

- 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, INC., a California corporation,) Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK
)
Plaintiff and Counterdefendant,)
v.) ORDER RE: SAMSUNG’S MOTION
) PURSUANT TO RULE 50; ORDER RE:
) APPLE’S MOTION TO STRIKE
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A)
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG)
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York)
corporation; SAMSUNG)
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,)
a Delaware limited liability company,)
)
Defendants and Counterclaimants.)
)


- The Court DENIED Apple’s motion to strike the Fidler tablet.
- The Court DENIED Apple’s motion to strike Itay Sherman’s testimony.

After considering all of the evidence presented by Apple, the Court made the following rulings on the record with respect to the parties' claims:

- The Court DENIED Samsung's renewed Rule 50 motion raising all of the same arguments Samsung made in its prior Rule 50 motions.
- The Court GRANTED Samsung's Rule 50 motion as to anticipation of the '460, '711, and '516 Patents. Apple conceded that it had introduced no evidence of anticipation of these three Samsung patents.
- The Court DENIED Samsung's Rule 50 motion as to anticipation as to the '893 and '941 Patents.
- The Court DENIED Samsung's Rule 50 motion as to obviousness of the '460, '893, '711, '516, and '941 Patents.
- The Court DENIED Samsung's Rule 50 motion as to Apple's claims of patent exhaustion, antitrust violation, waiver, unclean hands, breach of contract, and equitable estoppel.
- The Court DENIED Samsung's Rule 50 motion as to rebuttal damages.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 17, 2012


LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge