at -- Trump was definitely. Porter [phonetic]. If you want to say what swayed the jury one way or another, and I

don't know if you know this but the outcome of that trial was unusual. I kind of stood in the middle and sort of was the reason why the outcome was the way it was. So in terms of really why did the outcome come as it was, so Porter, the guy from --

Interviewer: Right, the Porter presentation.

Patricia Sibilialia: -- was also very pivotal for me. I mean, it just proved to me that they were definitely being aggressive in trying to shut down the USFL even when it was spring league and so forth. They just was going to not make it happen. So that was very telling. The Rozelle piece, I always say that --

Interviewer: So I didn't read the Porter testimony. What did he -- I just read the Porter presentation and what the USFL thinks that that meant and what the NFL thinks that meant. And what did you folks believe in terms of what that Porter presentation actually signified?

Patricia Sibilialia: All right. Hold on, let me find my notes because my notes were pretty extensive and find Porter. While looking through, the Rozelle, I thought they did the wrong thing by putting him on the stand first because he sort of started getting technical, and it was definitely like a lot of what was said was lost for a lot of us. So the Porter testimony is actually -- that's really, it's pretty short. I only have a

quarter of a page on him. "He approached Porter, did not show entire document, deleted certain slides." I have to say it might have been what was said about, you know, overall when it came to Porter because right after with Donlin [phonetic] and there was a whole discussion about the Porter within there.

Interviewer: But I mean bigger picture because I mean honestly our purpose is -- our focus is Trump.

Patricia Sibilialia: Right.

Interviewer: I'm going to tell the story of the trial, but I'm not going to get too into the nitty-gritty. But big picture, taking away from the Porter presentation, you folks did believe that the NFL was -- let me put this way, the NFL -- Rothman's explanation for the Porter presentation was it was just a professor throwing out some hypothetical ideas. He didn't know if they were legal or not, and the NFL people he was talking to were not really that important. And they were like, hey, I don't think this is legal. We shouldn't even be talking about this. So it didn't really represent in any way an effort by the NFL to aggressively combat --

Patricia Sibilialia: I didn't get it that way. Definitely did not see it that way. I think it was a targeted move.

Interviewer: Because I mean the presentation reads hilariously, like maybe *Art of War*, I mean explicitly saying methods they could use to put the USFL out of business.

So getting then to Trump and Rozelle, what do you remember about Donald? Before we talk about the substance of what Trump has to say, outside of his wearing a suit, was he dressed any differently, do you remember?

Patricia Sibilialia: No, I think he was just dressed as a businessman, you know, like a rich businessman.

Interviewer: So what were your memories of Trump's testimony?

Patricia Sibilialia: Well, he was one in particular where I was watching -- I paid very close attention as the judge had instructed us to. And he and I got into a staring match. And I thought he was extremely arrogant and I thought that he was obviously trying to play the game. He wanted straight up from everything that he wanted an NFL franchise. And, you know, the USFL was a cheap way in. And it just seemed that to me he was also trying to play again to the jury, part of the jury. But I just wasn't -- it didn't seem like he was for real.

So we ended up, after his testimony and he got off the stand, as I said, I kept looking at him and he kept looking at me. He and I literally, as he walked by the jury box, I think was trying to intimidate me and pretty much held my gaze the entire length of the walk past the jury box. It was really kind of spooky, odd, and left me with like I do not like this man. I mean, and honestly, I had no opinion of him going in. I mean I

knew he was just a big rich guy. So it wasn't like today where you hear him publicly as much as you do. I didn't have that opinion of him. So it was based strictly on how he conducted himself that I felt that way.

Interviewer: Yeah. I mean, what his public rep and his fame level back in 1996?

Patricia Sibilialia: I think he was known for his bankruptcies, if anything.

Interviewer: I don't think he would've gone bankrupt by then.

Patricia Sibilialia: I think he must have had at least once. For me, I don't know.

Interviewer: His financial troubles started about 1990 in Atlantic City. One of the interesting things about this trial is he was basically at that point he was riding high. He hadn't suffered -- the USFL trial was really his first big public failure, and then four years later is when he started getting his rear end handed to him in Atlantic City.

Patricia Sibilialia: Okay. And so then honestly it was a blank for me, that he was just a rich businessman.

