Apple Inc. v. Sams	ng Electronics Co. Ltd. et al	Doc. 639 Att. 6	
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 26	UNITED STATES	B DISTRICT COURT LIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK-PSG [PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING APPLE'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER REGARDING SAMSUNG'S FIRST RULE 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION NOTICE	
26			
27			
28			
	[DDODOSED] ODDED DENVING AD	-1- Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK	
	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING APPLE'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER		

1	On January 10, 2012, Plaintiff Apple Inc. ("Apple") moved for a protective order relieving		
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$	it of any obligation to respond to or comply with Samsung's First 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice,		
3	served to Apple on December 14, 2011. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. ("Samsung") has		
4	opposed the motion.		
5	Having considered the briefs and the arguments of the parties, the Court finds that Apple		
6	has not shown good cause for the entry of a protective order, and hereby DENIES Apple's motion		
7	for a protective order in its entirety. Apple shall identify its Rule 30(b)(6) designee(s) for the		
8	topics listed in Samsung's Notice within five calendar days of the date of this Order, and shall		
9	make the witness(es) available for deposition on mutually agreeable dates on or before March 1,		
10	2012.		
11			
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
13			
14	DATED:, 2012		
15			
16			
17	The Honorable Paul S. Grewal		
18	United States Magistrate Judge		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	O N. 11 01046 I IIV		
	-2- Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK [PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING APPLE'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER		