

EXHIBIT B

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 1:10cv023580-Civ-UU

MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

APPLE INC.,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA, INC. and
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Counterclaim Defendants.

**MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.’S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
APPLE INC.’S NOTICE OF DEPOSITION**

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 30 and the Court’s Pretrial Scheduling Order, Defendant Motorola Mobility, Inc. (“Mobility”) responds to Apple Inc.’s (“Apple”) Notice of Deposition.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Mobility makes the following General Objections to each topic of deposition in Apple's Notice:

1. Each of Mobility's specific responses to each topic is subject to, and specifically incorporates, each of these general objections, whether or not each response refers expressly to any particular general objection.

2. Mobility objects to the "Definitions" listed in the Notice of Deposition to the extent they are inconsistent with or seek to impose requirements or obligations that exceed or differ from those of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the Southern District of Florida, or any orders of this Court.

3. Mobility objects to the topics to the extent they are premature in light of the Court's Pretrial Scheduling Order. In particular, Mobility objects to the extent the topics prematurely seek Mobility's responses to contention interrogatories or expert testimony or opinions.

4. Mobility objects to the requested time and location of the deposition as unduly burdensome. Any deposition of a Mobility witness will take place on a mutually acceptable date and at a mutually acceptable location. Moreover, Mobility objects to the noticed date of July 29, 2011 because it does not provide sufficient time for Mobility to identify and adequately prepare a deponent, or deponents, responsive to each topic. Subject to its objections, Mobility is willing to provide witnesses for certain topics (or appropriate subsets) as soon as practicable.

5. Mobility objects to the deposition topics as unduly burdensome, overly broad, and oppressive to the extent they are not within the scope of permissible discovery as set forth in Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 30. Mobility objects to the topics to the extent they

improperly duplicate or are cumulative with other discovery. Moreover, Mobility objects to the excessive number of deposition topics and will meet and confer with Apple to reduce the scope.

6. Mobility objects to the topics as vague and ambiguous to the extent they include terms that are undefined. Mobility in its responses will identify any terms it believes are vague and ambiguous and will assume a reasonable meaning for each such term.

7. Mobility objects to the deposition topics to the extent they call for legal conclusions or expert testimony.

8. Mobility objects to the deposition topics to the extent they seek testimony regarding Mobility's contentions and the bases for Mobility's contentions in this matter. Depositions pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6) are an inappropriate, unfair and inefficient means to obtain discovery regarding the bases for a party's contentions.

9. Mobility objects to the deposition topics as premature to the extent they seek information that is likely to be the subject of expert testimony prior to the time set by the Court for expert witness discovery. Mobility witnesses will testify only as to properly discoverable facts.

10. In addition to any specific objections which may be made on an individual basis in the separate responses set forth below, Mobility objects generally to each deposition topic to the extent that it seeks to elicit information subject to and protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, the joint defense privilege, the common interest doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege.

11. Mobility objects generally to the deposition topics to the extent they seek information from outside a reasonable time period or from a point other than a reasonable time. Mobility also objects generally to the deposition topics to the extent the time period in question

is vague and ambiguous. Mobility is willing to meet and confer with Apple regarding reasonable time periods and time cutoffs.

12. Mobility objects to the topics to the extent they seek to compel Mobility to generate or create information and/or documents that do not already exist.

13. Mobility objects generally to the topics to the extent they seek confidential or proprietary information pertaining to Mobility's business, trade secrets and/or economic relationships, or confidential information which would impinge on the constitutionally protected right to privacy of individuals. Mobility will only provide such information subject to the terms of the protective order issued in the case.

14. Mobility objects generally to the topics to the extent they seek confidential proprietary or trade secret information of third parties.

15. Mobility objects to the topics on the grounds that they seek information already in the possession of Apple, publicly available, or as readily available to Apple as to Mobility.

16. Mobility objects to the topics on the grounds that they seek information unknown to Mobility or not within the possession, custody, or control of Mobility.