Interviewer: Right. Going back and reading the testimony, one of the funny things is Trump's testimony is like 220 pages, and it's like 50 pages of direct and like a 175 of cross because Rothman just gets exasperated with him. He keeps asking

questions and Trump keeps -- like Rothman the NFL lawyer at least three different times goes to judge and says, "Your Honor, I'm asking. I'm getting speeches. I'm not getting answers." I'm just curious of what your memories are at how Rothman handled himself and how the judge handled himself as Trump launched into these soliloquys?

Patricia Sibilialia: I don't remember that specifically, except I could say that generally I thought that Leisure did a great job in trying to move things along. And you know, and I do remember that Trump was one of these people not too far from Myerson in the pontification realm. That's very clear for me. But I can't tell you more specifics because I don't remember. I mean, quite a length of time ago and even in looking at notes, my notes are more representing facts that I felt were important that came out of what he said. And a lot of that is how, you know, he was talking about getting an NFL franchise before and that was what it was really all about. So honestly, I have to say I can't remember that sort of specific.

Interviewer: So there was obviously one key disagreement or dispute between Trump and Rozelle, that meeting in the hotel. What do you remember of that and how the jury assessed the truthfulness of each of those people?

Patricia Sibilialia: Well, I think that definitely there were bad feelings that came through pretty well. And a lot of it is

I think the frustrations on both, on the two parties' part. I think I can't say -- when it comes to the jury and how the jury took some of this, so there was a real split in the jury. And there was a couple of people who were straight out walked away from the whole trial saying, oh my god, the USFL was harmed and that they deserved everything. And then there were a couple of people who are like, no, no, no, no. How could you possibly say that? You know, the NFL is innocent here. And I felt that, wait guys, they're both really wrong.

And we did get into, during the deliberations, we were literally pulling out and asking for read backs of testimony. But a lot of us took notes and we would go back to our notes and point out, no, what about this, how about that. And Trump's was definitely a key one that we went back to. And I think each of us really saw differently, and a lot of it, as I said, it was so much showmanship that I think that people were buying into that instead of the substance sometimes.

Interviewer: Well, so I ask specifically then, you know, Pete Rozelle says that he barely knew Donald Trump from Adam before he gets his phone call in March of 1984. He says I might have bumped into him in a few charity events but I never talked to the guy. And Pete Rozelle says I get a phone call in March, says I want to talk to you. So I come and meet him in his hotel and he tells me he wants an expansion franchise in New York, and

I tell him that I can't promise that but I'll get back to you. And he says if I gave him an expansion franchise, he would sell the Generals to some stiff and sell out USFL and leave that league.

Trump tells me a totally opposite version, says that Pete Rozelle and I are good friends. I have known him for years. I gave his wife a ride once to one of her events. We talked a bunch of times. He told me that he had --

Patricia Sibilialia: I don't remember that. In the testimony that he gave, that piece?

Interviewer: And furthermore, Trump says that, yeah, we had this meeting but the meeting was Rozelle telling I should -- how did he word it? Trump's recollection of the meeting was that Rozelle was trying to tell him to get out of the USFL and that Rozelle said that I control -- that he and the NFL controlled the television networks and they were never going to get a fall deal, which would be obviously blatant anti-trust violations. So who did you guys believe?

Patricia Sibilialia: I believed what -- I don't think I really -- let me think about this. I wished I looked through the Trump notes before we spoke but I didn't look through my Rozelle notes that closely at all. I don't know. I think that I didn't believe either man, either truth. I remember walking away from the Rozelle and feeling very much -- there was

actually sections being in my notes here that say he's not clear, he's -- it's not -- he's trying to hide. So I don't think I believed either one.

Interviewer: So what do you think?

Patricia Sibilialia: And that was part of -- go ahead.

Interviewer: Now what do you think actually happened in that meeting then?

Patricia Sibilialia: I think I had to really just go with my gut and say that, you know, there had been conversations between the two of them about a franchise for Trump and Rozelle putting him off far from it and Trump deciding to go for the Generals and force the way in, because I think what I take away more from the Trump was more than Rozelle on this particular topic was that he very much early on wanted an NFL franchise and then ended up with the USFL. But then all of sudden, the lawsuit happened and it's all about, you know, the potential for a merger.

So it's to me, what their relationship was here or there, to me didn't matter so much as the fact that Trump really wanted an NFL franchise. And if he couldn't because the conversation with Rozelle didn't go as he wanted, he was going to get it another way.

