

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

ULTRATEC, INC. and CAPTEL, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SORENSEN COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
and CAPTIONCALL, LLC,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM

13-cv-346-bbc

Attached for the parties' consideration is a draft of the verdict form on liability.

Entered this 22d day of October, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

ULTRATEC, INC. and CAPTEL, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SPECIAL VERDICT:
LIABILITY

13-cv-346-bbc

SORENSEN COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
and CAPTIONCALL, LLC,

Defendants.

We, the jury, for our special verdict, find as follows:

Direct Infringement

Question No. 1: Did defendants literally infringe any of the following asserted patent claims?

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each claim.

Patent Claim	YES	NO
Claim 6 of the ‘482 Patent		
Claim 1 of the ‘314 Patent		
Claim 2 of the ‘314 Patent		

Patent Claim	YES	NO
Claim 1 of the '346 Patent		
Claim 7 of the '835 Patent		
Claim 8 of the '835 Patent		
Claim 2 of the '740 Patent		

If you answered “Yes” with respect to any claim, then in answering Question No. 2, do not answer Question No. 2 with respect to those claims. If you answered “No” with respect to claim 6 of the '482 patent, claim 1 of the '314 patent or claim 2 of the '314 patent, answer Question No. 2 with respect to those claims.

Question No. 2: If you answered “No” with respect to any of the following claims in Question No. 1, answer this question with respect to those claims. Did defendants infringe any of the following asserted patent claims under the doctrine of equivalents?

Patent Claim	YES	NO
Claim 6 of the '482 Patent		
Claim 1 of the '314 Patent		
Claim 2 of the '314 Patent		

Regardless how you answered any of the above questions, answer Question No. 3.

Question No. 3: Did defendants infringe claim 2 of the ‘104 patent under the doctrine of equivalents?

Answer “Yes” or “No”

Invalidity—Anticipation

Question No. 4: Are any of the following patent claims invalid as anticipated?

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each claim.

Patent Claim	YES	NO
Claim 1 of the ‘482 Patent		
Claim 1 of the ‘314 Patent		
Claim 2 of the ‘314 Patent		
Claim 1 of the ‘082 Patent		
Claim 7 of the ‘578 Patent		

Invalidity—Obviousness

Question No. 5: Are any of the following patent claims invalid because they were obvious to one of ordinary skill in the field of invention?

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each claim.

Patent Claim	YES	NO
Claim 1 of the ‘482 Patent		
Claim 6 of the ‘482 Patent		
Patent Claim	YES	NO
Claim 1 of the ‘314 Patent		
Claim 2 of the ‘314 Patent		
Claim 1 of the ‘346 Patent		
Claim 7 of the ‘835 Patent		
Claim 8 of the ‘835 Patent		
Claim 1 of the ‘082 Patent		
Claim 2 of the ‘740 Patent		
Claim 2 of the ‘104 Patent		
Claim 7 of the ‘578 Patent		
Claim 8 of the ‘578 Patent		
Claim 11 of the ‘578 Patent		

THIS IS THE END OF THE SPECIAL VERDICT FORM.

Regardless how you answered any of the above questions, sign and date this form.

Presiding Juror

Madison, Wisconsin

Date: _____