17. Mobility objects generally to the definition of the terms "You," "Your," "Mobility," and "Motorola Mobility" as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent they include "all predecessors, subsidiaries, parents, and affiliates" as well as "all past or present directors, officers, agents, representatives, employees, consultants, attorneys, entities acting in joint-venture or partnership relationships with the aforementioned entities, and others acting on their behalf." Mobility will construe these terms to mean Defendant Motorola Mobility, Inc.

18. Mobility objects generally to the definition of “Related Patent(s)” as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it includes foreign patent applications and patents.

Mobility will construe this term to mean U.S. patent applications and patents.

19. Mobility objects to each topic asking it to identify all documents on the grounds that such topics are overly broad and unduly burdensome. Such requests are more appropriately served as requests for production.

20. Mobility objects to each topic asking it to identify all persons on the grounds that such topics are overly broad and unduly burdensome. Also, such requests are neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

21. A response to a topic shall not be deemed a waiver of any applicable general or specific objection to a topic. In responding to a topic, Mobility does not waive any objections that may be applicable to the use, for any purpose, of any information, provided in response, or the admissibility, relevance, or materiality of any such information or documents to any issue in this case, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Evidence. A response to any topic is not a representation or admission relative to the existence of any documents or information, to the relevance or admissibility of any documents or information, or to the truth or accuracy of any statement or characterization contained in Apple’s requests. All objections as to relevance, authenticity, or admissibility of any testimony or document are expressly reserved.

22. Any objection by Mobility does not constitute a representation or admission that such information does in fact exist or is known to Mobility.

23. Mobility objects to these topics to the extent they purport to require Mobility to anticipate Apple’s future claims or defenses and/or other developments in this matter. Mobility

has not completed its discovery, investigation, research, and trial preparation, and provides these responses to Apple's topics based solely on the information presently available and known to it.

24. Mobility objects to these topics to the extent that they purport to require Mobility to analyze, interpret, or summarize information for Apple that is contained in documents responsive to Apple's requests for the production of documents.

25. Mobility objects to the topics to the extent they seek information for which the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs any likely benefit in resolving the issues in this action.

26. All responses are given without prejudice to Mobility's right to produce or rely on subsequently discovered information, facts, or documents. Mobility reserves the right to change its responses and to produce or rely on subsequently discovered documents. The responses contained herein are made in a good faith effort to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 30, and to supply such responsive information as exists and is presently within Mobility's possession, custody, or control, but are in no way to be deemed to be the prejudice of Mobility in relation to further discovery, research, and analysis.

28. Mobility has responded to the topics as it interprets and understands each topic. If Apple subsequently assert an interpretation of any topic or sub-part that differs from Mobility's understanding of that topic or sub-part, Mobility reserves the right to supplement, revise, amend, or modify its objections and responses.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing General Objections, Mobility responds as follows:

RESPONSES TO TOPICS OF DEPOSITION

TOPIC NO. 1:

The structure, function, operation, uses, and features of (1) each Motorola Accused Product, and (2) each product that You contend embodies or has ever embodied the subject matter of any Motorola Asserted Claim.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 1:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “structure, function, operation, uses, and features” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “structure,” “function,” “operation,” “uses,” “features,” “subject matter,” “embodies,” and “embodied” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 2:

Identification of all software, firmware, and/or source code comprising all or part of, or used by or for the operation of any Motorola Accused Product, including but not limited to the name and location of each software, firmware and/or source code file.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 2:

Mobility objects that this Topic is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects that this Topic is overly broad and unduly burdensome with respect to the “[i]dentification of all software, firmware, and/or source code comprising all or part of, or used by or for the operation of any Motorola Accused Product.” Mobility further objects to this Topic on the grounds that the term “including but not limited to” renders this Topic vague and ambiguous. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple’s request.

TOPIC NO. 3:

Internal or external Communications regarding the structure, function, operation, uses, and features of each Motorola Accused Product.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 3:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects on the grounds that the use of the phrases “internal or external communications” and “structure, function, operation, uses, and features” render this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility objects that the terms “communications,” “structure,” “function,” “operation,” “uses,” and “features,” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple’s request.

