## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

| EOLAS TECHNOLOGIES                | §<br>§  |                      |
|-----------------------------------|---------|----------------------|
| INCORPORATED and                  | \$<br>§ |                      |
| THE REGENTS OF THE                | §       |                      |
| UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,         | §       |                      |
|                                   | §       |                      |
| Plaintiffs,                       | §       |                      |
|                                   | §       |                      |
| vs.                               | §       | CASE NO. 6:09-CV-446 |
|                                   | §       |                      |
| ADOBE SYSTEMS, INC., AMAZON.COM   | §       |                      |
| INC., CDW CORPORATION, CITIGROUP  | §       |                      |
| INC., THE GO DADDY GROUP, INC.,   | §       |                      |
| GOOGLE INC., J.C. PENNEY          | §       |                      |
| CORPORATION, INC., STAPLES, INC., | §       |                      |
| YAHOO! INC., AND YOUTUBE, LLC.,   | §       |                      |
|                                   | §       |                      |
| Defendants.                       | §       |                      |

## FINAL JUDGMENT

This action was tried by a jury with the undersigned presiding, and the jury has reached a verdict.

## It is **ORDERED** that:

- Claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,906 are found to be invalid.
- Claims 1, 3, 10, 16, 18, 20, 22, 36, 38, 40, and 42 of U.S. Patent No. 7,599,985 are found to be invalid.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** that Plaintiffs take nothing from Adobe Systems, Inc.; Amazon.com Inc.; CDW Corporation; Google Inc.; J.C. Penney Corporation, Inc.; Staples, Inc.; Yahoo! Inc.; and YouTube, LLC ("Defendants") and that all pending motions are **DENIED**.

It is further **ORDERED**, **ADJUDGED**, **AND DECREED**, that Defendants' costs of court should be taxed against Plaintiffs. The parties are directed to the Standing Order Regarding Bill of Costs on the Court's website.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 13th day of February, 2012.

LEONARD DAVIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE