1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 SAN JOSE DIVISION 10 APPLE, INC., a California corporation, Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK 11 Plaintiff, TENTATIVE VERDICT FORM v. 12 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., 13 a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., 14 a New York corporation; SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS 15 AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, 16 Defendants. 17 18 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; 19 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; 20 SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, 21 a Delaware limited liability company, 22 Counterclaim-Plaintiffs, v. 23 APPLE, INC., a California corporation, 24 Counterclaim-Defendant. 25 26 We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case. 27

1

### 

### 

# 

### 

# 

### 

### 

### 

# 

# 

### 

# 

# 

### 

# 

### 

### 

# 

### 

### 

#### FINDINGS ON APPLE'S CLAIMS

#### APPLE'S UTILITY AND DESIGN PATENT CLAIMS AGAINST SAMSUNG

1. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed Claim 19 of the '381 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
	=	=
	Electronics	<b>Electronics Electronics</b>

2. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed Claim 8 of the '915 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)			
Continuum (JX 1016)			
Droid Charge (JX 1025)			
Epic 4G (JX 1012)			
Exhibit 4G (JX 1028)			
Fascinate (JX 1013)			
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)			
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)			
JX 1033 (Galaxy S II (T-Mobile))			
Galaxy Tab (JX 1036)			
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)			
Gem (JX 1020)			
Indulge (JX 1026)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Intercept (JX 1009)			
Mesmerize (JX 1015)			
Nexus S 4G (JX 1023)			
Replenish (JX 1024)			
Transform (JX 1014)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

**3.** For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed Claim 50 of the '163 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)			
Continuum (JX 1016)			
Droid Charge (JX 1025)			
Epic 4G (JX 1012)			
Exhibit 4G (JX 1028)			
Fascinate (JX 1013)			
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)			=
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)			
JX 1033 (Galaxy S II (T-Mobile))			
Galaxy Tab (JX 1036)			
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)			
Gem (JX 1020)			
Indulge (JX 1026)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Intercept (JX 1009)			
Mesmerize (JX 1015)			
Nexus S 4G (JX 1023)			
Replenish (JX 1024)			
Transform (JX 1014)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

# 4. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), took action that it knew or should have known would induce STA or SEA to infringe the '381, '915, or '163 Patents'?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	'381 Patent (Claim 19)	'915 Patent (Claim 8)	'163 Patent (Claim 50)
Captivate (JX 1011)			
Continuum (JX 1016)			
Droid Charge (JX 1025)			
Epic 4G (JX 1012)			
Exhibit 4G (JX 1028)			
Fascinate (JX 1013)			
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)			
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)			
JX 1033 (Galaxy S II (T-Mobile))			
Galaxy Tab (JX 1036)			
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)			
Gem (JX 1020)			
Indulge (JX 1026)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Intercept (JX 1009)			
Mesmerize (JX 1015)			
Nexus S 4G (JX 1023)			
Replenish (JX 1024)			
Transform (JX 1014)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed the D'677 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Fascinate (JX 1013)			
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)			
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)			
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX 1034)			
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX 1035)			
Galaxy S Showcase (i500) (JX 1017)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Mesmerize (JX 1015)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence **6.** that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed the D'087 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)			
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX 1034)			
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX 1035)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

7. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed the D'305 Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)			
Continuum (JX 1016)			
Droid Charge (JX 1025)			
Epic 4G (JX 1012)			
Fascinate (JX 1013)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S Showcase (i500) (JX 1017)			
Gem (JX 1020)			
Indulge (JX 1026)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Mesmerize (JX 1015)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

8. For each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed the <u>D'889</u> Patent?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)			
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (4G LTE) (JX 1038)			

9. If you found that Samsung Electronics America (SEA) or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) infringed in any of Questions 1 through 8, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), took action that it knew or should have known would induce SEA or SEC to infringe the <u>D'677, D'087, D'305</u>, and/or D'889 Patents?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

	D2/77 D-44	D2007 D-44	D2205 D-44	D2000
<b>Accused Samsung Product</b>	D'6// Patent	D'087 Patent	D'305 Patent	D'889 Patent
Captivate (JX 1011)				
Continuum (JX 1016)				
Droid Charge (JX 1025)				
Epic 4G (JX 1012)				
Fascinate (JX 1013)				
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)				
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)				
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)				
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)				
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)				
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)				
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX 1034)				
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX 1035)				
Galaxy S Showcase (i500) (JX 1017)				
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)				
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (4G LTE) (JX 1038)				
Gem (JX 1020)				
Indulge (JX 1026)				
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)				
Mesmerize (JX 1015)				
Vibrant (JX 1010)				

<b>10.</b>	If you answered "Yes" to any of Questions 1 through 9, and thus found that any
	Samsung entity has infringed any Apple patent(s), has Apple proven by clear and
	convincing evidence that the Samsung entity's infringement was willful?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Apple Utility and Design Patents	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
'381 Patent (Claim 19)			
'915 Patent (Claim 8)			
'163 Patent (Claim 50)			
D'677 Patent			
D'087 Patent			
D'305 Patent			
D'889 Patent			

# 11. Has Samsung proven by clear and convincing evidence that Apple's asserted utility and/or design patent claims are invalid?

