## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Epistar Corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Lowe's Companies, Inc., Lowe's Home Centers, LLC

Defendants.

Case 2:17-cv-03219-JAK-KS

## VERDICT FORM

**REDACTED** 



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. 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:

1	I. <u>INFRINGEMENT</u>
2	For questions in this section, " <b>Yes</b> " is a finding for Epistar and " <b>No</b> " is
3	finding for Lowe's.
4	A. <u>The '780 Patent:</u>
5	QUESTION 1: Has Epistar proven that it is more likely than not that every
6	requirement of Claims 1, 3, and 7 of the '780 Patent is included in at least one of
7	Lowe's accused products?
8	Claim 1 Yes V No
9	Claim 1       Yes       No       No         Claim 3       Yes       No       No         Claim 7       Yes       No       No
10	Claim 7 Yes No No
11	
12	B. The '771 Patent:
13	QUESTION 2: Has Epistar proven that it is more likely than not that every
14	requirement of Claims 36 and 38 of the '771 Patent is included in at least one of
15	Lowe's accused products?
16	Claim 36 Yes No  Claim 38 Yes No
17	Claim 38 Yes No
18	
19	II. <u>WILLFULNESS</u>
20	A. <u>'738 Patent</u>
21	QUESTION 3: Has Epistar proven that it is more likely than not that Lowe's
22	actually knew, intentionally ignored, or recklessly disregarded that its actions
23	constituted infringement of the '738 Patent?
24	Yes No
25	
26	B. <u>'780 Patent</u>
27	If you answered "Yes" to any part of Question 1, answer the following

question.

28

1	QUESTION 4: Has Epistar proven that it is more likely than not that Lowe's
2	actually knew, intentionally ignored, or recklessly disregarded that its actions
3	constituted infringement of the '780 Patent?
4	Yes No
5	
6	C. <u>'771 Patent</u>
7	If you answered "Yes" to any part of Question 2, answer the following
8	question.
9	QUESTION 5: Has Epistar proven that it is more likely than not that Lowe's
10	actually knew, intentionally ignored, or recklessly disregarded that its actions
11	constituted infringement of the '771 Patent?
12	Yes No
13	
14	
15	III. <u>INVALIDITY</u>
16	There are two forms of invalidity raised by Lowe's. For the first – Obviousness
17	- the ultimate legal conclusion will be made by the court, but in order for the court to
18	do so, you will answer preliminary factual questions. For the second – Anticipation –
19	you as the jury make the determination.
20	<u>OBVIOUSNESS</u>
21	For questions in this section, "Yes" is a finding for Lowe's and "No" is a
22	finding for Epistar.
23	
24	A. The '738 Patent
25	a. Scope and Content of the Prior Art
26	QUESTION 6: Were the following references within the scope and content
27	of the prior art at the time of the claimed invention?
28	Oohata '090 Yes No
	VEDDICT FODM

Case 2:17-cv-03219-JAK-KS Document 455 Filed 12/06/21 Page 4 of 10 Page ID #:16173

1	ii. Ophata '741 and Marchl
2	Lowe's Contention: Oohata '741 in view of Marchl
3	disclose all elements of Claims 1-3 of the '738 Patent
4	Epistar's Contention 1: Oohata '741 does not disclose
5	a substrate
6	Epistar's Contention 2: Oohata '741 does not disclose
7	epitaxial light-emitting stack layers
8	Epistar's Contention 3: Oohata '741 does not disclose
9	a plurality of electrically connected epitaxial light-
10	emitting stack layers
11	Epistar's Contention 4: Oohata '741 does not disclose
12	that the P-contact and the N-contact are disposed on the
13	same side of the epitaxial light-emitting stack layer.
14	Epistar's Contention 5: Oohata '741 does not disclose
15	a first conductive semiconductor stack layer
16	iii. <u>Qohata '741, Marchl and Sickmiller</u>
17	Lowe's Contention: Oohata '741 in view of Marchl
18	and Sickmiller disclose all elements of Claim 8 of the
19	'738 Patent
20	Epistar's Contention 1: The combination does not
21	disclose a substrate
22	Epistar's Contention 2: The combination does not
23	disclose epitaxial light-emitting stack layers
24	Epistar's Contention 3: The combination does not
25	disclose a plurality of electrically connected epitaxial
26	light-emitting stack layers
27	Epistar's Contention 4: The combination does not
28	disclose that the P-contact and the N-contact are

