1	[COUNSEL LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGES]		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
12			
13			
14	APPLE INC., a California corporation,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK	
15	Plaintiff,	APPLE'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE RESPONSE TO SAMSUNG'S	
16	v.	STATEMENT IDENTIFYING CLAIMS IT WILL ASSERT AT	
17	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG	TRIAL	
18	ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG		
19	TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,		
20	Defendants.		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	Apple's Motion for Leave to File Response to Samsung's Statement Identifying Claims Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK sf-3143830		

On May 2, 2012, this Court issued a Minute Order directing each party to "file a statement identifying with specificity the claims they will assert at trial, e.g., specific patent claims." Apple filed its statement at 6:00 p.m. on May 7th.

Over five hours later, and just twenty minutes before midnight, Samsung filed an eleven page statement. Rather than comply with the Court's order, Samsung devoted eight of its eleven pages to a brief challenging the sufficiency of Apple's trial plan. This brief was neither authorized nor permitted by this Court's Order.

Apple therefore moves for leave to file the attached Reply Statement, in order to respond to several important misstatements in Samsung's brief.

Apple sought but was unable to obtain Samsung's consent to file the attached Reply Statement. (Decl. of Richard S.J. Hung in Support of Apple's Motion for Leave to File Response to Samsung's Statement Identifying Claims It Will Assert at Trial ("Hung Decl." ¶ 1.) Samsung stated that it would oppose Apple's motion for leave, and proposed as an alternative that the parties file a "joint submission." The purpose of Apple's proposed submission is to respond to the facts in Samsung's original, improperly filed "Statement." It makes no sense to condition Apple's filing of a response on allowing Samsung to file yet another brief. (Hung Decl. Ex. 1.)

	Dated: May 9, 2012	HAROLD J. MCELHINNY (CA SBN 66781) hmcelhinny@mofo.com
1		MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664) mjacobs@mofo.com
2		JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368) jtaylor@mofo.com
3		ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363) atucher@mofo.com
4		RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425)
5		rhung@mofo.com JASON R. BARTLETT (CA SBN 214530)
6		jasonbartlett@mofo.com MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
7		425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105-2482
8		Telephone: (415) 268-7000 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522
9		WILLIAM F. LEE
10		william.lee@wilmerhale.com WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
11		HALE AND DORR LLP 60 State Street
12		Boston, MA 02109 Telephone: (617) 526-6000
13		Facsimile: (617) 526-5000
14		MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180)
15		mark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
16		HALE AND DORR LLP 950 Page Mill Road
17		Palo Alto, California 94304 Telephone: (650) 858-6000
18		Facsimile: (650) 858-6100
19		
20		By: /s/ Harold J. McElhinny
21		MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
22		Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim- Defendant
23		APPLE INC.
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		