<u>'381 Patent (Claim 19)</u>	Yes (for Samsung)	No (for Apple)
'915 Patent (Claim 8)	Yes (for Samsung)	No (for Apple)
'163 Patent (Claim 50)	Yes (for Samsung)	No (for Apple)
D'677 Patent	Yes (for Samsung)	No (for Apple)
D'087 Patent	Yes (for Samsung)	No (for Apple)
D'305 Patent	Yes (for Samsung)	No (for Apple)
D'889 Patent	Yes (for Samsung)	No (for Apple)

#### APPLE'S TRADE DRESS CLAIMS AGAINST SAMSUNG

#### **Protectability**

12. Has Samsung proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Apple's <u>registered</u> iPhone trade dress '983 is not protectable?

Yes (not protectable – for Samsung) \_\_\_\_\_ No (protectable – for Apple) \_\_\_\_\_

13. Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Apple's <u>unregistered</u> trade dresses are protectable?

(Please answer with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Apple Trade Dresses	Protectable
Unregistered iPhone 3 Trade Dress	
Unregistered Combination iPhone Trade Dress	
Unregistered iPad/iPad 2 Trade Dress	

### **Trade Dress Dilution**

14. Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Apple's trade dresses are famous?

(Please answer with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Apple Trade Dresses	Famous
Registered iPhone Trade Dress	
Unregistered iPhone 3 Trade Dress	
Unregistered Combination iPhone Trade Dress	
Unregistered iPad/iPad 2 Trade Dress	

If you did not find the registered iPhone trade dress protectable and famous, please skip to Question 16, and do not answer Question 15.

15. If you found the registered iPhone trade dress protectable and famous, for each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has diluted the registered iPhone trade dress?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)			
Continuum (JX 1016)			
Droid Charge (JX 1025)			
Epic 4G (JX 1012)			
Fascinate (JX 1013)			
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)			
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)			
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX 1034)			
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX 1035)			
Galaxy S II Showcase (i500) (JX 1017)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Mesmerize (JX 1015)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

If you did not find the unregistered iPhone 3 trade dress protectable and famous, please skip to Question 17, and do not answer Question 16.

16. If you found the unregistered iPhone 3 trade dress protectable and famous, for each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has diluted the unregistered iPhone 3 trade dress?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)			
Continuum (JX 1016)			
Droid Charge (JX 1025)			
Epic 4G (JX 1012)			
Fascinate (JX 1013)			
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)			
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)			
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX 1034)			
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX 1035)			
Galaxy S II Showcase (i500) (JX 1017)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Mesmerize (JX 1015)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

If you did not find the unregistered Combination iPhone trade dress protectable and famous, please skip to Question 18, and do not answer Question 17.

17. If you found the unregistered Combination iPhone trade dress protectable and famous, for each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has diluted the unregistered Combination iPhone trade dress?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Captivate (JX 1011)			
Continuum (JX 1016)			
Droid Charge (JX 1025)			
Epic 4G (JX 1012)			
Fascinate (JX 1013)			
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)			
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)			_
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)			
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)			
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX 1034)			
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX 1035)			
Galaxy S II Showcase (i500) (JX 1017)			
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)			
Mesmerize (JX 1015)			
Vibrant (JX 1010)			

If you did not find the unregistered iPad/iPad2 trade dress protectable and famous, please skip to Question 19, and do not answer Question 18.

18. If you found the unregistered iPad/iPad 2 trade dress protectable and famous, for each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has diluted the unregistered iPad/iPad 2 trade dress?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Accused Samsung Product	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)			
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (4G LTE) (JX 1038)			

If you did not answer "Yes" to any of Questions 15 through 18, please skip to Question 21, and do not answer Questions 19 and 20.

19. If you found that Samsung Electronics America (SEA) or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) infringed in any of Questions 15 through 18, for each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC) took action that it knew or should have known would induce SEA or STA to dilute any of the Apple trade dresses?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out.)

