

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
GOOGLE INC.,
Defendant.

No. C 10-03561 WHA

SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

YOUR ANSWERS MUST BE UNANIMOUS.

1. Has Oracle proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Google infringes claim 11, 27, 29, 39, 40, or 41 of United States Patent Number RE38,104?

| | Yes (Infringing) | No (Not Proven) |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| CLAIM 11: | _____ | _____ |
| CLAIM 27: | _____ | _____ |
| CLAIM 29: | _____ | _____ |
| CLAIM 39: | _____ | _____ |
| CLAIM 40: | _____ | _____ |
| CLAIM 41: | _____ | _____ |

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

2. Has Oracle proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Google infringes claim 1 or 20 of United States Patent Number 6,061,520?

| | Yes (Infringing) | No (Not Proven) |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| CLAIM 1: | _____ | _____ |
| CLAIM 20: | _____ | _____ |

3. Has Oracle proven by clear and convincing evidence that Google willfully infringed one or more claim of an asserted patent? (Answer this question only if above you answered “Yes” to one or more claims of a *given* patent.)

| | Yes (Willful) | No (Not Proven) |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| FOR THE '104 PATENT: | _____ | _____ |
| FOR THE '520 PATENT: | _____ | _____ |

Dated: May ____, 2012.

FOREPERSON