VERDICT FORM PAGE 4

PAGE 5

Case 2:17-cv-03219-JAK-KS Document 455 Filed 12/06/21 Page 6 of 10 Page ID #:16175

1	elements of claims 1, 3, and 7 of the '780 Patent
2	<b>Epistar's Contention 1:</b> Sugiura does not disclose a light
3	emitting stack layer
4	Epistar's Contention 2: Sugiura does not disclose a first
5	conductive-type semiconductor layer
6	Epistar's Contention 3: Sugiura does not disclose an active
7	layer
8	Epistar's Contention 4: Sugiura does not disclose a second
9	conductive-type semiconductor layer
10	Epistar's Contention 5: Nakamura does not disclose a sidewall
11	of the substrate comprising a first area and a second area
12	Epistar's Contention 6: Nakamura does not disclose a
13	substantially flat first area
14	Epistar's Contention 7: Nakamura does not disclose a
15	substantially textured second area
16	<b>Epistar's Contention 8:</b> Nakamura does not disclose a convex-
17	concave structure
18	
19	c. Secondary Considerations
20	QUESTION 11: Which of the following factors, if any, has Epistar established
21	by the evidence with respect to the claimed invention (check any that applies)?
22	commercial success of a product due to the merits of the claimed
23	invention
24	a long felt need for the solution that is provided by the claimed
25	invention
26	$\sum$ acceptance by others of the claimed invention as shown from the
27	licensing of the claimed invention
28	
	VEDDICT FORM

1 2 **ANTICIPATION** 3 For all questions in this section, "Yes" is a finding for Lowe's and "No" is a finding for Epistar. 4 The '771 Patent: 5 **QUESTION 12:** Has Lowe's established that it is highly probable that Claims 6 36 and 38 of Epistar's '771 Patent were anticipated by Kunio, or in other words, not 7 new? 8 

 Claim 36
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_
 No \_\_\_\_\_\_

 Claim 38
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_
 No \_\_\_\_\_\_

 9 10 11 IV. **FINDINGS ON DAMAGES** 12 When analyzing damages, you should consider infringement of the '738 Patent, 13 14|| which has already been determined, as well as any "Yes" answers you provided, if any, to Questions 1 and 2 concerning infringement of the '771 and '780 Patents, and any 15|| "No" answers you provided, if any, to Question 12 concerning anticipation of the '771 16 17 Patent. Follow the instructions below regarding each patent. 18 19 20 '738 Patent Assume the '738 Patent is valid and answer the following question. 21 22 For any infringing sales, what is the amount Epistar has proven it is entitled to 23 as a reasonable royalty. 24 (a) The jury concludes that a reasonable royalty should be assessed based on a royalty rate of % on \$ in total sales; or, 25 (b) The jury concludes that a reasonable royalty should be assessed as a one-26 time payment of \$\frac{707,000}{.} 27 28 VERDICT FORM PAGE 7

**'780 Patent** 1 If you answered "Yes" to any part of Question 1 concerning infringement of the 2 3 '780 Patent, assume the '780 Patent is valid and answer the following question. If you answered "No" to all of Question 1, do not answer this question. 4 For any infringing sales, what is the amount Epistar has proven it is entitled to 5 6 as a reasonable royalty. (a) The jury concludes that a reasonable royalty should be assessed based on a 7 royalty rate of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in total sales; or, 8 9 (b) The jury concludes that a reasonable royalty should be assessed as a onetime payment of \$\frac{407,000}{.} 10 11 **'771 Patent** 12 If you answered "Yes" to any part of Question 2 concerning infringement of the 13 '771 Patent, and you answered "No" to any part of Question 12 concerning 14 anticipation, answer the following question. If you answered "No" to all of Ouestion 15 2, or "Yes" to all of Question 12, do not answer this question, 16 For any infringing sales, what is the amount Epistar has proven it is entitled to 17 18 as a reasonable royalty. 19 (a) The jury concludes that a reasonable royalty should be assessed based on a royalty rate of % on \$ in total sales; or, 20 (b) The jury concludes that a reasonable royalty should be assessed as a one-time 21 payment of \$ 707,000 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 **VERDICT FORM** 

## V. CONCLUSION

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 Marshal that you have reached a verdict. The verdict form should then be placed in the envelope that has been provided to you. The Presiding Juror should keep possession of the envelope and bring it into the Courtroom when the jury returns there with the Marshal.

Date: 12/6/21

REDACTED

Presiding Juror

VERDICT FORM PAGE 9