EXHIBIT A

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN JOSE DIVISION
4	
5	
6	APPLE INC., A CALIFORNIA) C-11-01846 LHK CORPORATION,
7) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA PLAINTIFF,)
8) MAY 12, 2011 VS.
9) PAGES 1-52 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,
10	LTD., A KOREAN BUSINESS) ENTITY; SAMSUNG)
11	ELECTRONICS AMERICA,) INC., A NEW YORK)
12	CORPORATION; SAMSUNG) TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
13	AMERICA, LLC, A DELAWARE) LIMITED LIABILITY)
14	COMPANY,)
15	DEFENDANTS.)
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17	BEFORE THE HONORABLE LUCY H. KOH UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18	
19	
20	APPEARANCES ON NEXT PAGE
21	
22	
23	
24	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: LEE-ANNE SHORTRIDGE, CSR, CRR
25	CERTIFICATE NUMBER 9595

1	CAN YOU SAY THAT IN YOUR CASE?
2	MR. MCELHINNY: I CAN SAY
3	THE COURT: WHEN'S THE FIRST TIME THAT
4	YOU REQUESTED THIS TYPE OF DISCOVERY FROM SAMSUNG?
5	MR. MCELHINNY: WHAT I CAN SAY I CAN
6	SAY THAT THE ISSUES OF COPYING AND THE ALLEGATIONS
7	IN THE COMPLAINT AND THE NATURE OF WHAT THE CLAIMS
8	ARE HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF DISCUSSIONS.
9	I CANNOT SAY THAT THERE HAVE BEEN
10	SPECIFIC REQUESTS TO GIVE US A SAMPLE OF A
11	COMPLETED TOOL. THAT HAS BEEN TRIGGERED BY THE
12	ANNOUNCEMENTS THAT THESE SPECIFIC ITEMS ARE ABOUT
13	TO ENTER THE MARKETPLACE AND THAT THEY HAVE
14	ANTICIPATED RELEASE DATES.
15	THE COURT: OKAY.
16	MR. MCELHINNY: SO WHAT I WOULD SAY, IN
17	RESPONSE TO WHAT I WOULD SAY IN RESPONSE TO
18	JUDGE CHEN IS THE ISSUES
19	THE COURT: NO. IT SOUNDS LIKE NO.
20	MR. MCELHINNY: NO. ACTUALLY, WHAT I
21	WOULD SAY TO HIM IS THAT THE ISSUES HAVE BEEN
22	SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSED, THEY'VE BEEN SPECIFICALLY
23	IDENTIFIED, THE NATURE OF THE CLAIMS, AND THE FACT
24	THAT THERE IS AN ONGOING DESIGN EFFORT OF THIS NEW

GENERATION HAS BEEN DISCUSSED WITH THE HOPE THAT

SAMSUNG WOULD AGREE NOT TO COPY, AND THAT WHEN WE SAW THE FIRST PICTURES OF THESE THINGS RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC, WE FOUND OUT THAT WASN'T GOING TO BE THE COURSE THAT SAMSUNG TOOK.

1.3

THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME ASK -- MY NEXT

QUESTION IS THE EVIDENCE OF COPYING, OR DESIGN

AROUND, SEEMS TO GO MORE TOWARDS DAMAGES, TOWARDS

INTENT.

WHY WOULD YOU NEED THAT NOW?

MR. MCELHINNY: I -- I -- I WOULD DIVIDE

SOME OF THE -- I WOULD DIVIDE SOME OF THE -- I

WOULD DIVIDE SOME OF THE ISSUES IN THE SENSE THAT

WE DO BELIEVE THAT OUR BEST CASE, IF WE'RE GOING TO

MAKE A MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, IS TO

ACTUALLY SHOW YOU PHYSICAL OBJECTS WILL -- AS

OPPOSED TO PICTURES -- WILL MAKE IT MORE EASY FOR

THE COURT IN ORDER TO COMPARE THEM TO THE DESIGN

PATENTS, TO LOOK AT THE TRADEMARKS, TO LOOK AT THE

TRADE DRESS.

AND SO THE REQUEST FOR SPECIFIC PHYSICAL OBJECTS IS NOT, I WOULD SAY, RELATED TO INTENT.

IT'S RELATED TO DEMONSTRATING THE COPYING THAT IS APPARENTLY GOING TO GO ON HERE.