TOPIC NO. 4:

The conception, reduction to practice, research and development of (1) each Motorola Accused Product and (2) each product that You contend embodies or has ever embodied the subject matter of any Motorola Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 4:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “conception, reduction to practice, research and development” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “conception,” “reduction to practice,” “research,” “development,” subject matter,” “embodies,” and “embodied” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding the conception, reduction to practice, research, and development of each Motorola Accused Product at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 5:

Information contained in schematics, drawings, and design documents for each Motorola Accused Product.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 5:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “schematics, drawings, and design documents” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple’s request.

TOPIC NO. 6:

The type and amount of costs incurred by You in the research and development of each Motorola Accused Product.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 6:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague with respect to its use of the phrase “type and amount of costs incurred.” Mobility further objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “research and development” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 7:

The Person(s) involved in and the most knowledgeable any research, development, testing, prototyping, or experiments relating to any of the Motorola Accused Products.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 7:

Mobility objects that in the current form the Topic is incomprehensible, but will attempt to otherwise respond. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and

vague with respect to its use of the phrase “[p]erson(s) . . . most knowledgeable.” Mobility further objects that the terms “research,” “development,” “testing,” “prototyping,” “experiments,” and “relating” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome with regard to the Accused Mobile Devices, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding the research, development, testing, prototyping, or experiments relating to the Accused Set-Top Boxes at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 8:

The manufacture, fabrication, prototyping, testing, and assembly of (1) each Motorola Accused Product and (2) each product that You contend embodies or has ever embodied the subject.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 8:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “manufacture,” fabrication,” “prototyping,” “testing,” “assembly,” “subject matter,” “embodies,” and “embodied” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Mobility further objects to this Topic as being incomprehensible as to the “subject.”

TOPIC NO. 9:

The sales, importation, exportation, and distribution of (1) each Motorola Accused Product and (2) each product that You contend embodies or has ever embodied the subject matter of any Motorola Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 9:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “sales, importation, exportation, and distribution” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “subject matter,” “embodies,” and “embodied” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome with regard to the Accused Mobile Devices, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding the Accused Set-Top Boxes and the Motorola products that have embodied the subject matter of any Motorola Asserted Patent at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 10:

Your agreements with third parties concerning the supplement, manufacture, production, assembly, or importation of each Motorola Accused Product or portion thereof.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 10:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “agreements,” “concerning,” “supplemental,” “manufacture,” “production,” “assembly,” and “importation” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties, such as confidential proprietary and trade secret information. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome with regard to the Accused Mobile Devices, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify on this Topic regarding the Accused Set-Top Boxes at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 11:

The marketing and promotion efforts regarding the features, performance, attributes, or characteristics of (1) each Motorola Accused Product and (2) each product that You contend embodies or has ever embodied the subject matter of any Motorola Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 11:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague with respect to its use of the phrase “marketing and promotion efforts.” Mobility further objects that the terms “regarding,” “features,” “performance,” “attributes,” “characteristics,” “subject matter,” “embodies,” and “embodied” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome with regard to the Accused Mobile Devices, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding the Accused Set-Top Boxes and the Motorola products that have embodied the subject matter of any Motorola Asserted Patent at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 12:

Any competitive analysis, whether formal or informal, involving comparisons between the Motorola Accused Products and products of other companies, including but not limited to Apple.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 12:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility also objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “products of other companies” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility objects that the terms “competitive analysis,” “formal,” “informal,” and “comparisons” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome with

regard to the Accused Mobile Devices, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify on this Topic regarding the Accused Set-Top Boxes at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 13:

Your gross profits, gross margin, net income and net profits before taxes for the Motorola Accused Products from 2004 to present.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 13:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects that the terms “gross profits,” “gross margin,” “net income,” “net profits,” and “before taxes” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 14:

Your expected, projected, anticipated future sales revenue, costs, and profits from the Motorola Accused Products.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 14:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects that the terms “expected,” “projected,” “anticipated,” “future sales revenue,” “costs,” and “profits” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Motorola also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 15:

Financial documents maintained by You.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 15:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects that the terms “financial documents” and “maintained” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple’s request.

