EXHIBIT 23

MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION DESIGNATED CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

1 2 3 4 5 6	hmcelhinny@mofo.com MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664) mjacobs@mofo.com JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368) jtaylor@mofo.com ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363) atucher@mofo.com RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425) rhung@mofo.com	WILLIAM F. LEE william.lee@wilmerhale.com WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 60 State Street Boston, MA 02109 Telephone: (617) 526-6000 Facsimile: (617) 526-5000 MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180)
7	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	mark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
8	San Francisco, California 94105-2482 Telephone: (415) 268-7000	950 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, California 94304 Felephone: (650) 858-6000
10		Facsimile (650) 858-6100
11 12	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.	
13		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
16	SAN JOSE D	IVISION
	SAN JOSE D APPLE INC., a California corporation,	IVISION Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)
16		Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND
16 17	APPLE INC., a California corporation,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETS OF
16 17 18 19 20	APPLE INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH
16 17 18 19 20 21	APPLE INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETS OF
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	APPLE INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETS OF
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	APPLE INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETS OF
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	APPLE INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETS OF
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	APPLE INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETS OF
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	APPLE INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETS OF

Apple's Response to Samsung's 6th and 7th Sets of Requests for Production of Documents (365-553) Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 375:

All research, studies, reports or other DOCUMENTS REFERRING TO OR RELATING TO the impact of any aspect of the design of each version of the iPhone or iPad claimed by the APPLE DESIGN PATENTS or APPLE TRADE DRESS of each version of the iPhone or iPad's sales or consumer preferences or purchasing decisions.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 375:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to respond; or (iv) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, are already in Samsung's possession, or are publicly available. Additionally, Apple objects to this request to the extent that it calls for information which contains or otherwise reflects its trade secrets or any other confidential research, development, financial, commercial or proprietary information. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Apple further objects to the terms "relating to" and "any aspect of the design" to the extent that it fails to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, including in its use of the undefined terms "consumer preferences," and "purchasing decisions."

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced or will produce responsive, non-privileged market and consumer studies in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 376:

All DOCUMENTS REFERRING TO OR RELATING TO the impact of manufacturing, supply or inventory constraints on sales of each version of the iPhone or iPad.

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 376:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

sf-3106415

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; or (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control. Additionally, Apple objects to this request to the extent that it calls for information which contains or otherwise reflects its trade secrets or any other confidential research, development, financial, commercial or proprietary information. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Apple further objects to the terms "relating to" or "constraints" to the extent that it fails to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced or will produce responsive, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search sufficient to show manufacturing capacity over time for each version of the iPhone and iPad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 377:

All research, studies, reports and other DOCUMENTS REFERRING TO OR RELATING TO consumer perceptions of the APPLE brand, changes in consumer perceptions of the APPLE brand and the reasons for such perceptions or changes in perceptions any time from January 1, 2006 to the present.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 377:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of APPLE'S RESPONSE TO SAMSUNG'S 6TH AND 7TH SETS OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (365-553) Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG) 19

limited to market segments, the size of actual and potential markets, market growth rates, potential customer bases, the product offerings and pricing of competitors, actual and anticipated market shares, and product sales and profitability.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 414:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, are already in Samsung's possession, or are publicly available. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Apple further objects to the terms "relating to," "all DOCUMENTS," and "reasons why" to the extent that they fail to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought. Apple further objects to Samsung's request as overbroad to the extent it purports to require Apple to conduct a search for documents that is more extensive than is reasonable under the circumstances. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced or will produce responsive, non-privileged market studies in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 415:

DOCUMENTS sufficient to show APPLE's manufacturing or supply capacity for any products that APPLE contends practice one or more of the APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT and/or are covered by the APPLE TRADE DRESS and/or APPLE TRADEMARKS.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 415:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the APPLE'S RESPONSE TO SAMSUNG'S 6TH AND 7TH SETS OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (365-553) CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)

45
sf-3106415

attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or
immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of
Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to
respond. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Finally,
Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and
therefore unduly burdensome including without limitation to the undefined terms "manufacturing

