1		WILLIAM F. LEE
2	MICHAEĽ A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)	william.lee@wilmerhale.com WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
3	RACHEL KREVANS (CA SBN 116421)	HALE AND DORR LLP 60 State Street Roston, MA 02100
4	JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368)	Boston, MA 02109 Felephone: (617) 526-6000 Facsimile: (617) 526-5000
5	jtaylor@mofo.com ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363) atucher@mofo.com	racsinine. (017) 320-3000
6	RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425)	MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180) nark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com
7	JASON R. BARTLETT (CA SBN 214530)	WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
8	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	Palo Alto, California 94304
9	San Francisco, California 94105-2482	Facsimile: (650) 858-6000
10	Facsimile: (415) 268-7522	raesinine. (050) 656-0100
11		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.	
13	Counterclaim Defendant ATT LL IIVC.	
14		
15	UNITED STATES DI	STRICT COURT
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT	OF CALIFORNIA
17	SAN JOSE D	IVISION
18	APPLE INC., a California corporation,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)
19	Plaintiff,	APPLE'S FIRST REVISED DRAFT OF PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT
20	v.	FORM
21	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS	
22	AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS	Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh Place: Courtroom 8, 4th Floor
23	AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	Trial: July 30, 2012 at 9 A.M.
24	Defendants.	
25		
26		
27		
28	Appropria Fraggi Derivate Derive de Derive de Company	Tony,
	Apple's First Revised Draft of Proposed Special Verdic Case No. 11-cv01846-LHK (PSG) pa-1533697	CT FORM

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

FINDINGS ON APPLE'S CLAIMS

APPLE'S UTILITY AND DESIGN PATENT CLAIMS AGAINST SAMSUNG

1. For each of the following products, has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung infringed the indicated Apple utility patent claims?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). You do not have to provide an answer for any cell that has gray shading.)

	1 1201 P 1	104 F.D.	1462 B
Accused Samsung Product	'381 Patent (Claim 19)	'915 Patent (Claim 8)	'163 Patent (Claim 50)
Intercept			
Vibrant			
Captivate			
Epic 4G			
Fascinate			
Galaxy Ace			
Galaxy S (i9000)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T)			
Galaxy S II (i9100)			
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile)	Х		
Transform	X		
Mesmerize			
Continuum			
Galaxy Tab (original or 7.0)			
Galaxy S 4G			
Gem			
Galaxy Prevail			
Nexus S 4G			
Replenish			
Droid Charge			
Infuse 4G			
Indulge			
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and 4G LTE)			
Exhibit 4G			

2. For each of the following products, has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung infringed the indicated Apple design patents?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). You do not have to provide an answer for any cell that has gray shading.)

Accused Samsung Product	D'677 Patent	D'087 Patent	D'305 Patent
Intercept	Х	Х	X
Vibrant			
Captivate	X	X	
Epic 4G	X	X	
Fascinate		X	
Galaxy Ace		X	Х
Galaxy S (i9000)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T)			Х
Galaxy S II (i9100)			X
Galaxy S II (T- Mobile)		x	X
Galaxy SII (Epic 4G Touch)			X
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket)			х
Galaxy S (Showcase i500)		X	
Mesmerize		X	
Continuum	X	X	
Galaxy S 4G			
Gem	X	Х	
Droid Charge	Х	X	
Infuse 4G			
Indulge	Х	Х	

Accused Samsung Product	D'889 Patent
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and 4G LTE)	

1	3.	Has Samsung proven by c		vidence that A	Apple's asserted ι	ıtility
2		and design patent claims a	re invalid?			
3		'381 Patent (Claim 19)	Yes (for \$	Samsung) No) (for App	ple)
4		'915 Patent (Claim 8)	Yes (for \$	Samsung) No	(for App	ple)
5		'163 Patent (Claim 50)	Yes (for \$	Samsung) No) (for App	ple)
6		D'677 Patent	Yes (for S	Samsung) No	(for App	ple)
7		D'087 Patent	Yes (for \$	Samsung) No) (for App	ple)
8		D'889 Patent	Yes (for S	Samsung) No) (for App	ple)
10		D'305 Patent	Yes (for S	Samsung) No	(for Appl	le)
11	_					
12	4.	If in response to Question infringed any Apple paten	_	•	0	
13		Samsung's infringement v	vas willful?			
14		Yes	(for Apple) No	(for	Samsung)	
15						
16	5.	Which of the Samsung ent	ities do you find liable	e for patent i	nfringement?	
17		Samsung Electronics Co.,	Ltd.	Yes	No	
18		Samsung Electronics Amo	erica, Inc.	Yes	No	
19		Samsung Telecommunica	tions America LLC	Yes	No	
20		sumsung referentiation		100	110	
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

1	API	LE'S TRAD	E DRESS	CLAIMS AG	AINST SAM	<u>MSUNG</u>
2	6.				ely than not	t that Apple's <u>unregistered</u> iPad-related
3		trade dress	is protect	able?		
4		Ye	s	(for Apple)	No	_ (for Samsung)
5	7	II. a. A arada a	41	- 4 . 4	-l 4l	44b 44 A 1 27b
6	7.		•	at it is more lik are protectable	-	t that Apple's <u>unregistered</u> iPhone-
7		Ye	s	(for Apple)	No	_ (for Samsung)
8						
9	8.			that it is more not protectable		not that Apple's <u>registered</u> iPhone-
10				(for Samsung)		(for Apple)
11		10	s	(for Samsung)	110	_ (tot Apple)
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18 19						
20						
20						
21						
23						
24						
2 4 25						
25 26						
27						
28						

