

# EXHIBIT 19

March 28, 2012

Writer's Direct Contact  
415.268.7455  
MJacobs@mofo.com

Via E-Mail (victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com)

Victoria F. Maroulis  
Quinn Emanuel  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065-2139

Re: *Apple v. Samsung*, No. 2012-1105 (Fed. Cir.)

Dear Victoria:

Apple declines your request to bring the 035 model to the Federal Circuit oral argument on April 6, 2012.

Among other reasons, the model you have requested is “Highly Confidential – Attorney’s Eyes Only” under the Protective Order and cannot be used in open court. The model, itself, also is not part of the district court’s preliminary injunction record, and Samsung has failed to provide the Clerk of the Court with the required 14-day notice in advance of the argument for use of such a visual aid. Fed. Cir. R. 34(c)(1). Moreover, because the actual model was not before the district court when it ruled on the preliminary injunction, Samsung was required to (but did not) provide Apple with written notice at least 21-days prior to oral argument. Fed. Cir. R. 34(c)(2).

Finally, in light of Samsung’s request for Apple to bring a model subject to the Protective Order to open court, Apple reminds Samsung of its obligations under the Protective Order at the Federal Circuit argument. Samsung’s counsel should ensure that no confidential information is disclosed during her presentation of argument before the Court, and Apple objects to the disclosure of any information subject to the Protective Order.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Michael A. Jacobs*

Michael A. Jacobs