## Ex. PGS 1021



#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

WESTERNGECO L.L.C.,	§
	§
Plaintiff,	§
	§
<b>V.</b>	<b>§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:09-cv-1827</b>
	§
ION GEOPHYSICAL CORPORATION,	§ Judge Keith P. Ellison
	§
Defendant.	§

#### **VERDICT FORM**

QUESTION 1 – INFRINGEMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 271(f)(1)

Did WesternGećo prove by a preponderance of the evidence that ION infringed any of the patent claims listed below pursuant to Section 271(f)(1)?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each of the listed claims in the spaces provided below.

<u> '520 Patent</u>:

Claim 19:

YES

Claim 23:

YES

<u>'967 Patent</u>:

**Claim 15:** 

YES

'607 Patent:

Claim 15:

YES

<u>'038 Patent</u>:

Claim 14:

YES



### QUESTION 2 – INFRINGEMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. $\S$ 271(f)(2)

Did WesternGeco prove by a preponderance of the evidence that ION infringed any of the patent claims listed below pursuant to Section 271(f)(2)?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each of the listed claims in the spaces provided.

'520 Patent:

Claim 18:

YES

Claim 19:

YES

Claim 23:

YES

'967 Patent:

Claim 15:

YES

'607 Patent:

Claim 15:

YES

**'038 Patent:** 

Claim 14:

YES



#### QUESTION 3 – INVALIDITY

#### (A) '520 PATENT

#### Anticipation of the '520 Patent

Did ION prove by clear and convincing evidence that U.S. Patent No. 5,790,472 ("Workman Patent") anticipates Claim 18 of the '520 Patent?

Answer "Yes" or "No" in the space provided: NO

#### Non-enablement of the '520 Patent

Did ION prove by clear and convincing evidence any of the following claims of the '520 patent are *not* enabled?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each of the listed claims in the spaces provided:

Claim 18 of the '520 Patent NO

Claim 19 of the '520 Patent NO

Claim 23 of the '520 Patent NO



#### (B) '967 PATENT

#### **Obviousness of the '967 Patent**

Did ION prove by clear and convincing evidence that that the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,472 ("Workman Patent") and International Application WO 98/28636 ("'636 Patent Publication") renders Claim 15 of the '967 Patent obvious?

Answer "Yes" or "No" in the space provided: NO

#### Non-enablement of the '967 Patent

Did ION prove by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 15 of the '967 Patent is not enabled?

Answer "Yes" or "No" in the space provided:  $\nearrow \bigcirc$ 



# DOCKET

## 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.

