

Exhibit H

1 ROBERT DEZMELYK
2 UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
3 WASHINGTON, D.C.
4 INVESTIGATION NO. 337-TA-714
5 IN THE MATTER OF:
6 CERTAIN ELECTRONIC DEVICES WITH
7 MULTI-TOUCH ENABLED TOUCHPADS
8 AND TOUCHSCREENS

9 /
10 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF ROBERT DEZMELYK
11 WASHINGTON, D.C.

12 Tuesday, August 17, 2010

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 PAGES 1 - 206
24 JOB NO. 32753
25 REPORTED BY: Kathy Savich, RPR, CLR

1 ROBERT DEZMELYK

2 Tuesday, August 17, 2010

3 9:10 a.m.

4
5 Deposition of ROBERT DEZMELYK,
6 held at the offices of:

7
8 Weil Gotshal & Manges

9 1300 Eye Street, NW

10 Suite 900

11 Washington, D.C.

12
13 Pursuant to notice of taking
14 deposition, held before Kathy Savich,
15 Notary Public In and for the District
16 of Columbia.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 ROBERT DEZMELYK

2 APPEARANCES:

3
4 COUNSEL FOR APPLE:

5 WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

6 BY: SONAL N. MEHTA, ESQUIRE

7 201 Redwood Shores Parkway

8 Redwood Shores, California 94065

9 650-802-3118

10 sonal.mehta@weil.com

11
12 COUNSEL FOR Elan Microelectronics:

13 ALSTON & BIRD LLP

14 BY: YITAI HU, ESQUIRE

15 275 Middlefield Road

16 Menlo Park, California 94025

17 650-838-2020

18 yitai.hu@alston.com

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 ROBERT DEZMELYK

2 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

3

4 COUNSEL FOR ITC:

5 BY: KEVIN BAER, ESQUIRE

6 Office of Unfair Import Investigations

7 500 E Street S.W.

8 Washington, D.C. 20436

9 202-205-2221

10 kevin.baer@usitc.gov

11 ALSO PRESENT: CONWAY BARKER, VIDEOGRAPHER

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 ROBERT DEZMELYK
2 claims totally differently. Maybe your --
3 the structure you're looking for is -- is a
4 different -- I am not sure why I -- you
5 know --

6 BY MS. MEHTA:

7 Q. Le me ask it --

8 A. -- what -- what the point is
9 you're trying to get at.

10 Q. Let me ask it a different way.

11 Is there any disclosure that
12 you're aware of in the '352 patent that
13 provides a click function based on removal
14 and reappearance where the algorithm defines
15 time as a factor or input into deciding
16 whether there has been a click function?

17 A. Okay. The algorithm always has
18 time and generates reports in a time basis.
19 I think you're asking, in interpreting the
20 claim, to mean is it like a time-based tap
21 function, right, that is where you
22 independently measure the time, and then you
23 delay your reporting to say, oh, I didn't get
24 a button down or I didn't get a button up
25 based on some -- because that's -- that's

1 ROBERT DEZMELYK

2 what you're describing.

3 Q. No. What I mean -- let me -- I
4 think that's not what I am describing.

5 What I am describing is, is
6 there any algorithm that considers whether
7 removal and replacement of the maxima happens
8 at a predetermined time as a factor in
9 deciding whether to provide a click function?

10 MR. HU: Objection. The
11 question is vague.

12 THE WITNESS: No. But -- there
13 is an important but -- of course, the
14 practitioners would know how to do
15 that. So there is probably enough
16 disclosure -- and, again, I'm -- this
17 is -- now, I am not -- now I'm talking
18 about a claim I have not been asked to
19 testify about but -- okay, so I
20 haven't done any prep on it or
21 anything for a long time, but the --
22 there is prior disclosure -- there is
23 sufficient knowledge in the prior art
24 that the practitioners of this
25 certainly know how to do time-based

1 ROBERT DEZMELYK

2 generation of events because that's
3 part of the prior art.

4 BY MS. MEHTA:

5 Q. And you offered an opinion on
6 that in your declaration two weeks ago,
7 correct, on that term?

8 A. Probably.

9 Q. August 3rd, 2010, CX-25, last
10 page.

11 A. What I see here is completely
12 consistent with what I have said today. Do
13 you have a question about it?

14 Q. No. I just asked whether you
15 had offered an opinion on that term in your
16 declaration two weeks ago.

17 A. Right. But -- but it's on the
18 means -- it's not the term. I would make --
19 let's make it clear. It's on the -- this
20 declaration from, I believe, the rebuttal
21 declaration that you were talking about the
22 same declaration from -- you're saying from
23 -- which one? The one from the 3rd or from
24 two weeks ago? This is -- two weeks ago is
25 not quite -- yeah, it's almost two weeks ago,

1 ROBERT DEZMELYK

2 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3 I, Kathy Savich, the undersigned
4 RPR, CLR, and Notary Public in and for
5 the District of Columbia, do hereby
6 certify that the above-named witness,
7 after having been first duly sworn to
8 testify to the truth, did testify as
9 set forth in the foregoing pages, that
10 the testimony was reported by me in
11 stenotype and transcribed under my
12 personal direction and supervision,
13 and is a true and correct transcript.

14 I further certify that I am not
15 of counsel, not related to counsel or
16 the parties hereto, and not in any way
17 interested in the outcome of this
18 matter.

19 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO under my
20 hand this 17th day of August, 2010.

21 My Commission Expires: 1/1/2012

22 

23 Kathy Savich, RPR, CLR
24 Notary Public in and for the
District of Columbia

25