

Patent Infringement Damages

Advanced Technology Incubator, Inc. V. Sharp Corporation, Et Al.

SHARP SETTLED THE CASE BEFORE TRIAL

Scott Hampton was retained by Sharp Corporation as a damages expert with regard to a patent infringement case titled, *Advanced Technology Incubator, Inc. v. Sharp Corporation*, Case No. 2:07-CV-00468, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas Marshall Division.

Advanced Technology Incubator, Inc. filed the action against Sharp and DAI Nippon Printing, alleging the infringement of United States Patent Nos. RE. 37,682 and RE. 36,711, and requesting **\$109,000,000** in reasonable royalty damages.

Sharp was represented by Nixon and Vanderhye in Arlington, Virginia and DAI Nippon Printing was represented by Milbank's New York office.

The patents relate to a method of fabricating liquid crystal displays used in televisions, computer monitors, and handheld devices.

Mr. Hampton submitted an expert report and two supplemental reports establishing reasonable royalty damages.

Advanced Technology Incubator, Inc. moved to exclude Mr. Hampton's testimony. The court denied the motion and allowed Mr. Hampton's testimony.

Medtronic Sofamor Danek USA, Inc., Et Al. V. Globus Medical, Inc.

Conrad O'Brien Gellman & Rohn (Philadelphia) and McShea \ Tecce (Philadelphia) retained Hampton IP & Economic Consultants, on behalf of the Defendant, with regard to Case No. 2:06-CV-04248 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of the following patents: U.S. Patent No. 6,485,491 B1, titled *Posterior Fixation System*; U.S. Patent No. 6,530,929 B1, titled *Instruments for Stabilization of Bony Structures*; U.S. Patent No. 6,916,320 B2, titled *Anterior Cervical Plate System*; U.S. Patent No. 7,008,422 B2, titled *Instruments and Methods for Stabilization of Bony Structures*; U.S. Patent No. 7,063,725, titled *Systems and Techniques for*

Restoring and Maintaining Intervertebral Anatomy; and U.S. Patent No. 7,066,961 B2, titled *Spinal Implant*.

Hampton IP & Economic Consultants provided an opinion on lost profits and reasonable royalty damages, submitted a Rule 26 expert report, and gave deposition and trial testimony.

Anvik Corporation V. Sharp Corporation, Et Al.

Nixon Vanderhye (Washington D.C.) retained Hampton IP professionals, on behalf of the defendant (Tokyo, Japan), to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 4,924,257, titled *Scan and Repeat High Resolution Lithography System*; U.S. Patent No. 5,285,236, titled *Large-Area High Throughput*; U.S. Patent No. 5,291,240, titled *Nonlinearity-Compensated Large-Area Patterning System*; U.S. Patent No. 5,721,606, titled *Large-Area High Throughput Scan and Repeat*; and U.S. Patent No. 5,897,986, titled *Projection Patterning of Large Substrates*.

Hampton IP professionals provided an opinion on economic prejudices and patent misuse, and submitted a Rule 26 expert report.

Aspex Eyewear, Inc., Et Al. V. Altair Eyewear, Inc.

Reed Smith, LLP (Philadelphia) retained Hampton IP professionals on behalf of the defendant, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,054, titled *Auxiliary Lenses for Eyeglasses*.

Hampton IP professionals provided an opinion on reasonable royalty damages, commented on an opposing expert report, submitted a Rule 26 expert report, and gave deposition testimony in Phoenix, AZ.

Creative Integrated Systems, Inc. V. Nintendo Of America, Inc., And Macronix America, Inc., Et Al.

The San Diego, California office of Baker & McKenzie LLP engaged Hampton IP & Economic Consultants on behalf of Nintendo of America to provide an opinion of damages arising from alleged infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,241,497 and

5,812,461 in Case No. 2:10-cv-02735 in the United States District Court, Central District of California, Southern Division.

Creative Integrated Systems, headquartered in Santa Ana, California, is the assignee of the patents-in-suit. Nintendo develops, manufactures, and distributes video game hardware and software products worldwide. Its products include handheld Nintendo DS, Nintendo DS Lite, Nintendo DSi, Nintendo DSi XL, and Game Boy products, and Nintendo Wii, a console game system. Macronix, a leading integrated device manufacturer in the non-volatile memory market, is the largest supplier of Mask ROM products in the world.

Creative Integrated Systems alleged that Nintendo and other defendants infringed the '497 and '461 Patents by using Creative Integrated Systems' Read-Only-Memory technology.

Mr. Hampton assisted Nintendo with discovery, calculated damages, prepared an expert report and provided deposition and testimony.

Baden Sports, Inc. V. Molten Corporation

DAMAGES WERE CONSISTENT WITH OUR TESTIMONY

Vantage Law, PLLC (Seattle) retained our consultants, on behalf of the plaintiff (Seattle, WA), with regard to Case No. 2:06-CV-00210 in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, to provide an opinion of damages arising from alleged patent infringement and unfair competition regarding U.S. Patent No. 5,636,835, titled *Inflatable Ball, and unfair competition*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses, submitted a Rule 26 expert report, and Mr. Hampton testified at trial.

Andrx Pharmaceuticals, LLC V. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, Et Al.

THE CASE SETTLED FAVORABLY FOR ANDRX.

Isicoff Ragatz & Koenigsberg (Miami) retained our consultants, on behalf of the Plaintiff (Miami, FL), with regard to Case No. 1:05-CV-23264 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,905,708 titled, *Controlled Release Oral Dosage Form*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses submitted a Rule 26 expert report and gave deposition testimony.

Clock Spring, L.P. V. Wrapmaster, Inc., Et Al.

THE CASE SETTLED FAVORABLY FOR CLOCK SPRINGS.

Reed Smith (Philadelphia) retained our consultants, on behalf of the plaintiff (Houston, TX), with regard to Case No. 4:03-CV-03541 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,336,983 titled, *Method of and Apparatus for Reinforcing Pipe*. The invention involved a high tensile composite coil used to repair pressurized pipelines.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses in a Rule 26 expert report.

Coval V. Alpha Therapeutic & Green Cross Corp.

CASE SETTLED FAVORABLY FOR DR. COVAL IN TRIAL.

Nixon & Vanderhye, PC, (Washington D.C.) retained Hampton IP & Economic Consultants on behalf of the plaintiff (Seattle, WA), with regard to Case No. 2:97-CV-00035 in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patents Nos. 4,093,606 and 4,165,370. The patented technology covered methods of commercially separating gamma globulin.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses and submitted a Rule 26 expert report.

Electromotive, Inc. V. Mercury Marine, A Division Of Brunswick Corporation

JURY GAVE ROYALTY CONSISTENT WITH OUR TESTIMONY

Nixon & Vanderhye, PC (Washington D.C.) retained our consultants, on behalf of the plaintiff (Manassas, VA), with regard to Case No. 1:06-CV-01139 in the United States District Court for the District of Virginia, to provide an opinion of damages

arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent Re. 34,183 titled, *Ignition Control System for Internal Combustion Engines with Simplified Crankshaft Sensing and Improved Coil Charging*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses submitted a Rule 26 expert report and gave testimony at trial.

Hamilton Beach Brands, Inc. V. Sunbeam Products, Inc.

Panitch Schwarze Belisario & Nadel LLP (Philadelphia) retained Hampton IP professionals on behalf of the plaintiff (Richmond, VA), to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of the U.S. Patent No. 7,947,928, titled *Slow Cooker*.

Hampton IP professionals provided an opinion on lost profit and reasonable royalty damages, and submitted a Rule 26 expert report.

Hawaii International, Inc., Et Al. V. Mommy Gina Tuna Resources

Cades Schutte, LLP (Honolulu) retained our consultants, on behalf of the plaintiff (Honolulu, HI), with regard to Case No. 1:05-cv-00679 in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, to provide opinion on damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No.5,972,401 titled, *Process for Manufacturing Tasteless Super-Purified Smoke for Treating Seafood to be Frozen and Thawed*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses, and submitted a Rule 26 expert report.

Synchrome Technology, Inc. V. LG Electronics, USA, Inc. & Samsung Electronics America, Inc.

