02198.51855/4157433.4

1 2	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVA Charles K. Verhoeven (Cal. Bar No. 170151) charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com 50 California Street, 22 nd Floor	AN, LLP	
3 4	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 875-6600 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700		
5	Kevin P.B. Johnson (Cal. Bar No. 177129)		
6	kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com Victoria F. Maroulis (Cal. Bar No. 202603)		
7	victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Drive 5 th Floor		
8	Redwood Shores, California 94065 Telephone: (650) 801-5000		
9	Facsimile: (650) 801-5100		
	Michael T. Zeller (Cal. Bar No. 196417) michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com		
	865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017		
12	Telephone: (213) 443-3000 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100		
13	Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS		
14	CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. and SAMSUNG		
15	TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC		
16	LINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
17			
18	APPLE INC., a California corporation,	CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK	
19	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 11 CV 01040 EMX	
		DECLARATION OF TODD M. BRIGGS	
20	VS.	IN SUPPORT OF SAMSUNG'S MOTION	
21	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean business entity; SAMSUNG	TO COMPEL APPLE TO PRODUCE RECIPROCAL EXPEDITED DISCOVERY AND UNOPPOSED CIVIL	
22	York corporation; SAMSUNG	L.R. 6-3 MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME	
23	TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,		
24	Defendants.		
25			
26			
27			
28		Coso No. 11 av. 01946 LIIV	
.55. F		Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK DECLARATION OF TODD M. BRIGGS	
- 1	1		

I, Todd M. Briggs, declare:

1. I am a partner in the law firm of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, counsel for Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC (collectively "Samsung"). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called upon as a witness, I could and would testify to such facts under oath.

Exhibits

- 2. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "Today in Tech: Why the iPad 3 is one to watch, Verizon killing unlimited data." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *CNN Money* at the following website address: http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2011/03/02/today-in-tech-why-the-ipad-3-yes-3-is-the-one-to-watch/.
- 3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "Apple: Analyst Says No LTE in iPhone 5; To Add Sprint, T-Mobile." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *Forbes* at the following website address: http://blogs.forbes.com/ericsavitz/2011/05/13/apple-analyst-says-no-lte-in-iphone-5-to-add-sprint-t-mobile/.
- 4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "Apple Presents iPhone 4." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *Apple* at the following website address: http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2010/06/07iphone.html.
- 5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "Apple Announces the New iPhone 3GS—The Fastest, Most Powerful iPhone Yet." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *Apple* at the following website address: http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2009/06/08iphone.html.
- 6. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 5** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "Apple Introduces the New iPhone 3G." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *Apple* at the following website address:
- http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2008/06/09iphone.html.

7. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 6** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "iPhone Premieres This Friday Night at Apple Retail Stores." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *Apple* at the following website address: http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2007/06/28iphone.html.

- 8. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 7** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "Apple Launches iPad 2." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *Apple* at the following website address: http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2011/03/02ipad.html.
- 9. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 8** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "Apple Launches iPad." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *Apple* at the following website address: http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2010/01/27ipad.html.
- 10. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 9** is a true and correct copy of a report entitled "Apple Discontinues Sale of IPhone 3G Model Ahead of Conference." This copy of this report was printed on May 25, 2011 from the website of *Bloomberg Businessweek* at the following website address: http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-06-04/apple-discontinues-sale-of-iphone-3g-model-ahead-of-conference.html.
- 11. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 10** is a true and correct copy of a letter sent on May 16, 2011 from Victoria F. Maroulis, of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, Samsung's counsel, to the attention of Jason R. Bartlett, of Morrison and Foerster LLP, Apple's counsel.
- 12. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 11** is a true and correct copy of a letter sent on May 19, 2011 from Victoria F. Maroulis, of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, Samsung's counsel, to the attention of Jason R. Bartlett, of Morrison and Foerster LLP, Apple's counsel.
- 13. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 12** is a true and correct copy of a letter sent on May 20, 2011 from Jason R. Bartlett, of Morrison and Foerster LLP, Apple's counsel, to the attention of Victoria F. Maroulis, of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, Samsung's counsel.
- 14. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 13** is a true and correct copy of a letter sent on May 24, 2011 from Jason R. Bartlett, of Morrison and Foerster LLP, Apple's counsel, to the attention of Todd Briggs, of Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, Samsung's counsel.

28

the website of *Apple* at the following website address:

http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2010/03/02patents.html.

26

Jason Bartlett of Morrison and Foerster LLP, dated May 26, 2011 and May 27, 2011.

29. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 28** is a true and correct copy of excerpts from a Transcript of Proceedings Before the Honorable Lucy H. Koh, United States District Judge, in Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., et al.,, No. C-11-01846-LHK (N.D. Cal.) (May 12, 2011).

Parties' Conference Concerning Discovery Dispute

- 30. On May 16, 2011, my partner, Victoria F. Maroulis, sent a letter to counsel for Apple, Inc. ("Apple") that set forth reciprocal discovery that Samsung requests from Apple.
- 31. Not having heard back from Apple, on May 19, 2011, Ms. Maroulis sent another letter to counsel for Apple, asking that Apple inform Samsung by the end of the week whether Apple would produce the discovery Samsung requested.
- 32. On May 20, 2011, Jason R. Bartlett, of Morrison & Foerster LLP, counsel for Apple, sent Ms. Maroulis a letter informing her that Apple rejected the discovery requests set forth in Ms. Maroulis' May 16 letter.
- 33. On May 23, 2011, I conducted a teleconference with Mr. Bartlett and Grant L. Kim, also of Morrison & Foerster LLP. My associate, Erik C. Olson, was also on the call. During the teleconference, I explained to counsel for Apple why Samsung needed the discovery requested in Ms. Maroulis' letter of May 16. Specifically, I explained that the requested discovery was relevant to an analysis of whether there will be a likelihood of confusion between Apple's future products and Samsung's future products. I asked counsel for Apple whether Apple would withdraw its rejection of Samsung's discovery requests in light of our discussion. Counsel for Apple said they would confer with Apple and get back to us with Apple's response the following day.
- 34. On May 24, 2011, Mr. Bartlett sent me a letter informing me that Apple maintained its refusal to produce the discovery requested in Ms. Maroulis' May 16 letter.