Accused Samsung Product	Registered iPhone Trade Dress	Unregistered iPhone 3 Trade Dress	Unregistered Combination iPhone Trade Dress	Unregistered iPad/iPad 2 Trade Dress
Captivate (JX 1011)				
Continuum (JX 1016)				
Droid Charge (JX 1025)				
Epic 4G (JX 1012)				
Fascinate (JX 1013)				
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)				
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)				
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)				
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)				
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)				
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)				
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)				
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX 1034)				
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX 1035)				
Galaxy S II Showcase (i500) (JX 1017)				
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)				
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (4G LTE) (JX 1038)				
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)				
Mesmerize (JX 1015)				

Vibrant (JX 1010)		

20. If you answered "Yes" to any of Questions 15 through 18, and thus found that any Samsung entity has diluted any Apple trade dress(es), has Apple proven by clear and convincing evidence that the Samsung entity's dilution was willful?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Asserted Trade Dress	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Registered iPhone Trade Dress			
Unregistered iPhone 3 Trade Dress			
Unregistered Combination iPhone Trade Dress			
Unregistered iPad/iPad 2 Trade Dress			

#### **Trade Dress Infringement**

If you did not find the unregistered iPad/iPad2 trade dress protectable, please skip to Question 24, and do not answer Questions 21 through 23.

21. If you found the unregistered iPad/iPad2 trade dress protectable, for each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC), Samsung Electronics America (SEA), and/or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) has infringed the unregistered\_iPad/iPad2 trade dress?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Asserted Trade Dress	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung Electronics America, Inc.	Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)			
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (4G LTE) (JX 1038)			

If you did not answer "Yes" to any of Question 21, please skip to Question 24, and do not answer Questions 22 and 23.

22. If you found that Samsung Electronics America (SEA) or Samsung Telecommunications America (STA) infringed in any of Question 21, for each of the following products, has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Samsung Electronics Co. (SEC) took action that it knew or should have known would induce SEA or STA to infringe Apple's unregistered iPad/iPad 2 trade dress?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Accused Samsung Product	Unregistered iPad/iPad 2 Trade Dress
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)	
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (4G LTE) (JX 1038)	

If you did not answer "Yes" to any of Question 21 and 22, please skip to Question 24, and do not answer Question 23.

23. If you answered "Yes" to any of Ouestions 21-22, and thus found that any Samsung entity has infringed Apple's unregistered iPad/iPad 2 trade dress, has Apple proven by clear and convincing evidence that the Samsung entity's infringement was willful?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung).)

Asserted Trade Dress	Samsung	Samsung	Samsung
	Electronics Co.,	Electronics	Telecommunications
	Ltd.	America, Inc.	America, LLC
Unregistered iPad/iPad 2 Trade Dress			

### **DAMAGES TO APPLE FROM SAMSUNG (IF APPLICABLE)**

24.	What is the total dollar amount that Apple is entitled to receive from Samsung on the
	claims on which you have ruled in favor of Apple?

# 25. For the total dollar amount in your answer to Question 24, please provide the dollar breakdown by product.

Accused Samsung Product	Amount
Captivate (JX 1011)	
Continuum (JX 1016)	
Droid Charge (JX 1025)	
Epic 4G (JX 1012)	
Exhibit 4G (JX 1028)	
Fascinate (JX 1013)	
Galaxy Ace (JX 1030)	
Galaxy Prevail (JX 1022)	
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX 1007)	
Galaxy S 4G (JX 1019)	
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX 1031)	
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX 1032)	
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX 1033)	
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX 1034)	
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX 1035)	
Galaxy S Showcase (i500) (JX 1017)	
Galaxy Tab (JX 1036)	
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and LTE) (JX 1037)	
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (4G LTE) (JX 1038)	
Gem (JX 1020)	
Indulge (JX 1026)	
Infuse 4G (JX 1027)	
Intercept (JX 1009)	
Mesmerize (JX 1015)	
Nexus S 4G (JX 1023)	
Replenish (JX 1024)	
Transform (JX 1014)	
Vibrant (JX 1010)	

### SAMSUNG'S UTILITY PATENT CLAIMS AGAINST APPLE

26. For each of the following products, has Samsung proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Apple infringed the indicated Samsung utility patent claims?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Samsung), or with an "N" for "no" (for Apple). Do not provide an answer for any cell that is blacked out. )

Accused	. 516 Р	'516 Patent	.941 F	'941 Patent	'711 Patent	'893 Patent	,460 Patent
Apple Product	Claim 15	Claim 16	Claim 10	Claim 15	Claim 9	Claim 10	Claim 1
iPhone 3G (JX 1053)							
iPhone 3GS (JX 1054 and JX 1076)							
iPhone 4 (JX1055 and JX 1056)							
iPad2 3G (JX 1050 and JX 1051)							
iPod Touch 4 <sup>th</sup> Gen. (JX 1057 and JX 1077)							

