

VRINGO ANNOUNCES THAT THE USPTO AGAIN CONFIRMS VALIDITY OF THE '420 PATENT ASSERTED IN LITIGATION WITH GOOGLE

07/02/14

NEW YORK - July 2, 2014 - Vringo, Inc. (NASDAQ: VRNG), a company engaged in the innovation, development and monetization of intellectual property and mobile technologies, today announced that on July 2, 2014, the United States Patent and Trademark Office mailed a notice that it will issue a certificate confirming that all of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,420 remain valid and unchanged. This is the second time the USPTO has confirmed the validity of the '420 Patent.

The USPTO has also previously confirmed the validity of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,664, the other patent asserted in litigation with Google. At this time, there are no other pending reexaminations for the patents asserted in the litigation.

Background on United States Patent and Trademark Office Proceedings

On March 15, 2012, Google submitted a request to the USPTO for ex parte reexamination of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,420. On July 18, 2012, the USPTO issued a determination ordering a reexamination. On September 25, 2012, the USPTO issued a first, non-final office action where it adopted the rejections proposed by Google. I/P Engine's response was filed on November 26, 2012. A final, appealable office action maintaining the rejections was mailed on May 3, 2013. An interview was held with the Examiner and on July 3, 2013 I/P Engine filed a response. On September 13, 2013, the USPTO issued a certificate confirming that all of the claims in the '420 patent challenged by Google remain valid and unchanged. On September 20, 2013, the USPTO ordered a second reexamination of certain claims of the '420 patent based on a reference not relied upon by Google in the first reexamination. Today, the USPTO upheld the validity of the '420 patent in the second reexamination.

On November 20, 2012, Google submitted a request to the USPTO for ex parte reexamination of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,664 based on four prior art references. On January 17, 2013, the USPTO ordered reexamination based on only one of the four references submitted by Google. On February 8, 2013, Google filed a second request for reexamination based on the three references not adopted by the USPTO in the first proceeding. On March 7, 2013, the USPTO ordered a second reexamination proceeding. On May 10, 2013, the USPTO issued a first, non-final office action in the first reexamination. On June 13, 2013, the USPTO decided to merge the two reexamination proceedings. On June 25, 2013, the May 10 office action was rescinded and a new non-final office action was issued, rejecting the challenged claims based on two of the four references originally cited by Google. I/P Engine's response was timely filed on August 26, 2013. An interview was subsequently held with the Examiner on September 16, 2013. On November 5, 2013, the USPTO mailed a notice that it will issue a certificate confirming that all of the claims in the '664 patent challenged by Google remain valid and unchanged.

Documents regarding USPTO proceedings are publicly available on the Patent Application Information Retrieval website, <http://portal.uspto.gov/pair/PublicPair>, which is operated by the USPTO.

Background on Litigation

On November 6, 2012, a jury in U.S. District Court in Norfolk, Virginia ruled in favor of I/P Engine and against the defendants AOL Inc., Google, Inc., IAC Search & Media, Inc., Target Corp., and Gannett Co., Inc. with respect to defendants' infringement of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,314,420 and 6,775,664. After upholding the validity of the patents-in-suit, and determining that the asserted claims of the patents were infringed by the defendants, the jury found that reasonable royalty damages should be based on a "running royalty," and that the running royalty rate should be 3.5%. The jury also awarded I/P Engine a total of approximately \$30.5 million. On November 20, 2012, the clerk entered the District Court's final judgment. On January 3, 2014, the District Court ordered that I/P Engine recover an additional sum of \$17.32 million from Defendants for supplemental damages and prejudgment interest.

On January 21, 2014, the District Court ruled that Defendants' alleged design-around is "nothing more than a colorable variation of the system adjudged to infringe," and accordingly I/P Engine "is entitled to ongoing royalties as long as Defendants continue to use the modified system."

On January 28, 2014, the District Court ruled that the appropriate ongoing royalty rate for Defendants' continued infringement of the patents-in-suit that "would reasonably compensate [I/P Engine] for giving up [its] right to exclude yet allow an ongoing willful infringer to make a reasonable profit" is a rate of 6.5% of the 20.9% royalty base previously set by the District Court.

I/P Engine and Defendants have appealed the case to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The District Court proceedings are pending in the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk Division. The Appellate proceedings are pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The court dockets for the foregoing cases are publicly available on the Public Access to Court Electronic Records website, www.pacer.gov, which is operated by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

About Vringo, Inc.

Vringo, Inc. is engaged in the innovation, development and monetization of intellectual property and mobile technologies. Vringo's intellectual property portfolio consists of over 500 patents and patent applications covering telecom infrastructure, internet search, and mobile technologies. The patents and patent applications have been developed internally, and acquired from third parties. For more information, visit: www.vringoIP.com.

Forward-Looking Statements

This press release includes forward-looking statements, which may be identified by words such as "believes," "expects," "anticipates," "estimates," "projects," "intends," "should," "seeks," "future," "continue," or the negative of such terms, or other comparable terminology. Forward-looking statements are statements that are not historical facts. Such forward-looking statements are subject to risks and uncertainties, which could cause actual results to differ materially from the forward-looking statements contained herein. Factors that could cause actual results to differ materially include, but are not limited to: our inability to license and monetize our patents, including the outcome of the litigation against online search firms and other companies; our inability to monetize and recoup our investment with respect to patent assets that we acquire; our inability to develop and introduce new products and/or develop new intellectual property; new legislation, regulations or court rulings related to enforcing patents, that could harm our business and operating results; unexpected trends in the mobile phone and telecom infrastructure industries; our inability to raise additional capital to fund our combined operations and business plan; our inability to maintain the listing of our securities on a major securities exchange; the potential lack of market acceptance of our products; potential competition from other providers and products; our inability to retain key members of our management team; the future success of Infomedia and our ability to receive value from its stock; and other risks and uncertainties and other factors discussed from time to time in our filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"), including our annual report on Form 10-K filed with the SEC on March 10, 2014. Vringo expressly disclaims any obligation to publicly update any forward-looking statements contained herein, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise, except as required by law.

Contacts:

Investors and Media:

Cliff Weinstein
Executive Vice President
Vringo, Inc.
646-532-6777
cweinstein@vringoinc.com