## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

	`
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) Case No. 11-2686-JWL
TIME WARNER CABLE, INC., et al.,	)
Defendants.	) 
<u>VERDICT</u>	FORM
We, the jury, impaneled and sworn in the make the following answers to the questions particles.	he above-entitled case, upon our oaths, do ropounded by the Court:
Please answer each of the subparts of Question	ns 1 through 19.
1. Claim 1 of the '084 Patent	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ed, by a preponderance of the evidence, ed system literally infringed Claim 1 of the
Yes	No
	ed, by a preponderance of the evidence, ed system infringed Claim 1 of the '084 ivalents?
Yes	No

c.	evidence, that Claim 1 of the '084 Patent satisfy the written description requirement	is invalid because it does not
	Yes	No
d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '084 Patent	
	Yes	No
e.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '084 Patent	
	Yes	No
Claim	7 of the '084 Patent (dependent claim to	independent Claim 1)
a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system Patent?	
	Yes	No
b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 7 of the '084 Patent satisfy the written description requirement	is invalid because it does not
	Yes	No V
c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 7 of the '084 Patent	
	Yes	No
d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 7 of the '084 Patent	- · ·
	Yes	No V

2.

5.	Claim 1 of the 361 Patent		
	a. Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a preponderance of the evide that Time Warner Cable's accused system infringed Claim 1 of the Patent?		• •
		Yes	No
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '561 Pater satisfy the written description requirements	nt is invalid because it does not
		Yes	No
	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 1 of the '561 Pater	- · ·
		Yes	No
	d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 1 of the '561 Pater	
		Yes	No
4.	Claim	n 3 of the '561 Patent (dependent claim to	independent Claim 1)
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system Patent?	
		Yes	No
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 3 of the '561 Pater satisfy the written description requirement	nt is invalid because it does not
		Vas	No. V

The state of the s

	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and con evidence, that Claim 3 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?	
		Yes	No
5.	<u>Clain</u>	n 15 of the '561 Patent (dependent claim	to independent Claim 1)
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by that Time Warner Cable's accused syst Patent?	
		Yes	No
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 15 of the '561 Pat satisfy the written description requirem	ent is invalid because it does not
		Yes	No
	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 15 of the '561 Pat	<u> </u>
		Yes	No
	d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 15 of the '561 Pat	
		Yes	No _1

the state of the s

To the second of the second of

6.	Claim	a 23 of the '561 Patent (dependent claim t	o independent Claim 1)
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system Patent?	
		Yes	No
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 23 of the '561 Pate satisfy the written description requirement	ent is invalid because it does not
		Yes	No
	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 23 of the '561 Pate	-
		Yes	No
	d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 23 of the '561 Pate	
		Yes	No
7.	Clain	n 24 of the '561 Patent	
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system Patent?	
		Yes V	No
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 24 of the '561 Pate satisfy the written description requirements.	ent is invalid because it does not
		Yes	No

d. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 24 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?  Yes No  8. Claim 26 of the '561 Patent (dependent claim to independent Claim 24)  a. Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a preponderance of the evidenthat Time Warner Cable's accused system infringed Claim 26 of the Patent?  Yes No  b. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid because it does a satisfy the written description requirement?  Yes No  c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?  Yes No			Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 24 of the '561 Pate	
evidence, that Claim 24 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?  Yes No  8. Claim 26 of the '561 Patent (dependent claim to independent Claim 24)  a. Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a preponderance of the evidenthat Time Warner Cable's accused system infringed Claim 26 of the Patent?  Yes No  b. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid because it does to satisfy the written description requirement?  Yes No  c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?			Yes	No
<ul> <li>8. Claim 26 of the '561 Patent (dependent claim to independent Claim 24)</li> <li>a. Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a preponderance of the evidenthat Time Warner Cable's accused system infringed Claim 26 of the Patent?</li> <li>b. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid because it does not satisfy the written description requirement?</li> <li>Yes No</li> <li>c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?</li> </ul>		d.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-
<ul> <li>a. Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a preponderance of the evidenthat Time Warner Cable's accused system infringed Claim 26 of the Patent?  Yes No  Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid because it does not satisfy the written description requirement?  Yes No</li> <li>c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?</li> </ul>			Yes	No V
that Time Warner Cable's accused system infringed Claim 26 of the Patent?  Yes No  b. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid because it does a satisfy the written description requirement?  Yes No  c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?	8.	Claim	26 of the '561 Patent (dependent claim to	o independent Claim 24)
b. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid because it does a satisfy the written description requirement?  Yes No  c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?		a.	that Time Warner Cable's accused syste	
evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid because it does it satisfy the written description requirement?  Yes No  c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convirge evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?			Yes	No
c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convir evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?		b.	evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Pate	ent is invalid because it does not
evidence, that Claim 26 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?			Yes	No
Yes No		c.	-	-
•		ų.	Yes	No

9.	Claim	38 of the '561 Patent (dependent claim t	o independent Claim 24)	
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused syste Patent?		
		Yes	No	
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 38 of the '561 Pate satisfy the written description requirement	ent is invalid because it does not	
		Yes	No V	
	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 38 of the '561 Pate		
		Yes	No V	
	d.	d. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and co evidence, that Claim 38 of the '561 Patent is invalid as obvious?		
		Yes	No _ ✓	
10.	Claim	1 of the '052 Patent		
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused syste Patent?		
		Yes	No	
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '052 Pater satisfy the written description requirements.	nt is invalid because it does not	
		Yes	No.	

and the control of th

	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 1 of the '052 Paten	
		Yes	No
	d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 1 of the '052 Pater	
		Yes	No
11.	<u>Claim</u>	n 3 of the '052 Patent (dependent claim to	independent Claim 1)
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused syste Patent?	<b>- -</b>
		Yes	No
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 3 of the '052 Patern satisfy the written description requirements	it is invalid because it does not
		Yes	No
	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 3 of the '052 Pater	
	٠	Yes	No
	d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable ha evidence, that Claim 3 of the '052 Pater	
		Yes	No

and the second section of the second second

12.	12. Claim 4 of the '052 Patent (dependent claim to independent Claim 1)		o independent Claim 1)
•		Do you find that Sprint has proved, by that Time Warner Cable's accused sys Patent?	• •
		Yes	No
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable he evidence, that Claim 4 of the '052 Pate satisfy the written description requiren	ent is invalid because it does not
		Yes	No
	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable he evidence, that Claim 4 of the '052 Pate	•
		Yes	No
	d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable he evidence, that Claim 4 of the '052 Pate	
		Yes	No
13.	<u>Clain</u>	n 5 of the '052 Patent (dependent claim t	to independent Claim 1)
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by that Time Warner Cable's accused sys Patent?	·
		Yes	No
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable I evidence, that Claim 5 of the '052 Pate satisfy the written description requires	ent is invalid because it does not
		Ves	No. /

	c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has pevidence, that Claim 5 of the '052 Patent's			
		Yes	No	
14.	<u>Claim</u>	1 of the '429 Patent		
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system '429 Patent?	* -	
		Yes	No	
	b.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system Patent under the doctrine of equivalents?	m infringed Claim 1 of the '429	
		Yes	No	
	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '429 Paten satisfy the written description requireme	t is invalid because it does not	
		Yes	No	
	d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '429 Paten		
		Yes	No	
	e.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '429 Paten		
		Yes	No	

15.	<u>Clai</u>	m 5 of the '429 Patent (dependent	nt claim to independent Claim 1)	
	a.		roved, by a preponderance of the evidence used system infringed Claim 5 of the '4	
		Yes	No	
	ь.		r Cable has proved, by clear and conving 429 Patent is invalid because it does no requirement?	
		Yes	No	
	c.		r Cable has proved, by clear and convin- '429 Patent is invalid as anticipated?	cing
		Yes	No	
	d.		r Cable has proved, by clear and conving '429 Patent is invalid as obvious?	cing
		Yes	No	
16.	<u>Clai</u>	m 7 of the '429 Patent (depende	nt claim to independent Claim 1)	
	a.		roved, by a preponderance of the eviden- cused system infringed Claim 7 of the '4	
		Yes	No	
	b.	•	r Cable has proved, by clear and convin '429 Patent is invalid because it does no requirement?	_
		Vec	No. V	

c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convincing evidence, that Claim 7 of the '429 Patent is invalid as obvious?		
	Yes	No	
<u>Claim</u>	1 of the '064 Patent		
a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system '064 Patent?	m literally infringed Claim 1 of the	
	Yes	No	
b.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system Patent under the doctrine of equivalents?	m infringed Claim 1 of the '064	
	Yes	No	
c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '064 Patent satisfy the written description requirement	t is invalid because it does not	
	Yes	No	
d.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '064 Pater		
	Yes	No	
e.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 1 of the '064 Patent	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Yes	No	

17.

18.	Claim	3 of the '064 Patent (dependent claim to	independent Claim 1)	
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Time Warner Cable's accused system infringed Claim 3 of the '064 Patent?		
		Yes	No	
	b.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has evidence, that Claim 3 of the '064 Pater satisfy the written description requirements	nt is invalid because it does not	
		Yes	No	
	c.	Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convincing evidence, that Claim 3 of the '064 Patent is invalid as anticipated?		
		Yes	No 🗸	
	d.	d. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and conviewidence, that Claim 3 of the '064 Patent is invalid as obvious?		
		Yes	No	
19.	Clain	n 26 of the '064 Patent (dependent claim t	to independent Claim 1)	
	a.	Do you find that Sprint has proved, by a that Time Warner Cable's accused system Patent?		
		Yes	No	
	b. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convine evidence, that Claim 26 of the '064 Patent is invalid because it does satisfy the written description requirement?		ent is invalid because it does not	
		Yes	No /	

	c. Do you find that Time Warner Cable has proved, by clear and convincing evidence, that Claim 26 of the '064 Patent is invalid as obvious?		
	Yes	No	
that T AND Quest	ime Warner Cable did infringe that the claim is not invalid (w	addressed in Questions 1 through 19 above, you found e (either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents) ader any theory of invalidity), please answer ase sign and date the form below, and your	
20.	Do you find that Sprint proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the appropriate date of the hypothetical royalty negotiation between the parties is 2010?		
	Yes	No	
21.	State the amount of damages that Sprint proved by a preponderance of the evidence, representing a reasonable royalty for Time Warner's infringement of the asserted patent claims.		
	\$	139.8 million	
22.	Do you find that Sprint has p Warner Cable's infringement	roved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Time was willful?	
	Yes	No	
	deliberations are complete. Pi and notify the Court that you h	ease have the foreperson sign and date this verdict ave reached a verdict.	
3	-3-17		
Date		Foreperson	