UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORACLE AMERICA, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HEWLETT PACKARD ENTERPRISE COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-01393-JST

VERDICT FORM

We, the jury, duly empaneled and sworn in the above-entitled action, answer the questions posed to us as follows:

COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS

1. Did Defendant HPE directly infringe any copyright owned by Plaintiff Oracle?

Yes ✓ No _____

Please answer Question 2.

2. Did Terix directly infringe any copyright owned by Plaintiff Oracle?

Yes ✓ No _____

If you answered "yes" to Question 2, please answer Question 3. If you answered no to Question 2, but yes to Question 1, please answer Question 5. If you answered "no" to Questions 1 and 2, please skip Questions 3, 4, and 5, and answer Question 6.

3. Did Defendant HPE vicariously infringe any copyright owned by Plaintiff Oracle?

Yes ✓ No _____

Please answer Question 4.

4. Did Defendant HPE contributorily infringe any copyright owned by Plaintiff Oracle?

Yes _____ No ✓

If you answered "yes" to Questions 1, 3, or 4, please answer Question 5. If you answered "no" to Questions 1, 3, and 4, please skip Question 5 and answer Question 6.

5. What is the total amount of damages you award to Plaintiff Oracle for Defendant HPE's copyright infringement?

$ 30 million

Please answer Question 6.

INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE CLAIMS

6. Did Defendant HPE engage in intentional interference with Oracle's contractual relationships with the customers at issue?

Yes ✓ No _____

Please answer Question 7.

7. Did HPE engage in intentional interference with Oracle's prospective economic relationships with the customers at issue?

Yes ✓ No ____

If you answered "yes" to Questions 6 and/or 7, please answer Question 8. If you answered "no" to Questions 6 and 7, please stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

8. What are Oracle's damages for the interference claims described in Questions 6 and 7?

$ 24 million

Please answer Question 9.

9. Did Defendant HPE engage in the interference conduct described in Questions 6 and/or 7 with malice, oppression, or fraud?

Yes ____ No ✓

If you answered "yes" to Question 9, please answer Question 10. If you answered "no" to Question 9, please stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

10. Was the conduct constituting malice, oppression, or fraud committed by one or more officers, directors, or managing agents of Defendant HPE acting on behalf of HPE?

Yes ____ No ✓

Please have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

Dated: 6/14/2022 Signed: Anne Beaud

Presiding Juror

United States District Court
Northern District of California