TOPIC NO. 16:

Your accounting methods, forms, reports and internal terminology for compiling maintaining, and analyzing financial data from 2004 to present, including those relating to plans, budgets, forecasts, and financial reports on a company-wide basis and specifically for the Motorola Accused Products.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 16:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague with respect to its use of the phrase “accounting methods, forms, reports, and internal terminology for compiling maintaining and analyzing.” Mobility also objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “plans, budgets, forecasts, and financial reports” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “financial data” and “company-wide basis” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple’s request.

TOPIC NO. 17:

The manner by which You determined the prices, quantities, features, performance, goals, attributes, and other characteristics of the Motorola Accused Products, including, but not limited to the factors that contributed thereto.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 17:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “prices, quantities, features, performance, goals, attributes, and other characteristics” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “determined,” “including,” “not limited to,” “factors,” and “contributed” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Motorola also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony. Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome with regard to the Accused Mobile Devices, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic – as it relates to the Accused Set-Top Boxes – to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple’s request.

TOPIC NO. 18:

The date, manner, and circumstance of Your first awareness of the Apple Patents-in-Suit, including but not limited to Your reaction to the Apple Patents-in-Suit, including any steps You took to avoid infringement of the Apple Patents-in-Suit, including design-arounds or other modifications to the Motorola Accused Products, any other steps You took in response to learning of the existence of the Apple Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 18:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrases “date, manner, and circumstances,” and “design-arounds or other modifications” render this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “awareness,” “reaction,” “limited,” “not limited to,” “steps,” “avoid,” “learning,” and “existence” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to

the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 19:

All efforts undertaken by You to design around or otherwise avoid infringement of any of the Apple Asserted Claims.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 19:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “design around or otherwise avoid infringement” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “efforts” and “undertaken” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to this Topic as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to this Topic as calling for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 20:

Any testing, analysis, consideration, or evaluation conducted by You or anyone acting on Your behalf to determine where, or that may have revealed whether, any Motorola Accused Produced infringe any of the Apple Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 20:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrases “testing, analysis, consideration, or evaluation,” and “anyone acting on Your behalf” render this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “testing,” “analysis,” “consideration,” “evaluation,” “conducted” and “revealed” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 21:

Any affidavit, declaration, or other sworn testimony that summarizes, describes or refers to the Motorola Accused Products.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 21:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “summarizes, describes or refers” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “affidavits,” “declarations,” and “other sworn testimony” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 22:

The personnel and employment history for each of the named inventors of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 22:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “personnel and employment history” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility

objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola has already or will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 23:

The conception of the alleged invention(s) claimed in the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 23:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the term "conception" is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola has already or will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 24:

Any and all efforts towards reducing to practice the alleged invention(s) claimed in the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 24:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the term “efforts” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola has already or will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 25:

Any actual reduction to practice of the alleged invention(s) claimed in the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 25:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the term “actual” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola has already or will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 26:

The nature and extent of any involvement or contribution of any person(s) other than the named inventors in conception, diligence towards reduction to practice, and/or reduction to practice of the alleged invention(s) claimed in the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 26:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague with respect to its use of the phrase “nature and extent of any involvement or contribution.” Mobility

also objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “conception, diligence towards reduction to practice, and/or reduction to practice” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola has already or will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 27:

The preparation, filing, and/or prosecution of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit and any Related Patents, including reissue, interference, reexamination, opposition, cancellation, and/or nullity proceedings.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 27:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague with respect to its use of the phrase “preparation, filing, and/or prosecution.” Mobility also objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “reissue, interference, reexamination, opposition, cancellation, and/or nullity proceedings” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and

unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the term “Related Patents” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola has already or will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 28:

The scope, methodology (including identification of search terms), and results of any prior art searches or analysis related to the Motorola Patents-in-Suit and any Related Patents conducted by You, Your prosecuting attorneys, or anyone substantially involved with the prosecution of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit, whether prior to the issuance of the respective Motorola Patents-in-Suit or since that time.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 28:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and vague with respect to its use of the phrase “scope, methodology (including identification of search terms),

and results.” Mobility also objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “You, Your prosecuting attorneys, or anyone substantially involved with the prosecution” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “conducted,” “Related Patent,” and “prior art searches” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to this Topic as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time.

