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

2/24/24 FILED

February 26, 2024

WESTERN DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Jennifer Clark

Civil Action No. 6:22-cv-31-

ADA

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED** 

FLYPSI, INC. (D/B/A FLYP),

Plaintiff,

v.

**GOOGLE LLC,** 

Defendant.

#### VERDICT FORM

In answering the following questions, please follow the instructions that I have given you in the Court's jury charge and the directions provided throughout this Verdict Form. Your answers to each question must be unanimous.

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

- Flyp refers to Plaintiff Flypsi, Inc. (d/b/a Flyp).
- Google refers to Defendant Google LLC.
- The '770 Patent refers to U.S. Patent No. 9,667,770.
- The '105 Patent refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,051,105.
- The '094 Patent refers to U.S. Patent No. 10,334,094.
- The '554 Patent refers to U.S. Patent No. 11,012,554.

- The '585 Patent refers to U.S. Patent No. 11,218,585.
- The Asserted Patents refer to the '770 Patent, '105 Patent, '094 Patent, '554 Patent, and '585 Patent.
- The Asserted Claims refer collectively to Claims 1 and 2 of the '770
   Patent; Claim 1 of the '105 Patent, Claim 1 of the '094 Patent, Claim
   1 of the '554 Patent, and Claim 1 of the '585 Patent.

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

# READ THE INSTRUCTIONS 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:

#### **QUESTION 1: LITERAL INFRINGEMENT**

**Directions - Question No. 1:** In answering Question 1 below, please answer either "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim.

Question No. 1: Did Flyp prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Google has *literally* infringed the following claims of the Asserted Patents? "Yes" is a finding for Flyp. "No" is a finding for Google.

<u>'770 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES <u>✓</u> NO \_\_\_\_

Claim 2: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_

'105 Patent Claim 1: YES V NO NO

'094 Patent Claim 1: YES ✓ NO\_\_\_\_

'554 Patent Claim 1: YES V NO NO

<u>'585 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_ ✓ NO \_\_\_\_

**QUESTION 2: INFRINGEMENT BY DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS** 

Directions - Question No. 2: In answering Question 2 below, please answer either

"Yes" or "No" for each listed claim.

Question No. 2: If you answered "Yes" to Claims 1 and 2 of the '770 Patent and

Claim 1 of the '105 Patent in Question 1, skip to Question 3. Otherwise, answer the

following question before proceeding to Question 3. Did Flyp prove, by a

preponderance of the evidence, (a) that Google has infringed the "bridge telephone

number" limitation of the following claims under the doctrine of equivalents, AND

(b) that Google has literally infringed all other limitations of those claims? "Yes" is

a finding for Flyp. "No" is a finding for Google.

<u>'770 Patent</u> Claim 1:

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_

'105 Patent Claim 1:

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_

Please proceed to the next question.

5

### **QUESTION 3: PRIOR USE DEFENSE**

**Directions – Question No. 3**: In answering Question 3 below, please answer either "Yes" or "No."

Question 3 – Prior Use: Has Google proven by clear and convincing evidence that Google commercially used the claimed invention in Google Voice in the United States before July 17, 2012? "Yes" is a finding for Google. "No" is a finding for Flyp.

Claim 2: YES \_\_\_\_\_NO ✓

'105 Patent Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

<u>'094 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

\*\*\* '554 Patent Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

<u>'585 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

### **QUESTION 4: INVALIDITY**

**Directions** – **Question No. 4**: In answering Question 4 below, please answer either "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim.

Question No. 4: Has Google proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the Asserted Patents are invalid based on pre-2013 Google Voice? "Yes" is a finding for Google. "No" is a finding for Flyp.

<u>'770 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

Claim 2: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

'105 Patent Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

<u>'094 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_

<u>'554 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

<u>'585 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

### **QUESTION 5: WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT**

**Directions – Question No. 5:** In answering Question 5 below, please answer either "Yes" or "No" for each listed claim.

Question No. 5: Has Google proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents are invalid for lack of adequate written description? "Yes" is a finding for Google. "No" is a finding for Flyp.

<u>'770 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

Claim 2: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_

'105 Patent Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_

'094 Patent Claim 1: YES NO

2554 Patent Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_

<u>\*585 Patent</u> Claim 1: YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_

If you have reached this point in the verdict form, you should have answered at least Questions 1, 3, 4, and 5. If you have not answered Questions 1, 3, 4, and 5, please go back and answer them before proceeding.

You should proceed to answer Question 6 only if (1) you answered "YES" for any claims in Question 1 or Question 2 and (2) you answered "NO" for those same claims in Questions 3, 4, and 5. In other words, you should proceed to answer Question 6 only if you found one or more claims infringed, not in prior use by Google, and not invalid on any ground.

Do not answer Question 6 if:

- you answered "NO" for all claims in Questions 1 and 2, OR
- you answered "YES" for all claims in Question 3, OR
- you answered "YES" for all claims in Question 4, OR
- you answered "YES" for all claims in Question 5, OR
- you answered "YES" to at least one of Question 3, Question 4, or Question 5 for each Asserted Claim.

Instead, proceed to the last page, have your Jury Foreperson sign and date this Verdict Form, and then deliver it to the Court Security Officer. You should not pay attention to any other instructions between this point and the signature page found at the end of this verdict form.

## **QUESTION 6: DAMAGES**

**Directions – Question No. 6:** Only for the claim(s) that you found to be infringed by having answered "Yes" in Questions 1 or 2 AND that you found not subject to the prior use defense and not invalid by having answered "No" in Questions 3, 4, and 5, please answer Questions 6(a) and 6(b).

Question No. 6(a): If you found that Google is liable for infringement, what sum of money, if paid now in cash, did Flyp prove by a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate Flyp for Google's infringement?

Answer in U.S. Dollars and Cents, if any: \$ 12 million

Question No. 6(b): Does this number represent a running royalty or a one-time lump sum? Please check one only.

\_\_\_\_ Running Royalty

OR

\_\_\_\_ Lump Sum

#### FINAL PAGE OF THE JURY VERDICT

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.

