IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,	)
	)
Plaintiff,	)
	) C.A. No. 13-919-JLH
v.	)
	)
GOOGLE LLC,	)
	)
Defendant.	)

VERDICT FORM

Instructions: When answering the following questions and completing this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided and follow the Jury Instructions that you have been given. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

As used herein:

1. "Arendi" refers to Plaintiff Arendi S.A.R.L.;

2. "Google" refers to Defendant Google LLC; and

3. The "'843 Patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 7,917,843.

A. Infringement

Question No. 1A – Direct Infringement:

Did Arendi prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Google directly infringed any of the

following claims of the '843 Patent?

"Yes" is a finding in favor of Arendi.

"No" is a finding in favor of Google.

	YES (for Arendi)	NO (for Google)
Claim 23		
Claim 30		

Question No. 1B – Induced Infringement:

Did Arendi prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Google is liable for inducing

infringement of any of the following claims of the '843 Patent by third-party use of any of the

accused applications?

"Yes" is a finding in favor of Arendi.

"No" is a finding in favor of Google.

	YES (for Arendi)	NO (for Google)
Claim 23		
Claim 30		

Question No. 1C – Contributory Infringement:

Did Arendi prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Google is liable for contributory infringement of any of the following claims of the '843 Patent?

"Yes" is a finding in favor of Arendi.

"No" is a finding in favor of Google.

	YES (for Arendi)	NO (for Google)
Claim 23		
Claim 30		

B. Invalidity

Question No. 2A – Anticipation:

Did Google prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of the '843

Patent are invalid as anticipated by prior art?

"Yes" is a finding in favor of Google.

"No" is a finding in favor of Arendi.

	YES (for Google)	NO (for Arendi)
Claim 23		
Claim 30		

Question No. 2B – Obviousness:

Did Google prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of the '843

Patent are invalid as obvious in view of prior art?

"Yes" is a finding in favor of Google.

"No" is a finding in favor of Arendi.

	YES (for Google)	NO (for Arendi)
Claim 23		
Claim 30		

If you answered "YES" in Question No. 1A, 1B, or 1C (Infringement Section) as to any patent claim AND answered "NO" in all of Question Nos. 2A and 2B (Invalidity Section) as to that same patent claim (*i.e.*, you determined that at least one claim is infringed and not invalid), proceed to Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Otherwise, skip and DO NOT answer Questions 3,4, 5, and 6 and instead please proceed directly to the final page of this Verdict Form and sign and date that page.

C. Damages

Question No. 3:

For any infringement you found in Question Nos. 1A-1C what is the earliest possible date of first

infringement?

"August 21, 2017" is a finding in favor of Arendi.

"December 5, 2017" is a finding in favor of Google.

August 21, 2017: _____ or December 5, 2017: _____

Question No. 4:

What amount of damages, if any, has Arendi proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that it

is entitled to as a reasonable royalty for Google's infringement of the '843 Patent?

Answer: $ _____

Question No. 5:

Does the amount you have determined in response to Question No. 4 include damages for Google

apps installed on Samsung devices?

"Yes" is a finding in favor of Arendi.

"No" is a finding in favor of Google.

Yes: _____   No: _____

DOCKET ALARM

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.

fastcase®
Smarter legal research.