

# Exhibit 2



1	PETER BRESSLER,	09:13
2	called as a witness, having been duly	09:13
3	sworn, was examined and testified as	09:13
4	follows:	09:13
5	EXAMINATION	09:13
6	BY MR. ZELLER:	09:13
7	Q. Good morning.	09:13
8	A. Good morning.	09:13
9	MR. ZELLER: Let's please mark as	09:13
10	Exhibit 3510 a copy of United States	09:13
11	design patent 504889.	09:13
12	(P. Bressler Exhibit No. 3510 was marked	09:14
13	for identification.)	09:14
14	MR. ZELLER: Please mark as	09:14
15	Exhibit 3511 a copy of United States	09:14
16	design patent 593087.	09:14
17	(P. Bressler Exhibit No. 3511 was marked	09:14
18	for identification.)	09:14
19	MR. ZELLER: Please mark as	09:14
20	Exhibit 3512 a copy of United States	09:14
21	design patent 618677.	09:14
22	(P. Bressler Exhibit No. 3512 was marked	09:14
23	for identification.)	09:14
24	MR. ZELLER: Please mark as	09:14
25	Exhibit 3513 a copy of United States	09:14

1 Do you see that? 10:40

2 A. I do. 10:40

3 Q. As we talked about, when you compare 10:40

4 figure 1 and figure 3, there are diagonal lines 10:40

5 on both of those figures. 10:40

6 A. Correct. 10:40

7 Q. And you understand that figure 1 and 10:40

8 figure 3 are different perspectives of the top 10:40

9 view of the electronic device, design? 10:40

10 A. Top view? 10:40

11 Q. Right. 10:40

12 A. Is that how it's stated? 10:40

13 Q. If you look at the description, 10:40

14 you'll see. 10:40

15 A. Okay. 10:41

16 Q. Then you understand that figures 2 10:41

17 and 4 are views of the bottom -- 10:41

18 A. Yes. 10:41

19 Q. -- of the electronic device design. 10:41

20 So you'll see figures 1 and 3 and figures 2 and 10:41

21 4 correspond to one another. 10:41

22 A. Correct. 10:41

23 Q. Do you have any understanding or 10:41

24 explanation as to why there are diagonal lines 10:41

25 on figure 2, but not on figure 4, and why the 10:41

1 fact that those diagonal lines are also, in 10:41

2 fact, on both figures 1 and figure 3? 10:41

3 MR. BARQUIST: Objection, vague and 10:41  
4 ambiguous, misstates the document. 10:41

5 A. I believe that the diagonal lines 10:41  
6 included in figure 2 are used to help identify 10:41  
7 the topography of figure 4 to illustrate that 10:41  
8 it is flat. 10:41

9 Q. Is the bottom of the design shown in 10:42  
10 the '889 design patent reflective, translucent, 10:42  
11 or transparent? 10:42

12 A. I don't believe so. 10:42

13 Q. Directing your attention to figure 9, 10:42  
14 you'll see that there's a human figure in 10:42  
15 dotted line, at least in part. You'll see his 10:42  
16 hand is still not excluded. 10:43

17 A. Yes. 10:43

18 Q. But setting that aside for a moment, 10:43  
19 you generally understanding that the depiction 10:43  
20 of the human figure here is to show orientation 10:43  
21 and environment for the device? 10:43

22 A. That's what it explains in the 10:43  
23 description, yes. 10:43

24 Q. Do you have an understanding as to 10:43  
25 whether or not this tablet computer design that 10:43

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

I, MARY ANN PAYONK, CRR-RDR, CBC, CCP,  
CLR, shorthand reporter, do hereby certify:

That the witness whose deposition is  
hereinbefore set forth was duly sworn, and that  
such deposition is a true record of the  
testimony given by such witness.

I further certify that I am not related  
to any of the parties to this action by blood  
or marriage, and that I am in no way interested  
in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set  
my hand this 24th day of April, 2012.

---

MARY ANN PAYONK, CRR-RDR, CBC, CCP, CLR  
Shorthand Reporter