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced responsive, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search sufficient to show manufacturing capacity over time for each version of the iPhone and iPad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 416:

DOCUMENTS sufficient to show APPLE's marketing and sales capacity for any products that APPLE contends practice one or more of the APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT and/or are covered by the APPLE TRADE DRESS and/or APPLE TRADEMARKS.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 416:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to respond. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome including without limitation to the undefined terms "marketing and sales capacity," which fails to identify with sufficient particularity the documents sought.

or supply capacity."

sf-3106415

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 417:

All DOCUMENTS relating to any constraints on APPLE's manufacturing or supply capacity for any products that APPLE contends practice one or more of the APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT and/or are covered by the APPLE TRADE DRESS and/or APPLE TRADEMARKS.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 417:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to respond. Apple further objects to the terms "relating to" and "all DOCUMENTS" to the extent that they fail to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome including without limitation to the undefined terms "manufacturing or supply capacity."

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced responsive, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search sufficient to show manufacturing capacity over time for each version of the iPhone and iPad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 418:

All DOCUMENTS relating to any constraints on APPLE's marketing and sales capacity for any products that APPLE contends practice one or more of the APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT and/or are covered by the APPLE TRADE DRESS and/or APPLE TRADEMARKS.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 418:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this APPLE'S RESPONSE TO SAMSUNG'S 6TH AND 7TH SETS OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (365-553) CASE NO. 11-CV-01846-LHK (PSG)

request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to respond. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome including without limitation to the undefined terms "constraint" and "marketing and sales capacity," which fail to identify with sufficient particularity the documents sought.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 419:

DOCUMENTS sufficient to show any supply shortages of any products that APPLE contends practice one or more of the APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT and/or are covered by the APPLE TRADE DRESS and/or APPLE TRADEMARKS.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 419:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to respond. Apple further objects to the terms "relating to" and "all DOCUMENTS" to the extent that they fail to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced responsive, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search sufficient to show manufacturing capacity over time for each version of the iPhone and iPad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 420:

DOCUMENTS sufficient to show any supply or inventory excesses for any products that APPLE contends practice one or more of the APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT and/or are covered by the APPLE TRADE DRESS and/or APPLE TRADEMARKS.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 420:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; or (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control. Apple further objects to the terms "relating to" and "all DOCUMENTS" to the extent that they fail to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome including without limitation to the undefined terms "supply or inventory excesses."

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced responsive, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search sufficient to show manufacturing capacity over time for each version of the iPhone and iPad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 421:

All DOCUMENTS relating to the demand for the technology claimed in the APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT and/or the designs covered by the APPLE TRADE DRESS and/or APPLE TRADEMARKS, including but not limited to consumer surveys, consumer focus groups, and comparisons of the benefits, functionality, performance, design, and costs of alternative technologies.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 421:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; (iv) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to respond; or (v) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, are already in Samsung's possession, or are publicly available. Apple further objects to the terms "relating to" and "all DOCUMENTS" to the extent that they fail to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome, including without limitation because of the use of the undefined terms "demand for technology," "consumer surveys," "consumer focus groups," "benefits," and "alternative technologies."

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced or will produce responsive, non-privileged market and consumer studies in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 422:

Any intercompany agreement regarding reimbursement of research and development expenses for work in any way related to tablet computers or mobile phones.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 422:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad in scope; vague; unduly burdensome; not limited to the issues, parties or products in this action; unnecessary; and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; or (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that APPLE'S RESPONSE TO SAMSUNG'S 6TH AND 7TH SETS OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (365-553) CASE No. 11-CV-01846-LHK (PSG)

26 27 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

3

4

6

5

8

7

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

it is unlimited in time. Apple further objects to Samsung's request as overbroad to the extent it purports to require Apple to conduct a search for documents that is more extensive than is reasonable under the circumstances.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 423:

