Exhibit 32

1	
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
2	MARSHALL DIVISION
3	FRACTUS * Civil Docket No. * 6.09-CV-203
4	VS. * Tyler, Texas
5	* * May 20, 2011
6	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS, CO., LTD., * ET AL * 8:30 A.M.
7	TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL
8	BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONARD DAVIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	APPEARANCES:
10	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: MR. MAX TRIBBLE, JR.
11	Susman Godfrey 1000 Louisiana Street
12	Suite 5100 Houston, TX 77002
13	MR. MICHAEL HEIM
14	MR. LESLIE PAYNE Heim Payne & Chorush
	600 Travis St., Suite 6710
15	Houston, TX 77002
16	MR. JUSTIN NELSON MS. GENEVIEVE VOSE
17	Susman Godfrey 1201 Third Avenue
18	Suite 3800
19	Seattle, WA 98101
20	APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE:
21	
22	COURT REPORTERS: MS. SUSAN SIMMONS, CSR MS. JUDITH WERLINGER, CSR
23	Official Court Reporter 100 East Houston, Suite 125
24	Marshall, TX 75670 903/935-3868
25	(Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced on CAT system.)

```
106
   Was Samsung aware in 2006, while it was still doing
1
  business with Fractus, that Fractus was already building
2
3
  this nice jury story of infringement of the multilevel
   patent?
4
5
             This is the first time that I'm hearing it.
        Α.
             And that is a Samsung phone that's contained
6
7
   on Exhibit 172; is that correct?
8
        Α.
             Yes, it is.
9
             And at that time, Fractus and Samsung were
        Ο.
10
   still doing business together?
        Α.
            Yes.
11
12
            And never told you that they were -- had it in
13
   mind all along to sue us three years later?
14
             That's right. We never heard anything like
        Α.
15
   that.
16
                  MR. BARTA: Pass the witness.
17
                  THE COURT: All right. Cross-exam.
18
                       CROSS-EXAMINATION
19
   BY MR. NELSON:
20
            Good afternoon, Mr. Kim -- or good morning
21
   still.
22
        Α.
            Yes.
```

- 2.3 You understand that once a lawsuit has been
- 24 filed, every party has an obligation to preserve
- 25 relevant documents, correct?

1 Yes, I do. Α. 2 Your e-mails continued to delete after 14 days 3 even after this lawsuit was filed and after we had given notice about you personally to Samsung, correct? 4 5 Well, system-wise. It is system-wise. Α. system itself would -- is such way that it -- those were 6 deleted within 14 days, unless there's a request to 8 preserve these documents. And if these documents are 9 documents that are considered to be important, and those would be preserved, though. 10 MR. NELSON: First of all, could you 11 12 please tell the witness, if he can answer my question 13 yes or no, we have very limited time, so I would 14 appreciate yes or no answers, if he can. 15 Α. Yes. 16 Q. (By Mr. Nelson) The answer is: Yes, your e-mails continued to be destroyed after 14 days even 17 18 after we let Samsung know about you personally, correct? 19 Α. No. 20 MR. NELSON: Could we bring up the 21 JungMin Ro deposition, Page 61, Line 22? 22 (By Mr. Nelson) This was a corporate testimony Q. from Samsung. She stated: For the custodians listed, 23 24 has the automatic deletion function in mySingle been

25

suspended?

```
108
1
            ANSWER: No.
2
             Is that correct, or was she not telling the
3
  truth?
4
        Α.
            Yes. That's the way she answered it.
5
            Thank you.
        Q.
6
            It's also true, Mr. Kim, that when a Samsung
   employee changes computers, that computer is wiped
8
   clean, correct?
9
       Α.
            Well, yes.
10
        Q.
            Do you know --
11
                 MR. NELSON: Well, let's bring up
  Plaintiff's Exhibit 114, please. And let's go -- on the
12
13
   first page there. Yeah. Jae-Ki Jung.
14
            (By Mr. Nelson) Mr. Kim, do you know Jae-Ki
15
  Jung?
16
            I don't know this person very well.
       Α.
17
                 MR. NELSON: If we go to the following
18
  page, please. Next page. Blow up the date,
19
  please.
20
       Q. (By Mr. Nelson) This is an offer and
   acceptance of Fractus antennas, and it was accepted by
21
   Mr. Jae-Ki Jung, correct?
22
2.3
           Yes, that's right.
        Α.
```

MR. NELSON: Next page, please.

(By Mr. Nelson) And at the bottom, it states

24

25

Q.

```
1
              IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
               FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
2
                        MARSHALL DIVISION
3
   FRACTUS
                                            Civil Docket No.
                                            6:09-CV-203
4
  VS.
                                            Tyler, Texas
5
                                            May 23, 2011
   SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS, CO., LTD.,
6
  ET AL
                                            8:55 A.M.
7
                    TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL
               BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONARD DAVIS
8
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
   APPEARANCES:
10
  FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
                          MR. MAX TRIBBLE, JR.
                           Susman Godfrey
11
                           1000 Louisiana Street
                           Suite 5100
12
                           Houston, TX
                                         77002
13
                          MR. MICHAEL HEIM
                          MR. LESLIE PAYNE
                           Heim Payne & Chorush
14
                           600 Travis St., Suite 6710
15
                          Houston, TX
                                          77002
16
                          MR. JUSTIN NELSON
                          MS. GENEVIEVE VOSE
17
                           Susman Godfrey
                           1201 Third Avenue
                           Suite 3800
18
                           Seattle, WA 98101
19
   APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE:
21
   COURT REPORTERS:
                          MS. SUSAN SIMMONS, CSR
22
                          MS. JUDITH WERLINGER, CSR
                          Official Court Reporter
23
                           100 East Houston, Suite 125
                          Marshall, TX
                                          75670
24
                           903/935-3868
25 (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,
   transcript produced on CAT system.)
```