Interviewer: Yeah. You know it's funny. I talked to somebody knowledgeable with how the NFL operated at that time

and he told me yesterday. He was like, I don't know that Trump's really arrogant. I don't know if he would have known this, but there's absolutely no way in hell he would have gotten an NFL team because you need to -- you don't just need to have money. Any transfer of a team needs to get approved by a three-quarters vote of the owners, and there's no way that three quarters of those owners would want him becoming an NFL owner because of a couple of reasons, but primarily because he had a reputation of being very litigious, which NFL owners hated. And because at that time, he had casino ties and they were and still are very opposed to having owners who are in any way linked to casino operations, on top the fact that he's loud and the NFL by and large is old money.

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah.

Interviewer: It's not really, you know, even the new age like Jerry Jones was not an NFL owner at that point. Dan Rooney down here in D.C. was not an NFL owner at that point. So it sounds to me like you felt there was probably -- I won't put the words in your mouth. Tell me what you remember of deliberations and how --

Patricia Sibilialia: I want to back you up a second.

Interviewer: Sure.

Patricia Sibilialia: I'm just thinking through. The other witness said to me, and again this is just my memory, that really stood out was Al Davis.

Interviewer: Okay. So I wanted to ask about that. What did you, how did -- so Al comes in and he says what he has to say about his previous dealings with the NFL. And how did you feel about that?

Patricia Sibilialia: I felt that - let me see if I pull his testimony. But off the top of my head, I felt the man was genuine, and for a lot of these people that wasn't the case. And I felt like he really loved football and he was trying to do the right thing. But I need to look at my notes, but I remember clearly that he made a big impression on me. What did I say here about Hess? I'm sure it's difficult. Where is -- let me see if I could find -- hold on, I have to find his testimony. I kind of wish there was a listing of who spoke on what. Here's beginning with Al.

"Reading of Al Davis' testimony that had been previously been objected to. [Indiscernible] suggested after of an NFL franchise, man of financial strength now in place and ultimately with a strong team." I think he got recalled. Hold on. I think he might have had two testimonies. And also the whole TV contract thing was a huge -- I mean, I remember that as really

influencing me, how predatory they were. And it was definitely something that struck me.

Interviewer: Did you believe? So Al Davis goes up there and how he's followed by Cosell. And Cosell testifies that ABC's president, it was either Jim Spencer or Roone Arledge, I forget which one, but that one of them had told him, yeah, Rozelle is all over me for giving USFL the spring contract. The network director said that's not true. And Rozelle said I never would've said it. I never would've applied pressure to a network president about giving the USFL contract. How did you feel about all that? Who did you believe then?

Patricia Sibilialia: I felt that there was definitely pressure. Yeah, I definitely felt there was pressure. Somewhere throughout the testimony, I can't remember where, there was stated about that when there was coverage of the USFL games to make sure that they showed the empty stadium. And I remember that stuck with me. You know, make sure that the shots had empty seats and stuff like that. And I remember that really stuck with me.

I'm looking now at my notes on Davis. And my little side notes just show that he's very respectful and that he has soft-spoken presence. Let's see. Oh, it is just background. Yeah, he took the legal collaboration in the NFL with the Oakland

Coliseum and the destruction of the Oakland Invaders. And, of course, the Jets announced the move, that whole thing.

Interviewer: So what do you remember of the jury deliberations? I mean, I guess what I'm curious about is --

Patricia Sibilialia: A lot.

Interviewer: So when you guys went back there to begin with, what do you think was the ballpark breakdown in terms of people who felt the USFL deserved a win and big damages and people who thought the NFL was in the right?

Patricia Sibilialia: So it was a clear split with actually one or two sort of nowhere. And I'm just curious, did you manage to reach any of the other jurors?

Interviewer: No. I mean I have a few phone numbers here. One of the jurors has passed away, unfortunately.

Patricia Sibilialia: Is that Lily?

Interviewer: Yes. Was that -- I have her. Margaret Lilienfeld [phonetic]?

Patricia Sibilialia: Lilienfeld. Margaret Lilienfeld.

Interviewer: Yeah. She passed away in 2012. I have potential numbers for a few others here. I may call them, may not, depending on how much time I end up having here.

Patricia Sibilialia: No, understood. Understood. I was just curious. So Miriam and Bernice were definitely targeted as

underdogs, as underdog supporters, and that's where the USFL was constantly portrayed as an underdog.

Interviewer: Right.

Patricia Sibilialia: So they went in and the two of them absolutely - underdog, they deserve all the money. Margaret was staunch NFL the whole way and felt that there was nothing. You know, the USFL should get none. Nothing. There was no case for the USFL. Then there was the forewoman, Patricia, and then there was a guy who stayed -- and then I can't even remember his name. He stayed completely silent.

