

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 10-23580-CIV-SCOLA/BANDSTRA

MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

_____/

APPLE INC.,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA, INC., and
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Counterclaim Defendants.

_____/

ORDER

THIS CAUSE came before the Court on the following pretrial discovery motions filed by the parties in the above-captioned case. Upon review of these motions, all responses and replies thereto, the court file and applicable law, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows:

1. Apple Inc.'s [Sealed] Motion to Compel Responses to Interrogatories Regarding Set-Top Box Patents (Nos. 19-22) (D.E. 227) filed on January 31, 2012 is GRANTED consistent with this Court's February 24, 2012 Order addressing this matter.

2. Apple, Inc.'s [Sealed] Motion to Compel Production of Documents and Testimony

Regarding Set-Top Box Components (D.E. 285) filed on March 27, 2012 is GRANTED IN PART, the Court finding that Apple's Request for Production Nos. 5 & 6 seek information which is relevant to the subject matter of this action. Specifically, the Court finds that the information regarding the structure of integrated circuits contained in accused Motorola Products including Broadcom documentation and Bills of Materials ("BOM") for such accused Motorola products are responsive to these interrogatories. In view of the parties' contemplated stipulation regarding this production, Motorola shall produce representative BOMs for each of the accused STBs and documentation describing the structure and function of the relevant chips and/or components within ten (10) days of the date of this Order. In addition, Motorola shall produce a witness to testify concerning the accused STB hardware and components within this time period or as otherwise agreed upon by the parties.

3. Apple Inc.'s Motion to Compel Further Responses to Interrogatories Regarding Set-Top Box Patents (Nos. 19-22) (D.E. 286) filed on March 27, 2012 is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART as follows:

a. DENIED with respect to Interrogatory Nos. 19 & 21 in view of Motorola's supplemental responses which are consistent with the representations made during the meet and confer process and which provide sufficient information responsive to these interrogatories.

b. GRANTED with respect to Interrogatory Nos. 20 & 22, the Court finding Motorola's supplemental responses are vague and/or insufficient. Accordingly, Motorola shall provide better responses to these interrogatories including a description of the hardware components in the accused STB that support the claimed IPG functions within

ten (10) days of the date of this Order

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers, at Miami, Florida this 24th day of April, 2012.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ted E. Bandstra", is written over a horizontal line.

Ted E. Bandstra
United States Magistrate Judge

Copies furnished to:
Honorable Robert N. Scola
Counsel of record