THE DOCUMENTS THAT WE'RE ASKING FOR DO

TWO THINGS. ONE, THEY DO, IN FACT, GO -- THEY DO,

- 1 IN FACT, GO TO INTENT.
- 2 BUT INTENT IS NOT COMPLETELY LIMITED TO
- 3 DAMAGES. INTENT IS, IS LIMITED -- IS PART OF THE
- 4 TRADEMARK THAT GOES TO THE STRENGTHS OF THE
- 5 TRADEMARK. IT GOES TO THE STRENGTH OF THE TRADE
- 6 DRESS.
- 7 THE COURT: BUT IS -- AREN'T THESE MORE
- 8 THE LOOK AND FEEL OF ORDINARY OBSERVER TESTS?
- 9 WHETHER THEY COPIED OR NOT JUST DOESN'T SEEM TO
- 10 | PLAY INTO THE LOOK AND FEEL OF THE ORDINARY
- OBSERVER TEST FOR EITHER THE TRADE DRESS, THE
- 12 TRADEMARK, OR THE DESIGN PATENT INFRINGEMENT CLAIM.
- 13 MR. MCELHINNY: YOUR HONOR HAS A LOT OF
- 14 | EXPERIENCE IN THIS AREA, AND SO I'M -- I KNOW YOU
- 15 KNOW WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT.
- BUT ALSO, IN ADDITION, WHAT WE'RE TALKING
- 17 ABOUT IN TERMS OF THE -- IN SOME CASES YOUR HONOR
- 18 | IS GOING TO BE CALLED UPON TO MAKE A DETERMINATION
- 19 IN TERMS OF THE STRENGTH OF THE TRADEMARK, OR THE
- 20 STRENGTH OF THE TRADE DRESS, AND THE
- 21 DISTINCTIVENESS OF IT.
- 22 AND TO THE EXTENT THAT WE CAN PRODUCE
- 23 DOCUMENTS WHICH WE, YOU KNOW, WHICH WE FEEL EXIST,
- 24 WHICH IS EASY FOR ME TO SAY, BUT TO THE EXTENT THAT
- 25 YOU FIND DOCUMENTS IN WHICH -- WE GAVE YOU THE ONE

1 EXAMPLE WHERE THE KOREAN DISTRIBUTOR SAYS, YOU 2 KNOW, WE HAD A PRODUCT PLANNED AND NOW WE SEE THE 3 IPAD 2 AND SO WE'RE BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD. AND THEN WE SEE THE PICTURE OF THE NEW 4 5 PRODUCT WHICH COMES OUT LOOKING EXACTLY LIKE THE 6 IPAD 2. 7 THAT, WE BELIEVE, IS STRONG EVIDENCE THAT WILL CONVINCE YOUR HONOR ABOUT THE STRENGTH OF OUR 8 9 MARK AND WHY IT IS THAT SAMSUNG IS UNWILLING TO 10 COME UP WITH A UNIQUE DESIGN, OR UNABLE. 11 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET ME GO TO 12 MR. VERHOEVEN. DID I PRONOUNCE THAT CORRECTLY? 13 MR. VERHOEVEN: THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR 14 HONOR. 15 THE COURT: DO YOU CONCEDE THAT WHAT 16 APPLE HAS REQUESTED, YOU WOULD HAVE TO PRODUCE IN THE NORMAL COURSE OF DISCOVERY? 17 18 NOW, I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT THE TIMING, 19 BUT ONCE THERE WAS AN OPENING OF DISCOVERY PER RULE 20 26, YOU WOULD HAVE TO PRODUCE THIS STUFF; CORRECT? 21 MR. VERHOEVEN: NOT ALL OF IT, YOUR 22 HONOR. 23 I MEAN, FIRST OF ALL, IT'S IMPOSSIBLE TO 24 PRODUCE SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T EXIST, AND THEY'RE

