

EXHIBIT A

REDACTED

CONFIDENTIAL – OUTSIDE COUNSEL ONLY

CONTENTS

CONTENTS i

TABLES..... iv

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Assignment 2

III. Summary and Conclusions 3

IV. Background..... 4

 A. Arendi S.A.R.L..... 4

 B. Google 4

V. Patent-in-Suit 6

 i. U.S. Patent No. 7,917,843 6

 ii. Invalidity Challenges..... 7

VI. Technology Background..... 8

VII. Infringement Contentions and Accused Products..... 10

 A. Accused Products 10

 B. Asserted Claims..... 11

VIII. Analytical Framework for Damages..... 11

 A. Hypothetical Negotiation Framework 12

 B. Hypothetical Negotiation between Arendi and Google..... 17

 C. Damages Period..... 17

IX. *Georgia-Pacific* Analysis..... 17

Georgia-Pacific No. 1: The royalties received by the patentee for the licensing of the Patent-in-Suit, proving or tending to prove an established royalty 18

 a. Microsoft Corporation 18

 b. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. 20

 c. Microsoft Mobile, Inc..... 21

CONFIDENTIAL – OUTSIDE COUNSEL ONLY

d. Conclusion..... 22

Georgia-Pacific No. 2: The rates paid by the licensee for the use of other patents comparable to the Patent-in-Suit..... 27

Georgia-Pacific No. 3: The nature and scope of the license, as exclusive or non-exclusive; or as restricted or non-restricted in terms of territory or with respect to whom the manufactured product may be sold..... 29

Georgia-Pacific No. 4: The licensor’s established policy and marketing program to maintain his patent monopoly by not licensing others to use the invention or by granting licenses under special conditions designed to preserve that monopoly..... 30

Georgia-Pacific No. 5: The commercial relationship between the licensor and licensee, such as, whether they are competitors in the same territory in the same line of business; or whether they are inventor and promoter 30

Georgia-Pacific No. 6: The effect of selling the patented specialty in promoting sales of other products of the licensee; that existing value of the invention to the licensor as a generator of sales of his non-patented items; and the extent of such derivative or convoyed sales..... 31

Georgia-Pacific No. 7: The duration of the patent and the term of the license..... 32

Georgia-Pacific No. 8: The established profitability of the products made under the Patent-In-Suit, their commercial success, and their current popularity..... 33

 i. Established Profitability 33

 ii. Commercial Success and Current Popularity 34

Georgia-Pacific No. 9: The utility and advantages of the patent property over the old modes or devices, if any, that had been used for working out similar results..... 36

Georgia-Pacific No. 10: The nature of the patented invention; the character of the commercial embodiment of it as owned and produced by the licensor; and the benefits to those who have used the invention 36

 i. Patented Benefits 36

 ii. Conclusions Regarding Non-Infringing Alternatives..... 40

CONFIDENTIAL – OUTSIDE COUNSEL ONLY

Georgia-Pacific No. 11: The extent to which the infringer has made use of the invention; and any evidence probative of the value of that use 41

Georgia-Pacific No. 12: The portion of the profit or of the selling price that may be customary in the particular business or in comparable businesses to allow for the use of the invention or analogous inventions..... 42

Georgia-Pacific No. 13: The portion of the realizable profit that should be credited to the invention..... 42

Georgia-Pacific No. 14: The opinion testimony of qualified experts 47

Georgia-Pacific No. 15: The amount that a licensor (such as the patentee) and a licensee (such as the infringer) would have agreed upon (at the time the infringement began) if both had been reasonably and voluntarily trying to reach an agreement 47

 i. Form of the Royalty..... 48

 ii. Reasonable Royalty 50

 (1) Context of the Agreements 50

 (2) Rates agreed to by Arendi 51

 (3) Rates agreed to by Google 53

 (4) Geographic Scope of Patent Coverage..... 53

 (5) Timing and Duration of the License 53

 (6) Established Profitability and Commercial Success..... 54

 (7) Licensed Technology and Patented Benefits 55

 (8) Conclusions 55

X. Quantification of Damages 59

XI. Summary and Conclusions 60

XII. Prejudgment Interest 61

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.