DOCUMENTS sufficient to show APPLE'S accounting practices pertaining to the APPLE ACCUSED PRODUCTS, including but not limited to APPLE'S methods of accounting for revenues, costs and profits, methods of depreciation, allocation of expenses, inventory measurements, profit allocation, losses and assignments of debts, and APPLE'S methods of allocating between United States and worldwide revenue from January 1, 2007 to the present.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 423:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad in scope; vague; unduly burdensome; not limited to the issues, parties or products in this action; unnecessary; and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; or (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Finally, Apple further objects to Samsung's request as overbroad to the extent it purports to require Apple to conduct a search for documents that is more extensive than is reasonable under the circumstances.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 424:

All DOCUMENTS discussing the market for smartphones using the Android operating system.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 424:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of APPLE'S RESPONSE TO SAMSUNG'S 6TH AND 7TH SETS OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (365-553) CASE NO. 11-CV-01846-LHK (PSG) sf-3106415

Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, are already in Samsung's possession, or are publicly available. Apple further objects to this request that it is not limited to the issues in this action, the products in this action, or the relevant time period, and not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence. Apple objects that the term "market" is vague and ambiguous. Apple also objects that this Request is duplicative of prior Requests.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced or will produce responsive, non-privileged market and consumer studies in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 425:

All DOCUMENTS discussing competition between each version of the iPhone and smartphones using the Android operating system.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 425:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple further objects to this request that it is not limited to the parties, issues, time period, or products in this action, and not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, are already in Samsung's possession, or are publicly available. Finally, Apple objects that the term "discussing competition" is vague and fails to identify with sufficient particularity the documents sought. Apple also objects that this Request is duplicative of prior Requests.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced or will produce responsive, non-privileged market and consumer studies in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 426:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

All DOCUMENTS discussing competition between each version of the iPad and media tablets using the Android operating system.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 426:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple further objects to this request that it is not limited to the parties, issues, time period, or products in this action, and not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorneyclient privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, are already in Samsung's possession, or are publicly available. Finally, Apple objects that the term "discussing competition" is vague and fails to identify with sufficient particularity the documents sought. Apple also objects that this Request is duplicative of prior Requests.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced or will produce responsive, non-privileged market and consumer studies in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 427:

All DOCUMENTS relating to elasticity, elasticity of demand, or consumer price sensitivity for the APPLE ACCUSED PRODUCTS.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 427:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, are already APPLE'S RESPONSE TO SAMSUNG'S 6TH AND 7TH SETS OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (365-553) CASE No. 11-CV-01846-LHK (PSG)

in Samsung's possession, or are publicly available. Apple further objects to the term "relating to" to the extent that it fails to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome including without limitation to the undefined terms "elasticity" and "consumer price sensitivity".

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced responsive, non-privileged market and consumer studies, and retail, carrier and reseller price lists in its possession, custody, or control located after a reasonable search as discussed in more detail above.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 428:

All DOCUMENTS RELATING TO the capacity to manufacture the APPLE ACCUSED PRODUCTS at any point in time.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 428:

Apple objects to this request as untimely, overly broad, vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; or (iv) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to respond. Apple further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unlimited in time. Finally, Apple objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and therefore unduly burdensome including without limitation to the undefined term "capacity."

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple has produced responsive, non-privileged documents in its possession, custody, or control, if any, located after a reasonable search sufficient to show manufacturing capacity over time for each version of the iPhone and iPad.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 429:

All DOCUMENTS, regardless of date, RELATING TO the acquisition by APPLE of memory controllers technology from Anobit Technologies used in the APPLE ACCUSED PRODUCTS, including the acquisition agreement, DOCUMENTS reflecting APPLE'S purchase price accounting for the acquisition, and any valuations of assets or intellectual property performed by APPLE or a third-party in connection with the acquisition.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 429:

Apple objects to this request on grounds that it seeks information and/or documents irrelevant to this litigation. Apple further objects to the term "memory controllers technology" as vague and ambiguous. Apple further objects on grounds that this request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, especially insofar as it seeks "All DOCUMENTS, regardless of date" and information regarding technology not at issue in this litigation. Apple further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks documents outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control. Apple further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks the production of documents that are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, joint defense or common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, doctrine, or immunity.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 430:

