

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| NATERA, INC., |) |
| |) |
| Plaintiff, |) |
| |) C.A. No. 20-125 (GBW) |
| v. |) (CONSOLIDATED) |
| |) |
| ARCHERDX, INC., ARCHERDX, LLC and |) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED |
| INVITAE CORP., |) |
| |) |
| Defendants. |) |

VERDICT FORM

Instructions: When answering the following questions and completing this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided and follow the Jury Instructions that you have been given. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained 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.

As used herein:

1. “Natera” refers to Plaintiff Natera, Inc.
2. “Defendants” refers to Defendants ArcherDX, Inc., ArcherDX, LLC and Invitae Corp.
3. The “172 Patent” refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,557,172.
4. The “708 Patent” refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,597,708.
5. The “220 Patent” refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,731,220.

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows.

DIRECT INFRINGEMENT

1. Has Natera proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants directly infringed any asserted claim of the '172 patent? (a "YES" answer is a finding for Natera; a "NO" answer is a finding for Defendants):

| CLAIM | YES | NO |
|-------|-----|----|
| 1 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 8 | | |

2. Has Natera proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants directly infringed any asserted claim of the '220 patent? (a "YES" answer is a finding for Natera; a "NO" answer is a finding for Defendants):

| CLAIM | YES | NO |
|-------|-----|----|
| 1 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |

3. Has Natera proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants directly infringed any asserted claim of the '708 patent? (a "YES" answer is a finding for Natera; a "NO" answer is a finding for Defendants):

| CLAIM | YES | NO |
|-------|-----|----|
| 1 | | |
| 19 | | |

SAFE HARBOR

4. Have Defendants proven by a preponderance of the evidence that use of the PCM products was reasonably related to the development and submission of information to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (also known as the FDA)? (a “YES” answer is a finding for Defendants; a “NO” answer is a finding for Natera):

YES: _____ NO: _____

INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

5. Has Natera proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants indirectly infringed any asserted claim of the '172 patent either by induced infringement or contributory infringement? (a "YES" answer is a finding for Natera; a "NO" answer is a finding for Defendants):

| CLAIM | INDUCED INFRINGEMENT | | CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT | |
|-------|----------------------|----|---------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO | YES | NO |
| 1 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| 8 | | | | |

6. Has Natera proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants indirectly infringed any asserted claim of the '220 patent either by induced infringement or contributory infringement? (a "YES" answer is a finding for Natera; a "NO" answer is a finding for Defendants):

| CLAIM | INDUCED INFRINGEMENT | | CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT | |
|-------|----------------------|----|---------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO | YES | NO |
| 1 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| 7 | | | | |

7. Has Natera proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants indirectly infringed any asserted claim of the '708 patent either by induced infringement or contributory infringement? (a "YES" answer is a finding for Natera; a "NO" answer is a finding for Defendants):

| CLAIM | INDUCED INFRINGEMENT | | CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT | |
|-------|----------------------|----|---------------------------|----|
| | YES | NO | YES | NO |
| 1 | | | | |
| 19 | | | | |

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.