UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION APPLE, INC., a California corporation, ) Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK Plaintiff, ) ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO v. ) EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF RICHARD HOWARTH, ANDRES V SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A ) DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ) O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York ) NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA corporation; SAMSUNG ) O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN ELECTRONICS AMERICA, ILC., ) TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC. ) a Delaware limited liability company, ) Defendants. ) Defendants. ) SAMSUNG COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION NUMBER U US ITC Inv. Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing not relevant to any issue in this case, and is hierofero barred under FRE 40 Hearing 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud Transcript Indings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1266 14. Accordingly, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud Transcript Indings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1266 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's sobjection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA         SAN JOSE DIVISION         APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         Corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         Corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       O'BRIEN, DAVID BRIAN AGNETT/         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.         Defendants.       O'Brien count of the case, and balancing         considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object         as follows:       A. Andries Van Dam         1. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBIT       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       US ITIC Inv.         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       Televant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402         Hearing       403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud         Transcript       findings of parallel proceedin			
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA         SAN JOSE DIVISION         APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       OAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       O'BRIEN, DAVID BRIAN AGNETTA         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.         Defendants.       O'Brien Stansung's Objections         COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud         Transcript       Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA         SAN JOSE DIVISION         APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         Corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         Corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       O'BRIEN, DAVID BRIAN AGNETT/         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.         Defendants.       O'Brien count of the case, and balancing         considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object         as follows:       A. Andries Van Dam         1. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBIT       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       US ITIC Inv.         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       Televant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402         Hearing       403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud         Transcript       findings of parallel proceedin			
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA         SAN JOSE DIVISION         APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       OAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       O'BRIEN, DAVID BRIAN AGNETTA         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.         Defendants.       O'Brien Stansung's Objections         COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud         Transcript       Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA         SAN JOSE DIVISION         APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       OAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       O'BRIEN, DAVID BRIAN AGNETTA         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.         Defendants.       O'Brien Stansung's Objections         COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud         Transcript       Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA         SAN JOSE DIVISION         APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         Corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         Corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       O'BRIEN, DAVID BRIAN AGNETT/         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.         Defendants.       O'Brien count of the case, and balancing         considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object         as follows:       A. Andries Van Dam         1. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBIT       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       US ITIC Inv.         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       Televant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402         Hearing       403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud         Transcript       findings of parallel proceedin			
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA         SAN JOSE DIVISION         APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       DAM, STEPHENE GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         Curporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         Corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       O'BRIEN, DAVID BRIAN AGNETTA         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.         Defendants.       O'Brien count of the case, and balancing         considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object         as follows: <b>A. Andries Van Dam L. Samsung's Objections</b> Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-       403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud         Transcript       findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1266         14.       Accordingly, the Court sustating Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury a			
SAN JOSE DIVISION         APPLE, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, V.       Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF RICHARD HOWARTH, ANDRIES V PRICHARD HOWARTH, ANDRIES V OBRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA Corporation; SAMSUNG UCOPTORING: SAMSUNG Defendants.       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA Subleman Statistic Comparition NOT TRUE TO THE STAND TO TO THE STAND TO THE STAND Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing NO, 33.7TA- 796, Vol. 4 Not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude Transcript Findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1265 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence <td></td> <td>UNITED STATES I</td> <td>DISTRICT COURT</td>		UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT
APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       RICHARD HOWARTH, ANDRIES V         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York)       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         corporation; SAMSUNG       Defendants.         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC.,       a Delaware limited liability company,         Defendants.       Defendants.         Defendants.       Defendants.         Stollows:       A.         A. Andries Van Dam       1.         Samsung's Objections       EXHIBIT         NUMBER       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk or confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
APPLE, INC., a California corporation,       Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK         Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       RICHARD HOWARTH, ANDRIES V         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York)       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         corporation; SAMSUNG       Defendants.         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC.,       a Delaware limited liability company,         Defendants.       Defendants.         Defendants.       Defendants.         Stollows:       A.         A. Andries Van Dam       1.         Samsung's Objections       EXHIBIT         NUMBER       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk or confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence		SAN JOSE	DIVISION
Plaintiff,       ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO         v.       EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF         SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A       DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT         Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         corporation; SAMSUNG       NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.         Defendants.       Defendants.         Matter reviewing the parties' briefing, considering the record in the case, and balancing         considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object         as follows:         A. Andries Van Dam         1. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBT         US ITC Inv.       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing         No. 337-TA-         796, Vol. 4       not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402         403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's objection in limine to exclud         403. Furthermore, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk or         (and relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402         Hearing       10. Surthermore			
v. ) EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY OF RICHARD HOWARTH, ANDRIES V DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York ) Corporation; SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, ) a Delaware limited liability company, Defendants. ) Mathematical displays briefing, considering the record in the case, and balancing considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' objec as follows: A. Andries Van Dam 1. Samsung's Objections EXHIBIT NUMBER US ITC Inv. No. 337-TA- 796, Vol. 4 Hearing 4. Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence 1			
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A ) DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ) O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York ) Corporation; SAMSUNG ) NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, ) a Delaware limited liability company, ) Defendants. ) Defendants. ) Defendants. ) Defendants. ) Mathematical Structure of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object as follows: A. Andries Van Dam I. Samsung's Objections EXHIBIT COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION NUMBER US ITC Inv. Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information 796, Vol. 4 not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 Hearing 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude Transcript findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG       O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN         ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York       NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA         corporation; SAMSUNG       NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,       a Delaware limited liability company,       NISHIBORI, AND BRIAN AGNETTA         a Delaware limited liability company,       Defendants.       Defendants.			<ul> <li>RICHARD HOWARTH, ANDRIES VA</li> <li>DAM, STEPHEN GRAY, VINCENT</li> </ul>
corporation; SAMSUNG       )         TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, )       a Delaware limited liability company, )         a Delaware limited liability company, )       )         Defendants. )       )         Defendants. )       )         After reviewing the parties' briefing, considering the record in the case, and balancing considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object as follows:         A. Andries Van Dam       1. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBIT NUMBER       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         US ITC Inv.       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclud findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk or confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence	Korean corporat	tion; SAMSUNG	O'BRIEN, DAVID TEECE, SHIN
a Delaware limited liability company,       )         Defendants.       )         Defendants.       )         After reviewing the parties' briefing, considering the record in the case, and balancing considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object as follows:         A. Andries Van Dam       1. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBIT NUMBER       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         US ITC Inv.       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk or confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence         1       1	corporation; SA	MSUNG )	
After reviewing the parties' briefing, considering the record in the case, and balancing considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object as follows: A. Andries Van Dam 1. Samsung's Objections EXHIBIT NUMBER US ITC Inv. No. 337-TA- 796, Vol. 4 Hearing Transcript Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. <i>See</i> ECF No. 1265 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object as follows:         A. Andries Van Dam       1. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBIT       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       US ITC Inv.         US ITC Inv.       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence		Defendants.	)
considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object as follows: A. Andries Van Dam 1. Samsung's Objections EXHIBIT COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION NUMBER US ITC Inv. No. 337-TA- 796, Vol. 4 Hearing Transcript Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
considerations set forth in Federal Rule of Evidence 403, the Court rules on the parties' object as follows: A. Andries Van Dam 1. Samsung's Objections EXHIBIT COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION NUMBER US ITC Inv. No. 337-TA- 796, Vol. 4 Hearing Transcript Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence			
as follows: A. Andries Van Dam 1. Samsung's Objections EXHIBIT COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION US ITC Inv. No. 337-TA- 796, Vol. 4 Hearing Transcript Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence	After rev	viewing the parties' briefing, consi	dering the record in the case, and balancing
A. Andries Van Dam         I. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBIT       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         NUMBER       Image: Court of the second sec	considerations se	et forth in Federal Rule of Evidence	ce 403, the Court rules on the parties' objecti
1. Samsung's Objections         EXHIBIT NUMBER       COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION         US ITC Inv.       Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence	as follows:		
EXHIBIT NUMBERCOURT'S RULING ON OBJECTIONUS ITC Inv. No. 337-TA- 796, Vol. 4Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk o confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence	A. And	ries Van Dam	
EXHIBIT NUMBERCOURT'S RULING ON OBJECTIONUS ITC Inv. No. 337-TA- 796, Vol. 4Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk o confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence	1. Samsung's Objections		
US ITC Inv. No. 337-TA- 796, Vol. 4Sustained. This exhibit contains excerpts from Dr. Van Dam's ITC hearing testimony regarding patents not asserted in this litigation. Such information not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402 403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk o confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence1		COURT'S RULING ON OBJI	ECTION
796, Vol. 4not relevant to any issue in this case, and is therefore barred under FRE 402Hearing403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to excludeTranscriptfindings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 126914. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence1	US ITC Inv.		1 0
Hearing Transcript403. Furthermore, the Court granted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude findings of parallel proceedings as confusing to the jury. See ECF No. 1269 14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence1			0
14. Accordingly, the Court sustains Samsung's objection because the risk of confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence 1	· ·	403. Furthermore, the Court gra	nted Samsung's motion in limine to exclude
confusing the jury and wasting time by introducing excluded evidence 1	Transcript		
1			
Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK	·	1	
ORDER ON OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS			

## Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document1749 Filed08/14/12 Page2 of 7 outweighs the probative value of this testimony under FRE 403. Accord ECF 1 No. 1690 at 3; ECF No. 1657 at 2; ECF No. 1596 at 6. Overruled. Although Dr. Van Dam's expert report addressed invalidity of the PDX 27.22 2 '381 patent, his analysis required him to analyze and apply the claim terms of 3 that patent, including the language of claim 19, to prior art devices. Accordingly, Apple is entitled to ask Dr. Van Dam about the application of his 4 interpretations to other devices, including Samsung devices, in order to test their consistency. 5 2. Apple's Objections 6 **COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION EXHIBIT NUMBER** 7 DX720: Overruled. Apple argues that Dr. Van Dam only opined on the 2006 version of 8 SDX3964.003a-Tablecloth in his expert report, but is now being asked to testify at trial about the 2005 version. Apple apparently bases this argument on the fact that "[n]one of 37a: 9 SDX3964.071b: the ten photos of Tablecloth in his report depicts coordinate locations"—an SDX3964.02identifying feature distinguishing the 2005 version from the 2006 version. 10 These images alone are insufficient to conclude that Dr. Van Dam only 03: SDX3964.013considered the 2006 version of Tablecloth in his report. Indeed, in its 11 038: supplemental statement, Samsung clarified that the 2005 Tablecloth source code 12 was timely produced to Apple for inspection, that both versions behave the same SDX3964.071-072 way, and that Mr. Van Dam's expert report was not limited to the 2006 version. 13 Accordingly, Apple's objections are overruled. Overruled. DX694 is an internal Apple email and thus is an admission of a party DX694 14 opponent. Apple's knowledge of LaunchTile is relevant and is admissible under 15 FRE 403. **B.** Stephen Gray 16 1. Samsung's Objections 17 COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION **EXHIBIT** 18 **NUMBER PX49** Sustained-in-part and overruled-in-part. PX49 is a Samsung document and thus 19 an admission. Although Mr. Gray has never reviewed this document, Apple 20 may use the exhibit to impeach Mr. Gray if he testifies that Samsung's double tap development documents are unrelated to Apple or the '163 Patent. 21 PDX41.1 Sustained-in-part and overruled-in-part. Samsung objects that this video shows bounceback functionality that is irrelevant to the '915 and '163 patents-the 22 only patents about which Mr. Gray is testifying. However, the LaunchTile is 23 relevant to both the '381 Patent and the '163 Patent. PDX41.1 shows the World View and depicts a user tapping on a group of tiles to enter the Zone View. To 24 the extent the demonstrative shows a user tapping on a group of tiles, the demonstrative shows elements of LaunchTile's operation that are relevant to Mr. 25 Gray's opinion that '163 is invalid. If Mr. Gray opines that the '163 Patent is invalid in light of LaunchTile, then Samsung has opened the door, and Apple 26 may use this demonstrative to cross-examine Mr. Gray. 27 2. Apple's Objections 28

EXHIBIT NUMBER	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION
SDX3593.028, .030	Overruled. Mr. Gray disclosed a theory of invalidity, contending that Nomu inherently disclosed claim elements [1b] and [1d] of the '915 patent. Apple argues that this exhibit, however, attempts to show that Nomura meets eleme [1b] and [1d], which it claims is a different theory than inherency. The Cour not persuaded, inherency is effectively an argument that a particular piece of prior art <i>necessarily</i> anticipates a patent. Thus, Apple had notice that Mr. Gr intended to argue that Nomura anticipated claims [1b] and [1d] of the '915 patent.