1	1	
2	2 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:	
3	3 FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: MS. VICTORIA COOK Susman Godfrey	
4	<u>-</u>	
5		
6	MR. T. JOHN WARD, JR. Ward & Smith Law Firm	
7	Longview, TX 75606	
8		
9	FOR THE DEFENDANTS: MR. MICHAEL BARTA	
10	Baker Botts	
12	Washington, DC 20004	
13	MR. NEIL SIROTA	
14	MR. CHANG SIK KIM Baker Botts	
15		
16		
17		
18	110 North College Suite 500 Tyler, TX 75710	
19		
20	0	
21		
22		
23		
2425		
∠ ⊃		

```
pulled the wool over their eyes. We put a 2006 slide in
1
  a 2005 deck. Again, pretty poor job of manipulating
2
3
   evidence, but it's an evaluation of the 1995 patent,
  Fractus' 1995 patent. There was never any report, any
4
  feedback from Samsung of any complaints about our
5
  patents at issue starting from the 1999 patent
6
7
   application.
                  Go to Slide 4.
8
9
                  Again, here we are drawing polygons,
10
  identifying our patent application to them. That's in
   evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 224. You saw where we
1 1
12
   stamped our patent number on the planar inverted-F
13
   antenna. That's a PIFA antenna.
                  Nothing from Samsung saying: Wait a
14
  minute, Fractus. What are y'all doing? Why are you
15
  stamping this product this way? Your patent doesn't
16
   cover it.
17
18
                            They continued to buy our
                  Nothing.
19
  products. Not a word about: Hey, your patents don't
20
   cover this. No confusion to them. The only confusion
21
   comes when it's time to own up and pay for using our
22
  property.
23
                  And then the lawyers want to put a lot of
  documents together from our files -- nothing from
24
25
  Samsung's files, right? It's easier to tell a story
```

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
when you've got a clean slate. When you delete your
e-mails every 14 days, you deep six reports, pretty easy
to get in here and spin a story to a jury. If there's
any jury stories going on, I think it's coming from
Samsung's table, not from Fractus'.
               Samsung on these defenses. You know, we
had -- obviousness, until about 30 minutes ago, was in
the case. That was -- that was what they were telling
us, that these patents were obvious.
               It's kind of like nailing Jello to a wall
to get them to light on a story, because Mr. Barta just
said: Give up on obviousness. You got us cornered
there. I'm not going to stand up in front of the jury,
and on one hand, say: Well, Cohen has everything, and
on the other hand, tell them what's missing.
              We finally pin them down, and what do
they do? Cohen has everything. Obviousness is the
easiest one to answer now. They've conceded that these
patents were not obvious. He wouldn't even make the
argument to you, not with a straight face.
              So enablement and written description
have popped up. These are, again, defenses that had no
air time during -- during the case at all. No witness
testified about it. You heard nothing from their
expert, Dr. Best, who would be one of ordinary skill in
```

```
1
   including Samsung, who has the largest market share, but
2
  they don't want to play by the rules. No license from
3
   Samsung to any intellectual property covering any
  hardware on any cell phone device. Think about that.
  Not one in evidence.
5
                        None.
6
                  That's their position. Take it. Use it.
7
  Maybe a jury will stick you. Maybe you'll have to pay
   down the road after some appeals. That's their business
8
  model.
9
10
                  Because, you know, this afternoon when
11
  y'all come back with a verdict, there's going to be a
12
   phone call from Mr. Kim, and Mr. Kim's going to be
13
   calling Korea. They're going to be waking up, and he's
14
   going to say: You know what?
                                  It worked. Keep deleting
   the e-mails. Keep deep sixing the reports. Don't
15
  produce documents, because juries won't hold us
16
   responsible.
17
18
                  Or it could be another phone call.
19
  to change the way we do business. If we're going to
20
   compete in the largest market in the world and sell our
21
   cell phones and make money, we're going to have to
   respect duly issued United States patents.
22
23
                  And you-all are going to get to make the
  decision about which one of those phone calls gets made,
24
  and we hope you make that right decision.
25
```

```
1
                  THE COURT:
                               Thank you. We're adjourned.
2
                  (Court adjourned.)
3
4
5
6
                          CERTIFICATION
7
8
                 I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a
  true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes
10
  of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the
  best of my ability.
11
12
13
14
15
  /s/__
   SUSAN SIMMONS, CSR
                                         Date
16 Official Court Reporter
   State of Texas No.: 267
  Expiration Date: 12/31/10
17
18
19
20
   /s/_
   JUDITH WERLINGER, CSR
                                             Date
21
  Deputy Official Court Reporter
   State of Texas No.: 731
  Expiration Date: 12/31/10
22
23
24
25
```