THE CASE WAS SETTLED.

Watson Rounds engaged Hampton IP to quantify patent infringement damages arising from the infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,398 titled *Method And Apparatus For Allowing Communication Between a Host Computer And At Least Two Storage*

Devices Over A Single Interface and U.S. Patent No. 6,304,925 titled *Method And Apparatus For Allowing Communication Between a Host Computer And At Least Two Storage Devices Over A Single Interface*.

Fish & Richardson represented the defendant.

The patent-in-suit relates to a method or apparatus for allowing communication between a host computer and a least two storage devices of a single interface.

Hampton IP performed agreed upon procedures to establish royalty bases and estimate damages. Defendants settled prior to the issuance of a Rule 26 report.

Clinical Innovations, LLC D/B/A Clinical Innovations, Inc. V. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP, Et Al.

THE CASE SETTLED.

Parsons Behle & Latimer, PC (Salt Lake City) retained our consultants, on behalf of the plaintiff (Salt Lake City, UT), with regard to Case No. 5:05-CV-00633 in the United States District Court for the District of Utah, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,231,524 titled, *Pressure Catheter Device with Enhanced Fluid Monitoring Features*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses, and submitted a Rule 26 expert report.

Won-Door Corporation V. Cornell Iron Works

Hampton IP was retained to submit a Declaration in opposition to the Won-Door's Motion for Preliminary Injunction and to determine whether Plaintiff's motion and supporting declarations demonstrate the elements necessary to establish irreparable harm if the Court denied Won-Door's request for a preliminary injunction. Won-Door's motion for preliminary injunction claimed irreparable harm if Cornell was not enjoined from selling its allegedly infringing door products.

The Trask Britt Law Firm represents Won Door

The patent-in-suit related to header assemblies and overhead tracks.

Scott Hampton submitted a declaration that contained his opinions on irreparable harm arising from loss of market share, loss of customer relationships, loss of reputation, price erosion, and loss of market position.

Won-Door Corporation V. Cornell Iron Works

Clayton Howard & Cannon, P.C. located in Salt Lake City retained Hampton IP to submit a declaration in in Case No. 2:15-cv-00499 in the United States District Court for the District of Utah, Northern Division. Scott Hampton submitted a declaration in opposition to Won-Door's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, providing opinions on irreparable harm relating to market share, customer relationships, and price erosion.

Won-Door accused Cornell of infringing Won-Door's patent for a safety clip on an acoustic accordion door.

Hampton IP submitted a declaration.

FDL, Inc. V. Lifetime Products, Inc.

SETTLED BEFORE THE EXCHANGE OF EXPERT REPORTS

Baker & Daniels (Indianapolis) retained our consultants, on behalf of the plaintiff (Indianapolis, IN), with regard to Case No. 1:03-CV-00013 in the United States District Court for the District of Utah, to review and comment on the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,431,092 titled, *Portable folding utility table with center support assembly* and U.S. Patent No. 6,530,331 titled, *Portable folding utility table with integral receiving members*.

Our consultants assisted with discovery requests and depositions.

Quad/Tech, Incorporated V. Q.I. Press Controls B.V., Et Al.

SETTLED PRIOR TO A RULE 26 REPORT.

Panitch Schwarze Belisario & Nadel LLP, located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, engaged Hampton IP & Economic Consultants on behalf of Quad/Tech to provide an opinion of damages arising from the defendants' alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,412,577, unfair competition, and tortious interference with prospective contractual relationships.

Quad/Tech is a privately held company headquartered in Sussex, Wisconsin. Quad/Tech filed suit against the defendants alleging patent infringement and other wrongful acts related to the defendants' printing press color registration system.

Mr. Hampton assisted Quad/Tech with discovery and analysis of damages.

Technology Patents LLC V. Deutsche Telekom AG, Et Al.

Nixon Vanderhye (Washington D.C.) retained Hampton IP professionals, on behalf of the plaintiff, with regard to Case No. 8:07-cv-03012 in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Reissued Patent No. RE39,870, titled *Global Paging System Using Packet-Switched Digital Data Network and Remote Country Designation*.

Hampton IP professionals provided an opinion on lost profits and reasonable royalty damages, submitted a Rule 26 expert report, and gave deposition testimony.

Howlink Global LLC V. Centris Information Systems, LLC, Et Al.

THE CASE SETTLED BEFORE RULE 26 REPORT.

Glaser, Weil, Fink, Jacobs, Howard, & Shapiro, located in Los Angeles, California, engaged Hampton IP & Economic Consultants on behalf of Howlink Global to provide an opinion of damages arising from infringement of its U.S. Patent No. 7,876,744. Mr. Ey-Taeg Kwon, the inventor of the '744 Patent, established Howlink Global to enforce his patent rights.

The patent-in-suit, titled, "Method for Collect Call Service Based on VOIP Technology and System Thereof," deals with placing collect calls utilizing VOIP technology in place of traditional phone lines. The Defendants provide telephone services for inmates.

Mr. Hampton provided a reasonable royalty analysis

Jeff & Rieta Ebberts V. Harris Research, Inc. D/B/A Chem-Dry

THE CASE SETTLED BEFORE TRIAL.

Kirton & McConkie, PC (Salt Lake City) retained our consultants, on behalf of the plaintiff, with regard to Case No. 2:04-CV-00971 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Utah, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,126,697 titled, *Multiple Carbonate Cleaning Compound*, and U.S. Patent No. 6,554,207 titled, *Application Apparatus for Multiple Solution Cleaner*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty analysis, submitted a Rule 26 expert report, and gave deposition testimony.

Karen Umbrella Co. LTD. V. Yeh Hung Co., Et Al.

THE CASE SETTLED BEFORE TRIAL.

Wang and Patel (Los Angeles) retained our consultants, on behalf of the plaintiff, with regard to Case No. 02-CV-00875 in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,152,156 titled, *Sunshade With A Tilttable Canopy*.

We provided a Rule 26 expert report and a supplement report.

Lift-U, A Division Of Hogan Mfg., Inc. V. Ricon Corp., Et Al.

THE CASE SETTLED.

LaRiviere, Grubman & Payne, LLP (Monterey) retained Hampton IP professionals, on behalf of plaintiff Lift-U, a Division of Hogan Mfg., Inc., to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,533,432, U.S. Patent No. 7,533,433, U.S. Patent No. 7,533,434, and U.S. Patent No. 7,681,272, each titled *Counterbalance Assembly for a Fold Out Ramp*

Hampton IP professionals provided an opinion on lost profit damages and reasonable royalty damages, and submitted a Rule 26 expert report.

Medicis Pharmaceutical Corporation V. Acella Pharmaceuticals, LLC

Reed Smith (Philadelphia) retained Hampton IP professionals, on behalf of the plaintiff, with regard to Case No. 2:10-cv-01780, in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of the U.S. Patent No. 7,776,355, titled *Delivery System for Topical Medications*.

Hampton IP professionals provided an opinion on lost profit and reasonable royalty damages, submitted a Rule 26 expert report, and gave deposition testimony.

Osram Sylvania, Inc. V. American Induction Technologies, Inc.

Cantor Colburn (Hartford) retained Hampton IP professionals, on behalf of plaintiff, with regard to Case No. 2:09-cv-08748 in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,834,905, titled *High Intensity Electrodeless Low Pressure Light Source Drive By A Transformer Core Arrangement*.

Hampton IP professionals provided an opinion on lost profits and reasonable royalty damages.

TouchTunes Music Corp. V. Rowe International Corp., Et Al.

Nixon & Vanderhye, P.C., located in Washington, D.C., engaged Hampton IP & Economic Consultants on behalf of TouchTunes to provide an opinion of damages arising from Defendants' infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,848,398, 6,970,834, and 6,191,780. All of these patents were assigned to Arachnid.

Headquartered in New York, New York, TouchTunes provides interactive entertainment systems, including digital-downloading and pay-per-play commercial jukeboxes for bars, restaurants, retailers, and entertainment centers.

Arachnid, located in Loves Park, Illinois, produces electronic dartboards, specifically large arcade-style darting machines.

Touchtunes filed for declaratory judgment following notice that Arachnid intended to enforce claims of these and other patents against Touchtunes.

Mr. Hampton submitted a Rule 26 expert report, responding to Defendants' expert and providing his analysis of damages.

Treasure Garden, Inc. And Oliver Joen-An Ma V. Lancer & Loader Group

CASE WAS DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP (Irvine, CA) retained Hampton IP & Economic Consultants, on behalf of Treasure Garden, Inc., with regard to Case No. 2:13-cv-00123 in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, to provide an opinion on damages arising from the alleged infringement of asserted claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,134,762 and 7,497,583, both entitled "Light Providing Apparatus Attachable to Umbrella and Stand Assembly."

The accused product was an outdoor lighting accessory that attaches under an umbrella.

Our consultants assisted with discovery requests and preliminary calculations.

DataTreasury Corp. V. Ingenico, S.A. D/B/A Group Ingenico And Ingenico, Inc.

THE CASE SETTLED FAVORABLY BEFORE TRIAL.

Nixon & Vanderhye, PC (Washington D.C.) retained Hampton IP & Economic Consultants, on behalf of the defendant (Paris, France), with regard to Case No. 5:02-CV-00095 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,910,988 and 6,032,137 both titled, *Remote Image Capture with Centralized Processing and Storage*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses, submitted a Rule 26 expert report and gave deposition testimony.

Desert Extrusion Corp. V. K2, Inc. And The Shakespeare Company

THE CASE SETTLED.

Black Lowe & Graham, PLLC (Seattle) retained our consultants, on behalf of the defendant (Seattle, WA), and its subsidiary, Shakespeare Company, with regard to Case No. 2:02-CV-02180 in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, to provide an opinion of damages from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,109,005 titled, *Method of Packaging a Coiled Trimmer Line*.

We provided a Rule 26 expert rebuttal report.

Ecast, Inc. V. TouchTunes Music Corp.

SETTLED FAVORABLY FOR TOUCHTUNES BEFORE TRIAL.

Nixon & Vanderhye, PC (Washington D.C.) retained our consultants, on behalf of the defendant (New York, NY), with regard to Case No. 3:01-CV-04298 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to calculate damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,204 titled, *Method of Communications for an Intelligent Digital Audiovisual Playback System*.

We provided a Rule 26 expert report and provided deposition testimony.

GeoTag, Inc. V. Intelius, Inc.

Lane Powell retained Hampton IP on behalf of Intelius, Inc. to respond to GeoTag's damage claims in case No. 2:10-cv-00265 arising from Intelius's alleged infringement of U.S. Patent 5,930,474, titled, *Internet Organizer for Accessing Geographically and Topically Based Information*.

Friedman, Suder & Cooke, P.C. represents GeoTag.

The patent-in-suit relates to a software interface which organizes information predicated upon the geographical area of the resources about which the information is desired.

Hampton IP submitted a rebuttal report with calculations and opinions of damages related to GeoTag's reasonable royalty damages should the Court find the patent-in-suit not invalid and that Intelius infringed at least one of the asserted claims.

GeoTag, Inc. V. Fifth Third Bancorp D/B/A Fifth Third Bank

THE CLAIMS WERE DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

Paul Hastings, LLP (Atlanta, GA) retained Hampton IP & Economic Consultants, on behalf of Fifth Third Bank, with regard to Case No. 2:10-cv-00574 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division, to provide an opinion on damages arising from the alleged infringement of asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474, entitled “Internet Organizer for Accessing Geographically and Topically Based Information.”

GeoTag accused Fifth Third Bank and many others of infringing on technology relating to a method of sorting a database according to geographic location. This technology is allegedly used in many online and mobile locators. In this case, the accused product was the locator found on Fifth Third Bank’s mobile app.

We submitted a Rule 26 expert report.

Google Inc. V. Netlist, Inc.

Pruetz Law Group LLP (Los Angeles) and Lee Tran & Liang APLC (Los Angeles) retained Hampton IP professionals, on behalf of the defendant (San Francisco, CA), with regard to Case No. 4:08-cv-04144 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,289,386, titled *Memory Module Decoder*.

Hampton IP professionals provided an opinion on reasonable royalty damages, submitted a Rule 26 expert report, and gave deposition testimony.

