

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

FIRSTFACE CO., LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:18-cv-02245-JD

VERDICT FORM

1 When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the
2 directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the
3 questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer
4 to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the
5 questions below.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under
2 the instructions of this court as our verdict in this case:

3 **FINDINGS ON INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS**

4 (The questions about infringement should be answered regardless of your findings with respect to the
5 validity or invalidity of the patent.)

6 **STIPULATED VERDICT QUESTIONS RE DIRECT INFRINGEMENT**

7 **Direct Infringement – ’373 Patent**

8 1. Has Firstface proven that it is more likely than not that Apple directly and literally infringed any
9 asserted claim of U.S. Patent No. 9,633,373 (the ’373 Patent)? Please check either “Yes” (for Firstface)
10 or “No” (for Apple).

11
12 _____ Yes _____ No

13
14 If your answer to question 1 is “yes,” go to question 3. If your answer to question 1 is “no,” go to
15 question 2.

16
17 **Direct Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents– ’373 Patent**

18 2. Has Firstface proven that it is more likely than not that Apple practices accused methods that
19 include elements that are identical or equivalent to every requirement of any asserted claim of the ’373
20 Patent? In other words, for any requirement that is not literally found in the accused methods, do the
21 accused methods have an equivalent element to that requirement? Please check either “Yes” (for
22 Firstface) or “No” (for Apple).

23
24 _____ Yes _____ No

1 **Direct Infringement – ’419 Patent**

2 3. Has Firstface proven that it is more likely than not that Apple directly and literally infringed any
3 asserted claim of U.S. Patent No. 9,779,419 (the ’419 Patent)? Please check either “Yes” (for Firstface)
4 or “No” (for Apple).

5
6 _____ Yes _____ No

7
8 If your answer to question 3 is “yes,” go to question 5. If your answer to question 3 is “no,” go to
9 question 4.

10
11 **Direct Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents– ’419 Patent**

12 4. Has Firstface proven that it is more likely than not that Apple practices accused methods that
13 include elements that are identical or equivalent to every requirement of any asserted claim of the ’419
14 Patent? In other words, for any requirement that is not literally found in the accused methods, do the
15 accused methods have an equivalent element to that requirement? Please check either “Yes” (for
16 Firstface) or “No” (for Apple).

17
18 _____ Yes _____ No

1 **STIPULATED VERDICT QUESTIONS RE INDUCED INFRINGEMENT**

2 **Inducing Infringement – '373 Patent**

- 3 5. Has Firstface proven that it is more likely than not:
4 (i) that users of the accused products (other than Apple) literally infringed any asserted claim of
5 the '373 Patent;
6 (ii) that Apple took action that actually induced that infringement; and
7 (iii) that Apple was aware of the patent and knew that its actions would encourage infringement
8 of the patent, or alternatively that it was willfully blind as to whether its actions would encourage
9 infringement of the patent?

10
11 Please check either “Yes” (for Firstface) or “No” (for Apple).

12
13 _____ Yes _____ No
14

15 If your answer to question 5 is “yes,” go to question 7. If your answer to question 5 is “no,” go to
16 question 6.

17
18 **Inducing Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents– '373 Patent**

- 19
20 6. Has Firstface proven that it is more likely than not:
21 (i) that users of the accused products (other than Apple) infringed any asserted claim of the '373
22 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents;
23 (ii) that Apple took action that actually induced that infringement; and
24 (iii) that Apple was aware of the patent and knew that its actions would encourage infringement
25 of the patent, or alternatively that it was willfully blind as to whether its actions would encourage
26 infringement of the patent?

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.