EXHIBIT F

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Eolas Technologies, Inc.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 6:09-cv-446-LED
Adobe Systems, Inc.., Amazon.com, Inc.,	§	
Apple Inc., Argosy Publishing, Inc.,	§	
Blockbuster Inc., CDW Corp., Citigroup Inc.,	§	
eBay Inc., Frito-Lay, Inc., The Go Daddy	§	
Group, Inc., Google Inc., J.C. Penney	§	
Company, Inc., JPMorgan Chase & Co., New	§	
Frontier Media, Inc., Office Depot, Inc.,	§	
Playboy Enterprises International, Inc., Rent-A-	§	
Center, Inc., Staples, Inc., Sun Microsystems	§	
Inc., Texas Instruments Inc., Yahoo! Inc., and	§	
YouTube, LLC,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	

CDW'S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM[1]

---

[1] CDW reserves the right to amend, supplement, or modify this Verdict Form as the case proceeds.

In answering these questions, you are to follow the instructions I have given you in the Charge of Court. Your answers must be unanimous.

INFRINGEMENT

1. Has Eolas proven by a preponderance of the evidence that CDW has infringed any of its asserted patent claims?

     Yes _____ No _____

     If you answered "Yes" to Question 1, please go to the next question. If you answered "No" to Question 1, then skip Questions 2, 3, 4, and 5 and go to Question 6.

2. With respect to CDW's "Product Viewer" feature, has Eolas proven by a preponderance of the evidence that CDW has directly infringed, induced the infringement of, or contributorily infringed the following asserted patent claims?

    Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim responding separately for each of direct infringement, inducement to infringe, and contributory infringement.

'985 Patent	Direct Infringement?	Inducement to Infringe?	Contributory Infringement?
Claim 1	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 3	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 16	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 18	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 20	Yes _____ No _____	n/a	n/a
Claim 22	Yes _____ No _____	n/a	n/a

3.   With respect to CDW's "Web Collage" feature, has Eolas proven by a preponderance of the evidence that CDW has directly infringed, induced the infringement of, or contributorily infringed the following asserted patent claims?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim responding separately for each of direct infringement, inducement to infringe, and contributory infringement.

'985 Patent	Direct Infringement?	Inducement to Infringe?	Contributory Infringement?
Claim 1	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 3	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 16	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 18	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 20	Yes _____ No _____	n/a	n/a
Claim 22	Yes _____ No _____	n/a	n/a

4.   With respect to CDW's "Auto Suggest" (also called "TypeAhead") feature, has Eolas proven by a preponderance of the evidence that CDW has directly infringed, induced the infringement of, or contributorily infringed the following asserted patent claims?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim responding separately for each of direct infringement, inducement to infringe, and contributory infringement.

'985 Patent	Direct Infringement?	Inducement to Infringe?	Contributory Infringement?
Claim 36	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 38	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____	Yes _____ No _____
Claim 40	Yes _____ No _____	n/a	n/a
Claim 42	Yes _____ No _____	n/a	n/a

5.   With respect to CDW's "Video" feature, has Eolas proven by a preponderance of the evidence that CDW has directly infringed, induced the infringement of, or contributorily infringed the following asserted patent claims?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim responding separately for each of direct infringement, inducement to infringe, and contributory infringement.

'906 Patent	Direct Infringement?	Inducement to Infringe?	Contributory Infringement?
Claim 1	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____
Claim 6	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____
'985 Patent	Direct Infringement?	Inducement to Infringe?	Contributory Infringement?
Claim 1	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____
Claim 3	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____
Claim 16	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____
Claim 18	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____	Yes ____ No ____
Claim 20	Yes ____ No ____	n/a	n/a
Claim 22	Yes ____ No ____	n/a	n/a

INVALIDITY

6. For each asserted claim, did Defendants prove by clear and convincing evidence that the claim is invalid?

    Answer "Yes" or "No" to each question below. Your answer need not be the same for each question, but you may find that a claim is invalid on any or all of these bases. Answer all questions for all claims regardless of whether you have found those claims were infringed.

'906 Patent	Anticipation?	Obviousness?	Written description?
Claim 1			
Claim 6			
'985 Patent	**Anticipation?**	**Obviousness?**	**Written description?**
Claim 1			
Claim 3			
Claim 16			
Claim 18			
Claim 20			
Claim 22			
Claim 36			
Claim 38			
Claim 40			
Claim 42			

CONTRACTUAL AND LICENSE DEFENSES

7. Did Defendant CDW prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Plaintiffs' covenant not to sue Microsoft customers applies to CDW's conduct at issue in this case?

    Yes ____ No ____

8. Did Defendant CDW prove by a preponderance of the evidence that its conduct at issue in this case is authorized under an implied license?

    Yes ____ No ____

9. Did Defendant CDW prove by a preponderance of the evidence that its conduct at issue in this case is authorized under the doctrine of patent exhaustion?

    Yes ____ No ____

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT

10. Did Defendants prove by clear and convincing evidence that:

     a) Anyone involved in the prosecution of the '906 and '985 patents withheld material prior art from the Patent and Trademark Office?

     Yes ____ No ____

     b) Any withholding of material prior art to the '906 and '985 patents from the Patent and Trademark Office was done with intent to deceive?

     Yes ____ No ____

DAMAGES

ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY FOR PATENT CLAIMS ASSERTED AGAINST CDW THAT YOU FOUND INFRINGED AND NOT INVALID. IF YOU FOUND NO PATENT CLAIMS INFRINGED AND NOT INVALID, PLEASE DO NOT ANSWER THIS QUESTION.

11.   What sum of money, if any, do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate Eolas for CDW's infringement of the patent claims that you have found were infringed and not invalid?

Amount of Damages Awarded $_____

12.   Is this amount of damages a lump sum royalty?

Yes ____   No ____

Dated: February ____, 2012   _____
                                                         FOREPERSON