ASKING FOR, AS YOUR HONOR KNOWS, PRODUCTS THAT

- 1 IN OUR CASE.
- THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME ASK
- 3 MR. MCELHINNY, ARE YOU PREPARED FOR MUTUAL ASSURED
- 4 DESTRUCTION? IF I GRANT IT IN YOUR CASE, I MAY
- 5 GRANT IT IN HIS CASE AND BOTH OF YOU WILL BE DOING
- 6 A FIRE DRILL NOW WHEN YOU WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE THE
- 7 NORMAL 90, 120 DAYS TO ACTUALLY GET PREPARED FOR
- 8 DISCOVERY.
- 9 MR. MCELHINNY: MAY I OBJECT TO YOUR
- 10 QUESTION ON THE BASIS THAT IT ASSUMES FACTS NOT IN
- 11 EVIDENCE YET?
- 12 THE COURT: OKAY.
- 13 MR. MCELHINNY: I JUST WANTED TO INFORM
- 14 THE COURT, IN CASE YOU'RE NOT AWARE,
- 15 | MORRISON & FOERSTER WILL NOT BE REPRESENTING APPLE
- 16 IN THE CASE THAT'S BEEN FILED.
- 17 THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT. WILMER HALE
- 18 IS.
- 19 MR. MCELHINNY: AND I'VE BEEN TOLD THAT
- 20 | THERE WILL BE A TIMELY OPPOSITION FILED TO THE --
- 21 THE COURT: OKAY. THAT WAS ONE OF THE
- 22 QUESTIONS I WAS GOING TO ASK YOU. I THINK THE
- 23 OPPOSITION IS DUE ON MONDAY.
- MR. MCELHINNY: BUT THE ANSWER TO YOUR
- 25 QUESTION IS YES. YES, WE ARE PREPARED TO LIVE BY

1 EQUAL RULES. 2 MAY I MAKE THREE POINTS, PLEASE? 3 ON THE DELAY ISSUE, JUST EVEN ON THEIR GRAPH, YOUR HONOR, I'D POINT OUT TO YOU THAT THERE 4 5 IS NO TABLET PICTURED HERE. THERE IS NO TABLET 6 PRODUCT PICTURED IN THIS. 7 AND IT IS NOT THE LAW THAT IF YOU ISSUE 8 ONE PRODUCT AND YOU DON'T GET SUED, THAT THAT 9 ALLOWS YOU THEN, FOREVER AND EVER, A FREE PASS ON 10 THE COPYRIGHT AND TRADEMARK CLAUSE IN THE 11 UNITED STATES. THAT'S WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SAY ABOUT 12 1.3 DELAY. YOU WILL HEAR THAT ISSUE WHEN AND IF YOU 14 HEAR THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND YOU WILL BE 15 ABLE TO DECIDE IT. 16 ON THE TRADE SECRET ISSUE, I WOULD LIKE 17 TO CALL TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION A FACT THAT 18 ACTUALLY OCCURRED SINCE THE PLEADING WAS DONE IN 19 THIS CASE. 20 AND IF I MAY APPROACH, WE WERE --21 THE COURT: WELL, SHOW IT TO 22 MR. VERHOEVEN. 23 DO YOU HAVE ANY OBJECTION? 24 MR. VERHOEVEN: NO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: OKAY.

1 MR. MCELHINNY: WE FOUND A BLOG THAT WAS 2 DATED MAY 10TH, 2011 THAT SAYS THAT SAMSUNG HANDED 3 OUT 5,000 SAMPLES OF THE TABLET 10.1 WHICH THEY HAVE TOLD YOU UNDER OATH IS NOT AVAILABLE FOR 4 5 PRODUCTION. BUT THEY HANDED OUT 5,000 IN 6 SAN FRANCISCO AT THE GOOGLE I/O CONFERENCE. 7 AND, THIRD, I'D JUST LIKE TO MAKE SORT OF AN OVERALL FAIRNESS ISSUE. 8 9 OBVIOUSLY YOUR HONOR IS AWARE OF THE 10 SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS CASE AND YOU HAVE TALKED ABOUT 11 A GLOBAL WAR. 12 BUT WHAT APPLE CHOSE TO DO, AS A MATTER 1.3 OF QUITE CLEAR STRATEGY, WAS TO BRING THIS CRITICAL ISSUE -- APPLE'S BRAND IS NUMBER ONE IN THE 14 15 WORLD -- WE BROUGHT THIS ISSUE TO THIS COURT SO 16 THAT WE COULD GET AN IMMEDIATE, CLEAR, RULING ON 17 THESE ISSUES. 18 SAMSUNG HAS REACTED TO THAT BY MAKING 19 THIS A WORLDWIDE BATTLE. THEY HAVE SUED US IN FIVE 20 COUNTRIES. THEY ARE SEEKING EXPEDITED RELIEF IN 21 OTHER COUNTRIES.

IF WE CAN'T GET THAT SAME KIND OF QUICK ADJUDICATION IN THIS COURT, WE ARE AT A TREMENDOUS DISADVANTAGE.

THANK YOU.

22

23

24

- WITHOUT INTERFERENCE WITH OUR BIGGEST COMPETITOR,

 AND WHAT'S THE JUSTIFICATION FOR THAT, YOUR HONOR?

 YOU KNOW, THE -- OH, A RECTANGLE.

 THAT'S -
 THE COURT: I HAVE TO SAY THE PRODUCTS

 LOOK AWFULLY SIMILAR, MR. VERHOEVEN.

 MR. MCELHINNY: YOUR HONOR, ON THE SAMPLE

 ISSUE, ALL I'M SAYING IS IF THEY HAD 5,000 TO GIVE
 - ISSUE, ALL I'M SAYING IS IF THEY HAD 5,000 TO GIVE AWAY IN SAN FRANCISCO LAST WEEK, THEY CAN GIVE US ONE.

1.3

- THE COURT: WHY DIDN'T YOU GET ONE?

 MR. MCELHINNY: BECAUSE WE NEED ONE

 THAT'S PRODUCED FROM THEM SO THEY CAN AUTHENTICATE

 IT SO WE CAN SUBMIT IT INTO EVIDENCE, SO THAT WE

 CAN SUBMIT IT.
- THEY GAVE AWAY 500 -- ACTUALLY, THAT'S NOT TRUE. THEY GAVE AWAY 5,000 OF THE PHONES.

 THEY FLEW PEOPLE FROM THE UNITED STATES TO BARCELONA AND GAVE AWAY 5,000 OF THE PHONES.
- THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELL, LET'S -- I
 WILL CONSIDER THIS FURTHER, BUT I'M STILL INCLINED
 TO GRANT VERY LIMITED DISCOVERY TO BE PRODUCED
 WITHIN 30 DAYS, A SAMPLE OF THE PRODUCTS THAT HAVE
 BEEN REQUESTED, THE PACKAGE OR THE BOX -- AND I
 JUST MEAN CURRENT ITERATIONS. I DON'T THINK YOU

- 1 NEED EVERY ITERATION SINCE THE BEGINNING, JUST
- 2 CURRENT -- THE PACKAGE INSERT, AND I STILL DON'T
- 3 KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN BY MARKETING DIRECTIONS TO AD
- 4 AGENCIES.
- 5 WHAT DO YOU EXPECT TO FIND THERE? THAT
- 6 THEY'RE GOING TO SAY -- WHAT DO YOU EXPECT TO FIND
- 7 THERE?
- 8 MR. MCELHINNY: I EXPECT TO FIND ADS THAT
- 9 MIMIC THE APPLE ADS. THAT'S WHAT I EXPECT TO FIND,
- 10 | THAT THE PRESENTATION MIMICS THE WAY THAT APPLE HAS
- BEEN PRESENTING ITS PRODUCTS. THAT'S WHAT I EXPECT
- 12 TO FIND.
- 13 THE COURT: AND WHAT DOES THAT GO TO?
- 14 THE TRADE DRESS?
- 15 MR. MCELHINNY: IT GOES TO -- THANK YOU
- 16 FOR THAT.
- 17 WITH MY STAFF -- WITH MY HELPERS HERE, I
- 18 WAS POINTED OUT THAT IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT, YOUR
- 19 HONOR, IN AMF INC. VERSUS SLEEKCRAFT, WHICH IS ONE
- OF THE KEY CASES, LISTS THE EIGHT ELEMENTS THAT GO
- 21 TO CONFUSION, AND NUMBER SEVEN IS DEFENDANT'S
- 22 INTENT IN SELECTING THE MARK.
- 23 | WE INTEND TO PROVE TO YOUR HONOR -- I
- MEAN, MR. VERHOEVEN IS FREE TO ARGUE TO YOUR HONOR,
- 25 | HE'S FREE TO ARGUE TO THE WORLD THAT APPLE'S MARKS

- ARE NOT DISTINCT, AND WE'LL WORRY ABOUT WHETHER OR

 NOT HE WILL SUCCEED ON THAT.
- BUT WE INTEND TO DEMONSTRATE TO YOUR

 HONOR THAT UNLIKE EVERY -- UNLIKE THE PHONE

 MANUFACTURERS AND TABLET MANUFACTURERS WHO ARE

 COMPETING FAIRLY, SAMSUNG IS INTENTIONALLY

 ATTEMPTING TO MIMIC AND COPY APPLE IN ORDER TO, A,

 TAKE ADVANTAGE OF OUR MARKET POSITION; AND, B, IN

ORDER TO DILUTE OUR TRADEMARK.