Wonderland Nursery Goods Company V. Thorley Industries, LLC

Wonderland Nursery Goods Company is a major supplier of juvenile products to Graco Children's Products, Inc. Baker & McKenzie L.L.P. retained Hampton IP to calculate economic remedies arising from Thorley Industries, LLC's alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 8,047,609 titled, *Infant Rocking Chair and Driving Device for Driving the Same*.

The Webb Law Firm represents Thorley Industries.

The patent-in-suit related to a driving device adapted for an infant baby chair.

Hampton IP submitted a Rule 26 expert report with opinions and calculations of lost profit and reasonable royalty damages.

Litecubes, LLC, Et Al. V. Northern Light Products, Inc. D/B/A GlowProducts.Com

JURY FOUND WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT W/ ZERO DAMAGES.

Christensen O'Connor Johnson Kindness, PLLC (Seattle) retained our consultants, on behalf of the defendant, with regard to Case No. 4:04-CV-00485 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, to provide an opinion of damages resulting from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,416,198 titled, *Illuminatable Beverage Accessory Device, a novelty ice cube*.

We provided a Rule 26 expert report, and deposition and trial testimony.

Milbar Medical V. Medicis Pharmaceutical

THE CASE ENDED WITH SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR MEDICIS

Reed Smith (Philadelphia) retained our consultants, on behalf of the defendant, with regard to Case No. AAA 76 133 00023 99, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,409,693 titled, *Method for Treating and Preventing Sunburn and Sunburn Damage to the Skin* and U.S. Patent No. 5,574,063 titled, *Method and Compositions for Topical Application of Ascorbic Acid Fatty Acid Ester for Treatment and/or Prevention of Skin Damage*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses, which incorporated a royalty cap based upon the cost to design around the patent, and submitted a Rule 26 expert report. In addition, We provided deposition testimony.

Otto Bock Healthcare LP. V. Össur Americas, Inc.

THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION WAS DENIED.

Hampton IP was retained by Knobbe Martens to review and comment on Otto Bock's claim of irreparable harm arising from Össur's alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,726,726 B2 titled, *Vacuum Apparatus and Method For Managing Residual Limb Volume in an Artificial Limb*. Knobbe Martens asked Hampton IP to respond in a declaration to Otto Bock's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

Morrison & Forester, LLP represented Otto Bock Healthcare, LP.

The patent-in-suit related to artificial limbs that include a single socket to receive a residual limb.

Hampton IP offered opinions in rebuttal to Otto Bock's claims of irreparable harm arising from loss of market share, price erosion, copycatting, free-riding, loss of customer relationships, and loss of reputation. Scott Hampton submitted a declaration in opposition to the preliminary injunction.

Prism Technologies, LLC V. Sprint Spectrum L.P. D/B/A Sprint PCS

Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP (Kansas City, MO) retained Hampton IP & Economic Consultants, on behalf of Sprint Spectrum L.P., with regard to Case No. 8:12-cv-00123 in the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska, to provide an opinion on damages arising from the alleged infringement of asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,127,345, entitled "Method and System for Managing Access to Protected Computer Resources Provided Via an Internet Protocol Network," and U.S. Patent No. 8,387,155, entitled "System for Managing Access to Protected Computer Resources."

Prism Technologies, LLC, a non-practicing entity, accused a number of telecommunications companies, including Sprint Spectrum L.P., of infringing its patents relating to the authentication of Protected Computer Resources. The accused actions included authenticating customers' phones to the carrier's network with a two-step process.

Hampton IP submitted two Rule 26 expert reports and provided testimony at deposition and trial.

Roger D. Kooimba D/B/A Triple K Industries V. Zacklift International, Inc. And Stanley Zackovich

SETTLED FAVORABLY FOR ZACKLIFT BEFORE TRIAL.

Christensen O'Connor Johnson & Kindness, PLLC (Seattle) retained our consultants, on behalf of the defendant, with regard to Case No. 4:01-CV-04078 in the United States District Court in the District of South Dakota, to calculate damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,823,735 titled, *Attaching a Wheel Lift Apparatus to a Road Tractor*, and U.S. Patent No. 6,036,428 titled, *System For Attaching a Towing Apparatus to a Road Tractor*.

