	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document184	46 Filed08/19/12 Page1 of 3
2 3	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVA Charles K. Verhoeven (Cal. Bar No. 170151) charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com 50 California Street, 22 nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 875-6600 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700	AN, LLP
6 7 8	Kevin P.B. Johnson (Cal. Bar No. 177129) kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com Victoria F. Maroulis (Cal. Bar No. 202603) victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Drive 5 th Floor Redwood Shores, California 94065 Telephone: (650) 801-5000 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100	
	Michael T. Zeller (Cal. Bar No. 196417) michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com 865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017 Telephone: (213) 443-3000 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100	
13 14 15	Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC	
16	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CA	LIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION
18	APPLE INC., a California corporation,	CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK
19	Plaintiff,	CAMEUNCIC HIGH DDIODITY
20	vs.	SAMSUNG'S HIGH PRIORITY OBJECTIONS TO TENTATIVE FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS
21 22	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean business entity; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New	JUNI INSTRUCTIONS
23	York corporation; SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,	
24	LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	
25	Defendants.	
26		
27		
28		
02198.51855/4917949.1	SAMSUNG'S OBJECTIONS HIGH PRIORITY OBJE	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK CTIONS TO TENTATIVE FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS

1	Samsung hereby submits its non-binding statement of the topics and jury instruction	
2	numbers that will likely be the subject of Samsung's high priority objections to the Court's	
3	Tentative Final Jury Instructions (Dkt. Nos. 1826-1828, 1838).	
4	• Instruction No. 21—Samsung objects that these instructions fail to mention that the jury	
5	must consider whether the baseband processor chips were actually delivered to Apple in the United States to determine whether a sale was made in the United States.	
6 7	• Instruction No. 34.1 —Samsung objects that the instruction fails to inform the jury that copying is not equivalent to infringement.	
8	• Instruction No. 39 —Samsung objects that the instruction as worded uses an incorrect	
9	legal standard regarding functionality and fails to give the jury any guidance on how to treat functional elements even if the design as whole is found non-functional.	
10	• Instruction No. 42—Samsung objects that the instruction fails to accurately reflect the	
11	law, including by not instructing that Apple may obtain Samsung's profits from sales of products found to infringe Apple's design patents only to the extent that lost profits have	
12	not been awarded on those sales. While Samsung maintains its objection that Apple is required to elect between lost profits and infringer's profits as remedies, to the extent the	
13	Court disagrees, it should add limiting language to Instruction No. 42 to make clear that	
14	infringer's profits may only be awarded on infringing sales that are not already subject to a lost profits remedy. Otherwise, there is a serious risk of double-counting.	
15	• Instruction Nos.40-43 —Samsung objects that the instruction as worded incorrectly	
16	instructs the jury that it may award both lost profits and infringer's profits.	
17 18	• Instruction No. 51 —Samsung objects that the instruction as worded misstates Ninth Circuit precedent concerning functionality.	
19	• Instruction No. 55—Samsung objects that the instruction as worded includes language	
20	that misstates the law regarding association and the weighing of the statutory factors to assess dilution.	
21	• Missing Instruction—Samsung objects that the instructions received thus far do not	
22	include Samsung's proposed instruction No. 61.2 regarding statutory notice. (Dkt. No. 1818 p. 6). This instruction is derived from Ninth Circuit Model Instruction No. 15.24 and	
23	should be given here.	
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
02198.51855/4917949.1	-1- Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK SAMSUNG'S HIGH PRIORITY OBJECTIONS TO TENTATIVE FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS	

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document1846 Filed08/19/12 Page3 of 3
1	
2	
3	DATED: August 19, 2012 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
4	By /s/ Victoria F. Maroulis
5	Victoria F. Maroulis
6	Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
7	AMERICA, INC., and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC
8	
9 10	
10	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26 27	
27	
02198.51855/4917949.1	-2- Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK SAMSUNG'S HIGH PRIORITY OBJECTIONS TO TENTATIVE FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS