

C.2. Appendix

COMMENTS REGARDING USE OF SAMPLE VERDICT FORM

The following sample verdict form is provided for guidance in preparing an appropriate special verdict form tailored for your specific case. The sample is for a hypothetical case in which the patent holder alleges direct and indirect infringement of a single claim of one patent and seeks a combination of lost profits and a reasonable royalty for the allegedly infringing sales. The alleged infringer raises a number of invalidity defenses. No issue is raised, however, as to the conception date of the claimed invention. The issue of willfulness has not been bifurcated.

The form requires the jury to make specific findings on the bases for the affirmative defenses of “anticipation” and “statutory bars.”

The form also requires the jury to make factual determinations underlying a conclusion of “obviousness” or “nonobviousness.” It is expected that these issues will be presented to the jury as specifically as possible. For example, if the only dispute between the parties is whether a particular reference is within the “scope and content” of the prior art, that is the only question on that *Graham* factor that should be presented to the jury. As another example, if the only factual dispute between the parties on the “differences between the prior art and the claimed invention” is whether a prior art reference discloses a particular claim limitation, that is the only issue that should be presented to the jury on that *Graham* factor.

This form also provides two alternative section 11’s on obviousness. One asks the jury to only answer the underlying factual questions. The other permits the jury to give an advisory verdict on the ultimate question of obviousness. It must be remembered, however, that the ultimate question of obviousness is a question of law for the court. *KSR Intern, Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1745 (2007)(“The ultimate judgment of obviousness is a legal determination.”); see *Dippin’ Dots, Inc. v. Mosey*, 476 F.3d 1337, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Both alternatives are designed to focus the parties and the court on the factual disputes on the obviousness question. For example, the form requires that each party specify exactly what it contends constitutes the scope and content of the prior art. Although trial courts have often permitted the jury to reach the final conclusion of obviousness without specifying its underlying factual determinations, such an approach is not recommended. The verdict form should require the jury’s finding on each factual issue so that the trial judge may make the final determination on the obviousness question. As Judge Michel pointed out in his dissent in *McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001):

The issue presented in this appeal derives from the common, if unfortunate, practice of allowing the jury to render a general verdict on the ultimate legal conclusion of obviousness without requiring express findings on the underlying factual issues through a special verdict or special interrogatories under Fed. R. Civ. P. 49. Nevertheless, since the inception of our court, we have recognized that a court may submit this legal question to a jury and that doing so by general verdict rather than by Rule 49 is not ordinarily an abuse of discretion. We have emphasized, however, that there is no question that the judge must remain the

ultimate arbiter on the question of obviousness.")

Id. at 1358 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). The fact that the verdict form allows the jury to give an advisory conclusion on obviousness should not be construed as suggesting that the court defer to the jury's ultimate determination on obviousness. The law is clear that the ultimate question is a legal one for the court.

C.3. Appendix

SAMPLE VERDICT FORM

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail 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.

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 INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS

(The questions regarding infringement should be answered regardless of your findings with respect to the validity or invalidity of the patent.)

A. Direct Infringement

1. Has Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not that every requirement of claim 1 of its patent is included in Alleged Infringer's accused product?

Yes _____ No _____

If your answer to question 1 is "yes," go to question 3. If your answer to question 1 is "no," go to question 2.

B. Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents

2. Has Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not that the accused product includes parts that are identical or equivalent to every requirement of claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent? In other words, for any requirement that is not literally found in the Alleged Infringer's accused product, does the accused product have an equivalent part to that requirement?

Yes _____ No _____

C. Contributory Infringement

3. Has Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not: (i) that Direct Infringer infringed claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent; (ii) that Alleged Infringer supplied an important component of the infringing part of the product; (iii) that the component was not a common component suitable for non-infringing use; and (iv) that Alleged Infringer supplied the component with knowledge of the patent and knowledge that the component was especially made or adapted for use in an infringing manner?

Yes _____ No _____

D. Inducing Infringement

4. Has Patent Holder proven that it is more likely than not: (i) that Direct Infringer infringed claim 1 of Patent Holder’s patent; (ii) that Alleged Infringer took action that actually induced that infringement by Direct Infringer; (iii) that Alleged Infringer was aware of the patent; and (iv) that Alleged Infringer knew or should have known that taking such action would induce direct infringement?

Yes _____ No _____

E. Willful Infringement

5a. Has the Patent Holder proven that it is highly probable that from an objective point of view the defenses put forth by Alleged Infringer failed to raise any substantial question with regard to infringement, validity or enforcement of the patent claim?

Yes _____ No _____

[If the answer to question 5a is “yes,” answer question 5b. If your answer to question 5a is “no,” go to question 6.]

5b. Has the Patent Holder proven that it is highly probable that the Alleged Infringer actually knew, or it was so obvious that Alleged Infringer should have known, that its actions constituted infringement of a valid and enforceable patent?

FINDINGS ON INVALIDITY DEFENSES

(The questions regarding invalidity should be answered regardless of your findings with respect to infringement.)

A. Written Description Requirement

6. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that the specification of the Patent Holder's patent does not contain an adequate written description of the claimed invention?

Yes _____ No _____

B. Enablement

7. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that the specification of the Patent Holder's patent does not contain a description of the claimed invention that is sufficiently full and clear to enable persons of ordinary skill in the field to make and use the invention?

Yes _____ No _____

C. Best Mode

8. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that the patent does not disclose what the inventor believed was the best way to carry out the claimed invention at the time the patent application was filed?

Yes _____ No _____

D. Anticipation

9. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent was "anticipated," or, in other words, not new?

Yes _____ No _____

[If the answer is "yes," check any reason below that is applicable:

_____ The claimed invention was already publicly known or publicly used by others in the United States before the date of conception of the claimed invention.

_____ The claimed invention was already patented or described in a printed publication somewhere in the world before the date of conception.

_____ The claimed invention was already made by someone else in the United States before the date of conception and that other person had not abandoned the invention or kept it secret.

_____ The claimed invention was already described in another issued U.S. patent or published U.S. patent application that was based on a patent application filed before the date of conception.

_____ The named inventor did not invent the claimed invention but instead learned of the claimed invention from someone else.

_____ The named inventor was not the first inventor of the claimed invention.]

E. Statutory Bar

10. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that claim 1 of Patent Holder's patent was not filed within the time required by law?

Yes _____ No _____

If the answer is "yes," check any reason below that is applicable:

_____ The claimed invention was already patented or described in a printed publication somewhere in the world at least one year before the filing date of the patent application.

_____ The claimed invention was already being openly used in the United States at least one year before the filing date of the patent application and that use was not primarily an experimental use to test whether the invention worked for its intended purpose which was controlled by the inventor.

_____ A device or method using the claimed invention was sold or offered for sale in the United States and the claimed invention was ready for patenting at least one year before the filing date of the patent application and that offer or sale was not primarily for experimental purposes to test whether the invention worked for its intended purpose and which was controlled by the inventor.

_____ Patent Holder had already obtained a patent on the claimed invention in a foreign country before the original U.S. application, and the foreign application was filed at least one year before the U.S. application.

F. Obviousness

[Alternative 1 – Jury decides underlying factual issues only]

11. The ultimate legal conclusion on the obviousness question will be made by the court. However, in order for the court to do so, you must answer the following preliminary factual questions:

a. What was the level of ordinary skill in the field that someone would have had at the time the claimed invention was made? (check the applicable answer)

_____ set forth Alleged Infringer's contention, e.g., an individual with at least 3 years of experience in both furniture design and manufacture]

_____ [set forth Patent Holder's contention, e.g., anyone who has worked in the field of furniture design or manufacture for at least two years]

_____ [other, specify _____]

b. What was the scope and content of the prior art at the time of the claimed invention? (check the applicable answer)

_____ [set forth what the Alleged Infringer has offered as the invalidating prior art, e.g., '123 patent on fixed sitting device with four legs, general knowledge in field of industrial design that a horizontal surface may be held parallel to the ground using three legs and common knowledge that a person can easily move an object weighing under 25 pounds]

_____ [set forth what the Patent Holder asserts was within the scope and content of the prior art, e.g., '123 patent on fixed sitting device with four legs]

_____ [other, specify _____]

c. What difference, if any, existed between the claimed invention and the prior art at the time of the claimed invention?

