EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
Case No.: 10-23580-Civ-UNGARO

MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,   ) VOLUME 3B
)
          Plaintiff,   )
)
     -v-   )
)
APPLE, INC.,   )
) Miami, Florida
          Defendant.   ) October 19, 2011
) 2:25 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF MARKMAN HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE URSULA UNGARO

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff   ASTIGARRAGA DAVIS MULLINS & GROSSMAN, PA
                       BY: EDWARD M. MULLINS, ESQ.
                       701 Brickell Avenue - 16th Floor
                       Miami, Florida 33131
                             -and-
                       QUINN EMMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
                       BY: DAVID A. PERLSON, ESQ.,
                       ANTHONY PASTOR, ESQ., and
                       JOHN DUCHEMIN, ESQ.
                       50 California Street - 22nd Floor
                       San Francisco, California 94111
                             -and-
                       BY: RAYMOND N. NIMROD, ESQ.
                       51 Madison Street - 22nd Floor
                       New York, New York 10010

(Continued)

REPORTED BY: TAMRA K. PIDERIT, FPR, RPR, CRR

(561) 832-7500   Prose Court Reporting

                       250 South Australian Avenue - Suite 1500

                       West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

1   order.

2   MR. PASTOR: Sure.

3   THE COURT: If there was a cutoff for infringement

4   contentions, then we are going to live with that cutoff. So I

5   just want you to know that, and I will go back and I will look

6   to see whether or not there was. If there was I'm going to hold

7   you to enterprise application software, then I suppose I'm going

8   to need to know from you whether your position remains the same

9   under claim construction.

10   MR. PASTOR: Can I just explain somewhat? We have

11   accused the devices, and we accuse those devices in our

12   infringement contentions. The only thing we are going to update

13   are the documents supporting our contentions. We are not going

14   to be changing our infringement. So what we had was public

15   documents that we included.

16   THE COURT: This is a waste of time to have this

17   discussion. We need to see what the cutoff was, and I

18   suppose -- and I may need to see what was submitted and what you

19   all exchanged in response. I will have to go look and see.

20   I'm not going to make this any more complicated than it

21   is, so if I think that the infringement contentions were cut

22   off, I'm going to hold you to that, but I don't know what the

23   order says, so I have to look at it. I may need to see what you

24   all exchanged.

25   Okay?