TOPIC NO. 29:

Prior art to the alleged invention(s) of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit and any Related Patents, known at any time by You, Your prosecuting attorneys, or anyone substantially involved with the prosecution of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit, whether prior to the issuance of the respective Motorola Patents-in-Suit or since that time.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 29:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “You, Your prosecuting attorneys, or anyone substantially involved with the prosecution” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “Prior art,” “Related Patents,” and “known” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic.

Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 30:

The initial offer for sale, initial manufacture, initial use, initial sale, initial public use, initial shipment, initial announcement, initial disclosure, initial offer to license, and initial publication of each embodiment of the alleged invention(s) of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 30:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms "initial," "offer for sale," "manufacture," "use," "sale," "public use," "shipment," "announcement," "disclosure," "offer to license," "publication," and "embodiment" are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic.

Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as

seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome with regard to the Accused Mobile Devices, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify on this Topic regarding the Accused Set-Top Boxes at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 31:

The level of ordinary skill that You allege pertains to each of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 31:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “level of ordinary skill” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the term “pertains” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other

applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Motorola also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony.

TOPIC NO. 32:

The state of the art concerning the alleged invention(s) of each Motorola Patent-in-Suit at the time the respective alleged invention(s) were conceived and/or reduced to practice, including any perceived need in the industry for the alleged invention(s) of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 32:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “perceived need in the industry” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “state of the art,” “conceived,” and “reduced to practice” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time.

Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Motorola also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony.

TOPIC NO. 33:

The benefits of the alleged inventions of each of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit over the prior art.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 33:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “over the prior art” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the term “benefits” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Motorola also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony.

TOPIC NO. 34:

Any commercial success attributed by You to each of the Motorola Asserted Claims, including but not limited to Your sales, profitability, advertising, and use of the alleged invention(s) disclosed by each of the Motorola Assert Claims.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 34:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “sales, profitability, advertising, and use of the alleged invention(s)” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “commercial success,” “attributed,” and “including but not limited to” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 35:

The existence of any secondary considerations (as described in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966)) other than commercial success, such as long-felt need, failure of others, industry recognition, or copying, etc. of the subject matter of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 35:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “long-felt need, failure of others, industry recognition, or copying, etc.” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the term “subject matter” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Motorola also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony.

TOPIC NO. 36:

The availability of non-infringing alternatives or lack thereof to the products and devices alleged to practice the subject matter of each Motorola Asserted Claim.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 36:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “availability of non-infringing alternatives or lack thereof” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “products,” “devices,” and “practice” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Motorola also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony.

TOPIC NO. 37:

Each mode of practicing the subject matter of each Motorola Asserted Claim.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 37:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “mode of practicing” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further

objects that the term “subject matter” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Motorola also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony.

TOPIC NO. 38:

Any product, device, apparatus, method, process, system, or technology other than the Apple Accused Products that You believe is, was, may be, or may have been infringing the Motorola Patents-in-Suit or Related Patents in any other lawsuit, judicial proceeding, administrative proceeding, arbitration, or other adverse proceeding.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 38:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrases “product, device, apparatus, method, process, system, or technology,” and “lawsuit judicial proceeding, administrative proceeding, arbitration, or other adverse proceeding” render this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the term “believe” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic

seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 39:

Any lawsuit, judicial proceeding, arbitration, patent interference proceeding, appeal proceeding, reissue, or reexamination proceeding, or patent opposition, cancellation or nullity proceeding concerning the Motorola Patents-in-Suit, including but not limited to:

