| 1  | QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVA  | AN, LLP  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | Charles K. Verhoeven (Cal. Bar No. 170151)<br>charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com<br>50 California Street, 22 <sup>nd</sup> Floor   |  |
| 3  | San Francisco, California 94111<br>Telephone: (415) 875-6600  |  |
| 4  | Facsimile: (415) 875-6700   |  |
| 5  | Kevin P.B. Johnson (Cal. Bar No. 177129)<br>kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com   |  |
| 6  | Victoria F. Maroulis (Cal. Bar No. 202603)  |  |
| 7  | victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com<br>555 Twin Dolphin Drive 5 <sup>th</sup> Floor<br>Redwood Shores, California 94065<br>Telephone: (650) 801-5000<br>Facsimile: (650) 801-5100 |  |
| 8  |   |  |
| 9  | Michael T. Zeller (Cal. Bar No. 196417)   |  |
| 10 | michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com<br>865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor<br>Los Angeles, California 90017<br>Telephone: (213) 443-3000   |  |
| 11 |   |  |
| 12 | Facsimile: (213) 443-3100   |  |
| 13 | Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS  |  |
| 14 | AMÉRICÁ, INC. and SAMSUNG<br>TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC  |  |
| 15 |   |  |
| 16 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |  |
| 17 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION  |  |
| 18 | APPLE INC., a California corporation,   | CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK                           |
| 19 | Plaintiff,  | SAMSUNG'S BRIEF REGARDING                          |
| 20 | VS.   | REFERENCES AT TRIAL TO "PLAINTIFF" AND "DEFENDANT" |
| 21 | SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean business entity; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New   | TEAUVITT AND DEFENDANT                             |
| 22 |   |  |
| 23 | York corporation; SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,  |  |
| 24 | Defendants.   |  |
| 25 |   |  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 |   |  |
| 28 |   |  |
|    |   |  |

Both parties in this action have claims against the other that will be tried to the jury in the upcoming trial. Accordingly, both parties will at times be acting as plaintiffs and both as defendants, and it is therefore important that both parties are treated the same. It is important that the terminology that is used to refer to the parties reflects this fact. In order to avoid any unfair prejudice to Samsung that may result from references to Apple as "plaintiff" in front of the jury, Samsung requests that both parties be referred to as "claimants."

Additionally, Samsung requests that its counsel be permitted to sit at plaintiff's table while Samsung presents its affirmative case. The general rule in courts nationwide, both civil and criminal, is that the party with the burden of proof sits nearest the jury. In keeping with this practice, it makes sense that Samsung would sit at plaintiff's table while presenting its affirmative case. Furthermore, equal treatment of the parties with respect to where they sit while presenting their affirmative case will mitigate any prejudice to Samsung that may result from Apple being in closer proximity to the jury throughout the trial. It will also ensure that the jury does not draw any improper inference based on disparate treatment of the parties with respect to their positions in the courtroom. Other courts have adopted this approach in complex, high-stakes trials involving claims asserted by both parties. See Mattel v. MGA, Case No. 04-09049 (DOC) (C.D. Cal.), March 10, 2011 Trial Tr., Vol. 3, at 26:25-27:6, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

DATED: July 26, 2012

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

20

25

26

27

28

By /s/ Victoria F. Maroulis

Charles K. Verhoeven Victoria F. Maroulis Kevin P.B. Johnson Michael T. Zeller Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., and SAMSUNG

TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC

## **EXHIBIT A**

| 1  |  |
|----|--|
| 2  |  |
| 3  |  |
| 4  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT                             |
| 5  | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA                           |
| 6  | SOUTHERN DIVISION  |
| 7  |  |
| 8  | THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER, JUDGE PRESIDING           |
| 9  | W3 MM77 TVG 1  |
| 10 | MATTEL, INC., et al., Plaintiffs,                        |
| 11 | vs.  |
| 12 | CV-04-9049-DOC<br>MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC., DAY 31        |
| 13 | et al., Volume 3 of 3 Defendants.                        |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS                     |
| 18 | Santa Ana, California                                    |
| 19 | Thursday, March 10, 2011                                 |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 | SHARON A. SEFFENS, RPR<br>United States Courthouse       |
| 23 | 411 West 4th Street, Suite 1-1053<br>Santa Ana, CA 92701 |
| 24 | (714) 543-0870   |
| 25 |  |
|    |  |

```
1
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
 2
    For Plaintiff MATTEL, INC., ET AL.:
 3
     JOHN B. QUINN
    MICHAEL T. ZELLER
 4
     WILLIAM PRICE
     QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
 5
     865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
     Los Angeles, CA 90017
 6
     (213) 443-3000
 7
    For Defendant MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC., ET AL.:
 8
     THOMAS MCCONVILLE
     ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
 9
     4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
     Irvine, CA 92614
10
     (949) 567-6700
11
     ANNETTE HURST
     ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
12
     The Orrick Building
     405 Howard Street
13
     San Francisco, CA 94105
     (415) 773-4585
14
     KELLER RACKAUCKAS LLP
15
     JENNIFER L. KELLER
     18500 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 560
16
     Irvine, CA
     (949) 476-8700
17
18
    FOR CARLOS GUSTAVO MACHADO GOMEZ:
19
    MARK E. OVERLAND
     100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 950
20
     Santa Monica, CA 90401
     (310) 459-2830
21
22
     ALEXANDER COTE
     SCHEPER KIM AND HARRIS LLP
23
     601 West Fifth Street, 12th Floor
     Los Angeles, CA 90071-2025
24
     (213) 613-4655
25
```

```
1
     ALSO PRESENT:
 2
     MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC.
     JEANINE PISONI
 3
     16360 Roscoe Boulevard, Suite 105
     Van Nuys, CA 91406
 4
 5
     ALSO PRESENT:
 6
     ISAAC LARIAN, MGA CEO
 7
     KEN KOTARSKI, Mattel Technical Operator
 8
     MIKE STOVALL, MGA Technical Operator
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 going. 2 MR. COTE: Yes. 3 THE COURT: If that's acceptable to you, that 4 let's the parties start tomorrow. MR. COTE: Of course. 5 6 THE COURT: Counsel, I am going to pay all of you 7 a compliment in front of the jury about how hard you are 8 working. 9 Nancy, would you get the jury. 10 (Jury present.) 11 THE COURT: The jurors are present. Counsel are 12 present. 13 Mr. Quinn, on behalf of Mattel. 14 MR. QUINN: Your Honor, subject to the issues that 15 we discussed the jury's presence, Mattel rests. 16 THE COURT: Mattel is resting at this time. 17 are a few matters that we can accomplish this weekend and 18 outside your presence, but both parties have agreed to go 19 forward tomorrow. 20 We anticipated that Mattel would be resting 21 sometime this week. We didn't know quite know if it was 22 Wednesday, Thursday, or early Friday, but we anticipated 23 this, and MGA will be ready to start their presentation 24 tomorrow morning at 8:30. 25 Now, we are going to be switching tables.

will be sitting at the table that times has been referred to as the plaintiff's table, and Mr. Overland and Mr. Cote will be joining them. I am going to have a small table set up so we keep visually who is with whom, and Mattel will be over sitting over what we previously referred to as the defendant's table.

We have about 152 hours that we have been in session so far, maybe a little bit more by the end of today. I'm not quite certain. I haven't been keeping that close account, but you can see a running total over on this board. As of yesterday, it was 87 hours and 41 minutes for Mattel and MGA 64 hours and 8 minutes. That's about right. The plaintiff is usually using a few more hours in the presentation of their case, and now MGA will probably start using a few more hours.

All counsel are on notice when that hits 120 hours that's the end of the lawsuit for that party. Actually because of the preparation of counsel and the extraordinary efforts on both Mattel and MGA's part and Mr. Machado's counsel, the — because we are not having sidebars, because they are going all over the evidence on nights and during the weekends, means that that 120 hours for each side is probably the equivalent of about 200 hours. It's really about a four-month trial that's being brought down into about three months, so it's coming to you pretty quick.

CERTIFICATE I hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Date: March 11, 2011 Sharon A. Seffens 3/11/11 SHARON A. SEFFENS, U.S. COURT REPORTER