



Provided by:
[Overhauser Law Offices LLC](http://www.iniplaw.org)
www.iniplaw.org
www.overhauser.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION

FILED
December 04, 2023
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

BY: Jennifer Clark
DEPUTY

THE TRUSTEES OF
PURDUE UNIVERSITY,

Plaintiff,

v.

STMICROELECTRONICS
INTERNATIONAL N.V., and
STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 6:21-cv-00727-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

557 B^m
12/4/23

JURY 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.

In this Verdict Form, the following terms have the following meanings:

- **“Purdue”** refers to The Trustees of Purdue University.
- **“ST Inc.”** refers to STMicroelectronics, Inc.
- **“ST Int’l”** refers to ST Microelectronics International N.V.

- **“ST”** refers collectively to STMicroelectronics, Inc. and ST Microelectronics International N.V.
- The **“Patent-in-Suit”** refers to U.S. Patent No. 7,498,633.
- The **“Asserted Claims”** refers collectively to Claims 9 and 10 of the Patent-in-Suit.

**IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT YOU FOLLOW THE INSTRUCTIONS
PROVIDED IN THIS VERDICT FORM**

**READ THEM CAREFULLY AND ENSURE THAT YOUR VERDICT
COMPLIES WITH THEM**

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them as our verdict in this case:

INFRINGEMENT

Directions: In answering Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 below, please answer either “Yes” or “No” for each listed claim.

QUESTION 1: Has Purdue proven by a preponderance of the evidence that ST Inc. directly infringed the following claims of the **Patent-in-Suit**?

“Yes” is a finding for **Purdue**. “No” is a finding for **ST**.

Claim 9:	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 10:	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

QUESTION 2: Has Purdue proven by a preponderance of the evidence that ST Int'l directly infringed the following claims of the **Patent-in-Suit**?

“Yes” is a finding for **Purdue**. “No” is a finding for **ST**.

Claim 9:	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Claim 10:	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

QUESTION 3: Has Purdue proven by a preponderance of the evidence that ST Inc. induced infringement of the following claims of the **Patent-in-Suit**?

“Yes” is a finding for **Purdue**. “No” is a finding for **ST**.

Claim 9: Yes No

Claim 10: Yes No

QUESTION 4: Has Purdue proven by a preponderance of the evidence that ST Int'l induced infringement of the following claims of the **Patent-in-Suit**?

“Yes” is a finding for **Purdue**. “No” is a finding for **ST**.

Claim 9: Yes No

Claim 10: Yes No

VALIDITY

Directions: In answering Question 5 below, please answer either “Yes” or “No” for each question and listed claim.

QUESTION 5: Has **ST** proven by clear and convincing evidence that the following claims of the **Patent-in-Suit** are invalid?

“Yes” is a finding for **ST**. “No” is a finding for **Purdue**.

Claim 9: Yes ___ No

Claim 10: Yes ___ No

Before proceeding to the next page, please review questions 1–5 above to ensure that all questions have been answered unanimously.

DAMAGES

Directions: Only answer Questions 6, 7, and 8 below if you found one or more patent claims were infringed and not invalid by having answered: (a) “Yes” to at least one claim in response to Questions 1, 2, 3 and/or 4; and (b) “No” for the same claim(s) in response to Question 5.

QUESTION 6: Did Purdue establish by a preponderance of the evidence that Purdue has complied with the marking requirement prior to the filing of this lawsuit, as explained in Jury Instruction No. 33?

“Yes” is a finding for Purdue. “No” is a finding for ST.

Yes No

If you answer “No” to Question 6, the damages you award, if any, cannot start to accumulate until July 20, 2021, the date that Purdue served the complaint in this case alleging infringement.

QUESTION 7: What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, has **Purdue** proven by a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate **Purdue** for **ST's** infringement of the **Asserted Claims** of the **Patent-in-Suit**? Answer in United States dollars and cents, if any.

\$ 32,500,000.

QUESTION 8: Is the amount you found in Question 8, if any, meant to compensate only for infringement through December 31, 2022 (a running royalty through December 31, 2022), or to include all infringing sales through the expiration of the patent (a lump sum for all time)?

Check the blank next to the option you choose:

Running Royalty through December 31, 2022

Lump Sum for all time

Please proceed to the **FINAL PAGE**.

FINAL PAGE OF THE JURY VERDICT FORM

You have now reached the end of the Verdict Form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your **unanimous** determinations. The Jury Foreperson should then sign and date the Verdict Form in the spaces below. Once this is done, notify the Court Security Officer that you have reached a verdict. The Jury Foreperson should keep the Verdict Form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

I certify that the jury unanimously concurs in every element of the above verdict.

Signed this 4 day of December, 2023.

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the Jury Foreperson.

Jury Foreperson