

ef

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

Trading Technologies International, Inc., )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 eSpeed, Inc., ITSEcco Holdings Limited, )  
 and Ecco LLC )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. 04 C 5312  
Judge James B. Moran  
Magistrate Sidney I. Schenkier

**FILED**

OCT 10 2007

Judge James B. Moran  
United States District Court

**JURY VERDICT FORM**

**EXPLANATION REGARDING INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

On this Verdict Sheet you will find that independent claims are listed in boldface, and dependent claims in regular typeface. This is not an indication that some claims are more important than others. Rather, as explained in the jury instructions, if you find that an independent claim is not infringed, you need not consider whether the dependent claims listed underneath it are infringed. Similarly, if you find that an independent claim is valid, you need not consider whether the dependent claims listed underneath it are valid.

**SPECIAL VERDICT NO. 1: DIRECT INFRINGEMENT (eSpeed)**

1. For each of the Asserted Claims, did TT prove by a preponderance of the evidence that eSpeed directly infringed? (A "Yes" answer is a finding for TT on the issue; a "No" answer is a finding for eSpeed on the issue.)

**'132 Patent**

<b>Claim 1:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 2:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 7:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 20:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 23:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 24:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 25:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 27:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 28:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 50:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Claim 14:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 15:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 40:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 45:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 47:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 48:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 52:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

**'304 Patent**

<b>Claim 1:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 11:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 14:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 15:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 26:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SPECIAL VERDICT NO. 2: CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT (eSpeed)**

2. For each of the claims below, did TT prove by a preponderance of the evidence that eSpeed contributorily infringed? (A "Yes" answer is a finding for TT on the issue; a "No" answer is a finding for eSpeed on the issue.)

**'132 Patent**

Claim 14:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 15:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 40:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 45:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 47:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 48:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 52:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SPECIAL VERDICT NO. 3: INDUCEMENT TO INFRINGE (eSpeed)**

3. For each of the Asserted Claims, did TT prove by a preponderance of the evidence that eSpeed induced infringement by others? (A "Yes" answer is a finding for TT on the issue; a "No" answer is a finding for eSpeed on the issue.)

**'132 Patent**

Claim 1:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 2:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 7:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 20:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 23:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 24:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 25:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 27:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 28:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 50:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 14:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 15:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 40:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 45:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 47:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 48:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 52:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

**'304 Patent**

Claim 1:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 11:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 14:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 15:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 26:	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

# 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.