EXHIBIT A

PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, L.L.P.,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
GOOGLE, INC.,)
Defendant.))) C.A. No. 09-525 (LPS)
GOOGLE, INC.,)
Counterclaimant,)
v.)
PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, L.L.P. and YOCHAI KONIG,)))
Counterclaim-Defendants.)

[PROPOSED] INTERIM JUDGMENT FOLLOWING JURY VERDICT

This action came before the Court for a trial by jury on March 10, 2014. The issues have been tried, and the jury rendered its verdict on March 20, 2014. The verdict was accompanied by the verdict form (D.I. 666), a copy of which is attached hereto. Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered on the March 20, 2014 verdict in favor of Defendant, Google, Inc. and against Plaintiffs, Personalized User Model ("PUM") and Yochai Konig ("Konig") on the claims of infringement, validity, and breach of contract set out in the attached verdict form.

This Judgment is subject to modification following the Court's consideration of the parties' post-trial motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.	
March, 2014	
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, L.L.P.,)
Plaintiff, v.)))
GOOGLE, INC.,)
Defendant.))) C.A. No. 09-525 (LPS)
GOOGLE, INC.,)
Counterclaimant,)
v.)
PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, L.L.P. and YOCHAI KONIG,)))
Counterclaim-Defendants.	,)

VERDICT FORM

I. INFRINGEMENT

A. U.S. Patent No. 6,981,040 (the '040 Patent)

Has PUM proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following Google products directly infringe the following claims of the '040 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents ("DOE")?

Please answer yes or no in each box. A "Yes" finding is for PUM. A "No" finding is for Google.

	Google Search (using the Kaltix twiddler)					Sacrah Ada	/uning the	Conter YouTube (
	Link	Dilip	Rephil	Category NavBoost	Sessions Category	Search Ads User Based model ("	Ads Quality	Content Us Ads Qual ("CUB	ser Based ity model
	Literal	Literal	Literal	Literal	Literal	Literal	DOE	Literal	DOE
Claim 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO		NO	
Claim 22	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO		NO	

B. U.S. Patent No. 7,685,276 (the '276 Patent)

Has PUM proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following Google products directly infringe the following claims of the '276 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents ("DOE")?

Please answer yes or no in each box. A "Yes" finding is for PUM. A "No" finding is for Google.

	Google Search (using the Kaltix twiddler)					Sarah Ada (using the		Content Ads/	
	Link	Dilip	Rephil	Category NavBoost	Sessions Category	Search Ads (using the User Based Ads Quality model ("UBAQ"))		YouTube (using the Content User Based Ads Quality model ("CUBAQ"))	
	Literal	Literal	Literal	Literal	Literal	Literal	DOE	Literal	DOE
Claim 1	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO		NO	
Claim 3	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO		NO	
Claim 7						NO		NO	
Claim 21	NO	NO	ND	ND	ND	NO			

II. INVALIDITY

A. ANTICIPATION

Do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any claim (or claims) of the asserted patents is (are) invalid as anticipated by a single prior art reference?

Please write in yes or no for each box. A "Yes" is a finding for Google (that the corresponding prior art reference anticipates the claim). A "No" is a finding for PUM (that the corresponding prior art reference does not anticipate the claim).

'040 Patent	Anticipated?	Prior art
	Yes	Mladenic
Claim 1	YES	Montebello
	Yes	Wasfi
'276 Patent	Anticipated?	Prior art
Claim 1	125	Montebello

B. OBVIOUSNESS

Do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any claim (or claims) of the asserted patents is (are) invalid as obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention?

Please write in yes or no for each box. A "Yes" is a finding for Google (that the claim is obvious). A "No" is a finding for PUM (that the claim is not obvious).

'040 Patent	Obvious?
Claim 1	Yes
Claim 22	YES
'276 Patent	Obvious?
Claim 1	YES
Claim 3	Yes
Claim 7	YES
Claim 21	YÉS.

III. GOOGLE'S BREACH OF CONTRACT COUNTERCLAIM

1. Has Google proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the three-year statute of limitations that applies to the breach of contract claim against Dr. Konig was tolled?

