1	hmcelhinny@mofo.com	WILLIAM F. LEE william.lee@wilmerhale.com			
2 3	mjacobs@mofo.com	WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 60 State Street			
4	ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363)	Boston, MA 02109 Telephone: (617) 526-6000			
5	RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425)	Facsimile: (617) 526-5000			
6		MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180)			
7	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	mark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com WILMER CUTLER PICKERING			
8	San Francisco, California 94105-2482	HALE AND DORR LLP 950 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, California 94304 Telephone: (650) 858-6000			
9	Facsimile: (415) 268-7522				
10	J.	Facsimile: (650) 858-6100			
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.				
12	Counterclaini-Defendant AFFLE INC.				
13					
14	UNITED STATES DI	STRICT COURT			
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
16	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
17	APPLE INC., a California corporation,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)			
18	Plaintiff,	APPLE'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM			
18 19	Plaintiff, v.	APPLE'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM			
	v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a	VERDICT FORM			
19	v.	VERDICT FORM			
19 20 21 22	v.  SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and	Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh Place: Courtroom 8, 4th Floor			
19 20 21 22 23	v.  SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability	Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh Place: Courtroom 8, 4th Floor			
19 20 21 22 23 24	v.  SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh Place: Courtroom 8, 4th Floor			
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	v.  SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh Place: Courtroom 8, 4th Floor			
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	v.  SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh Place: Courtroom 8, 4th Floor			
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	v.  SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh Place: Courtroom 8, 4th Floor			

1 2		unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under us of this Court as our verdict in this case.				
3	FINDINGS ON APPLE'S CLAIMS					
4						
5	1.	Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung directly infringed the following Apple utility patent claims?				
<ul><li>6</li><li>7</li></ul>		<u>'381 Patent</u>				
8		Claim 19: Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)				
9		<u>'915 Patent</u>				
10		Claim 8: Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)				
11 12		'163 Patent				
13		Claim 50: Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)				
14	2.	If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 1, has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that the Samsung Korean parent entity (SEC) induced its U.S. subsidiaries				
15		(STA and SEA) to directly infringe?				
16 17		Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)				
18	3.	If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 1, has Apple proven by clear and convincing evidence that Samsung's infringement was willful?				
19		Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)				
20	4.	Has Samsung proven by clear and convincing evidence that Apple's asserted utility patent claims are invalid?				
21		'381 Patent				
22 23		Claim 19: Yes (for Samsung) No (for Apple)				
24		'915 Patent				
25		Claim 8: Yes (for Samsung) No (for Apple)				
26		<u>'163 Patent</u>				
27 28		Claim 50: Yes (for Samsung) No (for Apple)				

1	Apple's Des	ign Patent Infringer	nent Clain	ns Against Samsung	Z	
2	5.	Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung directly infringed				
3		the following Apple design patents?				
4		D'305 Patent:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
5		D'889 Patent:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
6		D'087 Patent:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
7		D'677 Patent:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
8	6.	If you answered "Y	es" to Oues	stion 5, has Apple pr	oven that i	t is more likely than
9		not that the Samsun	ig Korean p	arent entity (SEC) in		
10		(STA and SEA) to o	•			
11		Yes (for A	Apple) N	No (for San	nsung)	
12	7.	•	-	stion No. 5, has App sung's infringement	-	•
13		C				- •
14				No (for San		
15	8.	Has Samsung proven by clear and convincing evidence that Apple's asserted design patents are invalid?				
16		D'305 Patent:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
17						
18		D'889 Patent:		(for Samsung)		
19		D'087 Patent:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
20		D'677 Patent:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
21	Apple's Trad	le Dress Claims Aga	<u>inst Samsı</u>	ung		
22	A. <u>Unreg</u>	istered Trade Dress I	Dilution Cla	<u>nims</u>		
23	9.	Has Apple proven t	hat it is mo	re likely than not tha	ıt Samsung	g is liable to Apple for
24		dilution of Apple's	unregistere	d iPad-related trade	dress?	
25		Yes (for A	apple) N	No (for San	nsung)	
26	10.			<del>-</del>	_	g is liable to Apple for
27		dilution of Apple's	unregistere	d iPhone-related trac	de dress?	
28		Yes (for A	apple) N	No (for San	nsung)	

APPLE'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM CASE NO. 11-CV-01846-LHK AvSS Apple's Proposed Special Verdict Form/pa-1533697 v12

1	B. Registered Trade Dress Dilution Claims
2 3	11. Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung is liable to Apple for dilution of Apple's registered iPhone-related trade dress?
4	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
5	
6	C. <u>Trade Dress Infringement Claim</u>
7	12. Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung is liable to Apple for infringement of its iPad-related trade dress?
8	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
10	Damages for Samsung's Infringement and/or Dilution
11	13. What is the dollar amount that Apple is entitled to receive from Samsung for
12	Apple's utility patent infringement, design patent infringement, trade dress dilution, and trade dress infringement claims?
13	\$
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	
26	
27	
28	

27

28

1	3.	Has Apple pro- claims are inva	•	and convincing ev	ridence tha	t Samsung's asserted utility patent
2		'516 Patent				
3		Claim 15:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
4		Claim 16:		(for Apple)		(for Samsung)
5		'941 Patent				
6		Claim 10:		(for Apple)		(for Samsung)
		Claim 15:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
7		'604 Patent				
8		Claim 17:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
0		Claim 18:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
9		'711 Detent				
10		'711 Patent Claim 9:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
11		Ciaiii 7.	105	(101 1 ippie)	110	(Tot Sumsung)
		<u>'893 Patent</u>				
12		Claim 10:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
13		'460 Patent				
14		Claim 1:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
15	<u>Da</u>	mages for App	le's Infring	<u>ement</u>		
16 17	4.	What is the dolutility patent in			titled to red	ceive from Apple for Samsung's
18			J			
		\$				<del>.</del>
19						
20		FINDIN	NGS ON AP	PPLE'S COUNTE	CRCLAIM	IS AGAINST SAMSUNG
21	<u>Br</u>	each of Contra	<u>ct Claims a</u> r	nd Antitrust		
22	_	TT A 1	.1	19 1 4	1 0	1 12 12
23	5.			•		nsung breached its contractual property rights ("IPR") during the
						ts "declared essential" patents on fair,
24		reasonable, and	l non-discrin	minatory ("FRANI	O") terms?	
25		Yes	_ (for Apple	) No	(for Sams)	ung)
26						
27						
28						
_0						

1	6. Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung has violated Section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act by monopolizing one or more technology markets related to the						
2	UMTS standard?						
3	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)						
4	7. If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 5or Question No. 6, what is the dollar amount that						
5	Apple is entitled to receive from Samsung for Samsung's antitrust violation and/or breach of contract?						
6	\$						
7 8	Patent Exhaustion						
0	Tatent Danaustion						
9	8. Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung is barred from enforcing the '516, '941, and '604 patents against Apple based on the doctrine of patent exhaustion?						
11	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)						
12	<u>Waiver</u>						
13							
13	9. Has Apple proven by clear and convincing evidence that Samsung has waived its rights to enforce the '516, '941, and '604 patents against Apple?						
15	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)						
16	Equitable Estoppel						
17 18	10. Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung is equitably estopped from enforcing the '516, '941, and '604 patents against Apple?						
19	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)						
20							
21							
22		_					
23	Have the presiding juror sign and date this form.						
24							
25	Signed:Date:						
26	PRESIDING JUROR						
27	I RESIDING FOROIC						
28							

APPLE'S PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM CASE NO. 11-CV-01846-LHK AvSS Apple's Proposed Special Verdict Form/pa-1533697 v12