Interviewer: Steven Ziegler [phonetic]?

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah. He was definitely removed from the conversations. He sort of didn't have an opinion or he was afraid to say his opinion. And with the forewoman's hat, she was sort of -- she just was a little lost, to tell you the truth. That's my opinion of her was that she was sort of like she didn't know what to think, where Steven was just quiet. He wouldn't say. So there were some pretty strong voices between Margaret, Bernice, Miriam and myself.

I definitely felt that there was predatory action, but I also felt that the USFL really did some things that they were forcing the situation. Trump was really the testimony, as we already said. So the deliberations went back and forth, back

and forth. We definitely pulled a lot of testimony. We read. We were going through our notes.

Interviewer: And how long were the deliberations?

Patricia Sibilialia: We had to be sequestered overnight, just one night. So it was two days.

Interviewer: And where were you as you guys were discussing this?

Patricia Sibilialia: Oh. There's a deliberation room.

Interviewer: Oh, in the courthouse?

Patricia Sibilialia: Yes, in the courthouse.

Interviewer: Just around like a rectangular table?

Patricia Sibilialia: Yes, exactly. It's a conference room. Yeah, because I remember a good-sized room because I know at one point I just went off way into the corner and just stared out the window for a while to let things cool off. And I remember Ziegler actually was always not sitting with us. He was always aloof, distance in the room.

Interviewer: Did he ever talk?

Patricia Sibilialia: I don't recall. I don't really recall that he did. And it could be that there was, like I said, a lot of strong voices, but every once in a while, we'd have to go through and we'd take the vote. So we'd stop and we'd go through and we'd say what -- and it was often split. And it got

to the point where it was like, guys, we've got to -- this is a lengthy trial. We have to really come to some agreement here.

Interviewer: It was often split how?

Patricia Sibilialia: First between, yes, there's been predatory action, or, no, the USFL's really been harmed.

Interviewer: And did you guys ever get --

Patricia Sibilialia: It was the other way around. I said the same thing twice.

Interviewer: Yeah. Was there ever discussion from the folks who said the USFL was harmed, did they ever put dollar amounts on what they thought the damage should be?

Patricia Sibilialia: We did talk some dollar amounts, but I can't recall what they were. And actually, I do have a couple of pages. Let me just pull out the pages from the deliberations, which are nonsense-ish more, a lot of doodlings. I'll tell you that we pulled testimony about network coercion, particularly the client's testimony Cosell, Arledge, McCarthy, Whistler incident and Brodsky and Loosey [phonetic] and I have no idea what those are about, but that's what my notes say we felt - I felt - was network coercion. We pulled out Carvey NFL, the MNF interview following the player strike. I can't even recall.

Interviewer: You know who that is?

Patricia Sibilialia: And here was a list I had from me for the deliberations. The 5/19, Rozelle testimony concerning increase in roster size, and also cross on 5/21 on the roster side. On 5/28 and 5/29, the Donlin [phonetic] testimony concerning supplemental drafts and the 49-man roster. The Rozelle testimony over the Whistler incident. Now see, this keeps coming up and Rozelle's reaction. I don't even recall. I have to go back. I don't even remember what the Whistler incident was.

Interviewer: Yeah, nor do I. I read through that.

Patricia Sibilialia: 6/04, June 4th, the testimony concerning sports beat USFL slants on two programs. 6/13, Tillson's [phonetic] testimony over the Whistler incident. 7/08, Schramm [phonetic] testimony concerning Maurice Carcion [phonetic], also the roster size. And 7/21, Matthew McCarthy testimony in its entirety. So that's the stuff that we dug it and we pulled for to get dug into.

Interviewer: So tell me about how you guys hammered out this strange compromise that produced a really curious verdict.

Patricia Sibilialia: It was just plain old we've got to get out of here, guys, and find some middle ground. We have to come to some agreement. So the issue of saying that the USFL -- I'm sorry, that the NFL was absolutely predatory. And it's interesting because I don't have the questions, the actual

questions, but there was I guess 49 things that we had to deliberate on, and I don't have what those were. And there was a bunch where we all agree, and there was a bunch where I had to circle because it was we had a problem. Two yeses and one yes and that kind of thing.

And I know the specific questions where we felt that, so we just had to come to an agreement. So I said okay. So it seems like we have, you know, the USFL being harmed. Two people felt that. How about we say that there was predatory action but to compromise with the ones who felt that, really, that there wasn't that predatory action and that the NFL didn't do anything wrong, but we don't make any real monetary damage. So it's kind of a situation where, okay, satisfying the ones to say that, yes, there was predatory action on the part of the NFL but the USFL deserved no damages for it because of their own actions.

