## **EXHIBIT G**

MORRISON | FOERSTER

425 MARKET STREET SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA 94105-2482

TELEPHONE: 415.268.7000 FACSIMILE: 415.268.7522 WWW.MOFO.COM MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
NEW YORK, SAN FRANCISCO,
LOS ANGELES, PALO ALTO,
SACRAMENTO, SAN DIEGO,
DENVER, NORTHERN VIRGINIA,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

TOKYO, LONDON, BRUSSELS, BEIJING, SHANGHAI, HONG KONG

January 2, 2012

Writer's Direct Contact 415.268.6615 JasonBartlett@mofo.com

Via E-Mail (marissaducca@quinnemanuel.com)

Marissa Ducca Quinn Emanuel 1299 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 825 Washington, D.C. 20004

Re: Apple v. Samsung, Case No. 11-cv-1846-LHK (PSG) (N.D. Cal.)

Dear Marissa:

This letter responds to yours of December 29, 2011, relating to Apple's production of Mac OS v.10.0 source code.

*First*, Apple has made all reasonable efforts to comply with Samsung's demand for Mac OS v. 10.0 code and hardware. As promised, by December 15, Apple provided a working computer running Mac OS v. 10.0 and selected source code for both OS 10.0 and 10.1. When, after review, Samsung requested that Apple produce additional OS 10.0 source code, Apple did so *within 24 hours*. Samsung has reviewed the additional code and has not made any further requests.

With respect to the working computer, Samsung made no specific requests that a laptop computer with a brightness button, rather than a desktop computer with a brightness button, be provided. Samsung's accusation that Apple made "false" representations to the Court are *absolutely without basis*. Apple, unlike Samsung, has more than complied with its discovery obligations.

Second, Samsung's demand that Apple sign a stipulation on less than 24 hours notice is completely unreasonable. As your letter acknowledges, Apple and Samsung discussed the possibility of a stipulation *nine days ago* on December 21 and Samsung promised to get back to Apple quickly with a proposal. Samsung failed to do so until yesterday. We will discuss Samsung's proposal with Apple as soon as they return from their holiday break on January 3 and respond in due course.

Samsung does not need Apple to stipulate to obtain the information Samsung seeks, however. The public release date of software or hardware is information suited to an

## MORRISON | FOERSTER

Marissa Ducca January 2, 2012 Page Two

interrogatory. Samsung could help itself by serving one. Samsung's demand for a stipulation appears to be an attempt to end-run the agreed discovery limits in this case.

Sincerely,

/s/ Jason R. Bartlett

Jason R. Bartlett

cc: Samuel Maselli S. Calvin Walden Peter Kolovos