

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

CORELOGIC INFORMATION
SOLUTIONS, INC.

v.

INTERTHINX, INC.

§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:10-CV-132-RSP

VERDICT FORM

In answering these questions, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you.

1. **Did CoreLogic prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the Interthinx-developed AVMS in Interthinx's products infringed claims 1 or 10 of the '201 patent?**

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each patent claim. If you find the claim infringed, answer "Yes," otherwise, answer "No."

	Interthinx Infringed?
Claim 1 of the '201 Patent	NO
Claim 10 of the '201 Patent	NO

2. **Did Interthinx prove by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims are invalid in view of the prior art?**

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each claim. If you find the claim invalid, answer "Yes," otherwise, answer "No."

	Invalid as Anticipated?	Invalid as Obvious?
Claim 1 of the '201 Patent	NO	NO
Claim 10 of the '201 Patent	NO	NO

ANSWER QUESTION 3 ONLY IF YOU FOUND AT LEAST ONE CLAIM BOTH INFRINGED BY INTERTHINX AND NOT INVALID.

3. What sum of money do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate CoreLogic for the patent infringement by Interthinx?

\$ _____

The jury foreperson should sign and date the Verdict Form and return it to the Bailiff.

28 September 2012
Date