

EXHIBIT A

IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.

March _____, 2014

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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)					Search Ads (using the User Based Ads Quality model ("UBAQ"))		Content Ads/ YouTube (using the Content User Based Ads Quality model ("CUBAQ"))	
	Link	Dilip	Rephil	Category NavBoost	Sessions Category				
	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)					Search Ads (using the User Based Ads Quality model ("UBAQ"))		Content Ads/ YouTube (using the Content User Based Ads Quality model ("CUBAQ"))	
	Link	Dilip	Rephil	Category NavBoost	Sessions Category	Literal	DOE	Literal	DOE
	Literal	Literal	Literal	Literal	Literal				
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	NO	NO	NO	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
Claim 1	YES	Mladenic
	YES	Montebello
	YES	Wasfi
'276 Patent	Anticipated?	Prior art
Claim 1	YES	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	YES

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: _____
Foreperson

EXHIBIT B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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 24th, 2013


 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

DEPUY SYNTHES PRODUCTS, LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	C.A. No. 11-652-LPS
v.)	
)	
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. INFRINGEMENT

A. Infringement – Globus’ Independence® Product

1. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus’ Independence® product literally infringed 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 infringed under the doctrine of equivalents 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 literally infringed 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.

4. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents 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 ___

5. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product literally infringed the following claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,862,616 ("the '616 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 6.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 7.

6. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents the following claim of the '616 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 7.

If you answered no, please skip to question number 9.

7. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product literally infringed the following claim of the '616 patent?

Please check YES or NO.

YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 13: YES NO ___

If you answered NO, please answer question number 8.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 9.

8. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents the following claim of the '616 patent?

Please check YES or NO.

YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 13: YES ___ NO ___

9. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product literally infringed 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 answer question number 10.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 11.

10. 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 1: YES ___ NO ___

If you answered YES, please answer question number 11.

If you answered no, please skip to question number 15.

11. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product literally infringed 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 2: YES NO ___

If you answered NO, please answer question number 12.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 13.

12. 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 2: YES ___ NO ___

13. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product literally infringed 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 16: YES NO ___

If you answered NO, please answer question number 14.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 15.

14. 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 16: YES ___ NO ___

15. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Independence[®] product literally infringed 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 ___

If you answered NO, please answer question number 16.

If you answered YES, please 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 ___

B. Infringement – Globus’ Coalition® Product

1. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus’ Coalition® product literally infringed 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’ Coalition® product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents 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’ Coalition® product literally infringed 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.*

4. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus’ Coalition® product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents 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

5. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition[®] product literally infringed the following claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,862,616 ("the '616 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 6.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 7.

6. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition[®] product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents the following claim of the '616 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 7.

If you answered no, please skip to question number 9.

7. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition[®] product literally infringed the following claim of the '616 patent?

Please check YES or NO.

YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 13: YES NO

If you answered NO, please answer question number 8.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 9.

8. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition[®] product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents the following claim of the '616 patent?

Please check YES or NO.

YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 13: YES NO

9. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition[®] product literally infringed 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 answer question number 10.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 11.

10. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition[®] 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 1: YES NO

If you answered YES, please answer question number 11.

If you answered no, please skip to question number 15.

11. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition[®] product literally infringed 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 2: YES NO

If you answered NO, please answer question number 12.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 13.

12. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition[®] 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 2: YES NO

13. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition® product literally infringed 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 16: YES NO

If you answered NO, please answer question number 14.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 15.

14. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition® 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 16: YES NO

15. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition® product literally infringed 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

If you answered NO, please answer question number 16.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number C.1.

16. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' Coalition® 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

C. Infringement – Globus’ InterContinental[®] Product

1. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus’ InterContinental[®] product literally infringed 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’ InterContinental[®] product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents 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’ InterContinental[®] product literally infringed 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.

4. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus’ InterContinental[®] product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents 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

5. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product literally infringed the following claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,862,616 ("the '616 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 6.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 7.

6. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents the following claim of the '616 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 7.

If you answered no, please skip to question number 9.

7. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product literally infringed the following claim of the '616 patent?

Please check YES or NO.

YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 13: YES NO

If you answered NO, please answer question number 8.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 9.

8. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product infringed under the doctrine of equivalents the following claim of the '616 patent?

Please check YES or NO.

YES is a finding for Synthes. NO is a finding for Globus.

Claim 13: YES NO

9. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product literally infringed 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 answer question number 10.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 11.

10. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® 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 1: YES NO

If you answered YES, please answer question number 11.

If you answered no, please skip to question number 15.

11. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product literally infringed 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 2: YES NO

If you answered NO, please answer question number 12.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 13.

12. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® 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 2: YES NO

13. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product literally infringed 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 16: YES NO

If you answered NO, please answer question number 14.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number 15.

14. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® 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 16: YES NO

15. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® product literally infringed 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

If you answered NO, please answer question number 16.

If you answered YES, please skip to question number D.1.

16. Has Synthes proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Globus' InterContinental® 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

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.

- a. Claim 1: YES ___ NO

If you answered NO, skip to question D.2. below.

If you answered YES, answer the following question:

- b. Claim 13: YES ___ NO ___

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.

- a. Claim 1: YES ___ NO

If you answered NO, skip to question D.2.d. below.

If you answered YES, answer all of the following questions:

- b. Claim 2: YES ___ NO ___

- c. Claim 16: YES ___ NO ___

- d. Claim 42: YES ___ NO

3. Has Globus shown by clear and convincing evidence that any asserted claim of the '076 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.

Claim 1: YES ___ NO

If you answered NO, skip to question E.1. below.

If you answered YES, answer the following question:

Claim 11: YES ___ NO ___

E. Obviousness in View of
U.S. Patent No. 6,972,019 ("The Michelson '019 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 Michelson '019 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.

a. Claim 1: YES ___ NO

If you answered NO, skip to question E.2. below.

If you answered YES, answer the following question:

b. Claim 13: YES ___ NO ___

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 Michelson '019 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.

a. Claim 1: YES ___ NO

If you answered NO, skip to question E.2.d. below.

If you answered YES, answer all of the following questions:

b. Claim 2: YES ___ NO ___

c. Claim 16: YES ___ NO ___

d. Claim 42: YES ___ NO

3. Has Globus shown by clear and convincing evidence that any asserted claim of the '076 patent is invalid for obviousness based on combining the Michelson '019 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.

- a. Claim 1: YES ___ NO

If you answered NO, skip to question F.1. below.

If you answered YES, answer following question:

- b. Claim 11: YES ___ NO ___

F. Obviousness in View of U.S. Patent No. 5,397,364 ("The Kozak 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 Kozak 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.

- a. Claim 1: YES ___ NO

If you answered NO, skip to question F.2. below.

If you answered YES, answer the following question:

- b. Claim 13: YES ___ NO ___

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 Kozak 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.

- a. Claim 1: YES ___ NO

If you answered NO, skip to question F.2.d. below.

If you answered YES, answer all of the following questions:

- b. Claim 2: YES ___ NO ___

- c. Claim 16: YES ___ NO ___

- d. Claim 42: YES ___ NO

3. Has Globus shown by clear and convincing evidence that any asserted claim of the '076 patent is invalid for obviousness based on combining the Kozak 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.

- 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 ___

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?

15 %

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

\$ 106,678,815.00

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, 2013

By:

Foreperson

REDACTED

EXHIBIT C

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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 THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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 Claim No.	Direct	
	Yes	No
1	X	
2	X	
34	X	
41	X	
55	X	

'258 Patent Claim No.	Direct	
	Yes	No
1	X	
2	X	
3	X	
34	X	

II. VALIDITY

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 Claim No.	Obviousness	
	Yes	No
1		X
2		X
34		X
41		X
55		X

'258 Patent Claim No.	Obviousness	
	Yes	No
1		X
2		X
3		X
34		X

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

Dated: July 1, 2008

EXHIBIT D

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, L.L.P.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 09-525-LPS
)	
GOOGLE INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
GOOGLE, INC.)	
)	
Counterclaimant,)	
)	
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”).

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.