IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

BELDEN TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and BELDEN CDT (CANADA) INC.	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	Civ. No. 08-063-SLR
SUPERIOR ESSEX INC. and SUPERIOR ESSEX COMMUNICATIONS LP	)	
Defendant.	)	

VERDICT SHEET

Dated: September 15, 2010

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

I. ANTICIPATION

U.S. Patent No. 6,998,537 (the '537 patent)

1. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 19 of the '537 patent is invalid as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,755,629 [JTX-287]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 19: No ✓ Yes_____

U.S. Patent No. 6,570,095 (the '095 patent)

2. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 27 of the '095 patent is invalid as being anticipated by German Patent No. DE 297 19 866 A1 [JTX-301]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 27: No ✓ Yes_____

3. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 27 of the '095 patent is invalid as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. Hei5(1993)-290645 [JTX-304]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 27: No ✓ Yes_____

U.S. Patent No. 6,074,503 (the '503 patent)

4. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 1 of the '503 patent is invalid as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,385,485 [JTX-275]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 1: No _____ Yes ✓

II. OBVIOUSNESS

U.S. Patent No. 7,179,999 (the '999 patent)

5. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 2 of the '999 patent is invalid as being obvious in view of German Patent No. DE 297 19 866 A1 [JTX-301] in combination with U.S. Patent No 3,622,683 [JTX-302]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 2: No ✓ Yes _____

Sec. II cont. on p. 4

The '537 Patent

6. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 19 of the '537 patent is invalid as being obvious in view of German Patent No. DE 297 19 866 A1 [JTX-301] in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,670,748 [JTX-303]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 19: No ✓ Yes_____

The '095 Patent

7. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 31 of the '095 patent is invalid as being obvious in view of German Patent No. DE 297 19 866 A1 [JTX-301] in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,670,748 [JTX-303]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 31: No _____ Yes ✓

U.S. Patent No. 7,135,641 (the '641 patent)

8. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 13 of the '641 patent is invalid as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,046 [JTX-291] in combination with U.S. Patent No 6,150,612 [JTX-292]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 13: No ✓ Yes_____

U.S. Patent No. 5,242,491 (the '491 patent)

9. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the asserted claims of the '491 patent are invalid as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,792,442 [JTX-297] in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,010,210 [JTX-299]?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 1: No _____ Yes ✓

Claim 2: No _____ Yes ✓

The '503 Patent

10. Do you find that Superior Essex has proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that Claim 1 of the '503 patent is invalid as being obvious in view of Japanese Patent No. Sho56(1981)-7307 [JTX-276] in combination with knowledge of one skilled in the art at the time of the invention?

Checking "no" below indicates a finding for Belden.

Checking "yes" below indicates a finding for Superior Essex.

Claim 1: No _____ Yes ✓