DX561; SDX3952.046, 0.62, 0.066, 0.067	Overruled. Apple argues that the '187 application was not disclosed, and tha filing date of the '187 application cannot serve as the priority date for the '62 Patent. In fact, the '187 application is disclosed on the face of the '632 Pate which was repeatedly cited in Samsung's invalidity contentions. <i>See</i> Marou Decl., Ex. X. Furthermore, the '187 application contains a written description that is substantially similar to the '632 Patent. Accordingly, the '187 applications on slides SDX3953.066067 are not disclosed by '187 may be addressed on crocexamination of Mr. Gray.
C. Vincent O'Brien	
1. Samsung's Objections	
WITNESS AND EXHIBIT NO.	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION
PX2010; Samsung's Opening Slide 145	Overruled. Samsung objects to Apple's use of Samsung's own opening statement and slide on grounds that (1) they are inadmissible hearsay, and (2 they are not evidence and will confuse the jury. Samsung's own opening statement and slide have already been presented to the jury and are party admissions under FRE 801(d)(2) and thus not hearsay. Apple's use of these statements to cross-examine Samsung's own witnesses will not be unduly prejudicial or confusing to the jury under FRE 403.
2	. Apple's Objections
WITNESS AND	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION
EXHIBIT NO. SDX3956.022	Overruled-in-part, sustained-in-part. Apple argues that Dr. O'Brien's damage opinion should be altogether excluded because (1) his calculations rely, in part on survey data collected by Samsung's survey and marketing expert, Dr. Sukumar, who is not listed by Samsung as a trial witness and will not testify because Samsung failed to include him on Samsung's narrowed witness list, (2) he is not competent to sponsor Dr. Sukumar's survey opinions. Apple por to the Court's prior ruling requiring Mr. Poret and Mr. Van Liere to testify lif regarding their surveys, rather than simply allowing Dr. Winer to sponsor M Poret's and Mr. Van Liere's results. The Court finds that exclusion of Dr. Sukumar's survey would be unduly prejudicial to Samsung. Accordingly, the

**United States District Court** For the Northern District of California

	Court finds good cause for Samsung to replace one of its current identified witnesses with Dr. Sukumar so that he may present his survey and be subject to cross-examination.
SDX3956.019	Overruled. Apple argues that the parties should not re-litigate discovery disputes
	before the jury and objects to this demonstrative, which depicts a timeline of Apple's production of royalty reports, under FRE 403. In support of its
	argument, Apple cites Judge Grewal's ruling denying Samsung's motion to strik portions of an expert damages report prepared by Apple's damages expert, Terry
	Musika. <i>See</i> ECF No. 1144 at 8. However, Samsung's demonstrative does not contravene Judge Grewal's or any other Court order. Furthermore, Apple and its
	damages expert Mr. Musika have made an issue out of the alleged incompleteness of Dr. O'Brien's damages report, and Samsung may therefore
	attempt to bolster Dr. O'Brien's opinion by pointing to the unavailability of certain Apple licensing information at the time of Dr. O'Brien's expert report.
	Under these circumstances, the probative value of the demonstrative outweighs any prejudicial effect, and it will not be a waste of time under FRE 403.
D. Dovid	d Tasas
D. David Teece	
1. Samsung's Objections	
EXHIBIT NUMBER	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION
Teece: PX85 and PX87	Sustained. PX85 and PX87 risk creating litigation within litigation regarding a matter that is of limited relevance to this case and is therefore inadmissible unde FRE 403.
