1	HAROLD J. MCELHINNY (CA SBN 66781) hmcelhinny@mofo.com	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
2	MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664) mjacobs@mofo.com	Charles K. Verhoeven (Cal. Bar No. 170151)
3	JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368) jtaylor@mofo.com	50 California Street, 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111
4	ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363) atucher@mofo.com	Telephone: (415) 875-6600 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
5	RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425) rhung@mofo.com	Kevin P.B. Johnson (Cal. Bar No. 177129) Victoria F. Maroulis (Cal. Bar No. 202603)
6	JASON R. BARTLETT (CA SBN 214530) jasonbartlett@mofo.com	555 Twin Dolphin Drive 5th Floor Redwood Shores, California 94065
7	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street	Telephone: (650) 801-5000
8	San Francisco, California 94105-2482	Facsimile: (650) 801-5100 Michael T. Zeller (Cal. Bar No. 196417)
9	Telephone: (415) 268-7000 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522	865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff and	Telephone: (213) 443-3000 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100
11	Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.	Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
12		CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. and SAMSUNG
13		TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
17		
18	APPLE INC., a California corporation,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)
19	Plaintiff,	JOINT STIPULATION AND - (PROPOSED) ORDER
20	v.	DISMISSING CLAIMS WITHOUT PREJUDICE
21	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS	
22	AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS	
23	AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	
24	Defendants.	
25		
26		
27		
28		

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(ii), the Court's May 10, 2012 Order Regarding Parties' Statements Narrowing Claims to be Asserted at Trial (Dkt. No. 912), and the Court's directive during the June 29, 2012 Case Management Conference to further streamline and simplify the issues in this case, the parties, through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate and agree as set forth below. This statement reflects case narrowing that took place prior to trial.

WHEREAS, Apple Inc. ("Apple") commenced the above-captioned action (the "Litigation") against Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC (collectively "Samsung," and together with Apple, "the Parties" and individually each a "Party") on April 15, 2011;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Court's May 2, 2012 Case Management Order, a trial in this action commenced on July 30, 2012 (Dkt. No. 901);

WHEREAS, both parties have previously represented to each other and to the Court that each is willing to dismiss certain claims and counterclaims in the interests of streamlining and simplifying the issues in this case (Dkt. Nos. 893, 902, 1178, 1277);

WHEREAS, both parties previously submitted a Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order Dismissing Claims Without Prejudice, which was entered by the Court on May 29, 2012 (Dkt. No. 981); and

WHEREAS, both parties previously submitted a Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order Dismissing Claims Concerning D617,334 Without Prejudice, which was entered by the Court on June 21, 2012 (Dkt. 1116).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by the Parties as follows:

- 1. This Stipulation and Order dismisses without prejudice any claims by Apple against Samsung for infringement of Claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,663,607 (Tenth Claim for Relief).
- 2. This Stipulation and Order dismisses without prejudice any claims by Apple against Samsung for infringement or dilution by the original Galaxy Tab 7.0 of Apple's

unregistered iPad/iPad 2 trade dress (First and Fourth Claims for Relief). This Stipulation and Order does not dismiss Apple's claims against the Galaxy Tab 7.0 for infringement of Apple's utility patents.

- 3. This Stipulation and Order dismisses without prejudice any claims by Apple against Samsung's Acclaim, Nexus S, and Sidekick devices and any claims against the ThinkFree Office application relating to Apple's claims of infringement of the '381 Patent.
- 4. Samsung agrees that its corresponding counterclaims seeking declaratory judgment of non-infringement and invalidity for Apple's dismissed claims for infringement of the '607 Patent should be dismissed without prejudice. Samsung further agrees that its corresponding counterclaims of non-infringement against the Acclaim, Nexus S, and Sidekick devices and the ThinkFree Office application should be dismissed without prejudice. This stipulation of dismissal without prejudice is made subject to Samsung's reservation of rights to reassert these or other counterclaims and defenses relating to Apple's dismissed claims should any such dismissed claim be revived or reasserted by Apple for any reason.
- 5. This Stipulation and Order dismisses without prejudice any claims by Samsung against Apple for infringement of:
 - a. Claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,675,941;
 - b. Claim 17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,447,516;
 - c. Claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,698,711;
 - d. Claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,546,893; and
 - e. All remaining claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,928,604.
- 6. Apple agrees that its corresponding counterclaims seeking declaratory judgment of non-infringement and invalidity for Samsung's dismissed claims for infringement of claim 11 of the '941 Patent, claim 17 of the '516 Patent, claim 10 of the '711 Patent, claim 12 of the '893 Patent, and all remaining claims of the '604 Patent should be dismissed without prejudice. Apple further agrees that its corresponding counterclaims for Breach of Contract FRAND and Other Standard-Related Misconduct (Twenty-Fifth Counterclaim), Declaratory Judgment that Apple is Licensed to Samsung's Declared Essential Patents (Twenty-Seventh Counterclaim), violation of

Section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act (Twenty-Eighth Counterclaim), and Unfair Competition Under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, et seq. (Twenty-Ninth Counterclaim) as they relate to claim 11 of the '941 Patent, claim 17 of the '516 Patent,, and all remaining claims of the '604 Patent should be dismissed without prejudice. This stipulation of dismissal without prejudice is made subject to Apple's reservation of rights to reassert these or other counterclaims and defenses relating to Samsung's dismissed claims should any such dismissed claim be revived or reasserted by Samsung for any reason.

- 7. Apple agrees that its counterclaims seeking Breach of Contract FRAND and Other Standard-Related Misconduct (Twenty-Fifth Counterclaim), Declaratory Judgment that Apple is Licensed to Samsung's Declared Essential Patents (Twenty-Seventh Counterclaim), violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act (Twenty-Eighth Counterclaim) and Unfair Competition Under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, et seq. (Twenty-Ninth Counterclaim) for the Samsung claims dismissed in the May 29 Joint Stipulation and Order should be dismissed without prejudice. This stipulation of dismissal without prejudice is made subject to Apple's reservation of rights to reassert these or other counterclaims and defenses relating to Samsung's dismissed claims should any such dismissed claim be revived or reasserted by Samsung for any reason.
- 8. Due to the Court's granting summary adjudication of non-infringement with respect to Samsung's U.S. Patent No. 7,362,867 ("'867 patent") (Dkt. No. 1185), Apple agrees that its counterclaims seeking declaratory judgment of invalidity (Twelfth Counterclaim), Breach of Contract FRAND and Other Standard-Related Misconduct (Twenty-Fifth Counterclaim), Declaratory Judgment that Apple is Licensed to Samsung's Declared Essential Patents (Twenty-Seventh Counterclaim), violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act (Twenty-Eighth Counterclaim), and Unfair Competition Under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, et seq. (Twenty-Ninth Counterclaim) for the '867 patent should be dismissed without prejudice. This stipulation of dismissal without prejudice is made subject to Apple's reservation of rights to reassert these or other counterclaims and defenses relating to Samsung's dismissed claims should the '867 patent be revived or reasserted by Samsung for any reason.

1	
2	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.
3	
4	Dated: August 28 , 2012 By: The Honorebe Lycy H. Koh
5	The Honorab e Lucy H. Koh United States District Judge
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
2021	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
_0	