

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	<input type="checkbox"/> LODGED
<input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED	<input type="checkbox"/> COPY
SEP 18 2015	
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
BY _____	DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

ISOLA USA CORPORATION,
 Plaintiff/Counterclaim-
 Defendant,
 v.
 TUC TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
 Defendant/Counterclaimant.

Case No. 2:12-cv-01361 SLG

VERDICT FORM

REDACTED

Ladies and gentleman of the jury, it is now your duty to answer the questions presented in this verdict form after due deliberation. Please answer the questions in the order in which they appear, unless you are instructed otherwise.

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

I. U.S. PATENT NO. 6,509,414

A. ISOLA'S INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS AGAINST TUC FOR
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,509,414

1. DIRECT INFRINGEMENT – LITERAL

Question No. 1.

Do you find that Isola has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that TUC directly infringes any of the following claims of Isola's U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414?

Answer "Yes" or "No."

	Yes (For Isola)	No (For TUC)
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 2	✓	
Claim 14	✓	

2. DIRECT INFRINGEMENT – DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

Question No. 2.

Do you find that Isola has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that TUC infringes under the doctrine of equivalents any of the following claims of Isola’s U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414?

Answer “Yes” or “No.”

	Yes (For Isola)	No (For TUC)
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 2	✓	
Claim 14	✓	

3. INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT – INDUCEMENT

Question No. 3.

Do you find that Isola has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that TUC induces infringement of any of the following claims of Isola’s U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414?

Answer “Yes” or “No.”

	Yes (For Isola)	No (For TUC)
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 2	✓	
Claim 14	✓	

4. INFRINGEMENT – WILLFUL

Question No. 4.

Do you find that Isola has shown by clear and convincing evidence that TUC has willfully infringed Isola’s U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414?

Yes (For Isola) No (For TUC)

B. TUC’S INVALIDITY CLAIMS AGAINST ISOLA FOR U.S. PATENT NO. 6,509,414

1. ANTICIPATION

Question No. 5.

Do you find that TUC has shown by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of Isola’s U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414 are invalid as anticipated by WO 96/07683?

Answer “Yes” or “No.”

	Yes (For TUC)	No (For Isola)
Claim 1		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Claim 2		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Claim 14		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Question No. 6.

Do you find that TUC has shown by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of Isola’s U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414 are invalid as anticipated by Nelco N4000-13?

Answer “Yes” or “No.”

	Yes (For TUC)	No (For Isola)
Claim 1		✓
Claim 2		✓

2. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

Question No. 7.

Do you find that TUC has shown by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of Isola’s U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414 are invalid due to failure to meet the written description requirement?

Answer “Yes” or “No.”

	Yes (For TUC)	No (For Isola)
Claim 1		✓
Claim 2		✓
Claim 14		✓

3. ENABLEMENT

Question No. 8.

Do you find that TUC has shown by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of Isola’s U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414 are invalid due to failure to meet the enablement requirement?

Answer “Yes” or “No.”

	Yes (For TUC)	No (For Isola)
Claim 1		✓
Claim 2		✓
Claim 14		✓

C. PATENT MARKING

Question No. 9.

Do you find that Isola has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it substantially complied with the patent marking requirement as to U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414?

Answer “Yes” or “No.”

Yes (For Isola)

No (For TUC)

II. U.S. PATENT NO. 8,022,140

A. ISOLA'S INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS AGAINST TUC FOR
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,022,140

1. INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT – INDUCEMENT

Question No. 10.

Do you find that Isola has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that TUC induces others to infringe claim 9 of Isola's U.S. Patent No. 8,022,140?

Answer "Yes" or "No."

Yes (For Isola) No (For TUC)

B. TUC'S INVALIDITY CLAIMS AGAINST ISOLA FOR
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,022,140

1. ANTICIPATION

Question No. 11.

Do you find that TUC has shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 9 of Isola's U.S. Patent No. 8,022,140 is invalid as anticipated by Nelco N4000-13?

Answer "Yes" or "No."

Yes (For TUC) No (For Isola)

Question No. 12.

Do you find that TUC has shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 9 of Isola's U.S. Patent No. 8,022,140 is invalid as anticipated by WO 96/07683?

Answer "Yes" or "No."

Yes _____ (For TUC)

No (For Isola)

III. DAMAGES FOR INFRINGEMENT

A. Questions 13, 14 and 15

If you found that TUC infringes a valid claim of Isola's U.S. Patent Nos. 6,509,414 (in Section I), **and** if you found claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 8,022,140 to be valid (in Section II), proceed to answer Questions 13, 14, and, if applicable, 15. Otherwise, please proceed to Questions 16, 17 and 18.

Question No. 13.

What lost profits, if any, did Isola show it more likely than not suffered as a result of sales that it would with reasonable probability have made but for TUC's infringement, up to and including July 31, 2015?

Lost Profits: \$ 8,500,000⁰⁰

Question No. 14.

For those infringing sales for which Isola has not proved its entitlement to lost profits, or for which Isola has not sought lost profits, what has Isola proved it is more likely than not entitled to as a reasonable royalty, up to and including July 31, 2015?

Reasonable Royalty: \$ 3,000,000⁰⁰

If you answered Question No. 9 for TUC (in Section II), proceed to answer Question 15. Otherwise, please sign and date this form and do not answer any further questions.

Question No. 15.

What is the amount of damages you have determined that Isola proved it is entitled to as a result of TUC's infringement of the asserted patents after June 24, 2012, up to and including July 31, 2015?

Lost Profits: \$ _____

Reasonable Royalty: \$ _____

Do not answer further questions, please sign and date the form.

B. Questions 16, 17 and 18

If you found that TUC infringes a valid claim of Isola's U.S. Patent Nos. 6,509,414 (in Section I), **and** if you found claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 8,022,140 to be invalid (in Section II), proceed to answer Questions 16, 17 and, if applicable, 18. Otherwise, please proceed to Questions 19 and 20.

Question No. 16.

What lost profits, if any, did Isola show it more likely than not suffered as a result of sales that it would with reasonable probability have made but for TUC's infringement, up to and including July 31, 2015?

Lost Profits: \$ _____

Question No. 17.

For those infringing sales for which Isola has not proved its entitlement to lost profits, or for which Isola has not sought lost profits, what has Isola proved it is more likely than not entitled to as a reasonable royalty, up to and including July 31, 2015?

Reasonable Royalty: \$ _____

If you answered Question No. 9 for TUC (in Section II), proceed to answer Question 18. Otherwise, please sign and date this form and do not answer any further questions.

Question No. 18.

What is the amount of damages you have determined that Isola proved it is entitled to as a result of TUC's infringement of the asserted patents after June 24, 2012, up to and including July 31, 2015?

Lost Profits: \$ _____

Reasonable Royalty: \$ _____

Do not answer further questions, please sign and date the form.

C. Questions 19 and 20.

If you found that TUC does not infringe a valid claim of Isola's U.S. Patent No. 6,509,414 (in Section I), and if you found claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 8,022,140 to be valid (in Section II), proceed to answer Questions 19 and 20. Otherwise, do not answer Questions 19 and 20, and proceed to check and sign the verdict form.

Question No. 19.

What lost profits, if any, did Isola show it more likely than not suffered as a result of sales that it would with reasonable probability have made but for TUC's infringement, after June 24, 2012, up to and including July 31, 2015?

Lost Profits: \$ _____

Question No. 20.

For those infringing sales for which Isola has not proved its entitlement to lost profits, or for which Isola has not sought lost profits, what has Isola proved it is more likely than not entitled to as a reasonable royalty, after June 24, 2012, up to and including July 31, 2015?

Reasonable Royalty: \$ _____

Please sign and date this form.

Dated: 18 Sep, 2015

By: #5
Presiding Juror ✓