Accused Samsung Product	iPhone Trade Dress Dilution
Vibrant	
Captivate	
Epic 4G	
Fascinate	
Galaxy S (i9000)	
Galaxy S II (AT&T)	
Galaxy S II (i9100)	
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile)	
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch)	
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket)	
Galaxy S (Showcase i500)	
Mesmerize	
Continuum	
Galaxy S 4G	
Galaxy Prevail	
Galaxy Ace	
Droid Charge	
Infuse 4G	

Accused Samsung Product	iPad Trade Dress Dilution	iPad Trade Dress Infringement
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and 4G LTE)		

د2

1	40			
1	10.	Which of the Samsung entities do you find liabl	e for Apple's	s trade dress claims?
2		Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Yes	No
3		Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Yes	No
5		Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC	Yes	No
6	DAN	AACES TO ADDI E EDOM SAMSLING		
7	DAI	MAGES TO APPLE FROM SAMSUNG		
8	11.	What is the dollar amount that Apple is entitled claims on which you have ruled in favor of App		rom Samsung on the
9				
10		\$		<u>_</u> ·
11				
12				
13		FINDINGS ON SAMSUN	G'S CLAIM	S
14	SAN	ISUNG'S UTILITY PATENT CLAIMS AGAIN	ST APPLE	
15	12.	For each of the following products, has Samsun that Apple infringed the indicated Samsung util		•
16		(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Samsung)	or with an "N" for "no"
17		(for Apple). You do not have to provide an answer	O ,	
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

Accused Apple	'516 Patent		'941 Patent		'604 Patent		'711 Patent	'893 Patent	'460 Patent
Product	Claim 15	Claim 16	Claim 10	Claim 15	Claim 17	Claim 18	Claim 9	Claim 10	Claim 1
iPhone 3G	X	X	X	X				X	
iPhone 3GS	X	Х	X	Х					
iPhone 4									
iPad 3G	x	х	X	х			Х	X	X
iPad2 3G							X		
iPod Touch	X	X	X	X	X	X			

1 2	13.		•	and convincing	evidence tha	nt Samsung's asserted utility
3		patent claims	are invalid?			
		'516 Patent				
4		Claim 15:	Yes	_(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
5		Claim 16:		(for Apple)		
6		'941 Patent				
7		Claim 10:	Yes	_ (for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
8		Claim 15:		_ (for Apple)		
9		'604 Patent				
10		Claim 17:	Yes	_ (for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
11		Claim 18:		(for Apple)		
12		<u>'711 Patent</u>				
13		Claim 9:	Yes	_(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
14		'893 Patent				
1516		Claim 10:	Yes	_(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
17		<u>'460 Patent</u>				
18		Claim 1:	Yes	_ (for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
19 20	14.		Samsung pro			has infringed any Samsung evidence that Apple's
21			Yes	_ (for Samsung)	No	_ (for Apple)
22						
23	DA	MAGES TO S	AMSUNG FR	OM APPLE		
				_	4241 - 7.4	
24	15.			_		eceive from Apple for 6, '941, and '604 patents?
25		Sumbung b ut	Parent III	Somont ciun		of zing our puterios
26		\$				
27						
28						

1	16.	What is the dollar amount that Samsung is entitled to receive from Apple for
2		Samsung's utility patent infringement claims on the '711, '893, and '460 patents?
3		\$
4		
5		FINDINGS ON APPLE'S COUNTERCLAIMS AGAINST SAMSUNG
6	DD	
7	<u>BK</u>	EACH OF CONTRACT CLAIMS AND ANTITRUST
8	17.	Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung breached its contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose its intellectual property rights
9		("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard or by failing to license its "declared essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory ("FRAND") terms?
11		Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
12		
13 14	18.	Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung has violated Section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act by monopolizing one or more technology markets related to the UMTS standard?
15		to the UNITS standard:
16		Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
17	19.	If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 17 or Question No. 18, what is the dollar
18		amount that Apple is entitled to receive from Samsung for Samsung's antitrust violation and/or breach of contract?
19		\$
20		¥ <u></u> -
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

		re likely than not		ung is barred by p ing Samsung pate
Apple?	The second	g		88 1
(Please answer in Samsung).)	each cell with	a "Y" for "yes" (fo	or Apple),	or with an "N" for '
Samsung Pater	nt	Exhaustion		Equitable Estoppe
'516 Patent				
'941 Patent				
'604 Patent				
2041 D-44	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Sameung)
	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Sameung)
<u>'941 Patent</u> <u>'604 Patent</u>			No	(for Samsung)
'604 Patent	Yes	(for Apple)	No	
	Yes	(for Apple)	No	
'604 Patent ave the presiding juror	Yes	(for Apple) this form.		
'604 Patent	Yes	(for Apple) this form.	e:	(for Samsung)