

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
 Charles K. Verhoeven (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 (Bar No. 177129)
 kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com
 6 Victoria F. Maroulis (Bar No. 202603)
 victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com
 7 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
 Redwood Shores, California 94065-2139
 8 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

9 Michael T. Zeller (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 AMERICA,
 14 INC. and SAMSUNG
 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC
 15

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION
 18

19 APPLE INC., a California corporation,
 20 Plaintiff,
 21 vs.
 22 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a
 Korean business entity; SAMSUNG
 23 ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New
 York corporation; SAMSUNG
 24 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,
 LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,
 25 Defendants.
 26

CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)

**DECLARATION OF JOHN B. QUINN
 SUBMITTED AT THE REQUEST OF
 THE COURT REGARDING SAMSUNG'S
 DISCLOSURE OF PUBLIC
 INFORMATION IN RESPONSE TO
 PRESS INQUIRIES**

1 **DECLARATION OF JOHN B. QUINN**

2 I, John B. Quinn, do hereby declare as follows:

3 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before this Court, and am the managing
4 partner of Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, counsel for Samsung in this trial. I have
5 personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this Declaration and if called as a witness, could and
6 would competently testify to them.

7 2. On July 31, 2012, I approved and authorized the release of a brief statement—it
8 was not a general press release—and proposed trial demonstrative exhibits. This followed
9 multiple requests from members of the media seeking further explanation—including requesting
10 the demonstrative exhibits at issue—as to the basis for Samsung’s claims, made in open court and
11 in its public trial brief, that it had the right to present evidence that the iPhone was inspired by
12 “Sony style” and that Samsung had independently created the design for the F700 phone—that
13 was alleged in Apple’s opening statement to be an iPhone copy—in 2006, well before the
14 announcement of the iPhone.

15 3. A true and correct copy of a sample of the press inquiries seeking precisely the
16 information that was provided—including requesting the trial demonstrative exhibits at issue—is
17 attached as Exhibit A.

18 4. Contrary to the representations Apple’s counsel made to this Court, Samsung did
19 not issue a general press release and more importantly, did not violate any Court Order or any
20 legal or ethical standards. These false representations by Apple’s counsel publicly and unfairly
21 called my personal reputation into question and have resulted in media reports likewise falsely
22 impugning me personally.

23 5. Far from violating any order, Samsung’s transmission to the public of public
24 information disclosed in pretrial filings is entirely consistent with this Court’s statements—made
25 in denying both parties’ requests to seal documents—that “[t]he United States district court is a
26 public institution, and the workings of litigation must be open to public view. *Pretrial*
27 *submissions are a part of trial.*” See Dkt. No. 1256 at 2 (Order Denying Sealing Motions, dated
28 July 17, 2012) (emphasis added). Indeed, the Court has told the parties that “the whole trial is

1 going to be open.” *Id.* at 3. The Court repeated these sentiments on July 20, 2012, noting “the
2 plethora of media and general public scrutiny” of these proceedings, and stating that “[t]he public
3 has a significant interest in these court filings.” *See* Dkt. No. 1269 (Order Denying Motions to
4 Seal, dated July 20, 2012); *see also id.* at 2 (“The mere fact that the production of records may
5 lead to a litigant’s embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not, without
6 more, compel the court to seal its records. Unlike private materials unearthed during discovery,
7 judicial records are public documents almost by definition, and the public is entitled to access by
8 default.”) (internal quotations omitted).

9 6. All of the material in the excluded trial demonstrative exhibits at issue was
10 previously in the public record. The substance of these trial demonstrative exhibits was included
11 in Samsung’s trial brief, in other public filings (including filings by Apple) and reports, and were
12 specifically addressed in open court with the media in attendance. Per the Court’s instruction,
13 Samsung filed its evidence of independent creation as Exhibits 5, 6 and 8 to the Declaration of
14 Joby Martin in Support of Samsung’s Trial Brief; Apple’s “Sony-style” CAD drawings and
15 models were attached as Exhibits 1 and 2 to the Martin Declaration. *See* Dkt. No 1322. Apple
16 itself publicly filed Shin Nishibori’s testimony that the direction of the iPhone’s design was
17 completely changed by the “Sony-style” designs that Jonathan Ive directed him to make. *See* Dkt.
18 No. 1428-1. All of these filings are attached hereto as Exhibits B - F.

19 7. Other public filings that disclosed the information at issue include Docket Numbers
20 1438-2 (Tucher Declaration in Support of Apple’s Motion to Enforce), 1429-13 (Walker
21 Declaration in support of Samsung’s Opposition to Motion to Enforce), and 1451 (Cashman
22 Declaration in Support of Motion for Leave).

23 8. Moreover, before jury selection, virtually all of the information and images in the
24 excluded slides had already appeared in dozens of media reports, including by the [New York](#)
25 [Times](#), [Los Angeles Times](#), [Huffington Post](#), and [CNET](#).

26 9. As this Court has acknowledged, this is a case with genuine and substantial
27 commercial and public interest and with enormous potential commercial impact. The media has
28 been reporting in salacious detail Apple’s allegations of Samsung’s supposed "copying", causing

1 injury to Samsung's public reputation as a company. Moreover, Apple's baseless and public
2 assertions that Samsung's transmission to the media of public information constituted contempt of
3 court and that these actions were intended to pollute the jury were themselves glaring falsehoods,
4 highlighting why Samsung has every right to defend itself in the public domain from unfair and
5 malicious attacks.

6 10. Samsung's brief statement and transmission of public materials in response to
7 media inquiries was lawful, ethical, and fully consistent with the relevant California Rules of
8 Professional Responsibility (incorporated by N.D. Cal. Civil Local Rule 11-4) and legal
9 authorities regarding attorneys' communications with the press. California Rule of Professional
10 Responsibility 5-120(B)(2) specifically permits attorneys involved in litigation to disclose
11 "information in a public record." As shown above, all of the information disclosed was contained
12 in public records.

13 11. Further, Rule 5-120(C) specifically provides that "a member may make a statement
14 that a reasonable member would believe is required to protect a client from the substantial undue
15 prejudicial effect of recent publicity not initiated by the member or the member's client."

16 12. Samsung's brief statement and transmission of public materials in response to press
17 inquiries was not motivated by or designed to influence jurors. The members of the jury had
18 already been selected at the time of the statement and the transmission of these public exhibits,
19 and had been specifically instructed not to read any form of media relating to this case. The
20 information provided therefore was not intended to, nor could it, "have a substantial likelihood of
21 materially prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding." See Cal. R. Prof. Res. 5-120(A); see also
22 *Berndt v. Cal. Dep't of Corrections*, 2004 WL 1774227, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2004) (attorney's
23 extra-judicial statements regarding a pending case did not create a "substantial likelihood of
24 material prejudice" in part because the information "is contained in the public record, and Ms.
25 Price may freely state any information in the public record").

26 13. The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has held that attorneys'
27 speech to the press is protected by the First Amendment. See *Standing Comm. on Discipline of*
28 *U.S. Dist. Court for Cent. Dist. of Cal. v. Yagman*, 55 F.3d 1430 (9th Cir. 1995). In *Yagman*, the

