EXHIBIT B

COPY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Case Number: 3:02-CV-1267 (AVC)

- -

INTERMARK FABRIC CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICROFIBRES, INC.,

Defendant.

- -

DEPOSITION OF STEVEN ROSENTHAL

July 9, 2003

Q. What was Mr. Fulks' reaction to the proposed amendment?

A. Besides disgust. He was upset about it, and didn't feel it was appropriate. He said he didn't say what they claim he said.

Q. At some point was there a vote on the amendment?

A. Yes.

Q. Did all the persons present including Mr. Lucchesi vote?

A. No.

Q. What did you do?

A. I abstained.

Q. Why?

A. Because I had no notes to prove one way or the other that that information that they claimed that Mr. Fulks had said had been said. Not having any notes that it had been said one way or the other, I didn't feel I had appropriate knowledge to make a decision.

Q. Do you have any memory of Mr. Fulks making the statement at the August 2002 Flock Association meeting that Microfibres was transfer printing using dark pigmented

adhesives back in 1984.

A. I don't remember him saying that.

Q. Did persons other than yourself abstain?

A. Having looked at the minutes, I can say yes.

Q. Who abstained in addition to yourself?

A. There were four abstentions. The representative from Synthon, Tom Whitham; National Velour, Todd Der Manouelian; Flock Tex, Brian Abrmek and myself.

Q. Did you articulate at the meeting your reasons for abstention?

A. Yes.

Q. And what did you say?

A. That since when I looked at my notes I couldn't find anything to say that it was said one way or the other, that I didn't remember that being said, but I don't remember it not being said, that I didn't feel I had enough, you know, that my knowledge wasn't strong enough -- my memory wasn't strong enough to vote either way.

Q. Did any of the other abstainees