

# EXHIBIT I

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

```

-----x
APPLE INC., a California      )
corporation,                  )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
-----x

```

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 11-CV-01846LHK

```

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., )
a Korean entity; SAMSUNG      )
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a )
New York corporation; SAMSUNG )
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, )
LLC,                           )
a Delaware limited liability )
Company,                         )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
                               )
-----x

```

Defendants.

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF TONY GIVARGIS, PH.D.  
Los Angeles, California  
Tuesday, December 6, 2011

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Reported by:  
SUSAN A. SULLIVAN, CSR #3522, RPR, CRR  
JOB NO. 44330

1 MR. SHAH: Ali Shah, WilmerHale, for the witness  
2 and representing Apple.

3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you.

4 And will the reporter now swear or affirm  
5 the witness.

6

7 TONY GIVARGIS, PH.D.,

8 called as a witness, having been duly sworn by  
9 the court reporter, was examined and testified  
10 as follows:

11

12 EXAMINATION

13 BY MS. MAROULIS:

14 Q Good morning, Mr. Givargis. How are you  
15 today?

16 A Good, thank you.

17 Q My name is Victoria Maroulis and I will be  
18 asking you some questions today.

19 Have you ever been deposed before?

20 A No.

21 Q In that case let me briefly run you through  
22 the rules of the deposition.

23 First of all, do you understand that you  
24 are testifying today like you would be in a court of  
25 law under oath even though we're sitting in a

1 MR. SHAH: Objection. The document speaks for  
2 itself.

3 THE WITNESS: In my document I use Java as a  
4 very good example of an operating-system independent  
5 environment in programming language paradigm, you  
6 will say. But it certainly is not the only  
7 operating-system independent kind of applet for  
8 language.

9 Q BY MS. MAROULIS: The definition of  
10 operating-system independent you just used today is  
11 broader than what you used in your declaration,  
12 correct?

13 MR. SHAH: Objection; mischaracterizes his  
14 testimony.

15 THE WITNESS: Can you refer me to the definition  
16 I have used in the declaration?

17 Q BY MS. MAROULIS: I understand your  
18 declaration to equate Java and operating-system  
19 independence; is that right?

20 A It is the case that Java is an operating-  
21 system independent programming language.

22 Q Nowhere in your declaration have you  
23 actually stated the definition of the operating-  
24 system independence that you used a few minutes ago  
25 when I asked you a question; is that right?

1 MR. SHAH: Objection; the document speaks for  
2 itself.

3 THE WITNESS: That is correct, yes.

4 Q BY MS. MAROULIS: Now Mr. Cole considers  
5 the applets you and I have been discussing systems,  
6 operating-systems dependent, correct?

7 A Mr. Cole lists these applets and in some  
8 cases draws that conclusion. For example, in the  
9 case of AppleScript it says that AppleScript is a  
10 system scripting language used for the Macintosh OS  
11 operating system.

12 Q Do you disagree with him with respect to  
13 that?

14 A I do not disagree with him but I'm not  
15 certain if what Mr. Cole, for instance, says in 52  
16 eliminates the possibility of AppleScript being  
17 operating-system independent.

18 Q Would you be able to run an AppleScript  
19 applets on a Windows computer?

20 A If I could obtain the specification for  
21 AppleScript programming language, the scripting  
22 language, and if I were to build an interpreter that  
23 ran natively on Windows, then I could take an  
24 AppleScript applet and, without modification, run it  
25 or interpret it on the Windows environment.

1 Q But that would require constructing a whole  
2 new operating system, essentially, correct?

3 A That would require constructing an  
4 application that would be the host, that would be  
5 the interpreter of the AppleScript applet.

6 Q Without being able to construct a host or  
7 an interpreter you cannot run an AppleScript applet  
8 on a Windows system, correct?

9 A In the absence of an interpreter it would  
10 be impossible to run an AppleScript. Well, it would  
11 not be, that I can think of, possible to run an  
12 AppleScript applet, that is correct, yes.

13 Q Could you run a AppleScript applet on a  
14 Linux machine?

15 A Again, if I could design and implement this  
16 host application that had the ability to interpret  
17 the scripting language, AppleScript, then I would be  
18 able to take any AppleScript applet without  
19 modification and run that in the context of that  
20 interpreter on a Linux box.

21 Q But, again, if you could not build the host  
22 application and cause it to interpret the scripting  
23 language you could not run an AppleScript applet on  
24 a Linux, right?

25 A That is correct. A Linux box requires, has

1 its own machine language and -- which is

2 incompatible with an AppleScript applet, yes.

3 Q You used the term "translator" a minute  
4 ago, correct?

5 A Correct.

6 Q What is that?

7 A An interpreter is sometimes also referred  
8 to as a translator because it, in essence, it reads  
9 an instruction that is written in Program A, for  
10 example AppleScript, and translates it to an  
11 instruction that is -- that can be executed on a  
12 Machine B running a particular operating system.

13 Q Is there any mention of translators or  
14 interpreters in the '711 patent?

15 MR. SHAH: Objection; the document speaks for  
16 itself.

17 THE WITNESS: I do not think so, no.

18 Q BY MS. MAROULIS: To your recollection is  
19 there any mention of translators or interpreters in  
20 the file history of the '711 patent?

21 MR. SHAH: Same objection.

22 THE WITNESS: I do not think so, no.

23 Q BY MS. MAROULIS: Going to Mr. Cole's  
24 declaration, do you agree with the intrinsic  
25 evidence on which he relies?

1 MR. SHAH: Take whatever time you need.

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 MR. SHAH: Review that portion of the document.

4 Q BY MS. MAROULIS: And for your reference it  
5 is stated on Pages 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of his  
6 declaration.

7 A Yes. I do not agree with it entirely.

8 Q You disagree with his characterization,  
9 correct?

10 A That is correct.

11 Q But you do agree with the actual passages  
12 of which he relies?

13 MR. SHAH: Objection; vague.

14 THE WITNESS: I do agree that the passages were  
15 lifted directly from the '711 patent, especially the  
16 ones in the code, yes.

17 Q BY MS. MAROULIS: And those are the same  
18 passage of the specification in which you relied,  
19 correct?

20 A That is correct, yes.

21 Q I meant to ask you and I forgot. On Page 3  
22 there's a definition of "person of ordinary skill in  
23 the art" in Mr. Cole's declaration. Do you see  
24 that?

25 A Yes.



1 State of California )  
2 County of Los Angeles ) ss.  
3

4 I, SUSAN A. SULLIVAN, CALIFORNIA CSR No.  
5 3522, RPR, CRR, do hereby certify:

6 That prior to being examined TONY GIVARGIS,  
7 PH.D., the witness named in the foregoing  
8 deposition, was, before the commencement of the  
9 deposition, duly administered an oath in accordance  
10 with C.C.P. Section 2094;

11 That the said deposition was taken before  
12 me at the time and place therein set forth, and was  
13 taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter  
14 transcribed into typewriting under my direction and  
15 supervision; that the said deposition is a true and  
16 correct record of the testimony given by the  
17 witness;

18 I further certify that I am neither counsel  
19 for, nor in any way related to any party to said  
20 action, nor in any way interested in the outcome  
21 thereof.

22 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my  
23 name on this 6th day of December, 2011.

24  
25

  
SUSAN A. SULLIVAN