

# Exhibit 11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

APPLE INC., a California )  
corporation, )  
Plaintiff, )  
vs. ) Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., )  
LTD., a Korean business )  
entity; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS )  
AMERICA, INC., a New York )  
corporation; SAMSUNG )  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, )  
LLC, a Delaware limited )  
liability company, )  
Defendants. )

H I G H L Y C O N F I D E N T I A L  
A T T O R N E Y S ' E Y E S O N L Y

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN GRAY  
Palo Alto, California  
Friday, May, 4, 2012

BY: HEIDI BELTON, CSR, RPR, CRR, CCRR  
CSR LICENSE NO. 12885  
JOB NO. 49273

22           A.     Yes. There's another error in the  
23       indefiniteness section pertaining to the '915 patent,  
24       paragraph 266 on page 75. There's a sentence -- the  
25       paragraph 266 doesn't make sense. Something --

10:32:29

1 something happened in the drafting or something. But it 10:32:37  
2 doesn't -- it doesn't make sense.

3 The first sentence reads -- well, let's start  
4 with the second sentence. The second sentence says,  
5 "Each of the independent claims recites 'the event 10:32:48  
6 object invokes a...operation.' In my 35 years of  
7 systems experience, I have never observed a system where  
8 an event object invoked a method."

9 That's not true. That's the inaccuracy. It  
10 goes on to say that -- it goes on to make some claim 10:33:10  
11 about it.

12 Then there is a reference to a Platzner  
13 deposition that -- the sentence leading into that says,  
14 "Additionally, one of the inventors of the '915 patent,  
15 Mr. Platzner, agreed with me at his deposition." And 10:33:30  
16 there's a quote. And it doesn't follow the rest of the  
17 paragraph in 266. I saw this over the last couple of  
18 days when I was rereading my report. And it -- it is  
19 inaccurate.

20 Q. What should it say? 10:33:49

21 A. Well, I don't -- I'm not sure -- I don't  
22 have -- I'm not sure exactly what it -- but what I think  
23 it should have said is that -- something to the effect  
24 that "In my 35 years of experience, I've never observed  
25 a system where an event object invoked a method that 10:34:05

1 performed scrolling or zooming operations" would be an 10:34:12  
2 accurate statement. But the way it's phrased there is  
3 just not accurate. And factually I don't think it's  
4 correct. So 266 I think is -- needs some revision. And  
5 if asked by the attorneys for Samsung, I'll update it. 10:34:31

6 Q. Are there any other errors in your invalidity  
7 report that you're aware of today?

8 A. Those two errors I discovered over the last  
9 couple of days in reviewing the report; and those are  
10 the two that I know about now. There may be others, but 10:34:50  
11 those are the two that I've come across now.

12 Q. All right. Let's turn to your  
13 non-infringement rebuttal report, Deposition Exhibit 2.

14 As you sit here today, does that report  
15 accurately express all of the opinions on 10:35:10  
16 non-infringement that you may offer at trial, given what  
17 you know today?

18 A. Given what I know today, sitting here, I  
19 believe that Exhibit 2, my rebuttal report regarding  
20 non-infringement, contains the opinions of -- that I'm 10:35:40  
21 aware of today.

22 Again, as facts emerge and other information  
23 comes to light, I do want to make sure I reserve the  
24 right to modify it should something occur that  
25 changes -- materially changes my opinion about 10:36:02