Samsung's Civil L.R. 6-3 Motion to Shorten Time For Briefing and Hearing Schedule Reasons for the Request

35. On May 18, 2011, the Court issued a written order granting Apple limited expedited discovery of Samsung's future products, including Samsung's production to Apple of

1	"[t
2	Int
3	pa
4	Ap
5	ex
6	diı
7	
8	rec
9	iP
10	the
11	be
12	
13	Sa

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

"[t]he latest iteration of product samples for the Galaxy S2, Galaxy Tab 8.9, Galaxy Tab 10.1, Infuse 4G, and 4G LTE (or 'Droid Charge')," as well as the latest iterations of the packaging and packaging inserts for these products. (Order Granting Limited Expedited Disc. (D.N. 52), at 6.) Apple stated in its Reply In Support of Its Motion to Expedite Discovery that "Apple seeks expedited discovery for the express purpose of evaluating a motion for a preliminary injunction directed at products to be released in the near future." (D.N. 34 at 6.)

- 36. On May 16, after the hearing on Apple's Motion to Expedite Discovery, Samsung requested that Apple produce samples of the final, commercial version of the next generation iPhone and iPad that Apple will release, as well as the final version of the packaging in which these products will be delivered to retail customers and the final version of the insert(s) that will be included within such packaging.
- 37. Apple has informed Samsung that Apple does not believe that the discovery that Samsung has requested will be relevant to the resolution of a motion for a preliminary injunction that Apple will bring in this lawsuit.
- 38. Apple has not agreed to provide any discovery prior to its filing of a preliminary injunction motion.
- 39. Samsung seeks resolution of this discovery dispute on a shortened schedule so that it is not prejudiced in defending against Apple's motion for a preliminary injunction by Apple's early access to Samsung's products, but Samsung's delayed access to the discovery it seeks from Apple.

Samsung's Effort's to Obtain a Stipulation

40. On May 26, 2011, my associate, Erik C. Olson, e-mailed Mr. Bartlett asking whether Apple would join a stipulated request to shorten time on the briefing and hearing schedule for Samsung's Motion to Compel Apple to Produce Reciprocal Expedited Discovery ("Motion to Compel"). Attached to the email was a draft stipulated request. Mr. Olson asked Mr. Bartlett to inform Samsung whether Apple would join the stipulated request by the morning of May 27. (Ex. 27, attached hereto.)

28

27

02198.51855/4157433.4

- 41. On May 27, Mr. Bartlett e-mailed Mr. Olson, stating that Apple declined to join the stipulated request. However, Mr. Bartlett also stated that Apple would not oppose a motion by Samsung to obtain the briefing schedule set forth below.
 - Samsung's Opening Brief on its Motion will be due on or before May 27, 2011;
 - Apple's Opposition to Samsung's Motion will be due on or before June 2, 2011; and
 - Samsung's Reply in support of its Motion will be due on or before June 7, 2011.
- (Ex. 27, attached hereto.)

Prejudice that Samsung Will Suffer If the Court Does Not Shorten Time

- 42. Currently, Samsung must produce to Apple samples of the latest iterations of the Galaxy S2, Galaxy Tab 8.9, Galaxy Tab 10.1, Infuse 4G and 4G LTE, and those products' packaging and packaging inserts by June 17.
- 43. Apple has stated that it sought these product samples "for the express purpose of evaluating a motion for a preliminary injunction directed at [Samsung] products to be released in the near future." (Apple's Reply In Support of Mot. to Expedite Disc. (D.N. 34), at 6.)
- 44. Apple has not agreed to provide any discovery prior to its filing of a preliminary injunction motion.
- 45. If Samsung's Motion to Compel is not heard on a shortened schedule, Apple will have the opportunity to use Samsung's produced product samples and other discovery to work up its motion for a preliminary injunction and supporting evidence. In the meantime, Samsung would not have relevant discovery from Apple that it could use to prepare its defense to such a motion. Any delay in resolving the current discovery dispute would thus prejudice Samsung's ability to defend itself on the merits against any motion for a preliminary injunction.

Prior Time Modifications

46. On Monday, April 19, 2011, Apple filed a Motion to Expedite Discovery. (D.N. 10.) Also on April 19, Apple filed a Motion to Shorten Time for Briefing and Hearing on its Motion to Expedite Discovery ("Motion to Shorten Time"). (D.N. 12.) The Court granted in part Apple's Motion to Shorten Time, resulting in an approximately 12-day shortening of the

02198.51855/4157433.4

1	briefing and hearing schedule that would have otherwise been allowable under the Local Rules.
2	(D.N. 26.)
3	Effect of Requested Modification
4	47. The requested modification should have no effect on the rest of the schedule in this
5	action.
6	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in
7	Redwood Shores, California on May 27, 2011.
8	
9	
10	By /s/ Todd M. Briggs
11	Todd M. Briggs
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
02198.51855/4157433.4	-8- Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK

DECLARATION OF TODD M. BRIGGS