

EXHIBIT 5

March 10, 2012

Writer's Direct Contact
650.813.5718
MPernick@mofocom

Via E-Mail (dianehutnyan@quinnemanuel.com)

Diane Hutnyan
Quinn Emanuel
865 South Figueroa St., 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2543

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

Dear Diane:

This responds to your letter from yesterday regarding the next lead counsel meet-and-confer session.

Apple too takes the Court's order requiring an in-person lead counsel meet-and-confer session very seriously. That is why we proposed four separate days between March 5th and March 11th when Mr. McElhinny was available to meet with Samsung's counsel in person. We even offered to meet on a weekend. Although we understand that all of us have busy calendars, it is unfortunate that Samsung was not available on any of the dates we suggested, and that Mr. Verhoeven only had three days during this period when he could meet.

In any event, given both parties' scheduling constraints, we are open to your suggestions about how to proceed. If Samsung wants to approach the Court to request relief from Judge Koh's August 25, 2011 order, we would join in a motion for administrative relief allowing non-lead trial counsel to meet and confer. Michael Jacobs is available on Wednesday, March 14th, and we could meet any time that day in your San Francisco office as requested. If March 14th works for Samsung, we would propose exchanging agendas by Noon on March 13th.

Finally, for the record, my March 6th letter did not propose holding the lead counsel meeting on March 26th. As a courtesy, I was merely informing you that—after Samsung had rejected our offers to meet on March 5th, March 6th, March 7th, and March 11th—Mr. McElhinny himself would not be able to attend another lead counsel session in person until March 26th.

Rachel Herrick Kassabian
March 10, 2012
Page Two

Sincerely,

/s/ Marc J. Pernick

Marc J. Pernick

cc: Peter Kolovos
S. Calvin Walden