

Exhibit 2

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

MIRROR WORLDS, LLC

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 6:08-CV-88 LED

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

APPLE INC.

Counterclaim Plaintiff

v.

MIRROR WORLDS, LLC,
MIRROR WORLDS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Counterclaim Defendants.

APPLE INC.'S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

In answering these questions, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Court's Charge.

I. INFRINGEMENT OF MIRROR WORLDS' PATENTS

A. Did Mirror Worlds prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Apple directly infringed the listed claims of the '227 Patent by making, using, selling, and/or offering to sell the accused products in the United States?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim and product (skip line marked "N/A"):

	Mac OS X 10.4 Running on Apple Computer	Mac OS X 10.5 or 10.6 Running on Apple Computer
Claim 13	_____	_____
Claim 14	_____	_____
Claim 15	_____	_____
Claim 16	_____	_____
Claim 17	_____	_____
Claim 20	_____	_____
Claim 22	N/A	_____

B. Did Mirror Worlds prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Apple directly infringed the listed claims of the '313 Patent by making, using, selling, and/or offering to sell Mac OS X 10.5 or 10.6 running on an Apple computer in the United States?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim:

Claim 1 _____
Claim 2 _____
Claim 3 _____
Claim 4 _____
Claim 9 _____
Claim 10 _____
Claim 11 _____

C. Did Mirror Worlds prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Apple directly infringed the listed claims of the '427 Patent by making, using, selling, and/or offering to sell the accused products in the United States?

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each listed claim and product (skip lines marked “N/A”):

	Mac OS X 10.5 or 10.6 Running on Apple Computer	iPhone, iPod Touch, and iPad	iPod Classic and iPod Nano	iTunes Running on Apple Computer	Safari 4 Running on Apple Computer
Claim 1	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 2	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 5	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 7	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 8	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 9	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 10	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	Mac OS X 10.5 or 10.6 Running on Apple Computer	iPhone, iPod Touch, and iPad	iPod Classic and iPod Nano	iTunes Running on Apple Computer	Safari 4 Running on Apple Computer
Claim 13	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 15	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 16	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 17	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 18	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 19	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 22	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 24	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 25	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 26	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 29	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 31	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 32	_____	N/A	N/A	_____	_____
Claim 33	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 34	_____	N/A	N/A	_____	_____
Claim 37	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Claim 39	_____	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

D. Did Mirror Worlds prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Apple directly infringed claim 1 of the '999 Patent by making, using, selling, and/or offering to sell (i) any

Apple computer or device containing or utilizing Mac OS X 10.5 or 10.6 or Mac OS X Server 10.5 or 10.6 and (ii) an Apple enterprise server in the United States?

Answer “Yes” or “No” _____

II. INVALIDITY OF MIRROR WORLDS' PATENTS

A. Did Apple prove that the listed claims of the '227 Patent are invalid for any of the following reasons? For invalidity defenses based on prior art that was not considered by the USPTO during the prosecution of the '227 Patent, Apple must have proved invalidity by a preponderance of the evidence. For all other invalidity defenses, Apple must have proved invalidity by clear and convincing evidence.

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim and defense:

	1. Anticipation by Prior Art	2. Obviousness	3. Lack of Adequate Written Description	4. Lack of Enablement
Claim 13	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 14	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 15	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 16	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 17	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 20	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 22	_____	_____	_____	_____

B. Did Apple prove that the listed claims of the '313 Patent are invalid for any of the following reasons? For invalidity defenses based on prior art that was not considered by the USPTO during the prosecution of the '313 Patent, Apple must have proved invalidity by a preponderance of the evidence. For all other invalidity defenses, Apple must have proved invalidity by clear and convincing evidence.

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each listed claim and defense:

	1. Anticipation by Prior Art	2. Obviousness	3. Lack of Adequate Written Description	4. Lack of Enablement
Claim 1	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 2	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 3	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 4	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 9	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 10	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 11	_____	_____	_____	_____

C. Did Apple prove that the listed claims of the '427 Patent are invalid for any of the following reasons? For invalidity defenses based on prior art that was not considered by the USPTO during the prosecution of the '427 Patent, Apple must have proved invalidity by a preponderance of the evidence. For all other invalidity defenses, Apple must have proved invalidity by clear and convincing evidence.

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each listed claim and defense:

	1. Anticipation by Prior Art	2. Obviousness	3. Lack of Adequate Written Description	4. Lack of Enablement
Claim 1	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 2	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 5	_____	_____	_____	_____

	1. Anticipation by Prior Art	2. Obviousness	3. Lack of Adequate Written Description	4. Lack of Enablement
Claim 7	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 8	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 9	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 10	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 13	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 15	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 16	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 17	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 18	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 19	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 22	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 24	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 25	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 26	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 29	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 31	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 32	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 33	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 34	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 37	_____	_____	_____	_____
Claim 39	_____	_____	_____	_____

D. Did Apple prove that claim 1 of the '999 Patent is invalid for any of the following reasons? For invalidity defenses based on prior art that was not considered by the USPTO during the prosecution of the '999 Patent, Apple must have proved invalidity by a preponderance of the evidence. For all other invalidity defenses, Apple must have proved invalidity by clear and convincing evidence.

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each listed defense:

	1. Anticipation by Prior Art	2. Obviousness	3. Lack of Adequate Written Description	4. Lack of Enablement	5. Improper Inventorship
Claim 1	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

III. UNENFORCEABILITY OF MIRROR WORLDS' PATENTS

A. Did Apple prove by clear and convincing evidence that the '227 Patent is unenforceable for inequitable conduct?

Answer "Yes" or "No" _____

B. Did Apple prove clear and convincing evidence that the '313 Patent is unenforceable for inequitable conduct?

Answer "Yes" or "No" _____

C. Did Apple prove clear and convincing evidence that the '427 Patent is unenforceable for inequitable conduct?

Answer "Yes" or "No" _____

D. Did Apple prove clear and convincing evidence that the '999 patent is unenforceable for inequitable conduct?

Answer "Yes" or "No" _____

If you found in Questions I. A through D that Mirror Worlds proved that Apple infringed at least one claim of the Mirror Worlds Patents (a “Yes” answer to any claim) and you found in Questions II. A through D that Apple did not prove that any infringed claim was invalid (a “No” answer to any claim for which you found infringement) and you found in Questions III. A through D that Apple did not prove that any infringed and valid claim was unenforceable (a “No” answer to any claim for which you found infringement and did not find invalidity), then answer Questions IV and V. Otherwise skip to Question VI.

IV. WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT OF MIRROR WORLDS’ PATENTS

A. Did Mirror Worlds prove by clear and convincing evidence that Apple’s infringement of any valid and enforceable claim was willful?

Answer “Yes” or “No” _____

V. DAMAGES FOR INFRINGEMENT OF MIRROR WORLDS' PATENTS

A. What date did you determine damages for infringement of the Mirror Worlds' patents should begin?

Date: _____

B. What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, do you find should be awarded to Mirror Worlds as damages adequate to compensate it for the valid patent claims you have found to have been infringed? Only award damages for those claims you find infringed, valid, and enforceable. Do not award damages for claims that you did not find infringed, valid, and enforceable.

Answer: _____

C. You have heard testimony regarding a "running royalty," which is a royalty determined by the amount of use of the purported invention over time. You have also heard testimony regarding a "lump sum paid up royalty," which is a fixed amount paid to the patent holder regardless of the amount of use of the purported invention over time. If you have awarded reasonable royalty damages above, is that award based on a "running royalty" or a "lump sum paid up royalty"?

Answer: _____

VI. INFRINGEMENT OF APPLE’S PATENT

A. Did Apple prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Mirror Worlds Technologies (“MWT”) infringed the listed claims of the Apple Patent directly, indirectly, literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents?

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each listed claim:

- Claim 1** _____
- Claim 2** _____
- Claim 3** _____
- Claim 4** _____
- Claim 5** _____
- Claim 6** _____
- Claim 7** _____
- Claim 8** _____
- Claim 9** _____
- Claim 10** _____
- Claim 11** _____
- Claim 12** _____

VII. INVALIDITY OF APPLE’S PATENT

A. Did MWT prove that the listed claims of the ’101 Patent are invalid for any of the following reasons? For anticipation by prior art that was not considered by the USPTO during the prosecution of the ’101 Patent, MWT must have proved invalidity by a preponderance of the evidence. For all other invalidity defenses, MWT must have proved invalidity by clear and convincing evidence.

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each listed claim and defense:

	1. Anticipation by Prior Art	2. Obviousness
Claim 1	_____	_____
Claim 2	_____	_____
Claim 3	_____	_____
Claim 4	_____	_____
Claim 5	_____	_____
Claim 6	_____	_____
Claim 7	_____	_____
Claim 8	_____	_____
Claim 9	_____	_____
Claim 10	_____	_____
Claim 11	_____	_____
Claim 12	_____	_____

If you found in Question VI that Apple proved that the Mirror Worlds Parties infringed at least one claim of the Apple Patent (a “Yes” to any claim), and you found in Questions VII that MWT did not prove that any infringed claim was invalid (a “No” to any claim for which you found infringement) then answer Questions VIII and IX. Otherwise you are finished, and the foreperson should sign and date the last page of this Verdict Form.

VIII. WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT OF APPLE’S PATENT

A. Did Apple prove by clear and convincing evidence that MWT’s infringement of any valid claim was willful?

Answer “Yes” or “No” _____

IX. DAMAGES FOR INFRINGEMENT OF APPLE’S PATENT

A. What date did you determine damages for infringement of Apple’s Patent should begin?

Date: _____

B. What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, do you find should be awarded to Apple as damages adequate to compensate it for the valid patent claims you have found to have been infringed? Only award damages for those claims you find infringed and valid. Do not award damages for claims that you did not find infringed and valid.

Answer: _____

Signed this ____ day of September, 2010:

JURY FOREPERSON