

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
 Charles K. Verhoeven (Cal. Bar No. 170151)
 2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com
 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
 3 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
 4 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

5 Kevin P.B. Johnson (Cal. Bar No. 177129)
 kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com
 6 Victoria F. Maroulis (Cal. Bar No. 202603)
 victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com
 7 555 Twin Dolphin Drive 5th Floor
 Redwood Shores, California 94065
 8 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

9 Michael T. Zeller (Cal. Bar No. 196417)
 10 michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com
 865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor
 11 Los Angeles, California 90017
 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
 12 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

13 Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
 CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
 14 AMERICA, INC. and SAMSUNG
 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC
 15

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

18 APPLE INC., a California corporation,
 19 Plaintiff,
 20 vs.
 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
**SAMSUNG'S OBJECTION TO APPLE'S
 REQUEST FOR CORRECTION OF
 DESIGN PATENT CLAIM
 CONSTRUCTION ORDER**

26
 27
 28

1 Samsung Electronics Co, Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc. and Samsung
2 Telecommunication America, LLC (collectively, “Samsung”) hereby object to Apple, Inc.’s
3 (“Apple”) Request for Correction of the Court’s Design Patent Claim Construction Order.

4 Samsung does not object to the typographical corrections to the number of figures shown in
5 the D’087 and D’677 patents. Apple’s suggested revision to the Court’s Order as it relates to the
6 oblique lines shown on the D’889 and D’677 designs, however, is a far cry from a “correction.” It
7 is an improper motion for reconsideration of a substantive issue and is contrary to the plain
8 language of MPEP 1530.02. Indeed, Apple urged this very construction in its opening claim
9 construction brief, but the Court declined to adopt it. Dkt. 1089-3, at 3. Apple offers no
10 legitimate grounds for reconsideration at all, so the request should be rejected on that basis alone.
11 Apple is also wrong on the merits. As the Court properly stated, MPEP section 1530.02 (II)
12 provides that “[o]blique line shading must be used to show transparent, translucent and highly
13 polished or reflective surfaces.” Dkt. 1425, at 9, 10. Indeed, Apple has repeatedly cited and
14 quoted the very MPEP section that it now attempts to quarrel with. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 997-02, at 10
15 (Apple citing and relying on this MPEP provision); Dkt. 1089-3, at 3 (same). Apple’s purported
16 request for this “correction” should be denied.

17
18 DATED: July 28, 2012

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

19
20 By */s/ Victoria Maroulis*

21 _____
Charles K. Verhoeven
22 Kevin P.B. Johnson
Victoria F. Maroulis
23 Michael T. Zeller

24 Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,
LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
25 INC., and SAMSUNG
26 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC
27