

Rec'd 12/19/13
CP

United States District Court
District of Massachusetts

KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS N.V. and PHILIPS
ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION,

Plaintiffs/Counterclaim-Defendants,

v.

ZOLL MEDICAL CORPORATION,

Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff.

Civil Action No.
10-11041-NMG

VERDICT FORM

In answering these questions, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Court's charge. As used herein, "Philips" means the Plaintiffs/Counterclaim-Defendants Koninklijke Philips N.V. and Philips Electronics North America Corporation and "ZOLL" means the Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff ZOLL Medical Corporation.

WE, THE JURY, UNANIMOUSLY FIND AS FOLLOWS:

I. Patent Infringement: Philips's Patents

A. Philips's '460 Self-Test Patent

1) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that ZOLL's defibrillators **directly infringe** the following claim of the '460 patent?

U.S. Patent No. 5,800,460				
	AED Plus		AED Pro	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 7	✓		✓	

2) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that others directly infringed the following claim of the '460 patent through use of ZOLL's defibrillators, and that ZOLL **knowingly contributed to** such infringement?

U.S. Patent No. 5,800,460				
	AED Plus		AED Pro	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 7		✓		✓

3) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that others directly infringed the following claim of the '460 patent through use of ZOLL's defibrillators, and that ZOLL **knowingly induced** such infringement?

U.S. Patent No. 5,800,460				
	AED Plus		AED Pro	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 7		✓		✓

B. Philips's '374 Self-Test Patent

1) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that ZOLL's defibrillators **directly infringe** the following claims of the '374 patent?

U.S. Patent No. 5,879,374												
	AED Plus		AED Pro		R Series		E Series		M Series		X Series	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 42	✓		✓		✓							
Claim 43	✓		✓		✓						✓	
Claim 66		✓		✓				✓		✓		
Claim 67	✓		✓		✓							
Claim 68	✓		✓		✓							
Claim 73		✓		✓								

2) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that others directly infringed the following claims of the '374 patent through use of ZOLL's defibrillators, and that ZOLL **knowingly contributed to** such infringement?

U.S. Patent No. 5,879,374												
	AED Plus		AED Pro		R Series		E Series		M Series		X Series	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 42		✓		✓		✓						
Claim 43		✓		✓		✓						✓
Claim 66		✓		✓				✓		✓		
Claim 67		✓		✓		✓						
Claim 68		✓		✓		✓						
Claim 73		✓		✓								

3) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that others directly infringed the following claims of the '374 patent through use of ZOLL's defibrillators, and that ZOLL **knowingly induced** such infringement?

U.S. Patent No. 5,879,374														
	AED Plus		AED Pro		R Series		E Series		M Series		X Series			
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO		
Claim 42		✓		✓		✓								
Claim 43		✓		✓		✓								
Claim 66		✓		✓				✓		✓				
Claim 67		✓		✓		✓								
Claim 68		✓		✓		✓								
Claim 73		✓		✓										

C. Philips's '454 Waveform Patent

1) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that ZOLL's defibrillators **directly infringe** the following claim of the '454 patent?

U.S. Patent No. 5,607,454												
	AED Plus		AED Pro		R Series		E Series		M Series		X Series	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 51	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓	

2) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that others directly infringed the following claim of the '454 patent through use of ZOLL's defibrillators, and that ZOLL **knowingly contributed to** such infringement?

U.S. Patent No. 5,607,454												
	AED Plus		AED Pro		R Series		E Series		M Series		X Series	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 51		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓

3) Has Philips proven by a preponderance of the evidence that others directly infringed the following claim of the '454 patent through use of ZOLL's defibrillators, and that ZOLL **knowingly induced** such infringement?

U.S. Patent No. 5,607,454												
	AED Plus		AED Pro		R Series		E Series		M Series		X Series	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Claim 51		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓

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.