Please answer yes or no. A "Yes" finding is for Google. A "No" finding is for PUM.

Yes___/__ No_____

2. Has Google proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it acquired from SRI the right to assert SRI's breach of employment contract claim against Dr. Konig?

Please answer yes or no. A "Yes" finding is for Google. A "No" finding is for PUM.

Yes / No____

3. Has Google proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Dr. Konig breached his employment agreement with SRI by failing to assign his invention to SRI?

Please answer yes or no. A "Yes" finding is for Google. A "No" finding is for PUM.

Yes // No____

4. Has PUM shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Dr. Konig's invention was protected by Section 2870 of the California Labor Code?

Please answer yes or no. A "Yes" finding is for PUM. A "No" finding is for Google.

Yes____No___

When the jury has reached a verdict, you must each sign this verdict form and signal the U.S. Marshal that you are ready to render a verdict.

Dated: _	March 20, 2014	Signed:	Forepe	erson		· <u>-</u> .		
					, 	·		
			1		<i>y</i>		-	
								y.
							-54	
				~.				
			-				*	
				e P	1	•		
							,	

EXHIBIT B

DEPUY SYNTHES PRODUCTS, LLC,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	C.A. No. 11-652-LPS
GLOBUS MEDICAL, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

JUDGMENT FOLLOWING JURY VERDICT

This action came before the Court for a trial by jury beginning on June 3, 2013. The issues have been tried and the jury rendered a verdict on June 14, 2013. The verdict was accompanied by the verdict form (D.I. 321, 322), a copy of which is attached hereto. Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered on the June 14, 2013 verdict in favor of Plaintiff DePuy Synthes Products, LLC ("Synthes"), and against Defendant Globus Medical, Inc. ("Globus"), on all claims of infringement, validity and damages as set out in the attached verdict form.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered in favor of Synthes, and against Globus, for damages in the amount of \$16,001,822.25.

This Judgment is subject to modification following the Court's consideration of the parties' post-trial motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.

June 2013

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DEPUY SYNTHES PRODUCTS, LLC,)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No. 11-652-LPS
v.)	C.A. No. 11-032-LF3
GLOBUS MEDICAL, INC.,)	
Defendant)	

JURY VERDICT FORM

This case will be decided on the basis of the answers that you give to certain questions. Each of the questions calls for a "YES" or "NO" answer, or for a number. When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please refer to the Jury Instructions for guidance on the law applicable to the subject matter covered by each question.

The answer to each question must be based on a unanimous decision. When all of you have agreed on any answer, the Foreperson of the jury will write the answer in the space provided. As you will note from the wording of the questions, depending on how you answer certain questions, you may not have to answer others.

When you have answered all the questions that require answers, place the completed verdict form in an envelope the Court will provide to you and send the Court a note stating that you have reached a verdict.

Do not assume from the questions or from the wording of the questions or from the Court's instructions on them what the answers should be.

WE THE JURY, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case:

I.	INFR	INGE	MENT

	A.	Infringement -	Globus'	Independence®	Product
--	----	----------------	---------	---------------	---------

1.	Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence® product <u>literally infringed</u> the following claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,875,076 ("the '076 patent")?
	Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 1: YES NO ____

If you answered NO, please answer question number 2.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 3.

2. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence® product <u>infringed under the doctrine of equivalents</u> the following claim of the '076 patent?

Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 1: YES ____ NO ___

If you answered YES, please answer question number 3.

If you answered no, please skip to question number 5.

3. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence® product <u>literally infringed</u> the following claim of the '076 patent?

Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 11: YES _____ NO ___

If you answered NO, please answer question number 4. If you answered YES, please skip to question number 5.

K	4.	Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Glo Independence® product infringed under the doctrine of equivaler following claim of the '076 patent?		
			ease check YES or NO. S is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim 11:	YES	NO
	5.	Independe		ance of the evidence that Globus' inged the following claim of U.S. ent")?
			ease check YES or NO. ES is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim 1:	YES V	NO
			_	answer question number 6. skip to question number 7.
	6.	Independe		ance of the evidence that Globus' nder the doctrine of equivalents the
			ease check YES or NO. ES is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim 1:	YES	NO
		ν.	you answered YES, please you answered no, please s	answer question number 7. kip to question number 9.
	7.			ance of the evidence that Globus' ringed the following claim of the '616
			ease check YES or NO. ES is a finding for Synthes	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim 13:	YES V	NO
			-	answer question number 8. e skip to question number 9.

8.	Indepe	s Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' dependence product <u>infringed under the doctrine of equivalents</u> the llowing claim of the '616 patent?			
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.	
	Claim	13:	YES	NO	
9.	Indepe	endence		inged the following claim of U.S. ent")?	
		YES is	,	NO is a finding for Globus.	
	Claim	1:	YES V	NO	
			-	answer question number 10. skip to question number 11.	
10.	Indep	endence		ance of the evidence that Globus' der the doctrine of equivalents the	
			e check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.	
	Claim	1:	YES	NO	
				answer question number 11. kip to question number 15.	
11.		endence		ance of the evidence that Globus' inged the following claim of the '20'	
			e check YES or NO. s a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.	
	Clain	n 2:	YES V	NO	
				answer question number 12. c skip to question number 13.	

12.	Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence® product <u>infringed under the doctrine of equivalents</u> the following claim of the '207 patent?					
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.		
	Claim	2:	YES	NO		
13.		ndence		nce of the evidence that Globus' anged the following claim of the '207		
				NO is a finding for Globus.		
	Claim	16:	YES V	NO		
				answer question number 14. skip to question number 15.		
14.	Indepe	endence	proven by a prepondera product <u>infringed un</u> m of the '207 patent?	ance of the evidence that Globus' der the doctrine of equivalents the		
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.		
	Claim	16:	YES	NO		
15.		endence		ance of the evidence that Globus' inged the following claim of the '207		
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.		
	Claim	42:	YES <u></u>	NO		
			_	answer question number 16. skip to question number B.1.		

16. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence® product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents the following claim of the '207 patent?

Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 42: YES ___ NO ___

В.	Infrino	ement – Glob	ous' Coalition® Product	
	1.	Has Synthes Coalition® p	proven by a prepondera	nce of the evidence that Globus' the following claim of U.S. Patent
			se check YES or NO. is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim 1:	YES	NO
			_	answer question number 2. skip to question number 3.
	2.	Coalition® p		ance of the evidence that Globus' he doctrine of equivalents the
			se check YES or NO. is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim 1:	YES	NO
			-	answer question number 3. kip to question number 5.
	3.	•		ance of the evidence that Globus' and the following claim of the '076
			ase check YES or NO. is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim 11:	YES V	NO
				answer question number 4. skip to question number 5.
	4.	Coalition® 1		ance of the evidence that Globus' the doctrine of equivalents the
			ase check YES or NO. Tis a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim 11:	YES	NO

5.	Coaliti	on [®] proc		rance of the evidence that Globus' ed the following claim of U.S. Patent
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes	. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim	1:	YES V	NO
			_	answer question number 6. e skip to question number 7.
6.	Coaliti	on® pro		rance of the evidence that Globus' the doctrine of equivalents the
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes	. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim	1:	YES	NO
			_	e answer question number 7. skip to question number 9.
7.		ion® pro		rance of the evidence that Globus' ed the following claim of the '616
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes	s. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim	13:	YES V	NO
			_	e answer question number 8. e skip to question number 9.
8.	Coalit	ion [®] pro		rance of the evidence that Globus' the doctrine of equivalents the
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthe	s. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim	13:	YES	NO

9.	Coalition [®]		nce of the evidence that Globus' the following claim of U.S. Patent
		ase check YES or NO. S is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 1:	YES V	NO
		_	answer question number 10. skip to question number 11.
10.	Coalition [®]		ance of the evidence that Globus' he doctrine of equivalents the
		ease check YES or NO. S is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 1:	YES	NO
		_	answer question number 11. kip to question number 15.
11.			ance of the evidence that Globus' d the following claim of the '207
		ease check YES or NO. ES is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 2:	YES <u> </u>	NO
		, <u> </u>	answer question number 12. skip to question number 13.
12.	Coalition		ance of the evidence that Globus' the doctrine of equivalents the
		ease check YES or NO. ES is a finding for Synthes.	. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 2:	YES	NO

13.	-	2 2 2	ance of the evidence that Globus's the following claim of the '207
		ase check YES or NO. S is a finding for Synthes	. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 16:	YES V	NO
		_	answer question number 14. e skip to question number 15.
14.	Coalition®		rance of the evidence that Globus the doctrine of equivalents the
		ase check YES or NO. S is a finding for Synthes	. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 16:	YES	NO
15.			rance of the evidence that Globus ed the following claim of the '207
		ase check YES or NO. S is a finding for Synthes	s. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 42:	YES _	NO
		_	e answer question number 16. e skip to question number C.1.
16.	Coalition®		rance of the evidence that Globus the doctrine of equivalents the
		ease check YES or NO. S is a finding for Synthe.	s. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 42:	YES	NO

C.	Infring	gement –	Globus	'InterContinental® P	roduct
	1.	InterCo	ntinenta		ance of the evidence that Globus' afringed the following claim of U.S. ent")?
				check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim	1:	YES V	NO
					answer question number 2. skip to question number 3.
	2.	InterCo	ontinent		ance of the evidence that Globus' under the doctrine of equivalents the
				check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim	1:	YES	NO
				_	answer question number 3. kip to question number 5.
	3.		ontinent		ance of the evidence that Globus' infringed the following claim of the
				check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim	11:	YES 1	NO
				4	answer question number 4. skip to question number 5.
	4.	InterCo	ontinent		ance of the evidence that Globus' under the doctrine of equivalents the
				check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
		Claim	11:	YES	NO

5.	Patent No. 7,862,616 ("the '616 pa	infringed the following claim of U.S.
		s. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 1: YES	NO
		e answer question number 6. se skip to question number 7.
6.	Has Synthes proven by a preponde InterContinental® product infringe following claim of the '616 patent'	d under the doctrine of equivalents the
	Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthe	s. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 1: YES	NO
	If you answered YES, please If you answered no, please	se answer question number 7. skip to question number 9.
7.		erance of the evidence that Globus' infringed the following claim of the
	Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthe	es. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 13: YES	NO
		e answer question number 8. se skip to question number 9.
8.		erance of the evidence that Globus' ed under the doctrine of equivalents the
	Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthe	es. NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 13: YES	NO

9.	Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product <u>literally infringed</u> the following claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,846,207 ("the '207 patent")?					
	Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.				
	Claim 1: YES	NO				
	If you answered NO, please of If you answered YES, please	-				
10.	Has Synthes proven by a prepondera InterContinental® product infringed following claim of the '207 patent?	ance of the evidence that Globus' under the doctrine of equivalents the				
	Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.				
	Claim 1: YES	NO				
	If you answered YES, please If you answered no, please s	answer question number 11. kip to question number 15.				
11.	Has Synthes proven by a preponder: InterContinental® product <u>literally in</u> '207 patent?					
	Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.				
	Claim 2: YES	NO				
	If you answered NO, please If you answered YES, please	-				
12.	Has Synthes proven by a preponder InterContinental® product infringed following claim of the '207 patent?	ance of the evidence that Globus' under the doctrine of equivalents the				
	Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.				
	Claim 2: YES	NO				

13.		ntinenta		nce of the evidence that Globus' <u>afringed</u> the following claim of the
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim 1	6:	YES V	NO
				answer question number 14. skip to question number 15.
14.	InterCo	ntinent		ance of the evidence that Globus' under the doctrine of equivalents the
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim	16:	YES	NO
15.	Has Sy InterCo '207 pa	ontinent	roven by a preponders al [®] product <u>literally in</u>	ance of the evidence that Globus' nfringed the following claim of the
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim	42:	YES V	NO
		0 0	-	answer question number 16. skip to question number D.1.
16.	InterCo	ontinen		ance of the evidence that Globus' under the doctrine of equivalents the
			check YES or NO. a finding for Synthes.	NO is a finding for Globus.
	Claim	42:	YES	NO

II. VALIDITY

D.

Obviousness in View of U.S. Patent No. 6,432,106 ("The Fraser Patent") 1. Has Globus shown by clear and convincing evidence that any asserted claim of the '616 patent is invalid for obviousness based on combining the Fraser patent with any one or more other references? Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Globus. NO is a finding for Synthes. NO V YES Claim 1: a. If you answered NO, skip to question D.2.below. If you answered YES, answer the following question: YES NO b. Claim 13: 2. Has Globus shown by clear and convincing evidence that any asserted claim of the '207 patent is invalid for obviousness based on combining the Fraser patent with any one or more other references? Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Globus. NO is a finding for Synthes. NO V YES Claim 1: a. If you answered NO, skip to question D.2.d. below. If you answered YES, answer all of the following questions: Claim 2: YES NO b. YES ___

NO ____

Claim 16:

Claim 42: YES ___

c.

d.

	3.	claim o	•	nt is invalid fo	or obviou	evidence that any asserted sness based on combining the erences?
			Please check Y YES is a findin		NO is a	finding for Synthes.
		Claim	1: YES _	_	NO 🗸	-
			If you answere If you answere	_	-	E.1.below. owing question:
		Claim	11: YES _		NO	_
E.			n View of o. 6,972,019 ("	The Michelson	n '019 Pa	atent")
	1.	claim o	of the '616 pate	ent is invalid fo	or obviou	evidence that any asserted asness based on combining the other references?
			Please check? YES is a findin		NO is a	finding for Synthes.
		a.	Claim 1:	YES		NO <u>✓</u>
			If you answere If you answere	_	-	E.2. below. lowing question:
		b.	Claim 13:	YES		NO
	2.	claim	of the '207 pate	ent is invalid f	or obviou	evidence that any asserted usness based on combining the other references?
			Please check YES is a findi		NO is a	a finding for Synthes.
		a.	Claim 1:	YES		NO V
				ed NO, skip to ed YES, answe	-	n E.2.d. below. he following questions:
		b.	Claim 2:	YES		NO
		c.	Claim 16:	YES		NO
		d.	Claim 42:	YES		NO 🗸

F.

3.	claim o	of the '076 pate		evidence that any asserted usness based on combining the e other references?
		Please check? YES is a findin	YES or NO. ng for Globus. NO is a	a finding for Synthes.
	a.	Claim 1:	YES	NO V
			skip to question F 1. be answer following que	
	b.	Claim 11:	YES	NO
Obvio	usness i	in View of U.S.	Patent No. 5,397,364	("The Kozak Patent")
1.	claim	of the '616 pate	_	evidence that any asserted busness based on combining the eferences?
		Please check YES is a findi	YES or NO. ng for Globus. NO is	a finding for Synthes.
	a.	Claim 1:	YES	NO 🗸
			ed NO, skip to questio ed YES, answer the fo	
	b.	Claim 13:	YES	NO
2.	claim	of the '207 pat		g evidence that any asserted busness based on combining the eferences?
		Please check YES is a find	YES or NO. ing for Globus. NO is	a finding for Synthes.
	a.	Claim 1:	YES	NO 🗸
		<i>U V</i>	red NO, skip to questio red YES, answer all of	on F.2.d. below. the following questions:
	b.	Claim 2:	YES	NO
	c.	Claim 16:	YES	NO
	ď.	Claim 42:	YES	NO V

Please check YES or NO. YES is a finding for Globus. NO is a finding for Synthes. a. Claim 1: YES NO If you answered NO, skip to Section III. below. If you answered YES, answer the following question: b. Claim 11: YES NO	3.	claim	of the '076 par	₹	obviousness based on combining the ther references?
If you answered NO, skip to Section III. below. If you answered YES, answer the following question:					NO is a finding for Synthes.
If you answered YES, answer the following question:		a.	Claim 1:	YES	NO V
b. Claim 11: YES NO					
		b.	Claim 11:	YES	NO

III. DAMAGES

Complete this Section if you answered "YES" for any claim in Section I and you did not answer "YES" for that same claim in Section II.

1. For infringing sales made by Globus, what percentage royalty is necessary to adequately compensate Synthes for Globus' infringement?

2. What is the dollar amount of sales by Globus to which the percentage royalty should apply to calculate Synthes' damages?

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Foreperson should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and all other jurors must then sign the verdict form in the spaces below. Then, notify the marshal that you have reached a verdict.

The Foreperson should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

DATED JUNE 14, 2	2013	By:	
		Foreperson	

EXHIBIT C

LINEAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	C.A. No. 06-476 GMS
MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

JUDGMENT

This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury rendered its verdict on July 1, 2008. The verdict was accompanied by a verdict form (D.I. 227), a copy of which is attached hereto. Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered in favor of the plaintiff, LINEAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION and against the defendant, MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC., that MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC. infringes Claims 1, 2, 34, 41, and 55 of U.S. Patent No. 5,481,178 ('178 Patent), AND that MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC., infringes Claims 1, 2, 3, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,258 ('258 Patent), AND that the '178 and '258 patents are valid.¹

Dated: November 17, 2008

CHIEF, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Certain claims remain pending before the court. This judgment is not a final judgment as to all claims, consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), but serves to trigger the 10-day limitations period under Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b).

IN T	HE U	NIT	ED S	TATI	ES D	ISTR	ICT	COU	RT
F	OR 1	THE	DIST	CRICI	OF	DEL	AWA	ARE	

LINEAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION)
Plaintiff,)
v.) C.A. No. 06-476 (GMS)
MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,)
Defendant)

VERDICT FORM

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

INFRINGEMENT

A. Do you find that Linear has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that MPS has infringed any of the following patent claims?

A "YES" answer is a finding for Linear. A "NO" answer is a finding for MPS.

'178 Patent	Di	rect
Claim No.	Yes	No
1	X	
2	$\dot{\lambda}$	
34	X	
41	Χ	
55	χ	

'258 Patent	Dii	rect
Claim No.	Yes	No
1	$\overline{\chi}$	
2	X	
3	X	
34	X	

II. <u>VALIDITY</u>

A. Do you find that MPS has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, invalidity of any of the following claims by reason of obviousness?

A "YES" answer is a finding for MPS. A "NO" answer is a finding for Linear.

'178 Patent	Obvio	usness
Claim No.	Yes	No
1		X
2		X
34		Х
41		×
55		$\overline{\lambda}$

'258 Patent	Obvio	usness
Claim No.	Yes	No
1		$\overline{\chi}$
2		X
3		X
34		X

Each juror must sign the verdict form to reflect that a unanimous verdict has been reached.

Dated: Tuly 1 , 2008	Dated:	Tuly	1	, 2008
----------------------	--------	------	---	--------

2386940

EXHIBIT D

PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, L.L.P.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 09-525-LPS
)	
GOOGLE INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
GOOGLE, INC.)	
~)	
Counterclaimant,)	
V.)	
v.)	
PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, LLP and)	
YOCHAI KONIG)	
)	
Counterdefendants.)	

JUDGMENT

For reasons stated in the jury verdict of March 20, 2014:

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered on behalf of defendant Google Inc. as to no infringement of claim 1 or 22 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,981,040 ("040 patent").

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered on behalf of defendant Google Inc. as to no infringement of claims 1, 3, 7, or 21 of U.S. Patent No. 7,685,276 ("276 patent").

01980.51575/5830935.2

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered on behalf of defendant Google Inc. that claim 1 of the '040 patent and claim 1 of the '276 patent are invalid because they are anticipated and obvious.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered on behalf of defendant Google Inc. that claim 22 of the '040 patent, and claims 3, 7, and 21 of the '276 patent are invalid because they are obvious.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered on behalf of defendant Google Inc. that Yochai Konig breached his employment agreement with SRI.

Therefore, PUM takes nothing by way of its patent infringement claims, and those claims are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.