IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

OSSEO IMAGING, LLC, Plaintiff, vs. PLANMECA USA INC., Defendant.	**C.A. NO. 1:17-CV-01386-JFB** **JUDGMENT FOLLOWING JURY VERDICT**

This action is before the Court for a jury trial beginning on August 22, 2022. The jury rendered its verdict on August 29, 2022, D.I. 191. A redacted copy of the verdict form is attached hereto.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that judgment be and is hereby entered on the jury's verdict as set forth in the attached verdict form.

IT IS FURTHER NOTED that this JUDGMENT FOLLOWING JURY VERDICT is subject to revision pursuant to any rulings on any post-trial motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.

Dated this 2nd day of September, 2022.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon
Senior United States District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

OSSEO IMAGING, LLC, Plaintiff, vs. PLANMECA USA INC., Defendant.	**C.A. NO. 1:17-CV-01386-JFB** **VERDICT FORM**

INTRODUCTION

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 for guidance on the law applicable to each question.

You should answer all of questions 1 to 10. Question 11, about damages, should only be answered if you find that there is at least one asserted claim of any one or more of the patents that is both infringed and not invalid.

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.

I. DIRECT INFRINGEMENT

The '301 Patent

1. Has Osseo proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Planmeca directly infringed any of the following claims of the '301 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell within, or importing into the United States the Accused Systems?

"Yes" is in favor of Osseo, and "No" is in favor of Planmeca.

CLAIM 1 YES ✓ NO_____

If YES for claim 1, answer Question 1 for claim 7. If NO, go to Question 2.

CLAIM 7 YES ✓ NO_____

The '262 Patent

2. Has Osseo proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Planmeca directly infringed CLAIM 1 of the '262 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell within, or importing into the United States the Accused Systems?

"Yes" is in favor of Osseo, and "No" is in favor of Planmeca.

YES ✓ NO_____

The '374 Patent

3. Has Osseo proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Planmeca directly infringed any of the following claims of the '374 Patent by making, using, selling, offering to sell within, or importing into the United States the Accused Systems?

"Yes" is in favor of Osseo, and "No" is in favor of Planmeca.

CLAIM 1 YES ✓ NO_____

If YES for claim 1, answer Question 3 for claim 6. If NO, go to Question 4.

CLAIM 6 YES____ NO ✓

II. INVALIDITY

OBVIOUSNESS

The '301 Patent

4. Has Planmeca proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '301 Patent are invalid due to obviousness?

"Yes" is in favor of Planmeca, and "No" is in favor of Osseo.

CLAIM 1	YES____	NO✓
CLAIM 7	YES____	NO✓

The '262 Patent

5. Has Planmeca proven by clear and convincing evidence that CLAIM 1 of the '262 patent is invalid due to obviousness?

"Yes" is in favor of Planmeca, and "No" is in favor of Osseo.

YES____ NO✓

The '374 Patent

6. Has Planmeca proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '374 patent are invalid due to obviousness?

"Yes" is in favor of Planmeca, and "No" is in favor of Osseo.

CLAIM 1	YES____	NO✓
CLAIM 6	YES____	NO✓

WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

The '262 Patent

7. Has Planmeca proven by clear and convincing evidence that CLAIM 1 of the '262 Patent is invalid due to lack of written description?

"Yes" is in favor of Planmeca, and "No" is in favor of Osseo.

YES____ NO✓____

The '374 Patent

8. Has Planmeca proven by clear and convincing evidence that CLAIM 6 of the '374 Patent is invalid due to lack of written description?

"Yes" is in favor of Planmeca, and "No" is in favor of Osseo.

YES____ NO✓____

ENABLEMENT

The '262 Patent

9. Has Planmeca proven by clear and convincing evidence that CLAIM 1 of the '262 Patent is invalid due to lack of enablement?

"Yes" is in favor of Planmeca, and "No" is in favor of Osseo.

YES____ NO✓

The '374 Patent

10. Has Planmeca proven by clear and convincing evidence that CLAIM 6 of the '374 Patent is invalid due to lack of enablement?

"Yes" is in favor of Planmeca, and "No" is in favor of Osseo.

YES____ NO✓

III. DAMAGES

Directions: If for any asserted claim(s) of the '301 Patent, '262 Patent, or '374 Patent, you answered both "Yes" to infringement and "No" as to invalidity for all questions that pertain to that particular asserted claim, please answer the question below. To be clear, you should only answer this question if for any one or more of the patents you find that there is at least one asserted claim of that patent that is both infringed and not invalid.

11. What amount of damages do you find Osseo has proven by a preponderance of the evidence it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty for Planmeca's past infringement of the '301 Patent, the '262 Patent, and/or the '374 Patent?

$ 2,300,000

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and you should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. You must each sign the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Court Security Officer after you have reached a verdict. The Foreperson should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it to the courtroom in the envelope provided when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

Dated this 29th day of August, 2022.

[redacted]

FOREPERSON

[redacted]