9

10

11

12

- THE COURT: LET ME ASK -- LET ME ASK,

 MR. VERHOEVEN, IS THERE -- I GUESS ARE THERE -- I

 DON'T KNOW WHAT WOULD BE THE TERM FOR MARKETING

 MATERIAL FOR A SMART PHONE.
- MR. MCELHINNY: MAY I PROPOSE THAT --
- THE COURT: WHAT WOULD THAT BE CALLED?
- MR. MCELHINNY: MAY I PROPOSE TO YOUR

 HONOR THAT WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO IS GET -- I CAN

 GET YOU BETTER LANGUAGE FROM SOMEONE WHO'S ACTUALLY

 INVOLVED IN THIS MARKETING AND I CAN FAX IT TO YOU
- 20 AND TO MR. VERHOEVEN LATER THIS AFTERNOON.
- OR -- I'LL TELL YOU THIS. IF YOUR

 HONOR -- EVEN IF YOU PUT YOUR -- I MEAN, IF YOU

 JUST SAY MARKETING MATERIALS THAT DEMONSTRATE THE

 NATURE OF THE MARKETING --
- 25 THE COURT: THAT'S TOO BROAD. THAT'S TOO

1 VAGUE. I WON'T ADOPT THAT. 2 I MEAN, NORMALLY MR. VERHOEVEN WOULD HAVE 3 90 TO 120 DAYS TO GET ALL THIS ORGANIZED. YOU'RE ASKING HIM TO DO IT IN 30. IT'S GOT TO BE 4 5 REASONABLE. 6 MR. MCELHINNY: WHAT I WANT -- WHAT I 7 WANT IS THE PACKAGE OF MATERIALS THAT IS PREPARED 8 THAT IS UNIQUE TO THIS PRODUCT, WHICH IS ALREADY --9 THEY WOULD HAVE IT TOGETHER IN ONE PLACE, THEY DO 10 HAVE IT TOGETHER IN ONE PLACE, THAT DESCRIBES HOW 11 THE PRODUCT IS TO BE MARKETED. 12 THE COURT: PACKAGE OF MATERIALS UNIQUE 1.3 TO PRODUCT THAT DESCRIBES HOW PRODUCT IS TO BE MARKETED? THAT JUST SOUNDS TOO BROAD TO ME. 14 15 MR. VERHOEVEN: I DON'T HAVE ANY IDEA 16 WHAT THAT MEANS. THE COURT: I REALLY DON'T EITHER. 17 18 MR. VERHOEVEN: YOUR HONOR --19 THE COURT: ANYWAY, I'M REALLY SORRY, I 20 HAVE TWO OTHER CASES THAT HAVE BEEN PATIENTLY 21 WAITING. 22 MR. MCELHINNY: I KNOW. 23 THE COURT: WE NEED TO MOVE ON WITH THIS. 24 MR. VERHOEVEN: YOUR HONOR, MAY I SAY ONE

25

THING VERY BRIEFLY?

MR. MCELHINNY: IT'S PARTIALLY FOR INTENT.

1.3

ALSO, YOUR HONOR SAW IN THE BRIEF THE

SEMANTIC POSITION TAKEN ABOUT WHETHER DESIGNS WERE

FINAL, AND YOUR HONOR CLEARLY REACTED TO THAT AND

THAT'S WHY YOU ORDERED THE CURRENT PRODUCT.

BUT UNLESS WE HAVE SOMEBODY WHO SAYS THIS
IS WHAT'S GOING TO THE MARKET, THEN WE RUN THE RISK
THAT WE'RE DOING SOMETHING AND WHEN WE GET IN FRONT
OF YOUR HONOR, IT TURNS OUT THAT IT'S NOT AND WE'VE
WASTED YOUR HONOR'S TIME AND OUR TIME AND ALL THE
REST OF THIS.