All DOCUMENTS, regardless of date, RELATING TO the acquisition by APPLE of facial recognition technology from Polar Rose used in the APPLE ACCUSED PRODUCTS, including the acquisition agreement, DOCUMENTS reflecting APPLE'S purchase price accounting for the acquisition, and any valuations of assets or intellectual property performed by APPLE or a third-party in connection with the acquisition.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 430:

Apple objects to this request on grounds that it seeks information and/or documents irrelevant to this litigation. Apple further objects on grounds that this request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, especially insofar as it seeks "All DOCUMENTS, regardless of date" and information APPLE'S RESPONSE TO SAMSUNG'S 6TH AND 7TH SETS OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (365-553) CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)

regarding technology not at issue in this litigation. Apple further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks documents outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control. Apple further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks the production of documents that are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, joint defense or common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, doctrine, or immunity.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 431:

All DOCUMENTS, regardless of date, RELATING TO the acquisition by APPLE of 3D mapping technology from C3 Technologies used in the APPLE ACCUSED PRODUCTS, including the acquisition agreement, DOCUMENTS reflecting APPLE'S purchase price accounting for the acquisition, and any valuations of assets or intellectual property performed by APPLE or a third-party in connection with the acquisition.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 431:

Apple objects to this request on grounds that it seeks information and/or documents irrelevant to this litigation. Apple further objects on grounds that this request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, especially insofar as it seeks "All DOCUMENTS, regardless of date" and information regarding technology not at issue in this litigation. Apple further objects to the term "3D mapping technology" as vague and ambiguous. Apple further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks documents outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control. Apple further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks the production of documents that are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, joint defense or common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, doctrine, or immunity.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 432:

All DOCUMENTS, regardless of date, RELATING TO the acquisition by APPLE of web mapping technology from Poly9 used in the APPLE ACCUSED PRODUCTS, including the acquisition agreement, DOCUMENTS reflecting APPLE'S purchase price accounting for the acquisition, and any valuations of assets or intellectual property performed by APPLE or a third-party in connection with the acquisition.

MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION DESIGNATED CONFIDENTIAL UNDER THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

relevant time period in this action. Apple objects to this request to the extent it seeks production of documents that: (i) are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or immunity; (ii) are not relevant to the claims or defenses at issue in the case; (iii) are outside of Apple's possession, custody, or control; (iv) would require Apple to draw a legal conclusion to respond; or (v) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, are already in Samsung's possession, or are publicly available. Apple further objects to the terms "relating to" and "all DOCUMENTS and things" to the extent that they fail to provide reasonable particularity as to the scope of the documents sought.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General and Specific Objections, Apple objects that it is incapable of responding to this request without performing an unduly burdensome search.

12

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Dated: March 10, 2012

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

By: /s/ Jason Bartlett Jason R. Bartlett

> Attorneys for Plaintiff APPLE INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE 1 [Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)] 2 I declare that I am employed with the law firm of Morrison & Foerster LLP, whose address 3 is 425 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105-2482. I am not a party to the within cause, 4 and I am over the age of eighteen years. 5 I further declare that on March 10, 2012, I served a copy of: 6 7 APPLE INC.'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG'S SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETS OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION 8 by electronically mailing a true and correct copy through Morrison & Foerster LLP's electronic 9 10 mail system to the e-mail address(s) set forth below, or as stated on the attached service list per agreement in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b). 11 12 Charles K. Verhoeven Kevin P.B. Johnson charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com 13 Victoria F. Maroulis Michael T. Zeller 14 victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com 15 Edward J. DeFranco Margret M. Caruso eddefranco@quinnemanuel.com margretcaruso@quinnemanuel.com 16 Todd M. Briggs Rachel H. Kassabian 17 toddbrigsgs@quinnemanuel.com rachel@kassabian@quinnemanuel.com 18 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at San 19 Francisco, California on March 10, 2012. 20 21 /s/ Nathan B. Sabri Nathan B. Sabri 22 23 24 25 26

27