Filed in open court this 22nd September 2017.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

AMGEN INC. and AMGEN MANUFACTURING LIMITED, Plaintiffs, v. HOSPIRA, INC., Defendant.	Civil No. 1:15-cv-839-RGA

JURY VERDICT

Instructions: When answering the following questions and completing 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. Throughout this form, "Amgen" refers to the plaintiffs, Amgen Inc. and Amgen Manufacturing Limited, and "Hospira" refers to the defendant, Hospira, Inc.

You should answer all of questions 1 to 5. Question 6, about damages, should only be answered if you find that there is at least one of the accused batches that infringed a valid claim and that was not protected by the Safe Harbor Defense.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,756,349 (THE '349 PATENT)

1. Do you find that Amgen has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Hospira infringed any of the following cell or process claims of the '349 patent?

Answer this question for each claim by circling either "Yes" or "No" to the right of the claim number.

"Yes" is a finding for Amgen.
"No" is a finding for Hospira.

Claim 1	Yes	(No)
Claim 2	Yes	(No)
Claim 3	Yes	(No)
Claim 4	Yes	(No)
Claim 5	Yes	(No)
Claim 6	Yes	(No)
Claim 7	Yes	(No)

INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,856,298 (THE '298 PATENT)

2. Do you find that Amgen has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Hospira infringed either of the following process claims of the '298 patent?

Answer this question for each claim by circling either "Yes" or "No" to the right of the claim number.

"Yes" is a finding for Amgen.
"No" is a finding for Hospira.

Claim 24	(Yes)	No
Claim 27	(Yes)	No

SAFE HARBOR

3. Do you find that Hospira has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the Safe Harbor Defense applied to the manufacture of the following batches of Hospira's EPO drug substance?

Answer this question for each lot listed below by marking either "Yes" or "No" to the right of the lot number.

"Yes" is a finding for Hospira.
"No" is a finding for Amgen.

Year of manufacture	Lot Number	Yes	No
2013	410733	✓	
2013	410740	✓	
2013	410744		✓
2013	410751		✓
2014	410753		✓
2014	410754		✓
2014	410759		✓
2014	410762		✓
2014	410765		✓
2014	410768		✓
2015	410840		✓
2015	410844		✓
2015	410845	✓	
2015	410846	✓	
2015	410847	✓	
2015	410848	✓	
2015	410849	✓	
2015	410850		✓
2015	410851		✓
2015	410852		✓
2015	410853		✓

ANTICIPATION

4. Do you find that Hospira has proven by clear and convincing evidence that either of the following claims of the '298 patent is invalid because the claimed method was anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,667,016 (Lai)?

Answer this question for each claim by circling either "Yes" or "No" to the right of the claim number.

"Yes" is a finding for Hospira.
"No" is a finding for Amgen.

Claim 24	Yes	(No)
Claim 27	Yes	(No)

OBVIOUSNESS

5. Do you find that Hospira has proven by clear and convincing evidence that either of the following claims of the '298 patent is invalid because the claimed method was obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of the '298 patent, based on U.S. Patent No. 4,667,016 (Lai) in combination with the Lukowsky article?

Answer this question for each claim by circling either "Yes" or "No" to the right of the claim number.

"Yes" is a finding for Hospira.
"No" is a finding for Amgen.

Claim 24	Yes	(No)
Claim 27	Yes	(No)

DAMAGES

6. What is the amount of damages that Amgen has proven by a preponderance of the evidence?

Damages: $70 million

UNANIMOUS VERDICT

UPON REACHING A UNANIMOUS VERDICT ON EACH QUESTION ABOVE, EACH JUROR MUST SIGN BELOW.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the above questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

September 22, 2017

REDACTED