Exhibit I

```
Page 1
 1
          UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
         NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
               SAN JOSE DIVISION
 3
 4
 5
 6
     APPLE INC., A CALIFORNIA
 7
     CORPORATION,
                   PLAINTIFF,
 8
 9
          VS.
                                  : CASE NO.
                                  : 11-CV-01846-LHK
10
     SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS, CO.,
     LTD., A KOREAN BUSINESS
11
     ENTITY; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
     AMERICA, INC., A NEW YORK
12
     CORPORATION; SAMSUNG
     TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,
13
     LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED
     LIABILITY COMPANY,
14
                      DEFENDANTS
15
16
17
18
19
20
           DEPOSITION OF ANDRIES VAN DAM, an Expert
     Witness in the above-entitled cause, taken on
     behalf of the Plaintiff, before Barbara
21
     Warner, RPR, Notary Public in and for the
22
     State of Rhode Island, at the offices of
     Allied Court Reporters, 115 Phenix Avenue,
     Cranston, RI, on September 14, 2011
23
     at 9:30 A.M.
24
25
     Job Number: 41901
```

```
Page 2
 1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
 3
     FOR THE PLAINTIFF APPLE INC.:
     MORRISON & FOERSTER
     BY: RICHARD S.J. HUNG, ESQ.
     BY: DEOK KEUN MATTHEW AHN, ESQ.
 5
     425 MARKET STREET
     SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105
 6
 7
 8
 9
     FOR THE DEFENDANTS SAMSUNG:
10
     QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES
     BY:
         TODD M. BRIGGS, ESQ.
11
     BY:
         AARON KAUFMAN, ESQ.
     555 TWIN DOLPHIN DRIVE
12
     REDWOOD SHORES, CALIFORNIA 94065
13
14
15
     ALSO PRESENT:
    MIKE HENRIQUES, VIDEOGRAPHER
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

				Page 3
1				
2				
3		INDEX		
4	WITNESS	P	AGE	
5				
6	ANDRIES VAN	DAM		
7	711VDICED V711V			
8				
9	EXAMINATION BY MR. HUNG			
10	EXAMINATION	DI MK. HONG 0		
11				
12		EVIITDIMO		
13		EXHIBITS		
14	DESCRIPTION	Р	AGE	
15	EXHIBIT 129	NOTICE OF DEPOSITION	6	
16	EXHIBIT 130	DECLARATION OF ANDRIES	6	
17		VAN DAM	6	
18	EXHIBIT 131	LONG VERSION OF VAN DAM CV	6	
19	EXHIBIT 132	iPAQ	58	
20	EXHIBIT 133	CHECKERBOARD DOCUMENT	122	
21	EXHIBIT 134	EXHIBIT A TO THE BEDERSON DECLARATION	145	
22	D.W. T.D. T. 105			
23		SONY DEVICE	159	
24	EXHIBIT 136	EXHIBIT 4 TO THE VAN DAM DECLARATION	164	
25	EXHIBIT 137	BATES NUMBERS 1156		

				Page 4	
1	EXHIBITS				
2					
3	DESCRIPTION	I	PAGE		
4	EXHIBIT 138	EXHIBIT 5 TO THE VAN DAM DECLARATION	176		
5	EXHIBIT 139	VAN DEN HOVEN REFERENCE	177		
6	EXHIBIT 140	READING AND WRITING THE	4.0.4		
7		ELECTRONIC BOOK	184		
8	EXHIBIT 141	SOURCE CODE MODULE	199		
9					
10					
11					
12	*EXHIBITS 132 AND 135 RETAINED BY THE ATTORNEYS.				
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

Page 5

- 1 (DEPOSITION COMMENCED AT 9:54 A.M.)
- 2 ANDRES VAN DAM
- 3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the
- 4 start of the tape labeled number 1 of the
- 5 videotaped deposition of Andries van Dam in
- 6 the matter of Apple Inc., versus Samsung
- 7 Electronics Company, Limited, in the United
- 8 States District Court, Northern District of
- 9 California, San Jose Division. The
- 10 deposition is being held at Allied Court
- 11 Reporters, 115 Phenix Avenue, Cranston, Rhode
- 12 Island on September 14, 2011 at approximately
- 13 9:54 a.m.
- 14 My name is Mike Henriques. I am
- 15 the legal video specialist from TSG
- 16 Reporting, Inc., headquarted at 747 Third
- 17 Avenue, New York, New York. The court
- 18 reporter is Barbara Warner in association
- 19 with TSG Reporting. And if counsel could
- 20 please introduce themselves.
- 21 MR. HUNG: Richard Hung of
- 22 Morrison & Foerster for Apple Inc. With me
- 23 today is Matthew Ahn, also of Morrison &
- 24 Foerster.
- 25 MR. BRIGGS: Todd Briggs from

- 1 Q. Or doesn't infringe, as represented in those
- 2 claim charts?
- 3 A. Correct.