Our consultants submitted a Rule 26 expert report that included a reasonable royalty calculation, incorporating a royalty cap based on the cost to design around the patent.

Rollerblade, Inc. V. K2 Corporation

CASE SETTLED WITH A CROSS LICENSING AGREEMENT.

Black Lowe & Graham, PLLC (Seattle) retained Hampton IP & Economic Consultants, on behalf of the defendant, with regard to Case No. 1:00-CV-02239 in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, to provide an opinion of damages arising from the alleged infringement of U.S. Patents Nos. 5,848,796 and 6,139,030 both titled, *In-Line Roller Skate*.

We provided lost profit and reasonable royalty damage analyses, and submitted a Rule 26 expert report.

Stratasys Inc. V. Microboards Technology, LLC D/B/A Afinia

THE CASE SETTLED PRIOR TO TRIAL.

Hampton IP was retained by the law firm Cantor Colburn, LLP (Hartford, Connecticut) on behalf of Microboards Technology, LLC d/b/a Afinia to provide a rebuttal opinion on monetary damages arising from alleged patent infringement in Case No. 0:13-cv-03228 in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.

The alleged patent infringement involved three separate patents, each components of Stratasys' 3D printer. Stratasys claimed Afinia infringed each of the patents. Hampton IP provided a Rebuttal Report, calculating a reasonable royalty through a hypothetical negotiation.

Hampton IP submitted a Rebuttal Expert Report.

The Sliding Door Company V. KLS Doors, LLC

THE CASE SETTLED.

Fox Rothschild LLP (Los Angeles, CA) retained Hampton IP & Economic Consultants, on behalf of KLS Doors, LLC, with regard to Case No. 5:13-cv-00196 in the United States District Court Central District of California, to assist with calculations for mediation. The patent-in-suit is U.S. Patent No. 7,647,729, entitled "Sliding Door System."

The infringing products included room dividers, closet doors, and partitions.

We assisted with calculations for mediation.

University Of Utah Research Foundation, Myriad Genetics, Inc., Et Al. V. Ambry Genetics, Inc.

McDermott Will & Emery LLP retained Scott Hampton on behalf of Ambry Genetics, Inc. and Gene by Gene, Inc. to opine on irreparable harm and balance of hardship related to Myriad's motion in support of a preliminary injunction related to the patent infringement matter *University of Utah Research Foundation, Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, HSC Research and Development Limited Partnership, Endorecherche, Inc., and Myriad Genetics, Inc. v. Ambry Genetics Corporation*, Case Nos. 2:13-cv-00640 and 2:13-cv-00643, in the United States District Court for the District of Utah Central Division.

The University of Utah Research Foundation, et al. filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunctive Relief and Memorandum in Support against Ambry Genetics Corporation relating to litigation alleging infringement of ten patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,709,999; 5,747,282; 5,753,441; 5,837,492; 6,033,857; 5,654,155; 5,750,400; 6,051,379; 6,951,721; and 7,250,497. This action followed Ambry's announcement that it would begin offering genetic testing for the BRCA1/BRCA2 mutations at a significantly

reduced cost (relative to Myriad) after the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the process of isolating naturally occurring DNA is insufficient to transform the natural phenomenon into a patentable invention.

Myriad asserted claims left ambiguous by the Supreme Court. Myriad filed a motion for preliminary injunction arguing that Ambry's and Gene by Gene's low prices create irreparable harm consisting of (1) price erosion and the loss of the benefit of Myriad's established pricing strategy; (2) the loss of market share; (3) reputational injury; and (4) loss of the benefit of the remaining limited term of patent exclusivity and Myriad's business plans for that period, as well as the inability to fully obtain its reliance interest obtained by disclosing its discovery and investing hundreds of millions of dollars to commercialize that discovery in exchange for a limited exclusive right.

Myriad was represented by Parsons Behle and Latimer.

Mr. Hampton submitted a declaration in support of Defendants' Opposition and a supplemental declaration in response to declarations of Thomas N. Parks, David W. Pershing, and Dr. James R. Kearl.