

Exhibit K

Hung, Richard S. J.

From: Todd Briggs [toddbriggs@quinnemanuel.com]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 10:03 AM
To: Hung, Richard S. J.; Victoria Maroulis
Cc: Jacobs, Michael A.; 'Mark.Selwyn@wilmerhale.com'; Monach, Andrew E.; Ow, Eric W
Subject: RE: Apple v. Samsung -- Revised New Products Stipulation
Rich,

Where do we stand on this? As I mentioned last night, Samsung is fine with last part of the stipulation so long as you include the "absent good cause" language. Please let me know if that will work for Apple. It is now Saturday in Korea, so I will have a very difficult time today working out this stipulation if we cannot settle on that language.

Thanks, Todd

From: Hung, Richard S. J. [mailto:RHung@mof.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 10:19 PM
To: Todd Briggs; Victoria Maroulis
Cc: Jacobs, Michael A.; Mark.Selwyn@wilmerhale.com; Monach, Andrew E.; Ow, Eric W
Subject: Apple v. Samsung -- Revised New Products Stipulation

Todd --

Here you go. Attached is a draft deleting "substantially" from both parties' sections, as discussed. It includes our revised proposal re: additional discovery (to replace our prior "good cause" language). I think that the latter point is the only (but significant) point on which we disagree.

Please let me know your thoughts.

Rich

Richard S.J. Hung
Morrison & Foerster LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 268-7602 (direct)
(415) 268-7522 (fax)
rhung@mof.com
www.mof.com

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, Morrison & Foerster LLP informs you that, if any advice concerning one or more U.S. Federal tax issues is contained in this communication (including any attachments), such advice is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed