- Apple Retail Germany GmbH is the defendant in Case Nos. 4a O 69/11,
 4a O 116/11, and 4a O 117/11 pending in the Dusseldorf District Court. These actions were all filed by Motorola Mobility, Inc. on April 12, 2011.
- 5. Apple Sales International is the defendant in Case No. 6 U 136/11, pending in the Higher District Court of Karlsruhe and filed on December 14, 2011, which is an appeal of a decision of the Mannheim District Court in Case No. 7 O 122/11, filed by Motorola Mobility, Inc. on April 1, 2011.
- Apple Sales International is the defendant in Case Nos. 7 O 229/11 and 7
 O 230/11, both filed by Motorola Mobility, Inc. on April 1, 2011 in the Mannheim District
 Court.
- 7. Apple Inc. is the defendant in Case Nos. 7 O 169/11 and 7 O 443/11, filed by Motorola Mobility, Inc. on April 26, 2011 in the Mannheim District Court.
- 8. The Mannheim and Dusseldorf District Courts determine liability and, upon a finding of infringement, may enter an injunction and order the infringer to pay damages.
- 9. In Cases Nos. 4a O 69/11, 6 U 136/11, 7 O 122/11, 7 O 169/11 Motorola asserts that Apple products infringe European Patent No. EP 1 010 336 ("the '336 cases"). In Cases Nos. 4a O 117/11, 7 O 230/11, and 7 O 443/11, Motorola asserts that Apple products infringe European Patent No. EP 1 053 613 ("the '613 cases").
- 10. Qualcomm Incorporated ("Qualcomm") is headquartered in San Diego, California, which is within the Southern District of California. *See* 2010 Qualcomm 10K, a true and correct excerpt of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
 - 11. Qualcomm is not a party to the German Actions.
- 12. The Apple products accused of patent infringement in the '336 cases and the '613 cases contain semiconductor chips manufactured by Qualcomm and its affiliates. The functionalities accused by Motorola in the '336 cases and the '613 cases generally relate to the wireless communications chips within the iPhone and iPad, some of which are supplied by Qualcomm.

1	13. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of an April 7, 2011
2	opinion in In re Am. Petroleum Institute, 11-80008-JF (PSG) (N.D. Cal.).
3	14. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of a September 19,
4	2008 opinion in Mirana v. Battery Tai-Shing Corp., No. 08-80142 (N.D. Cal.).
5	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the
6	foregoing is true and correct.
7	
8	Date: January 17, 2012
9	Christine S. Haskett
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	