THE COURT: I'M SAYING PRODUCE THE LATEST ITERATION, CURRENT VERSION. I'M ASSUMING -- HE'S AN OFFICER OF THE COURT. IF HE PRODUCES SOMETHING THAT HE SAYS IS THE LATEST ITERATION, CURRENT VERSION, I'M ASSUMING THAT'S THE CASE.

WHY DO YOU NEED A WITNESS TO TESTIFY THAT THAT IS THE LATEST VERSION?

MR. MCELHINNY: WELL, IF YOUR HONOR IS -IF YOUR HONOR -- IF YOUR HONOR IS GOING TO TAKE A
SUBMISSION IN RESPONSE TO YOUR ORDER AS AN
EVIDENTIARY ADMISSION, THEN I DON'T NEED SOMEBODY
TO SAY THAT IT'S FINAL.

BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT HAPPENED IN THESE

- 1 PAPERS. BUT THAT'S -- THE POINT IS THAT --
- THE COURT: WELL, I THINK THEY'RE GOING
- 3 TO SAY IT'S NOT THE FINAL BECAUSE SOME OF THE DATES
- 4 ARE NOT COMING FOR SOME TIME.
- 5 SO -- ANYWAY, IF THE BEST YOU CAN GIVE ME
- 6 FOR WHY YOU NEED AN INDIVIDUAL DEPOSITION IS TO SAY
- 7 THAT THESE ARE THE FINAL PRODUCTS, THEN IT'S DENIED
- 8 UNLESS YOU CAN GIVE ME SOMETHING ELSE WHY YOU NEED
- 9 A PERSON AND WHY YOU CAN'T JUST LOOK AT IT FROM THE
- 10 SAMPLE OF THE BOX --
- 11 MR. MCELHINNY: I'M SORRY. WE WANT TO
- 12 KNOW IF THEY ATTEMPTED TO DESIGN AROUND OUR DESIGN;
- 13 WE WANT TO KNOW WHETHER OR NOT THEY PAID ANY
- 14 ATTENTION AT ALL TO THE TRADEMARK LAWS; IF THEY
- 15 LOOKED AT OUR DESIGNS; IF THEY TOOK THEM INTO
- 16 CONSIDERATION; IF THEY ARE MAKING ANY ATTEMPT AT
- 17 ALL TO COMPLY WITH THE LAWS IN THIS COUNTRY.
- 18 AND THAT IS COMPLETELY RELEVANT EVIDENCE
- 19 AS TO WHAT'S GOING ON WITH THE ATTEMPT TO USE OUR
- TRADEMARKS.
- 21 MR. VERHOEVEN: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T KNOW
- 22 | HOW TO BEGIN TO EVEN THINK ABOUT WHO WE'RE GOING TO
- 23 | PUT UP TO SAY, "DID YOU COMPLY WITH THE LAWS OF
- 24 THIS COUNTRY?" I MEAN, THAT'S COMPLETELY VAGUE.
- 25 THEY'VE GOT -- IF YOUR HONOR GIVES THEM

1 THE PRODUCT, THEY'VE GOT THE PRODUCT.

THEIR ONLY CLAIM ON THIS MOTION THAT I'VE

3 READ IS ORNAMENTAL DESIGN PATENTS AND TRADE DRESS.

4 THAT'S WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE. IT'S NOT HOW

5 IT FUNCTIONS. IT'S WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE.

1.3

AND SO THERE'S NO REASON FOR THEM TO NEED
TO GO UNDER THE GUTS OF THIS AND START TALKING TO
TECHNICAL PEOPLE ON AN EXPEDITED BASIS WITH VERY
COMPLICATED PRODUCTS.

AND LET'S NOT FORGET, THESE ARE MOST

LIKELY GOING TO BE FOLKS THAT RESIDE IN KOREA THAT

PROBABLY WILL NEED TO HAVE TRANSLATORS, AND IF

THEY'RE ASKING TO HAVE THEM SHIPPED UP IN FIVE DAYS

TO THE UNITED STATES SO THEY CAN DEPOSE THEM, IT'S

RIDICULOUS.

MR. MCELHINNY: JUST IN TERMS OF OUR GOOD FAITH TO NARROW THIS, YOUR HONOR, THIS IS WHY -THIS IS EXACTLY HOW WE ENDED UP AT A 30(B)(6),
BECAUSE IF YOU WALK AWAY FROM A 30(B)(6), THEN YOU
GET THE ARGUMENT THAT THERE IS NO INDIVIDUAL AND
THE ONE THAT YOU TRIED TO PICK IS THE WRONG ONE, ET
CETERA, ET CETERA.