- (a) Motorola, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., Civil Action No. 10-cv-700, filed November 10, 2010, in the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin; and
- (b) Certain Wireless Communications System Server Software, Wireless Handheld Devices and Battery Packs, U.S. International Trade Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-706.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 39:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase "lawsuit, judicial proceeding, arbitration, patent interference proceeding, appeal proceeding, reissue, or reexamination proceeding, or patent opposition, cancellation or nullity proceeding" renders this

Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “concerning” and “including” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 40:

Your patent policies or practices regarding licensing and/or sublicensing of Your Patent Portfolio.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 40:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “patent policies and practices” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the term “Patent Portfolio” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product

doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

TOPIC NO. 41:

Your actual and expected revenues from licensing and/or sublicensing of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 41:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “actual and expected revenues” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 42:

Agreements, including but not limited to licenses, between You and any Person concerning the Motorola Patents-in-Suit or the Motorola Accused Products.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 42:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase “including but not limited to licenses” renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “Agreements” and “concerning” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple’s request.

TOPIC NO. 43:

Any offers to license or notice letters written by Your to any person concerning the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 43:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “offers to license,” “notice letters,” “written,” and “concerning” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 44:

The marking of any product or related materials with the patent number of any of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit by You or any licensee to the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 44:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “marking” and “related materials” are vague

and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 45:

Any meeting of Your board of directors during which the Apple Patents-in-Suit, Motorola Patents-in-Suit, this Action, or any Accused Apple Products was discussed or considered.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 45:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms "meeting," "discussed," and "considered" are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-

client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 46:

Any testing, analysis, consideration, or evaluation conducted by or on behalf of You, Your counsel, or anyone else acting on Your behalf to determine whether, or that may have revealed whether, any Apple Accused Products infringe any of the Motorola Asserted Claims.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 46:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrases “testing, analysis, consideration, or evaluation” and “You, Your counsel, or anyone else acting on Your behalf” render this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility further objects that the terms “conducted,” “determine,” and “revealed” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this

Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 47:

Your first knowledge of Apple's alleged infringement of the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 47:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the term "knowledge" is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 48:

Any notice given to Apple prior to the filing of this Action reflecting Your belief that Apple was, is, or may be infringing the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 48:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “notice,” “reflecting,” and “belief” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 49:

Any communications between you and Apple concerning the Apple Patents-in-Suit or the Motorola Patents-in-Suit that occurred prior to the filing of the instant lawsuit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 49:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible

evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “communications” and “concerning” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 50:

Communications between You and any Person concerning the Apple Patents-in-Suit or the Motorola Patents-in-Suit.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 50:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “communications” and “concerning” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the

extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple's request.

TOPIC NO. 51:

Communication between You and any Person concerning whether the Motorola Patents-in-Suit are invalid, unenforceable, or not infringed by Apple.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 51:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms "communications," "concerning," "invalid," and "unenforceable" are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is

not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple's request.

TOPIC NO. 52:

The fifteen factors set forth in *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers, Inc.*, 318 F. Supp. 1116, 1120 (S.D.N.Y. 1970) as they apply to Your claim for damages in this Action.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 52:

Mobility objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the term "apply" is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility also objects to the extent this Topic calls for expert testimony.

TOPIC NO. 53:

All facts and circumstances relied on by You to support the allegations stated in any pleading served in this Action.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 53:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “facts,” “circumstances,” “relied,” and “support” are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 54:

All Communications between You and Apple as they related to the Apple Patents-in-Suit, the Motorola Patents-in-Suit, the Apple Accused Products, the Motorola Accused Products, or this Action.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 54:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible

evidence. Mobility further objects that the term “Communications” is vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 55:

All cable service providers that have entered into any license, service, or other agreements with Motorola and Motorola’s relationship with each such cable service provider.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 55:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “providers,” “license,” “service” and “agreements” and “relationships” are vague, ambiguous and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as

readily available to Apple as it is Mobility. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 56:

