

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

FINJAN, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SOPHOS INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.: 14-CV-01197-WHO

VERDICT FORM

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the Form. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail 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.

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

Jury Form 1000 - 1

I. INFRINGEMENT

QUESTION 1: Has Finjan proven by a preponderance of the evidence that any of Sophos’s products infringe any of the claims of the Asserted Patents?

A “yes” is a finding for Finjan, a “no” is a finding for Sophos.

Yes No

If you answered “yes,” please mark the claim(s) you found to be infringed and circle whether you found the infringement to be literal or under the doctrine of equivalents. If you answered “no,” please skip to Question 3.

'844 Patent	Claim 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
	Claim 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
	Claim 16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
'494 Patent	Claim 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
	Claim 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
	Claim 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
	Claim 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
'780 Patent	Claim 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
	Claim 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
'926 Patent	Claim 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
	Claim 22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents
'154 Patent	Claim 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Literal</u> / Doctrine of Equivalents

If you answered “Yes” to Question 1 above with respect to the '844 Patent and/or the '780 Patent, answer Question 2 below.

QUESTION 2: Has Finjan proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Sophos willfully infringed the following patents?

A "yes" is a finding for Finjan, a "no" is a finding for Sophos.

'844 Patent	Yes _____	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
'780 Patent	Yes _____	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

II. INVALIDITY

QUESTION 3: Has Sophos proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the claims of the Asserted Patents are invalid as anticipated, or, in other words, not new?

A "yes" is a finding for Sophos, a "no" is a finding for Finjan.

Yes _____ No

If you answered "yes," please mark the claim(s) you found to be anticipated.

'844 Patent	Claim 1 _____
	Claim 7 _____
	Claim 16 _____
'494 Patent	Claim 1 _____
	Claim 10 _____
	Claim 14 _____
	Claim 18 _____
'780 Patent	Claim 9 _____
	Claim 18 _____
'926 Patent	Claim 18 _____
	Claim 22 _____
'154 Patent	Claim 1 _____

If you have found one or more the claims of the Asserted Patents to be infringed and not anticipated, answer Question 4 below.

III. DAMAGES (IF APPLICABLE)

QUESTION 4: If you have found any claim of the Asserted Patents to be both infringed and valid, what has Finjan proved it is entitled to:

a payment of \$ _____ for a reasonable royalty through 2017

OR

a payment of \$ _____ through September, 2016


OR

a payment of \$ 15,000,000.00 for the life of the patent(s).

* * * * *

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Presiding Juror should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Security Guard that you have reached a verdict. The Presiding Juror should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

DATED: September 21, 2016

By: 
Presiding Juror