-	
3	
	rmia
171	Califo
3	Jo
3	rict
7	Oist
3	em I
ra	Vorth
1	the]
2	Fort
=	

1	1							
2	2	E-filing						
3	3							
4	4							
5	5							
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
7		FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
8		JISTINET OF CAL	ZII ORVIA					
9	9							
10	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,	No. C 10	0-03561 WHA					
11	Plaintiff,	,						
12	2 v.	CDECL	AL VEDDICT FORM					
13	GOOGLE INC.,	SPECIA	AL VERDICT FORM					
14	Defendant.							
15								
16	Y OUR ANSWERS	Your answers must be unanimous.						
17								
18	* .							
19	1. Has Oracle proven by a prepond	erance of the evider	nce that Google infringes					
20	claim 11, 27, 29, 39, 40, or 41 of United States Patent Number RE38,104?							
21		Yes	No					
22 23	(11	nfringing)	(Not Proven)					
24	CLAIM II:		V					
25	CLAIM 27:							
26	CLAIM 29:							
27	CLAIM 59:							
28	CLAIM 40.							
	CLAIM 41:							



	-							
1	2. Has Oracle proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Google infringes							
2	claim 1 or 20 of United States Patent Number 6,061,520?							
3	Claim 1 of 20 of Officed States Faterit Number 0,001,320?							
4		Ye (Infri	es inging)	No (Not Proven)				
5	CLAIM 1:	(66)	(1.0.71.)				
. 6	CLAIM 20:							
7								
8	3. Has Oracle j	proven by clear and con	nvincing evider	ace that Google willfully				
9	infringed one or more claims of an asserted patent? (Answer this question only if above you							
10	answered "Yes" to one or more claims of a given patent.)							
11	a a							
12		Ye (Will		No (Not Proven)				
13	For the '10	04 PATENT:						
14	For the '52	20 PATENT:						
15					0.0			
16				71				
17	Dated: May <u>23</u> , 2012.		Ereg	FOREPERSON				
18				TOREFERSON				
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24	15							
25								
26	,							
27 28								
20								

