

Exhibit 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FRANCE TELECOM S.A.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARVELL SEMICONDUCTOR INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 12-cv-04967-WHO

**ORDER REGARDING TENTATIVE
FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS**

Re: Dkt. No. 188

The parties have filed proposed opening and final jury instructions. Dkt. No. 188. I previously issued an order regarding the opening instructions. *See* Dkt. No. 207. The parties agree on proposed final jury instructions 1-20, 22, 31, 39, and 46. The parties disagree on the remaining final jury instructions. Subject to any argument offered by the parties at the final pretrial conference, the Court intends to adopt the versions of the disputed final jury instructions listed below.

Per my prior order on the parties' motions *in limine*, France Telecom is precluded from presenting testimony, argument, or evidence on the doctrine of equivalents. *See* Dkt. No. 213 at 5-8. Accordingly, the jury will not be instructed on the doctrine of equivalents in either the preliminary or final jury instructions.

CONTENTS¹

Final Jury Instruction No. 21 Summary Of Contentions.....	4
Final Jury Instruction No. 23 Method Claims.....	5
Final Jury Instruction No. 24 Interpretation Of Claims	6
Final Jury Instruction No. 25 Infringement—Burden Of Proof.....	8
Final Jury Instruction No. 26 Direct Infringement.....	9
Final Jury Instruction No. 27 Infringement—Extraterritoriality.....	10
Final Jury Instruction No. 28 Literal Infringement	11
Final Jury Instructions Nos. 29-30 Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents and Restrictions on the Doctrine of Equivalents.....	12
Final Jury Instruction No. 32 Inducing Patent Infringement.....	13
Final Jury Instruction No. 33 Contributory Infringement	15
Final Jury Instruction No. 34 Willfulness	16
Final Jury Instruction No. 35 Invalidity—Burden Of Proof	17
Final Jury Instruction No. 36 Invalidity—Prior Art.....	18
Final Jury Instruction No. 37 Invalidity—Obviousness.....	19
Final Jury Instruction No. 38 Invalidity—Improper Inventorship	22
Final Jury Instruction No. 40 Invalidity—Indefiniteness.....	23
Final Jury Instruction No. 41 Damages—Burden Of Proof.....	24

¹ The instructions are numbered according to the numbers assigned by the parties in their joint submission. If necessary, the instructions will be renumbered to correct for any gaps resulting from instructions not given or given in a different order than what was requested.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Final Jury Instruction No. 42 Damages—Reasonable Royalty—Definition	25
Final Jury Instruction No. 43 Damages—Availability of Non-Infringing Alternatives	28
Final Jury Instruction No. 44 Damages—Extraterritoriality	29
Final Jury Instruction No. 45 Damages—Instances Of Direct Infringement.....	30
Final Jury Instruction No. 47 Damages—Laches Defense	31
Final Jury Instruction No. 48 Damages—End Of Damages Period.....	33

United States District Court
Northern District of California

FINAL JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 21**SUMMARY OF CONTENTIONS**

I will now again summarize for you each side's contentions in this case. I will then tell you what each side must prove to win on each of its contentions.

As I previously told you, France Telecom seeks money damages from Marvell Semiconductor for allegedly infringing the '747 patent by using a method within the United States that France Telecom argues are covered by claims 1 and 10 of the patent. These are the asserted claims of the '747 patent. France Telecom also argues that Marvell Semiconductor has actively induced infringement of these claims of the '747 patent by others and contributed to the infringement of these claims of the '747 patent by others. The methods that are alleged to infringe are turbo coding methods used for channel coding by certain Marvell Semiconductor communication processor chips that are incorporated into third party devices such as smart phones.

Marvell Semiconductor denies that it has infringed the asserted claims of the '747 patent and argues that, in addition, the asserted claims are invalid. Invalidity is a defense to infringement. Marvell Semiconductor also contends that France Telecom unreasonably and inexcusably delayed in filing this lawsuit, and in doing so prejudiced Marvell Semiconductor. This defense is known as laches.

Your job is to decide whether the asserted claims of the '747 patent have been infringed and whether any of the asserted claims of the '747 patent are invalid. If you decide that any claim of the patent has been infringed and is not invalid, you will then need to decide any money damages to be awarded to France Telecom to compensate it for the infringement. You will also need to make a finding as to whether the infringement was willful. If you decide that any infringement was willful, that decision should not affect any damage award you give. I will take willfulness into account later. Finally, you will also be asked to make a finding as to whether France Telecom unreasonably and inexcusably delayed in filing this lawsuit and in doing so prejudiced Marvell Semiconductor.

Court's analysis:

The Court adopts Marvell's proposed instruction. This instruction closely follows the Model Patent Jury Instructions for the Northern District of California. As discussed in my order regarding the opening jury instructions, France Telecom's proposed instruction recites an improper standard for infringement of method claims.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.