Interviewer: And I'm going to go back to look at my notes and see one [indiscernible]. Who was the juror who, after the thing was read, told the press --?

Patricia Sibilialia: Was it Miriam?

Interviewer: "I didn't understand." Yeah, someone said, "I didn't understand. I thought the judge was going to award damages. I just, you know, I --"

Patricia Sibilialia: It was either Miriam or Bernice. They were the two that were really all USFL the whole way. And no,

and that was complete bogus because we talked about the dollar amount. I don't remember what numbers they were throwing out, and we talked about them being trouble. I remember it clearly. Yeah.

Interviewer: It'd be accurate to say that two of the six jurors, when that thing started, when you folks started deliberating, wanted to find in favor of the USFL and wanted to find significant damages.

Patricia Sibilialia: Correct. Absolutely.

Interviewer: And so you don't remember a dollar figure, but I mean, significant that the USFL was seeking hundreds of millions of dollars, which trebled with the high hundreds of millions of dollars or potentially in excess of a billion dollars.

Patricia Sibilialia: Uh-huh.

Interviewer: So those two people, that's what they wanted.

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah.

Interviewer: Okay. Can you describe for me what you remember of how the courtroom, the reaction went when you folks read the verdict?

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah. It was stunned. Stunned. I think that people didn't know how to interpret it. And the judge thanked us and sent us on our way. But you know,

obviously coming out, oh my god, I remember it clearly because -

-

Interviewer: Who read the verdict?

Patricia Sibilialia: The forewoman.

Interviewer: Which was whom? What was her name?

Patricia Sibilialia: Patricia whatever her last name was.

Interviewer: Yeah. Patricia McCabe [phonetic].

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah. Once --

Interviewer: Go ahead. No, you go ahead.

Patricia Sibilialia: Once we left the actual, you know, we were done, we left the courtroom, we were mobbed. We were absolutely mobbed and it was a very overwhelming feeling. I mean, and individually, so we were where we had always walked in and out together, we were now leaving separately and it was definitely each one of us had mobs against us. And I remember being approached by ESPN. Would you come and be on air tonight? We'll take you right away. We'll take you in the car. We'll drop you home. And I was just like I have to get out of here. It was just way too -- I mean afterwards, it was draining to deliberate and then just way too overwhelming to be actually --

Interviewer: Had you guys been sequestered during the trial or just during deliberation?

Patricia Sibilialia: No, just during the deliberation. In fact, there was one alternate juror who was excused because it

was in the papers, obviously, every day and he had been caught reading the papers. And we got warnings at that point that if that happened again, we'd be sequestered for the full length of the trial. So it was one night basically of being sequestered.

Interviewer: And were they sequestering you guys?

Patricia Sibilialia: Were we sequestered? Now I'm trying to think. Hold on a second because I was involved in another fiasco trial where that was also lengthy and there was the Mafia hit. And now I'm thinking I'm mixing the whole two up. Let me think about this. Or were we -- no. We just deliberated late. Hold on a second. We just deliberated. We went out to dinner. I remember we went to a really nice Italian restaurant right outside the court, so it was in Little Italy. We deliberated after that and I think what happened is they drove us home and then they picked us up in the morning. I don't remember staying in a hotel, so that we went back to our homes and then just got - I'm trying to remember, but I think that's what happened - and just got picked up.

And so it was a car service as opposed to us finding our own way. And then we got picked up and taken back to the court. So I don't think we stayed over in a hotel, but we deliberated into the evening and then got driven home and picked up and driven back.

Interviewer: All right. You don't remember though as the verdict was read out, if any particular members of the audience, NFL folks or USFL folks stormed out, explained?

Patricia Sibilialia: I don't. Yeah. I honestly can't recall because I mean it was just an overwhelming situation and, you know, that the details are just not there.

Interviewer: Right. Is there anything else about the trial itself we didn't touch on that you think I should know that just comes to mind as you think back on the experience?

Patricia Sibilialia: No. I think that's it. I think you have me curious to go through and read my notes a little bit more, but no. Yeah, it just was definitely quite the experience.

Interviewer: So you've kept your notes all these years?

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah, I have. You're probably about the third or fourth person who's contacted me over the years. I mean I think one year with the anniversary, I got contacted. And then after the trial, definitely even a couple of years after, I got contacted. Yeah, I just always kept the notes because to me, it was a piece of my history. I mean, when we first started, the trial, it was just like I remember Rozelle on the stand. It was just like I need notes. So we weren't allowed to take notes until a day or so in. I was like I need to take -- you know, I asked the judge. And the judge was like

oh yeah, absolutely. And he handed out pads and pencils and pens to all of us and said, yes, take notes. And so those notes were always -- they're kind of my experience. And so yeah. I've always kept them.

Interviewer: So how did you -- like legal pads or how did you take them?

Patricia Sibilialia: Yes. They're legal. They're yellow legal pads that actually, you know, has -- the way I set it up was every day, who was on the witness stand was in the column and in the margins, and then my feelings about what I thought about them were also in the margin, where the other side was the facts that I took down. Yeah, and I'll tell you I went through two legal pads in the course of this. And then I have a couple of sheets, as I say, that are from the deliberations.

And I also kept -- they were handed out, the packet that we were given when we first walked into the courtroom, which was the panel questions as it was called, that had the list of the witnesses and ways that you could be excused and then also the *voir dire* questions. So I kept that. Yeah, it was a once in a lifetime experience.

Interviewer: And where do you keep these notes now?

Patricia Sibilialia: Where do I keep the notes now?

Interviewer: Yeah.

Patricia Sibilialia: I keep them in the attic.

Interviewer: I'm just curious. In a shoebox or --

Patricia Sibilialia: No. Actually, because they're legal sized and all my files as a businessperson have always been letter sized, I actually took an old box that you would put a shirt in for a gift box that was big enough for legal, and they're all in there.

Interviewer: All right. I think if there's anything else we have not covered. Do you not go by Patricia or do you?

Patricia Sibilialia: I do go by Patricia.

Interviewer: Okay. So there were two Patricias on the --

Patricia Sibilialia: She was Pat.

Interviewer: She was Pat. Okay. All right. And where do you live now, if you don't mind me asking? Just the town.

Patricia Sibilialia: I live in Albany, right outside of Albany. Right outside of Albany, in the town of Bethlehem, Delmar, New York.

Interviewer: And were you living in the city back in '86?

Patricia Sibilialia: I lived in Mount Vernon, Fleetwood.

Interviewer: Oh, the one thing I wanted to ask -- just a little scenery thing. There in a testimony at some point, the judge mentions it being like really hot and humid in the courtroom. Did the AC go out at some point or --

Patricia Sibilialia: I don't recall that at all.

Interviewer: Okay. That could just have been him talking, but --

Patricia Sibilialia: I mean, what I loved was Fridays off. I mean, I just thought that was, to me, the most strangest thing in the world because I mean I worked on Wall Street. I had a hard job. I mean they wrung it out on you, so it was like being on a little mini-vacation in a sense because even though you had lunch hours, I often would walk over to the Brooklyn Bridge and back because lunch hours were long, you know? It wasn't what I was used to. So it was like a respite from regular life.

Interviewer: Well, Patricia I really appreciate your time. I'm going to basically file a memo of notes to the two main writers on this book project. I don't know how it's going to look, how it's going to come out in the paper in terms of like size of the story and when it will run. But when I get a firmer hand on that, I'll circle back with you.

Patricia Sibilialia: Okay. Yeah, please. Because you said a book, right? And now, or is it in --

Interviewer: So it's -- I mean it's both, basically. It's a book and we're taking parts of the book and running them in the paper as stories.

Patricia Sibilialia: Yup.

Interviewer: But how exactly that's going to work with stuff like this, which is, you know, has already been reported

and has been out there, we'll just keep kind of framing it differently now the guy's running for president. It isn't just a big businessman. I'm not quite certain how it's going to look in the paper and when it would run. And there's a chance that it doesn't run in the paper at all and that it's just part of this book that comes out later this year. But if it is going to be a news story and I get an idea when, I'll circle back and let you know.

Patricia Sibilialia: Okay.

Interviewer: And you have my number if anything comes up that you think of at all. I should have told him that. And yeah, if I have any last second questions, I might give you a shout back.

Patricia Sibilialia: Yeah, no worries.

Interviewer: All right?

Patricia Sibilialia: Okay. Cool.

Interviewer: Thank you for your time. I really appreciate it.

Patricia Sibilialia: All right. Okay. Good luck.

Interviewer: You too.

Patricia Sibilialia: Okay.

Interviewer: Bye-bye.

Patricia Sibilialia: Bye-bye.

[End of file] [End of transcript]