

May 19, 2011

By Electronic Filing and Hand Delivery

The Honorable Lucy H. Koh
United States District Judge
Robert F. Peckham Federal Courthouse
Courtroom 4, 5th Floor
280 South First Street
San Jose, California 95113


Re: In re iPhone Application Litigation, Case No. 10-CV-05878-LHK (N.D. Cal.)

Dear Judge Koh:

I write on behalf of defendant Apple Inc. ("Apple") in connection with Apple's Motion to Enlarge Time to Respond to Complaint, filed in the above-referenced actions on Monday, May 16, 2011 (Dkt. No. 94). As the Court is aware, that motion requested additional time in which to respond to the Consolidated Complaint because, as it stands, Apple is obliged to file its motion to dismiss two days before the Court is scheduled to hear argument on Apple's separate motion to stay the actions pending resolution of proceedings before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (Dkt. No. 72).

Over the past two weeks, Plaintiffs have entered into various stipulations and agreements extending until June 13 the time for various other defendants to these actions to respond to the Consolidated Complaint. Plaintiffs declined a request from Apple for a similar stipulation, which is why Apple filed its Motion to Enlarge Time. The most recent stipulation was filed late yesterday involving defendants Flurry, Inc. and Pinch Media, Inc. Assuming the Court's approval of these various stipulations, this stipulation leaves Apple as the only party obliged to respond to the Consolidated Complaint next Monday, May 23. Apple respectfully suggests, as it did in its Motion, that it would serve the interests of judicial economy and fairness if all defendants, including Apple, respond to the complaint on the same schedule.

Very truly yours,



Michael L. Charlson

Partner
michael.charlson@hoganlovells.com
D 650.463.4003

cc: All Counsel via electronic filing