

# Exhibit E

**From:** Maselli, Samuel [Samuel.Maselli@wilmerhale.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2011 7:31 AM  
**To:** Victoria Maroulis  
**Cc:** 'Samsungv.Apple@quinnemanuel.com'; AppleMoFo; WH Apple Samsung NDCal Service  
**Subject:** Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd, et al., Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (N.D. Cal.) - Correspondence  
**Attachments:** 2011-12-14 Letter from Maselli to Maroulis.pdf

Victoria,

Please find the attached correspondence related to the above-referenced action.

Regards,

Sam Maselli

**Samuel Maselli | WilmerHale**

950 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304 USA  
+1 650 858 6148 (t)  
+1 650 858 6100 (f)  
sam.maselli@wilmerhale.com

**Please consider the environment before printing this email.**

---

This email message and any attachments are being sent by Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately—by replying to this message or by sending an email to [postmaster@wilmerhale.com](mailto:postmaster@wilmerhale.com)—and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you.

For more information about WilmerHale, please visit us at <http://www.wilmerhale.com>.

December 14, 2011

**Samuel Maselli**

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

+1 650 858 6148(t)  
+1 650 858 6100(f)  
samuel.maselli@wilmerhale.com

Victoria Maroulis, Esq.  
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, California 94065

Re: *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. et al.*, Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (N.D. Cal.)

Dear Victoria:

We write in response to your December 5 letter regarding proposed reciprocal stipulations to amend the parties' infringement contentions.

Your letter, which was sent in response to my November 30, 2011 letter, does not answer the questions I asked. While you say that "Samsung believes that the contentions under Local P.R. 3-1 need to be amended for each added product," you do not explain in what respect(s) Samsung seeks to amend its infringement contentions. We understand that Samsung wants to amend its contentions to identify the iPhone 4S as an accused product. My question was whether Samsung seeks to amend any other aspect of its contentions.

Accordingly, I ask again that you please let us know as soon as possible whether Samsung seeks to modify in any way its disclosures and contentions set forth on September 7, 2011 pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-1(a), (c)-(h), or, on the other hand, whether Samsung will commit in this case to the identical infringement theories for the iPhone 4S as those set forth against the Apple products previously identified.

Finally, in response to your question of how Apple intends to proceed, as noted in the proposed stipulation that we circulated on November 9, Apple plans to proceed under our previously disclosed theories with respect to the additional Samsung products.

Yours very truly,

*/s/ Samuel J. Maselli*

Samuel J. Maselli

cc: Counsel of Record