The research, engineering, design, development, implementation, revision, support, or provision of any version of the interactive program guides running on each of the Motorola Accused Set-Top Boxes.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 56:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “research,” “engineering,” “design,” “development,” “implementation,” “revision,” “support,” “provision,” “version,” “interactive,” and “running on” are vague, ambiguous and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be

construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 57:

The microchip(s), microprocessor(s), microcontroller(s), chipset(s) or other component(s) that implements, supports, or provides interactive program guide functions on each of the Motorola Accused Set-Top Boxes, including without limitation any mechanisms for obtaining television programming information from a source signal, television programming listing displays, picture-in-picture displays, picture-in-picture jumping mechanisms, program reminder mechanisms, program marking mechanisms, and recording mechanisms.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 57:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “implements,” “supports,” “provides,” “functions,” “mechanisms,” “revision,” “information,” “source signal,” “listing displays,” “jumping mechanisms,” “program reminder mechanisms” and “recording mechanisms” are vague, ambiguous and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility.

Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 58:

The software, firmware, or other source code used to implement, support, or provide interactive program guide functions on each of the Motorola Accused Set-Top Boxes, including without limitation any mechanisms for obtaining television programming information from a source signal, television programming listing displays, picture-in-picture displays, picture-in-picture jumping mechanisms, program reminder mechanisms, program marking mechanisms, and recording mechanisms.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 58:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “software,” “firmware,” “implement,” “support,” “provide,” “functions,” “mechanisms,” “information,” “source signal,” “listing displays,” “jumping mechanisms,” “program reminder mechanisms” and “recording mechanisms” are vague, ambiguous and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility

objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 59:

The operation of the user interface for locking or unlocking the touch screen of each Motorola Accused Mobile Device, including (i) the conditions under which the touch screen becomes locked; (ii) the way(s) in which a user may unlock a locked touch screen; (iii) any graphical elements presented by the user interface when the touch screen is locked; (iv) whether such graphical element(s) are interactive and, if so, how a user may interact with such graphical element(s); and (v) any of the aforementioned locking or unlocking functionalities.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 59:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms "operation," "user interface," "conditions," "graphical elements," "presented," "graphical elements," "interactive," and "functionalities" are

vague, ambiguous and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 60:

The software, firmware, or other source code used by any Motorola Accused Mobile Device, including without limitation Droid X, Atrix, and Xoom, that (i) detects the addition or removal of additional devices or peripherals; (ii) detects the addition or removal of additional display devices; or (iii) allocates video output between the built-in display and additional display devices.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 60:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms "software," "firmware," "detects," "allocates," "built-in" and "display" are vague, ambiguous and overly broad in the context of this Topic.

Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple's request.

TOPIC NO. 61:

The software, firmware, or other source code used by any Motorola Accused Mobile Device, including without limitation Droid X, Atrix, and Xoom, that implements the Webtop and (HD) Entertainment Center applications.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 61:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms "software," "firmware" and "implements" are vague, ambiguous and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects to this Topic to the extent responsive information is as readily available to Apple as it is Mobility.

Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple's request.

TOPIC NO. 62:

The file name(s) and directory location(s) for the source code references in Topics 58-61.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 62:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms "file name(s)" and "directory location(s)" are vague and ambiguous in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative

of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Subject to and without waiving its general and specific objections, Motorola is willing to meet-and-confer with Apple to narrow this Topic to an appropriate scope, if any, or to discuss alternative methods of discovery more appropriate to addressing Apple's request.

TOPIC NO. 63:

The corporate and personnel structure of Motorola Mobility.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 63:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrase "corporate and personnel structure" renders this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility's possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. . Mobility further objects to this request as unduly burdensome, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

TOPIC NO. 64:

Your policies, practices, and procedures for retention, preservation, and destruction of Documents (including electronic documents and e-mails) related to the foregoing deposition Topics, including the actual steps taken to retain and preserve documents relevant to this Action as well as the location, organization, and custodians of such Documents.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 64:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility objects on the grounds that the use of the phrases “policies, practices, and procedures for retention, preservation, and destruction of Documents (including electronic documents and e-mails)” and “actual steps taken to retain and preserve documents relevant to this Action” render this Topic vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

Mobility further objects that the terms “policies,” “practices,” “procedures,” “retention,” “preservation,” “destruction,” “Documents,” “actual,” “steps,” “retain,” “preserve,” “location,” and “organizations” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law. Mobility further objects to this request as unduly

burdensome, as Apple has already taken several depositions on this topic in one or more of the Related Litigations.

Subject to the foregoing objections, Motorola will produce a witness or witnesses to testify regarding this topic at an appropriate date, time and location.

TOPIC NO. 65:

The identity, locations, titles, and job descriptions of persons most knowledgeable about each the foregoing deposition Topics.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 65:

Mobility objects that the Topic is incomprehensible as written, but Mobility will attempt to respond. Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “identity,” “locations,” “titles,” “job descriptions,” and “knowledgeable” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

TOPIC NO. 66:

The identity and location of all persons, documents, and things consulted, reviewed, communicated with or relied upon in preparing to testify about each of the foregoing Topics.

RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 66:

Mobility objects to this Topic as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague and ambiguous, and neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Mobility further objects that the terms “identity,” “locations,” “documents,” “things consulted,” “reviewed,” “communicated with,” “relied upon” and “preparing” are vague, ambiguous, and overly broad in the context of this Topic. Mobility objects that this Topic seeks information outside of Mobility’s possession, custody, and control. Mobility objects that the Topic seeks information that may be subject to privilege of third parties. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic seeks or may be construed as seeking testimony protected by attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privileges and protections. Mobility objects to this Topic as unduly burdensome to the extent it is duplicative of other discovery requests. Mobility also objects that this Topic is not limited at all in time. Mobility further objects to the extent this Topic calls for a legal conclusion or presents a question of law.

Dated: July 19, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC. (f/k/a
MOTOROLA, INC.) AND MOTOROLA
MOBILITY, INC.

By: /s/ Anthony Pastor
Anthony Pastor

Charles K. Verhoeven
Anthony Pastor
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
Email: charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com
anthonypastor@quinnemanuel.com

Edward M. Mullins (863920)
Astigarraga Davis Mullins & Grossman, P.A.
701 Brickell Avenue, 16th Floor
Miami, Florida 33131
Phone: (305) 372-8282
Fax: (305) 372-8202
Email: emullins@astidavis.com

Edward J. DeFranco
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, New York 10010
Phone: (212) 849-7000
Fax: (212) 849-7100
Email: eddefranco@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Nelson
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
500 West Madison St., Ste. 2450
Chicago, IL 60661
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401
Email: davenelson@quinnemanuel.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim-
Defendant Motorola Solutions, Inc. and
Motorola Mobility, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on July 19, 2011, I served the foregoing document via electronic mail on all counsel of record identified on the attached Service List.

/s/ John P. Duchemin

John P. Duchemin

SERVICE LIST
Motorola Mobility, Inc. versus Apple Inc.
Case No. 1:10cv023580-Civ-UU
United States District Court, Southern District of Florida

Christopher R.J. Pace
christopher.pace@weil.com
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1200
Miami, Florida 33131
Tel.: (305) 577-3100 / Fax: (305) 374-7159

Attorneys for Apple, Inc.
Electronically served via e-mail

Of Counsel:
Matthew D. Powers
matthew.powers.@weil.com
Steven S. Cherensky
steven.cherensky@weil.com
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
201 Redwood Shores Parkway
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 802-3000
Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

Mark G. Davis
mark.davis@weil.com
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
1300 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 682-7000
Facsimile: (202) 857-0940

Robert T. Haslam
rhaslam@cov.com
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 700
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 632-4700
Facsimile: (650) 632-4800

Robert D. Fram
framrd@cov.com
Christine Saunders Haskett
chaskett@cov.com
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
One Front Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 591-6000
Facsimile: (415) 591-6091

Attorneys for Apple, Inc.
Electronically served via e-mail