EXHIBIT 69

```
Page 1
1
              IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3
                        SAN JOSE DIVISION
4
     APPLE, INC., a California
5
     corporation,
6
7
                            Plaintiff,
                                           No. 11-CV-01846-LHK
            -vs-
9
     SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
10
     a Korean business entity; et al.,
11
                            Defendants.
12
13
               VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF HAL PORET
14
                           CONFIDENTIAL
15
                    SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
16
                    THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 2012
17
18
19
20
21
     Reported by: LOUISE MARIE SOUSOURES, CSR NO. 3575
22
                   Certified LiveNote Reporter
23
     JOb 48723
24
25
```

		Page 132
1	that there might be a distinction between owners and	13:28
2	purchasers of cellular telephones?	13:28
3	A. Yes, I addressed that.	13:28
4	Q. Why did you focus on owners as opposed to	13:29
5	purchasers?	13:29
6	A. I didn't.	13:29
7	Q. The survey you accepted results from	13:29
8	persons who owned who were not purchasers, right?	13:29
9	A. I let people take the survey, but I didn't	13:29
10	use them in the secondary meaning universe.	13:29
11	Q. They were excluded from that?	13:29
12	A. It's just what you were asking me about	13:29
13	before, those people took the survey, but in the	13:29
14	analysis of the secondary meaning level, those people	13:29
15	weren't included in that universe.	13:29
16	Q. Why did you let them take the survey if you	13:29
17	were not including them in the universe of people	13:29
18	whose responses would be considered for determining	13:30
19	secondary meaning?	13:30
20	A. For a couple of reasons.	13:30
21	Number one, the most important one being that	13:30
22	since there was potentially a dilution aspect to this	13:30
23	case, and there was a general interest in finding out	13:30
24	how widely the iPhone trade dress was recognized even	13:30
25	outside of the narrower universe for secondary	13:30

		Page 133
1	meaning.	13:30
2	So including people who owned mobile phones	13:30
3	but don't fall within the narrower category of	13:30
4	secondary meaning universe being the recent purchasers	13:30
5	or the likely future purchasers gave us a broader base	13:30
6	of relevant consumers to see what the recognition	13:30
7	level of the trade dress was there.	13:30
8	Q. Is it your testimony that the cellular	13:30
9	telephone survey you performed could be used both to	13:31
10	measure secondary meaning and in a dilution analysis?	13:31
11	A. No, that's not what I was saying.	13:31
12	What I mean is this by including somewhat	13:31
13	of a broader audience at least there are some results	13:31
14	just as you were asking me before what would the	13:31
15	results have been among people who bought a phone more	13:31
16	than 12 months ago, we have those results.	13:31
17	So if somebody is interested in getting a	13:31
18	sense of is the iPhone trade dress recognized amongst	13:31
19	a broader audience there's data on that.	13:31
20	Q. Anywhere in your report do you break out your	13:32
21	findings with respect to secondary meaning among just	13:32
22	the group of respondents who were likely to purchase a	13:32
23	cellular telephone in the coming 12 months?	13:32
24	A. I don't think so. I mean it's in the data	13:32
25	that's produced along with the report, but it's not	13:32

		Page 134
1	laid out like that in the body of the report.	13:32
2	Q. Why not?	13:32
3	A. Because I don't see the relevance of breaking	13:32
4	that out as a separate group to look at when that's	13 : 32
5	just one piece of the relevant universe.	13 : 32
6	Q. So in your view, looking at secondary meaning	13:33
7	among prospective purchasers is not relevant?	13:33
8	MR. BEARD: Objection, misstates and	13:33
9	mischaracterizes prior testimony.	13:33
10	THE WITNESS: No, that's not what I said.	13:33
11	BY MR. QUINTO:	13:33
12	Q. I'm sorry, would you explain it again,	13:33
13	please?	13:33
14	A. I just said the universe as I see it is	13:33
15	consists of recent and likely future purchasers.	13:33
16	So I don't see the reason for breaking out	13:33
17	the results based on only part of that being just the	13:33
18	future purchasers, but anybody who wants to do that,	13:33
19	it's in the data.	13:33
20	Q. Do you intend to analyze your data further	13:33
21	between now and trial, your data for either the cell	13:34
22	phone or the tablet computer surveys?	13:34
23	A. I don't know. Only if there's some reason	13:34
24	to.	13:34
25	Q. As you sit here today, you have no such	13:34