2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

2223

2425

26

27

28

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

UTHERVERSE GAMING LLC,

Case No. 2:21-cv-00799-RSM

Plaintiff,

٧.

EPIC GAMES, INC.,

VERDICT FORM

Defendant.

ering the following questions and completi

Instructions: When answering the following questions and completing this Verdict Form, you must follow the instructions provided and follow the Jury Instructions that you have been given. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in the Jury Instructions. You must 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:

- "Utherverse" refers to Plaintiff Utherverse Gaming LLC.
- "Epic" refers to Defendant Epic Games, Inc.
- The "'605 patent" refers to U.S. Patent No. 9,724,605.
- The "asserted claims" refers to claims 2, 5, and 8 of the '605 patent.
- The "accused events" refers to two events hosted by Epic in its multiplayer online videogame Fortnite: the Travis Scott and Ariana Grande concerts.

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

**QUESTION NO 1.** Has Utherverse proven by a preponderance of the evidence that either of the accused events infringed any of the asserted claims?

Check "YES" (for finding in favor of Utherverse) or "NO" (for finding in favor of Epic)

PATENT/CLAIM	INFRINGED – TRAVIS SCOTT?	INFRINGED – ARIANA GRANDE?
'605 patent, claim 2	YESNO	YESNO
'605 patent, claim 5	YESNO	YESNO
'605 patent, claim 8	YESNO _V	YESNO

Please proceed to Question No. 2.

**QUESTION NO. 2.** Has Epic proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims are invalid as obvious based on the prior art?

Check "YES" (for Epic) or "NO" (for Utherverse)

PATENT/CLAIM	INVALID AS OBVIOUS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART?		
'605 patent, claim 2	YES NO NO		
'605 patent, claim 5	YESNO		
'605 patent, claim 8	YESNO_		

ALL NO de

Page 3 of 5

Please proceed to Question 3.

QUESTION NO. 3. Has Epic proven by clear and convincing evidence that the elements of any of the asserted claims, taken individually or together, involved only technology that a person of ordinary skill in the art would consider to be well-understood, routine, and conventional as of August 12, 2014?

Check "YES" (for Epic) or "NO" (for Utherverse)

PATENT/CLAIM	INVALID AS WELL-UNDERSTOOD, ROUTINE, AND CONVENTIONAL?		
'605 patent, claim 2	YESNO		
'605 patent, claim 5	YESNO		
'605 patent, claim 8	YESNO		

If you answered "YES" for one or more claims in Question No. 1 for either accused event and also answered "NO" to Questions Nos. 2-3 for those same claims (in other words, you found at least one claim infringed and not invalid), then please proceed to Question No. 4. Otherwise, please skip to the last page, sign and date the verdict form, and return it to the court clerk.

QUESTION NO. 4. What is the total amount of damages Utherverse has proven by a					
prepond	preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty for Epic's				
infringe	ement?				
Total A	mount for Infringement: \$				
QUESTION NO. 5. If you entered an amount of damages for Question No. 4, did that amount reflect a calculation of percentage royalty damages, or a one-time lump sum royalty payment?					
	TYPE OF DAMAGES	SELECT ONE			
	Percentage Royalty				
	One Time, Lump Sum Royalty Payment				
Presiding Juror, please sign and date this Verdict Form.					
Dated this 10 day of May, 2025.					
		Presiding Juror			