_____ [set forth the Alleged Infringer's contention as to the difference, e.g., no difference between scope of invention and what is known in prior art]

_____ [set forth the Patent Holder's contention as to the difference, e.g., only 3 legs on a sitting device and portability]

_____ [other, specify _____]

d. Which of the following factors has been established by the evidence with respect to the claimed invention: (check those that apply)[verdict form should list only those factors for which a *prima facie* showing has been made]:

_____ commercial success of a product due to the merits of the claimed invention

_____ a long felt need for the solution that is provided by the claimed invention

_____ unsuccessful attempts by others to find the solution that is provided by the claimed invention

_____ copying of the claimed invention by others

_____ unexpected and superior results from the claimed invention

_____ acceptance by others of the claimed invention as shown by praise from others in the field or from the licensing of the claimed invention

_____ independent invention of the claimed invention by others before or at about the same time as the named inventor thought of it

[_____ other factor(s) indicating obviousness or nonobviousness—describe the factor(s) _____]

[Alternative 2 - Jury decides underlying factual issues and renders advisory verdict on obviousness]

11. The ultimate conclusion that must be reached on the obviousness question is whether Alleged Infringer has proven that it is highly probable that the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field at the time the patent application was filed. In order to properly reach a conclusion the following preliminary questions must be answered:

a. What was the level of ordinary skill in the field that someone would have had at the time the claimed invention was made? (check the applicable answer)

_____ [set forth Alleged Infringer's contention, e.g., an individual with at least 3 years of experience in both furniture design and manufacture]

_____ [set forth Patent Holder's contention, e.g., anyone who has worked in the field of furniture design or manufacture for at least two years]

_____ [other, specify _____]

b. Was [disputed reference] within the scope and content of the prior art at the time of the claimed invention? (check only if reference was within the scope and content of the prior art)

_____ [set forth the prior art reference [alleged infringer] has offered as prior art that the [patent holder] disputes as being in the scope and content of the prior art. If there is more than one reference in dispute, each disputed reference should be listed separately.]

c. What difference, if any, existed between the claimed invention and the prior art at the time of the claimed invention?

_____ [set forth the Alleged Infringer's contention as to the difference, e.g., no difference between scope of invention and what is known in prior art]

_____ [set forth the Patent Holder's contention as to the difference, e.g., only 3 legs on a sitting device and portability]

_____ [other, specify_____]

d. Which of the following factors has been established by the evidence with respect to the claimed invention: (check those that apply)[verdict form should list only those factors for which a *prima facie* showing has been made]:

_____ commercial success of a product due to the merits of the claimed invention

_____ a long felt need for the solution that is provided by the claimed invention

_____ unsuccessful attempts by others to find the solution that is provided by the claimed invention

_____ copying of the claimed invention by others

_____ unexpected and superior results from the claimed invention

_____ acceptance by others of the claimed invention as shown by praise from others in the field or from the licensing of the claimed invention

_____ independent invention of the claimed invention by others before or at about the same time as the named inventor thought of it

[_____ other factor(s) indicating obviousness or nonobviousness—describe the factor(s)_____]

After consideration of the answers to the preliminary questions above, do you find that the Alleged Infringer has proven that it is highly probable that the claim of Patent Holder's patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field at the time the patent application was filed?

Yes _____

No _____

G..Inventorship

12. Has Alleged Infringer proven that it is highly probable that Patent Holder's patent fails to meet the requirement to name all actual inventors and only the actual inventors?

Yes _____ No _____

FINDINGS ON DAMAGES (IF APPLICABLE)

If you answered question 1, 2, 3 or 4 "yes" and questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 "no," proceed to answer the remaining questions. If you did not so answer, do not answer the remaining questions and proceed to check and sign the verdict form.

13. What lost profits, if any, did Patent Holder show it more likely than not suffered as a result of sales that it would with reasonable probability have made but for Alleged Infringer's infringement?

\$ _____

14. For those infringing sales for which Patent Holder has not proved its entitlement to lost profits, what amount has it proved it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty?

\$ _____

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Presiding Juror should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Security Guard that you have reached a verdict. The Presiding Juror should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

DATED: _____, 20____	By: _____ Presiding Juror