

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MEDTRONIC, INC., a Minnesota corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

AGA MEDICAL CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. C07-00567

**VERDICT FORM**

VERDICT FORM  
CASE NO. C07-00567

Medtronic Exhibit 2005  
Edwards v. Medtronic  
IPR2014-00362

**Medtronic Exhibit 2005**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**VERDICT FORM**

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. 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 agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this court as our verdict in this case.

**INFRINGEMENT**

**1. Direct Infringement of '141 Patent**

Has Medtronic proven by a preponderance of the evidence that all models and sizes of the AGA Occluder products when subjected to the load test by AGA meet every requirement of the following claim? Please answer "YES" or "NO."

**'141 Patent**

Claim 18    Yes     No

Please answer the next question.

**2a. Contributory Infringement of '141 Patent**

For all models and sizes of the AGA Occluder products, has Medtronic proven by a preponderance of the evidence that AGA contributes to the infringement of any of the following claims? Please answer "YES" or "NO."

**'141 Patent**

Claim 1    Yes     No

Claim 2    Yes     No

Claim 5    Yes     No

Claim 17    Yes     No

Claim 18    Yes     No

Claim 21    Yes     No

Please answer the next question.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**2b. Contributory Infringement of '141 Patent**

For all models and sizes of the AGA Vascular Plug products, has Medtronic proven by a preponderance of the evidence that AGA contributes to the infringement of any of the following claims? Please answer "YES" or "NO."

**'141 Patent**

Claim 1	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 17	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Please answer the next question.

**3. Contributory Infringement of '957 Patent**

For all models and sizes of the following AGA products: AMPLATZER® Septal Occluder, Multi-Fenestrated Septal Occluder, PFO Occluder, Duct Occluder I, Membranous VSD Occluder, Muscular VSD Occluder, P.I. Muscular VSD Occluder, and Vascular Plug I, has Medtronic proven by a preponderance of the evidence that AGA contributes to the infringement of any of the following claims? Please answer "YES" or "NO."

**'957 Patent**

Claim 1	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 5	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 6	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 10	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 11	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 16	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 17	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Please answer the next question.

4. Infringement Through the Supply of Components of the Patented Invention to Another Country

Has Medtronic proven by a preponderance of the evidence that AGA supplied components of the patented invention to others in another country for all models and sizes of the following AGA products: AMPLATZER® Septal Occluder, Multi-Fenestrated Septal Occluder, PFO Occluder, Duct Occluder I, Membranous VSD Occluder, Muscular VSD Occluder, P.I. Muscular VSD Occluder, and Vascular Plug I? Please answer "YES" or "NO."

**'957 Patent**

- Claim 1      Yes       No
- Claim 5      Yes       No
- Claim 6      Yes       No
- Claim 10     Yes       No
- Claim 11     Yes       No
- Claim 16     Yes       No
- Claim 17     Yes       No

Please answer the next question.

**INVALIDITY DEFENSES**

5. **Anticipation**

Has AGA proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '141 and '957 patents were anticipated, or in other words, not new? Please answer "YES" or "NO."

**'141 Patent**

- Claim 1      Yes       No
- Claim 2      Yes       No
- Claim 5      Yes       No
- Claim 17     Yes       No
- Claim 18     Yes       No
- Claim 21     Yes       No

1                   **'957 Patent**2                   Claim 1       Yes\_\_\_       No 3                   Claim 5       Yes\_\_\_       No 4                   Claim 6       Yes\_\_\_       No 5                   Claim 10      Yes\_\_\_       No 6                   Claim 11      Yes\_\_\_       No 7                   Claim 16      Yes\_\_\_       No 8                   Claim 17      Yes\_\_\_       No 

9                   Please answer the next question.

10                  **6.       Obviousness**11                  Has AGA proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the claims of the '141 and  
12                  '957 patents would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the  
13                  invention? Please answer "YES" or "NO."14                  **'141 Patent**15                  Claim 1       Yes\_\_\_       No 16                  Claim 2       Yes\_\_\_       No 17                  Claim 5       Yes\_\_\_       No 18                  Claim 17      Yes\_\_\_       No 19                  Claim 18      Yes\_\_\_       No 20                  Claim 21      Yes\_\_\_       No 21                  **'957 Patent**22                  Claim 1       Yes\_\_\_       No 23                  Claim 5       Yes\_\_\_       No 24                  Claim 6       Yes\_\_\_       No 25                  Claim 10      Yes\_\_\_       No 26                  Claim 11      Yes\_\_\_       No 27                  Claim 16      Yes\_\_\_       No 28                  Claim 17      Yes\_\_\_       No

# 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.