	PX85 is Samsung's "Re-Amended Defense and Counterclaim" in a British case.
	PX87 is an expert report prepared for Samsung in the British case by experts no
	testifying in the current case. Apple seeks to admit PX85 and PX87 as
	Samsung's party admissions about FRAND licensing that contradict Samsung's assertions in this case. Samsung argues that PX85 and PX87 are inadmissible under FRE 403 balancing and are hearsay.
	DV05 and DV07 relate to a Dritish asso that involved different parties different
	PX85 and PX87 relate to a British case that involved different parties, different patents, and the setting of different industry-wide standards than the current case
	Accordingly, PX85 and PX87 are of limited relevance and are likely to waste time and confuse the jury.
2.	
WITNESS AND	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION
WITNESS	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION Sustained. Samsung's demonstrative depicts UMTS rates and LTE rates. Dr. Teece admitted during his deposition that LTE and UMTS are different

Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK ORDER ON OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS

	explain why a license offer for a portfolio of LTE patents is comparable to the reasonable royalty rate for two UMTS standard essential patents. Samsung does not provide an explanation as to why the LTE licenses are comparable to the
	hypothetical license at issue. Moreover, Dr. Teece could not identify whether
	any of Samsung's UMTS-declared essential patents have been declared essential to LTE. <i>See</i> Walden Decl. Ex. 4 [Teece Dep. 141-42]. Thus, because the
	comparability of the licenses has not been shown, any probative value of the LTE licenses is outweighed by the risk of prejudice, wasting time, and confusing the
	jury, and the LTE licenses are therefore excluded under FRE 403. <i>See Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.,</i> 580 F.3d 1301, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2009) ("[L]icenses
	relied on by the patentee in proving damages [must be] sufficiently comparable to the hypothetical license at issue in suit."); <i>accord Uniloc USA</i> , <i>Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 632 F.3d 1292, 1316-17 (Fed. Cir. 2011).
	As for Qualcomm's UMTS rate, Apple argues that the rates cited pre-date
	finalization of the UMTS standard and principally involve standards other than UMTS. Samsung does not dispute this point. Accordingly, Samsung has not shown that the Qualcomm "UMTS rate" is a comparable license to the
	hypothetical license at issue, and thus its probative value is outweighed by the risk of prejudice, wasting time, and confusing the jury under FRE 403.
DX630	Overruled. Apple objects that Samsung did not identify DX630 on its trial
	exhibit list as a FRE 1006 exhibit. Apple itself has introduced numerous summary exhibits pursuant to FRE 1006. Rule 1006 provides: "The contents of
	voluminous writings, recordings, or photographs which cannot conveniently be examined in court may be presented in the form of a chart, summary, or
	calculation." "A proponent of summary evidence must establish that the underlying materials upon which the summary is based (1) are admissible in
	evidence and (2) were made available to the opposing party for inspection."
	<i>United States v. Rizk</i> , 660 F.3d 1125, 1130 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing <i>Amarel v. Connell</i> , 102 F.3d 1494, 1516 (9th Cir. 1996)). "These materials must be
	admissible, but need not themselves be admitted into evidence." <i>Id.</i> (citing <i>United States v. Meyers</i> , 847 F.2d 1408, 1412 (9th Cir. 1988)). "The availability
	requirement ensures that the opposing party has 'an opportunity to verify the reliability and accuracy of the summary prior to trial.'" <i>Id.</i> (quoting <i>Paddack v.</i>
	<i>Dave Christensen, Inc.</i> , 745 F.2d 1254, 1261 (9th Cir. 1984)). Apple challenges only the form in which this summary chart of information is presented, but Apple
	does not contest the admissibility of the underlying license agreements, nor does Apple claim that the underlying documents are unavailable for Apple's
	inspection. Indeed, each underlying license agreement is identified by Bates number in DX630. Accordingly, the Court finds that this exhibit is admissible under FRE 1006.