BUT JUST TO GO BACK TO THE EVIDENCE

THAT'S BEFORE YOU, THERE IS EVIDENCE IN THIS RECORD

THAT SAMSUNG ENGAGED IN AN EXPLICIT REDESIGN OF A

1 PRODUCT AS A RESULT OF THE RELEASE OF THE IPAD 2. 2 THAT EVIDENCE OF WHAT THEY DID, 3 PARTICULARLY IF IT SHOWS THAT THEY MADE CHANGES IN ORDER TO GET CLOSER TO THE TRADEMARK OF THE IPAD 2, 4 5 IS DIRECT EVIDENCE OF INTENT. 6 THE COURT: SO THEN WHY DO YOU NEED MORE EVIDENCE OF COPYING AND INTENT? IF YOU ALREADY HAVE IT, THEN WHY DO YOU NEED AN INDIVIDUAL 8 9 DEPOSITION TO GET MORE EVIDENCE OF INTENT TO COPY? 10 MR. MCELHINNY: BECAUSE THEY HAVE ARGUED 11 IN THEIR PAPERS THAT WHAT -- THAT THE CHANGES WENT 12 TO PRICE, THEY WENT TO THINNESS, THAT THEY DID NOT 13 GO TO GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACES. THEY ARE NOT ADMITTING THAT THEY COPIED 14 15 OUR TRADEMARKS. 16 THE COURT: AND DO YOU THINK ANY 17 INDIVIDUAL THAT THEY HAVE PREPPED FOR DEPOSITION IS 18 GOING TO ADMIT THAT? 19 MR. MCELHINNY: I BELIEVE IF WE GET THE 20 DOCUMENTS --21 THE COURT: I MEAN, COME ON. HE'S GOING 22 TO PREP THEM NOT TO ADMIT THAT. 23 MR. MCELHINNY: YOUR HONOR, THERE'S A 24 COUPLE OF THINGS THAT'LL HAPPEN.

ONE, IF WE GET THE DOCUMENTS, WE'LL HAVE

THE QUESTIONS TO ASK, AND IN ANY EVENT, WE'LL BE
ABLE TO ASK THE QUESTIONS.

AND IF HE DENIES IT UNDER OATH AND THEN
IN THE NORMAL COURSE WE GET THE DOCUMENTS, THEN
THERE WILL BE REPERCUSSIONS FROM YOUR HONOR AND
THAT'S A PERFECTLY LEGITIMATE -- I MEAN, HE'S GOING
TO HAVE TO SAY SOMETHING, AND WHAT HE SAYS UNDER
OATH IS GOING TO BE VERY VALUABLE AND I ASSUME HE
WILL TELL THE TRUTH UNDER OATH.

THE COURT: LET ME GO TO A COUPLE OTHER QUESTIONS.

FIRST OF ALL, I GRANTED SAMSUNG'S MOTION

TO FILE UNDER SEAL, BUT IT DOESN'T LOOK LIKE YOU'VE

ACTUALLY FILED THE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL OR FILED

THE REDACTED VERSION OF YOUR OPPOSITION BRIEF. ARE

YOU PLANNING TO DO THAT?

MR. OLSON: WE'LL DO THAT THIS AFTERNOON,
YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

THE MOTION FOR RELATED CASE WAS FILED TWO WEEKS AFTER THE COMPLAINT WAS FILED.

NOW, I KNOW YOU ASKED FOR A STIPULATION
FROM THE OTHER SIDE, I GUESS FROM WILMER, HALE ON
MAY 6TH, BUT WHY WAS THERE THE DELAY? DID YOU
INITIALLY NOT THINK THESE CASES WERE RELATED? OR

1	
2	
3	
4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
5	
6	
7	
8	I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT
9	REPORTER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
10	THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH
11	FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY
12	CERTIFY:
13	THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT,
14	CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, CONSTITUTES A TRUE, FULL AND
15	CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES TAKEN AS
16	SUCH OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE PROCEEDINGS
17	HEREINBEFORE ENTITLED AND REDUCED BY COMPUTER-AIDED
18	TRANSCRIPTION TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	/s/
24	LEE-ANNE SHORTRIDGE, CSR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 9595
25	CERTIFICATE NUMBER 9595