

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

APPLE, INC., a California corporation,)	Case No.: 12-CV-00630-LHK
)	
Plaintiff and Counterdefendant,)	ORDER DENYING APPLE’S AND
)	SAMSUNG’S MOTIONS FOR
v.)	JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW
)	REGARDING THE ’647 PATENT AT
)	THE CLOSE OF EVIDENCE
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a)	
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG)	
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York)	
corporation; and SAMSUNG)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,)	
a Delaware limited liability company,)	
)	
Defendants and Counterclaimants.)	
)	

At the close of evidence, Apple and Samsung moved for judgment as a matter of law pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50(a). Both parties opposed each other’s motions. Rule 50 provides that the court may grant a motion for judgment as a matter of law against a non-moving party if “the court finds that a reasonable jury would not have a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for the party on” an issue. After considering the evidence presented and arguments by both parties at the hearing on April 28, 2014, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Court denied both parties’ motions. Specifically, the Court ruled as follows:

- 1 • The Court DENIED Samsung's Rule 50 motion for judgment of non-infringement
- 2 of the asserted claim of the '647 patent.
- 3 • The Court DENIED Samsung's Rule 50 motion for judgment of no willful
- 4 infringement of the asserted claim of the '647 patent.
- 5 • The Court DENIED Samsung's Rule 50 motion for judgment of invalidity of the
- 6 asserted claim of the '647 patent.
- 7 • The Court DENIED Apple's Rule 50 motion for judgment of infringement of the
- 8 asserted claim of the '647 patent.
- 9 • The Court DENIED Apple's Rule 50 motion for judgment of no invalidity of the
- 10 asserted claim of the '647 patent.
- 11 • The Court DENIED Apple's Rule 50 motion for judgment of willful infringement of
- 12 the asserted claim of the '647 patent.

13
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: April 28, 2014



16 _____
17 LUCY H. KOH
18 United States District Judge