E. Bria	n Agnetta
1.	. Samsung's Objections
WITNESS	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION
AND EXHIBIT NO. Agnetta: Depo	Overruled. As the inventor of the '632 Patent, Agnetta can testify to what he

54:08-09, 54:18-19.	invented. Samsung objects that Mr. Agnetta cannot testify as an expert regard all possible embodiments of the patent. However, Mr. Agnetta's testimony is limited to the embodiments actually contained in his own patent.
2	. Apple's Objections
WITNESS	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION
AND EXHIBIT NO.	
Agnetta: Depo 14:1-7	Sustained. Agnetta testified that the '632 Patent was conceived "at least prior early May of 2005." The filing of the provisional patent application No. 60/718,187 (the '187 application) on September 16, 2005 is not corroboration an early May 2005 conception date.
Agnetta: 15:21-16:19 and DX561	Overruled. Agnetta testified as to the '187 application (DX561) filed on September 16, 2005. Apple argues that (1) the '187 application was not disclosed in Samsung's patent invalidity contentions, and (2) the filing date of the '187 application cannot serve as the priority date for the '632 Patent.
	The '187 application is the provisional application which became the '632 Patent. The '187 application and the '632 Patent have substantially similar written descriptions. Moreover, the '187 application was disclosed on the face the '632 Patent, which was repeatedly cited in Samsung's invalidity contention <i>See</i> Maroulis Decl., Ex. X. Accordingly, Agnetta Depo 15:21-16:19 and DX5 are relevant evidence as to the priority date of the '632 Patent.
F. Rich	ard Howarth
1	. Apple's Objections
EXHIBIT NUMBER	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION
DX579	Sustained. This document was not disclosed in Samsung's interrogatory responses served on February 22, 2012, and February 29, 2012, which request Samsung to disclose Samsung's documents in support of its claims of functionality. DX579, an e-mail, was not disclosed in the interrogatory responses and is excluded.
DX2627	Overruled. This slide show presentation contains pictures of the F700 and the LG Prada. Apple contends that this slide show should be precluded because ( it contains an incorrect date and therefore could be misleading to the jury, and the F700 has been excluded.
	Samsung explains that this document is relevant to show that Apple compares own products with others in the industry. Evidence used for this purpose is admissible. To the extent that the date is erroneous on the document, the Cour will explain to the jury that the correct date is 2007 and not 2006. Additionall the Court will issue a limiting instruction with respect to the images of the F70 "You may not consider the F700 as evidence of invalidity or non-infringemen you may only consider the F700 for alternative design and functionality."

Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK ORDER ON OBJECTIONS TO EXHIBITS

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document1749 Filed08/14/12 Page7 of 7		
1	1.	Apple's Objections	
2	EXHIBIT NUMBER	COURT'S RULING ON OBJECTION	
3	Nishibori	Sustained-in-part and overruled-in-part. The Court has reviewed Samsung's	
4	Deposition	deposition designations for Nishibori. The Court has previously excluded Mr. Nishibori's testimony to rebut Apple's creation theory of the iPhone, to rebut	
5		allegations of copying and willfulness and to establish that the industry was moving towards the iPhone design concept. ECF No. 1553. The only purpose	
6		for which Mr. Nishibori's testimony is admissible is related to functionality of the design. The deposition designations at 6:24-7:1 and 10:6-10:15 contain	
7		background information and therefore this testimony is admissible. However,	
8		the remainder of the testimony that Samsung seeks to elicit from Mr. Nishibori is to be used for one of the improper purposes described above. The jury is	
9		unlikely to consider this evidence for functionality purposes. Therefore, pursuant to FRE 403, Apple's objection is sustained. The Court notes that Mr. Nishibori	
10		testified regarding the functionality of Apple designs, but Samsung has not designated this testimony.	
11			
12	IT IS SO ORDE	CRED.	
13	Dated: August 14, 2012		
14		LUCY HKOH United States District Judge	
15		C C	
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22 22			
23 24			
24 25			
23 26			
20 27			
28			
	Case No.: 11-CV-01 ORDER ON OBJEC	7 846-LHK CTIONS TO EXHIBITS	

United States District Court For the Northern District of California