'516 Patent				
Claim 15:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
Claim 16:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
'914 Patent				
Claim 10:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
Claim 15:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
'711 Patent				
Claim 9:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
'893 Patent				
Claim 10:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
'460 Patent				
Claim 1:	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
3. Has Apple pro patent claims		r and convincing	evidence	that Samsung's as
			evidence	that Samsung's as
patent claims a	are invalid			that Samsung's as (for Samsung)
patent claims a	are invalid? Yes	?	No	C
reparent claims a constant claim 15:	are invalid? Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
repatent claims a constraint of the constraint o	Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple)	No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)
reparent claims a constraint of the constraint o	Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple) (for Apple)	No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung)
reparent claims a constraint of the constraint o	Yes Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple)	No No No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)
'516 Patent Claim 15: Claim 16:  '914 Patent Claim 10: Claim 15:	Yes Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple)	No No No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)
repatent claims a constraint of the claims a constraint of the claims a constraint of the claims and constraint of the claims are constraint of the claims are claims and constraint of the claims are	Yes Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple)	No No No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)
repatent claims a constraint of the constraint o	Yes Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple)	No No No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)
repatent claims a constraint of the claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 16: Claim 10: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 9: Claim 9: Claim 10: Claim 10: Claim 10: Claim 10:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple)	No No No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)
repatent claims a constraint of the claim 15: Claim 16: Claim 16: Claim 10: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 9: Claim 9:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple) (for Apple)	No No No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)
repatent claims a constraint of the claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 16: Claim 10: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 9: Claim 9: Claim 10: Claim 10: Claim 10: Claim 10:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple)	No No No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)
repatent claims a constraint of the claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 16: Claim 10: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 15: Claim 9: Claim 9: Claim 10: Claim 10: Claim 10: Claim 10:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	(for Apple)	No No No No	(for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung) (for Samsung)

	What is the total dollar amount that Samsung is en Apple's utility patent infringement claims on the '5	
		_
	\$	·
0.	What is the total dollar amount that Samsung is en Apple's utility patent infringement claims on the '7	
		•
	\$	·
1.	For the total dollar amounts in your answers to Qu the breakdown by product.	estion Nos. 29 and 30, pleas
	Accused Samsung Product	Amount
	iPhone 4 (JX1055 and JX 1056)	
	iPad2 3G (JX 1050 and JX 1051)	
	iPod Touch 4 <sup>th</sup> Gen. (JX 1057 and JX 1077)	
BR]	EACH OF CONTRACT CLAIMS AND ANTITRUS	<u>8T</u>
	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-disc	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rig or by failing to license its " riminatory ("FRAND") ter
	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rig or by failing to license its " riminatory ("FRAND") ter
2.	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discrete Yes (for Apple) No	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rigor by failing to license its "riminatory ("FRAND") term (for Samsung)
32.	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-disc	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rigion by failing to license its "riminatory ("FRAND") term (for Samsung)
2.	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discrete Yes (for Apple) No  Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act by monopolizing on	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rigior by failing to license its "riminatory ("FRAND") term (for Samsung)  nce that Samsung has violate or more technology mark
3.	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discrete the second secon	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rigior by failing to license its "riminatory ("FRAND") term (for Samsung)  nce that Samsung has violate or more technology mark  (for Samsung)
32.	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discrete Yes (for Apple) No  Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act by monopolizing on to the UMTS standard?	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rigior by failing to license its "riminatory ("FRAND") term (for Samsung)  nce that Samsung has violate or more technology mark (for Samsung)
3.	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discrete sesential patents on fair, reasonable, and n	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rigior by failing to license its "riminatory ("FRAND") term (for Samsung)  nce that Samsung has violate or more technology mark  (for Samsung)  ion No. 33, what is the dollate samsung's antitrust violation
3.	Has Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discrete that Apple proven by a preponderance of the evider 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act by monopolizing on to the UMTS standard?  Yes (for Apple) No  Yes (for Apple) No  If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 32 or Quest that Apple is entitled to receive from Samsung for Standard for Samsung for Standard for Samsung for Standard for Samsung	nce that Samsung breached its intellectual property rigior by failing to license its "riminatory ("FRAND") term (for Samsung)  nce that Samsung has violate or more technology mark  (for Samsung)  ion No. 33, what is the dollate samsung's antitrust violation

# United States District Court For the Northern District of California

<u>'516 Patent</u>	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
<u>'914 Patent</u>	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
<u>WAIVER</u>				
66. Has Apple prove to enforce the follow				nmsung has waived its rights
<u>'516 Patent</u>	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
<u>'914 Patent</u>	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
Have the presiding jurg	or sign and date t	his form.		
Have the presiding jurd	C		nte:	