

1 HAROLD J. MCELHINNY (CA SBN 66781)
 hmcclhinny@mofo.com
 2 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
 mjacobs@mofo.com
 3 RACHEL KREVANS (CA SBN 116421)
 rkrevans@mofo.com
 4 JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368)
 jtaylor@mofo.com
 5 ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363)
 atucher@mofo.com
 6 RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425)
 rhung@mofo.com
 7 JASON R. BARTLETT (CA SBN 214530)
 jasonbartlett@mofo.com
 8 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 425 Market Street
 9 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
 Telephone: (415) 268-7000
 10 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

WILLIAM F. LEE
 william.lee@wilmerhale.com
 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
 HALE AND DORR LLP
 60 State Street
 Boston, MA 02109
 Telephone: (617) 526-6000
 Facsimile: (617) 526-5000

MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180)
 mark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com
 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
 HALE AND DORR LLP
 950 Page Mill Road
 Palo Alto, California 94304
 Telephone: (650) 858-6000
 Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

11
 12 Attorneys for Plaintiff and
 Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 16 SAN JOSE DIVISION

18 APPLE INC., a California corporation,
 19 Plaintiff,
 20 v.
 21 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a
 Korean business entity; SAMSUNG
 22 ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York
 corporation; SAMSUNG
 23 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a
 Delaware limited liability company,
 24 Defendants.
 25

Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)

**APPLE'S REQUEST FOR
 CORRECTION TO DESIGN
 PATENT CLAIM
 CONSTRUCTION**

1 Apple has noted several small errors in the Court’s design patent claim constructions
2 issued on July 27, 2012 and respectfully requests that they be corrected as follows.

3 **D’087 Patent**

4 With respect to the D’087 patent, the Court’s claim construction is:

5 The D’087 Patent claims the ornamental design of an electronic
6 device as shown in Figures 1-46. The broken lines in the D’087
7 Patent constitute unclaimed subject matter. Thus, the D’087 Patent
8 claims the front face, a ‘bezel encircling the front face of the
9 patented design [that] extends from the front of the phone to its
10 sides,’ and a flat contour of the front face, but does not claim the
11 rest of the article of manufacture.

12 (Dkt. No. 1425, Order at p. 8 lines 2-6 (emphasis added).)

13 The D’087 patent has 48 figures, not 46 figures. Apple requests that the claim
14 construction be corrected as follows:

15 The D’087 Patent claims the ornamental design of an electronic
16 device as shown in Figures 1-48. The broken lines in the D’087
17 Patent constitute unclaimed subject matter. Thus, the D’087 Patent
18 claims the front face, a ‘bezel encircling the front face of the
19 patented design [that] extends from the front of the phone to its
20 sides,’ and a flat contour of the front face, but does not claim the
21 rest of the article of manufacture.

22 **D’677 Patent**

23 With respect to the D’677 patent, the Court’s claim construction is:

24 The D’677 Patent claims the ornamental design of an electronic
25 device as shown in Figures 1-6. The broken lines in the D’677
26 Patent constitute unclaimed subject matter. The use of “solid black
27 surface shading” on the D’677 Patent represents the color black.
28 The use of oblique line shading on the D’677 Patent is used to show
a transparent, translucent **and** highly polished or reflective surface.

(*Id.* at p. 9, lines 15-19 (emphasis added).)

The D’677 patent has 8 figures, not 6 figures. Moreover, because a surface cannot
simultaneously have *all* of the following traits at once: transparent, translucent, highly polished,
and reflective, Apple believes that the “and” in the final clause of the Court’s claim construction
is intended to be an “or.” This is consistent with the Court’s statement in the preceding paragraph
that: “Thus, the use of oblique line shading and solid black surface shading in the D’677 Patent

1 indicate that the patentee claimed a black surface that is also transparent, translucent, highly
2 polished, or reflective.” (*Id.* at p. 9, lines 11-13 (emphasis added).)

3 Apple requests that the claim construction be corrected as follows:

4 The D’677 Patent claims the ornamental design of an electronic
5 device as shown in Figures 1-8. The broken lines in the D’677
6 Patent constitute unclaimed subject matter. The use of “solid black
7 surface shading” on the D’677 Patent represents the color black.
8 The use of oblique line shading on the D’677 Patent is used to show
9 a transparent, translucent or highly polished or reflective surface.

10 **D’889 Patent**

11 With respect to the D’889 patent, the Court’s claim construction is:

12 The D’889 Patent claims the ornamental design of an electronic
13 device as shown in Figures 1-9. The broken lines depicting the
14 human figure in figure 9 do not form a part of the claimed design.
15 The other broken lines in the other figures are part of the claimed
16 design. The D’889 also includes oblique line shading on several of
17 the figures. The oblique line shading in Figures 1-3 and Figure 9
18 depicts a transparent, translucent and highly polished or reflective
19 surface from the top perspective view of the claimed design, the top
20 view of the claimed design, and the bottom perspective view of the
21 claimed design.

22 (*Id.* at p. 11, lines 2-8 (emphasis added).)

23 As with the D’677 patent, the use of the word “and” suggests that the surface must have
24 *all* of the following traits: transparent, translucent, highly polished and reflective. As explained
25 above, this is not consistent with the Court’s explanation of the use of the oblique lines in
26 connection with the D’677 patent, and it creates an impossible requirement because a surface
27 cannot simultaneously have all four traits at the same time.
28

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
26
27
28

Apple requests that the claim construction be corrected as follows:

The D'889 Patent claims the ornamental design of an electronic device as shown in Figures 1-9. The broken lines depicting the human figure in figure 9 do not form a part of the claimed design. The other broken lines in the other figures are part of the claimed design. The D'889 also includes oblique line shading on several of the figures. The oblique line shading in Figures 1-3 and Figure 9 depicts a transparent, translucent or highly polished or reflective surface from the top perspective view of the claimed design, the top view of the claimed design, and the bottom perspective view of the claimed design.

Dated: July 28, 2012

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

By: /s/ Michael A. Jacobs
Michael A. Jacobs

Attorneys for Plaintiff
APPLE INC.