

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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 JOSE DIVISION

APPLE INC., a California corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
a Korean corporation;
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
a New York corporation;
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS
AMERICA, LLC,
a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendants.

Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK

AMENDED
VERDICT FORM

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
a Korean corporation;
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
a New York corporation;
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS
AMERICA, LLC,
a Delaware limited liability company,

Counterclaim-Plaintiffs,

v.

APPLE INC., a California corporation,

Counterclaim-Defendant.

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.

FINDINGS ON APPLE'S CLAIMS

APPLE'S UTILITY AND DESIGN PATENT CLAIMS AGAINST SAMSUNG

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
1. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed Claim 19 of the '381 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)	Y		Y
Continuum (JX 1016)	Y		Y
Droid Charge (JX 1025)	Y		Y
Epic 4G (JX 1012)	Y		Y
Exhibit 4G (JX 1028)	Y		Y
Fascinate (JX 1013)	Y		Y
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)	Y		
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)	Y		Y
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)	Y		
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)	Y		Y
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)	Y		Y
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)	Y		
Galaxy Tab (JX 1036)	Y		Y
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi) (JX 1037)	Y	Y	
Gem (JX 1020)	Y		Y
Indulge (JX 1026)	Y		Y
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)	Y		Y
Mesmerize (JX 1015)	Y		Y
Nexus S 4G (JX 1023)	Y		Y
Replenish (JX 1024)	Y		Y
Vibrant (JX 1010)	Y		Y

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

2. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed Claim 8 of the '915 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)	Y		Y
Continuum (JX 1016)	Y		Y
Droid Charge (JX 1025)	Y		Y
Epic 4G (JX 1012)	Y		Y
Exhibit 4G (JX 1028)	Y		Y
Fascinate (JX 1013)	Y		Y
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)	N		
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)	Y		Y
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)	Y		
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)	Y		Y
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)	Y		Y
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)	Y		
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)	Y		Y
Galaxy Tab (JX 1036)	Y		Y
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi) (JX 1037)	Y	Y	
Gem (JX 1020)	Y		Y
Indulge (JX 1026)	Y		Y
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)	Y		Y
Intercept (JX 1009)	N		N
Mesmerize (JX 1015)	Y		Y
Nexus S 4G (JX 1023)	Y		Y
Replenish (JX 1024)	N		N
Transform (JX 1014)	Y		Y
Vibrant (JX 1010)	Y		Y

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

3. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed Claim 50 of the '163 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)	N		N
Continuum (JX 1016)	N		N
Droid Charge (JX 1025)	Y		Y
Epic 4G (JX 1012)	Y		Y
Exhibit 4G (JX 1028)	Y		Y
Fascinate (JX 1013)	Y		Y
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)	Y		
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)	Y		Y
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)	Y		
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)	Y		Y
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)	Y		Y
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)	Y		
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)	Y		Y
Galaxy Tab (JX 1036)	Y		Y
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi) (JX 1037)	Y	Y	
Gem (JX 1020)	N		N
Indulge (JX 1026)	N		N
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)	Y		Y
Intercept (JX 1009)	N		N
Mesmerize (JX 1015)	Y		Y
Nexus S 4G (JX 1023)	N		N
Replenish (JX 1024)	Y		Y
Transform (JX 1014)	N		N
Vibrant (JX 1010)	N		N

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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



4. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC) took action that it knew or should have known would induce STA or SEA to infringe the '381, '915, or '163 Patents?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	'381 Patent (Claim 19)	'915 Patent (Claim 8)	'163 Patent (Claim 50)
Captivate (JX 1011)	Y	Y	N
Continuum (JX 1016)	Y	Y	N
Droid Charge (JX 1025)	Y	Y	Y
Epic 4G (JX 1012)	Y	Y	Y
Exhibit 4G (JX 1028)	Y	Y	Y
Fascinate (JX 1013)	Y	Y	Y
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)	Y	Y	Y
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)	Y	Y	Y
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)	Y	Y	Y
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)		Y	Y
Galaxy Tab (JX 1036)	Y	Y	Y
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi) (JX 1037)	Y	Y	Y
Gem (JX 1020)	Y	Y	N
Indulge (JX 1026)	Y	Y	N
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)	Y	Y	Y
Intercept (JX 1009)		Y	N
Mesmerize (JX 1015)	Y	Y	Y
Nexus S 4G (JX 1023)	Y	Y	N
Replenish (JX 1024)	Y	N	Y
Transform (JX 1014)		Y	N
Vibrant (JX 1010)	Y	Y	N

[Handwritten signature]
8/24/12

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

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.