

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CONTINUOUS COMPOSITES, INC.,)	
a Delaware corporation,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 21-998 (MN)
)	
MARKFORGED, INC.,)	
a Delaware corporation,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

VERDICT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS

In answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Court's charge. Your answers to each question must be **unanimous**. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in the jury instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

As used herein:

1. The '660 patent refers to United States Patent Number 11,173,660.
2. Continuous Composites refers to Plaintiff Continuous Composites, Inc.
3. MarkForged refers to Defendant MarkForged, Inc.

INFRINGEMENT

Question No. 1: Did Continuous Composites prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MarkForged directly infringed claims 2 and 4 of the '660 patent?

	Yes (for Continuous Composites)	No (for MarkForged)
Claim 2	_____	_____ ✓
Claim 4	_____ ✓	_____

Question No. 2: Did Continuous Composites prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MarkForged indirectly infringed claims 2 and 4 of the '660 patent by inducing infringement?

	Yes (for Continuous Composites)	No (for MarkForged)
Claim 2	_____	_____ ✓
Claim 4	_____ ✓	_____

Question No. 3: Did Continuous Composites prove by a preponderance of the evidence that MarkForged indirectly infringed claims 2 and 4 of the '660 patent by contributing to infringement?

	Yes (for Continuous Composites)	No (for MarkForged)
Claim 2	_____	_____ ✓
Claim 4	_____ ✓	_____

INVALIDITY

Question No. 4: Did the evidence establish that the '660 Patent claims are entitled to the August 29, 2012 priority date of the provisional patent application?

	Yes (for Continuous Composites)	No (for MarkForged)
Claim 2	_____	_____ ✓
Claim 4	_____ ✓	_____

If you answered “Yes” for a claim in Question No. 4, please skip Question Nos. 5 and 6 for that claim, and continue with Question No. 7.

If you answered “No” for a claim in Question No. 4, please answer Question Nos. 5 and 6 for that claim, and then continue with Question No. 7.

Question No. 5: Did MarkForged prove by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims of the '660 patent are invalid because of prior invention?

	Yes (for MarkForged)	No (for Continuous Composites)
Claim 2	_____	_____ ✓
Claim 4	_____	_____

Question No. 6: Did MarkForged prove by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims of the '660 patent are invalid because of prior public use?

	Yes (for MarkForged)	No (for Continuous Composites)
Claim 2	_____	_____ ✓
Claim 4	_____	_____

Question No. 7: Did MarkForged prove by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims of the '660 patent are invalid because of obviousness?

	Yes (for MarkForged)	No (for Continuous Composites)
Claim 2	_____	_____ ✓
Claim 4	_____	_____ ✓

Question No. 8: Did MarkForged prove by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims of the '660 patent are invalid because they lack written description support?

	Yes (for MarkForged)	No (for Continuous Composites)
Claim 2	_____ ✓	_____
Claim 4	_____	_____ ✓

DAMAGES

Answer this question only if you find that at least one of the claims of the '660 patent is infringed and not invalid. Otherwise, skip to the end of the Verdict Form.

Question No. 9: What amount of reasonable royalty has Continuous Composites proven by a preponderance of the evidence it is entitled to recover?

\$ 17,341,310.00

UNANIMOUS VERDICT

Upon reaching a unanimous verdict on each question above, each juror must sign below, and the foreperson should add the date.

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

Dated: 4/11/24

