

Exhibit 1

Matt Korhonen

From: Ho, Jill [jill.ho@weil.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2011 10:47 AM
To: David Perlson; Anthony Pastor; John Duchemin
Cc: Pace, Christopher; Cappella, Anne; Matthew.Powers@tensegritylawgroup.com; 'chaskett@cov.com'; emullins@astidavis.com; Moto-Apple-SDFL; Weil_TLG Apple Moto FL External; AppleCov@cov.com
Subject: RE: Apple/Motorola (FL): Markman hearing

Hi David,

You have made your position clear, so we will represent to the Court that you oppose our motion.

As far as meet and confer concerning other issues, 10am PT on Wednesday is fine with us.

Best regards,
Jill

From: David Perlson [mailto:davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com]
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2011 2:42 PM
To: Ho, Jill; Anthony Pastor; John Duchemin
Cc: Pace, Christopher; Cappella, Anne; Matthew.Powers@tensegritylawgroup.com; 'chaskett@cov.com'; emullins@astidavis.com; Moto-Apple-SDFL; Weil_TLG Apple Moto FL External; AppleCov@cov.com
Subject: RE: Apple/Motorola (FL): Markman hearing

Jill, the parties had initially agreed that three hours for each side would be enough time for the Markman and I confirmed this with the Court in the September 7 teleconference. And I as I indicated in my email below, at the tutorial, Apple indicated that two days should be sufficient for the Markman: "MR. POWERS: I think two will be sufficient. I think there will be two. I think we can assume two full days. But that will be sufficient." We should be respectful of the Court's time, and if we focus on the most important, and relevant, issues, the two days allotted should be sufficient as Apple has already said.

In all events, we believe it is inappropriate for Apple to contact the Court on this issue before meeting and conferring, especially given that Apple has provided no reason why Apple's prior representations to the Court on timing are no longer accurate. In response to your demand Saturday for a response ASAP, we indicated Sunday we were available today to meet and confer today. Yet, Apple did not respond until this afternoon, and did not make itself available to meet and confer today. We are not available tomorrow, as I have a deposition in another matter. We are available Wednesday. I suggest 10 am Pacific.

David

From: Ho, Jill [mailto:jill.ho@weil.com]
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2011 1:57 PM
To: David Perlson; Anthony Pastor; John Duchemin
Cc: Pace, Christopher; Cappella, Anne; Matthew.Powers@tensegritylawgroup.com; 'chaskett@cov.com'; emullins@astidavis.com; Moto-Apple-SDFL; Weil_TLG Apple Moto FL External; AppleCov@cov.com
Subject: RE: Apple/Motorola (FL): Markman hearing

Hi David,

We disagree that two days will be "plenty of time" for the Markman hearing. In any event, since you have not indicated that anyone from Quinn has a scheduling conflict on Wednesday, October 19, we plan to let the Court know that Apple believes it would be prudent to reserve three days for the Markman hearing and we will make ourselves available for three days.

If you wish to discuss further, I am available tomorrow or Wednesday afternoon. In addition, Christine Haskett will participate so we can meet and confer about the order of claim terms to be presented.

Best regards,
Jill

From: David Perlson [mailto:davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2011 5:38 PM
To: Ho, Jill; Anthony Pastor; John Duchemin
Cc: Pace, Christopher; Cappella, Anne; Matthew.Powers@tensegritylawgroup.com; 'chaskett@cov.com'; emullins@astidavis.com; Moto-Apple-SDFL
Subject: RE: Apple/Motorola (FL): Markman hearing

Jill, at the end of the tutorial, when Court suggested it would want a presentation on claim construction legal principles the parties agreed that the markman could be done in two days. Nothing happened in the interim to change that and this is what we have planned for. Two days should be plenty of time if the parties focus their presentations on the relevant issues. Additionally, we do not agree that the three proposed days of "limited duration" would be an efficient use of Court or party resources.

I suggest we meet and confer tomorrow mid to late afternoon Pacific time to confer regarding the procedure and timing for the Markman as we also indicated to the Court we would do. At that time, we can also discuss the issues regarding listing means and listing interface in the 456 patent that we were unable to discuss with Apple last week.

David

From: Ho, Jill [mailto:jill.ho@weil.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 08, 2011 3:19 PM
To: Anthony Pastor; David Perlson; John Duchemin
Cc: Pace, Christopher; Cappella, Anne; Matthew.Powers@tensegritylawgroup.com; chaskett@cov.com
Subject: Apple/Motorola (FL): Markman hearing

Hi Tony / David / John,

We are planning to request that the Markman hearing last three days, from October 17-19, to allow the parties sufficient time to cover all the claim construction disputes that have been raised. We further plan to propose that each of the three days be limited in duration, (e.g., 10am-4pm with a 1 hour lunch), to allow Judge Ungaro sufficient time to digest the issues presented each day. Please let me know ASAP whether we can present this to the Court as a joint request.

Best regards,
Jill

The logo for the law firm Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP, featuring the word "Weil" in a bold, white, sans-serif font on a dark rectangular background.

Jill Ho

Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
201 Redwood Shores Parkway
Redwood Shores, CA 94065-1134
jill.ho@weil.com

+1 650 802 3163 Direct
+1 650 802 3100 Fax

The information contained in this email message is intended only for use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by email, postmaster@weil.com, and destroy the original message. Thank you.