IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION, Plaintiff, v. EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY, Defendant.	Civil Action No. 06-251 (GMS)

EXHIBIT I4: PLAINTIFF PHILIPS' PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

Plaintiff U.S. Philips Corporation ("Philips") hereby submits its proposed verdict form as of March 3, 2008. Philips may submit revisions to its Proposed Verdict Form after meeting and conferring with Defendant Eastman Kodak Company ("Kodak") on outstanding trial management issues, after receiving the Court's rulings on the parties' respective motions *in limine*, and as necessary to conform to the evidence presented at trial and the rulings of the Court.

INFRINGEMENT

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

Question No. 1:

Do you find that Philips has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Kodak has infringed any of the following claims of Philips' U.S. Patent No. 4,901,075, either directly or indirectly, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents?

Answer "Yes" or "No".

	Yes (For Philips)	No (For Kodak)
Claim 3		
Claim 4		
Claim 7		
Claim 8		
Claim 11		

WILLFULNESS

Question No. 2:

Do you find that Philips has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that Kodak's infringement of any one of Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, or 11 of Philips' U.S. Patent No. 4,901,075 was willful?

Answer "Yes" or "No".

Yes (For Philips)	No (For Kodak)

ANTICIPATION

Question No. 3(a):

Do you find that Kodak has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of Philips' U.S. Patent No. 4,901,075 are invalid because each and every element of the invention defined in the claim of Philips' patent was disclosed in a single item of prior art relied upon by Kodak?

Answer "Yes" or "No".

	No (For Philips)	Yes (For Kodak)
Claim 3		
Claim 4		
Claim 7		
Claim 8		

Question No. 3(b):

If you answered "Yes" to Question 3(a) with respect to any claim, please identify each item of prior art that you find rendered that claim invalid.

Claim 3	
Claim 4	
Claim 7	
Claim 8	

OBVIOUSNESS

Question No. 4(a):

Do you find that Kodak has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of Philips' U.S. Patent No. 4,901,075 are invalid because the claimed invention described in the claim would have been obvious to persons of ordinary skill in the art in view of the prior art at the time of the invention?

Answer "Yes" or "No".

	No (For Philips)	Yes (For Kodak)
Claim 3		
Claim 4		
Claim 8		
Claim 11		

Question No. 4(b):

If you answered "Yes" to Question 4(a) with respect to any claim, please identify the prior art that you find rendered that claim invalid.

Claim 3	
Claim 4	
Claim 8	
Claim 11	

MONETARY DAMAGES FOR INFRINGEMENT

Question No. 5:

If you have found one or more claims of Philips' U.S. Patent No. 4,901,075 to be valid and infringed by Kodak, please identify the amount of monetary damages that will compensate Philips for Kodak's infringement.

$_____

FRAUD

Question No. 6:

Do you find that Kodak has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Philips has committed fraud?

Answer "Yes" or "No".

No (For Philips)	Yes (For Kodak)

NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

Question No. 7:

Do you find that Kodak has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Philips has committed negligent misrepresentation?

Answer "Yes" or "No".

No (For Philips)	Yes (For Kodak)

DECEPTIVE TRADE PRACTICES

Question No. 8:

Do you find that Kodak has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Philips has engaged in deceptive trade practices in violation of Delaware's Deceptive Trade Practices Act?

Answer "Yes" or "No".

No (For Philips)	Yes (For Kodak)