- 4 Q. Do you have any patents of your own?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. I take it you are not an inventor on any
- 7 patent, whether a utility patent or design
- 8 patent?
- 9 A. I am not.
- 10 Q. Or form patent?
- 11 A. I am not.
- 12 Q. Now, I would like to get into some of the
- 13 substance of your declaration.
- 14 A. Please.
- 15 Q. Turn to paragraph 21 of your declaration.
- 16 A. Starting with --
- 17 Q. I apologize. Paragraph 21 on page 5. I will
- use paragraphs today to make it easier.
- 19 A. That's fine.
- MR. HUNG: Todd, if I can help him
- just find the paragraph.
- MR. BRIGGS: Sure.
- 23 A. I have read it.
- 24 Q. I will be referring today to this snap-back
- 25 feature referenced in paragraph 21, and I

Page 30

- 1 want to make sure we are on the same page
- with respect to how we understand that
- feature. Describe to me what you meant by
- 4 the snap-back feature?
- 5 A. Yes. If you are moving an electronic
- document in a certain direction, and you
- 7 scroll it past its edge, where there is no
- 8 new information to come into view, you are
- going to be displaying beyond the edge. If
- 10 your excursion beyond the edge is small and
- 11 you lift your finger or your stylist,
- whatever your pointing device is, then the
- view will snap back so that there is no
- 14 unrelated information to be seen. That
- 15 material beyond the edge disappears. So it
- 16 should be seen as a mechanism for overpanning
- or overscrolling and realigning the final
- 18 view.
- 19 Q. There are two more words I want to ask you
- about two, three more words, because at least
- 21 two of them appeared in your declaration.
- What do you mean by overpanning?
- 23 A. Going beyond the edge. An attempt to pull
- the electronic document further than it
- 25 should go and this particular form of visual

Page 31

- 1 feedback lets you know that by as soon as you
- lift up, snapping the document to another
- 3 view in which there is no material beyond the
- 4 edge visible.
- 5 Q. I take it that overscrolling is different
- 6 than overpanning?
- 7 A. No, I mean them exactly the same way.
- 8 Scrolling to some people means moving in a
- 9 linear direction, similar direction. Panning
- 10 may mean that or it could mean in an
- arbitrary direction in a way that a film
- 12 camera can pan.
- 13 Q. You refer to the feature as snap-back. Is
- that the same as moving back? Is there a
- distinction between moving back and snapping
- 16 back?
- 17 A. Yes, there is.
- 18 Q. What is the distinction?
- 19 A. The term snap-back or bounce-back is used
- 20 to indicate that there is an attempt to
- 21 simulate a kind of physics which you would
- get from, say, attaching a rubber band to the
- edge and having the rubber band pull the edge
- back. So the animation which you can see on
- 25 my iPhone does that. It gives you the

1 CERTIFICATE I, Barbara Warner, a Notary Public in 2 and for the State of Rhode Island, duly commissioned and qualified to administer 3 oaths, do hereby certify that the foreging Deposition of Andries van Dam, a Witness in the above-entitled cause, was taken before me 4 on behalf of the Plaintiff, at the offices of 5 Allied Court Reporters, 115 Phenix Avenue, Cranston, Rhode Island on September 14, 2011 6 at 9:30 A.M.; that previous to examination of said witness, who was of lawful age, he was 7 first sworn by me and duly cautioned to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and that he thereupon 8 testified in the foregoing manner as set out 9 in the aforesaid transcript. I further testify that the foregoing 10 Deposition was taken down by me in machine 11 shorthand and was later transcribed by computer, and that the foregoing Deposition 12 is a true and accurate record of the testimony of said witness. 13 Pursuant to Rules 5(b) and 30(f) of the 14 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, original transcripts shall not be filed in Court; 15 therefore, the original is delivered to and retained by Plaintiff's attorney, Richard S.J. Hung, Esquire. 16 17 Correction and signature pages were sent to Plaintiff's Counsel, Todd M. Briggs. 18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set 19 my hand and seal this 15th day of September, 2011. 20 21 22 23 24 BARBARA WARNER, NOTARY PUBLIC/CERTIFIED 25 COURT REPORTER

1	NAME OF CASE: Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.
2	DATE OF DEPOSITION: September 14, 2011
3	NAME OF WITNESS: Andries Van Dam
4	
5	
6	ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT
7	
8	I, ANDRIES VAN DAM, do hereby acknowledge that I have
9	read and examined the foregoing testimony, and the same
10	is a true, correct and complete transcription of the
11	testimony given by me, with the exception of the noted
12	corrections, if any, appearing on the attached errata
13	sheet signed by me, to the best of my knowledge and
14	belief.
15	
16	190ct 2011 anders WIT
17	(Date) (Signature)
18	
19	Subscribed and sworn to before me this AMANDA MORRISSETTE
20	day of UCOU. NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
21	My commission expires MY COMMISSION EXPIRES NOV. 21, 2012
22	Notary Public Waylel Missill
23	
24	
25	