## Exhibit A

l	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document1825-1	Filed08/18/12 Page2 of 12
1	HAROLD J. MCELHINNY (CA SBN 66781) hmcelhinny@mofo.com	WILLIAM F. LEE william.lee@wilmerhale.com
2	MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664) mjacobs@mofo.com	WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
3	RACHEL KREVANS (CA SBN 116421) rkrevans@mofo.com	60 State Street Boston, MA 02109
4	JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368) jtaylor@mofo.com	Telephone: (617) 526-6000 Facsimile: (617) 526-5000
5	ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363) atucher@mofo.com	
6	RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425) rhung@mofo.com	MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180) mark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com
7	JASON R. BARTLETT (CA SBN 214530) jasonbartlett@mofo.com	WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
8	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street	950 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, California 94304
9	San Francisco, California 94105-2482 Telephone: (415) 268-7000	Telephone: (650) 858-6000 Facsimile: (650) 858-6100
10	Facsimile: (415) 268-7522	
11		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.	
13		
14		
15	UNITED STATES D	
16	NORTHERN DISTRIC	
17	SAN JOSE D	DIVISION
18	APPLE INC., a California corporation,	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)
19	Plaintiff,	APPLE'S SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT
20	v.	FORM
21	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS	
22	AMERICA, INC., a New York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS	
23	AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,	
24	Defendants.	
25		
26		
27		
28		
	APPLE'S SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF PROPOSED SPECIAL VEI	

We, the jury, unanimously agree to t the instructions of this Court as our v		ng questions and	l return them un
FIND	INGS ON APPLE'S CL	AIMS	
APPLE'S UTILITY AND DESIG	N PATENT CLAIMS A	CAINST SAMS	SUNG
1. For each of the following pro			likely than not
that Samsung infringed the in	ndicated Apple utility pa	atent claims?	
(Please answer in each cell with	th a "Y" for "yes" (for A	ople), or with an	"N" for "no" (fo
Samsung). You do not have to			
Accused Samsung Product	t '381 Patent (Claim 19)	'915 Patent (Claim 8)	'163 Patent (Claim 50)
Intercept (JX1009)	(Claim 17)	(Claim 0)	(Claim 50)
Vibrant (JX1010)			
Captivate (JX1011)			
Epic 4G (JX1012)			
Fascinate (JX1013)			
Galaxy Ace (JX1030)			
[SEC only]			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX1007)			
[SEC only]			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX1032)			
[SEC only]			
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX1033)			
Transform (JX1014)			
Mesmerize (JX1015)			
Continuum (JX1016)			
Galaxy Tab (original or 7.0) (JX1	036)		
Galaxy S 4G (JX1019)			
Gem (JX1020)			
Galaxy Prevail (JX1022)			
Nexus S 4G (JX1023)			
Replenish (JX1024) Droid Charge (JX1025)			
Infuse 4G (JX1027)			
Indulge (JX1027)			
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and 4G L	TF)		
	· /		
(JX1037 & JX1038)			

1

3

## 2. For each of the following products, has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung infringed the indicated Apple design patents? 2

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). You do not have to provide an answer for any cell that has gray shading.)

4	Accused Samsung Prod	luct D'677	D'087 Patent	D'305
5		Patent		Patent
6	Vibrant (JX1010)			
7	Captivate (JX1011)			
7	Epic 4G (JX1012)			
8	Fascinate (JX1013)			
9	Galaxy Ace (JX1030) [SEC only]			
10	Galaxy S (i9000) (JX1007) [SEC only]	)		
1	Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX10			
12	Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX103 [SEC only]	32)		
13	Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX1033)			
14	Galaxy SII (Epic 4G Touch (JX1034)	1)		
5	Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX1035)			
.6 .7	Galaxy S (Showcase i500) (JX1017)			
	Mesmerize (JX1015)			
8	Continuum (JX1016)			
9	Galaxy S 4G (JX1019)			
0	Gem (JX1020)			
20	Droid Charge (JX1025)			
1	Infuse 4G (JX1027)			
22	Indulge (JX1026)			
3	Accused Samsur	ng Product	<b>D'889</b>	Patent
4	Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and (JX1037 & JX1038)			
25			1	
.6				
27				
28				
	Apple's Second Revised Draft of Prop Case No. 11-CV-01846-LHK pa-1547512	OSED SPECIAL VERDI	CT Form	

	Ca	se5:11-cv-01846-LHK	Document1825-1	Filed08/18/12	2 Page5 of	12
1 2	3.	If in response to Quest infringed any Apple pa Samsung's infringeme	atent(s), has Apple	•		U
3		Yes	(for Apple)	No(	for Samsung	)
4 5	4.	Has Samsung proven t design patent claims a		bable that Apple	e's asserted	utility and/or
6		<u>'381 Patent (Claim 19)</u>	Yes	_(for Samsung)	No	_(for Apple)
7		<u>'915 Patent (Claim 8)</u>	Yes	_(for Samsung)	No	_(for Apple)
8		<u>'163 Patent (Claim 50)</u>	Yes	_(for Samsung)	No	_(for Apple)
9 10		D'677 Patent	Yes	_(for Samsung)	No	_(for Apple)
10		D'087 Patent	Yes	_(for Samsung)	No	_(for Apple)
12		D'889 Patent	Yes	_(for Samsung)	No	_(for Apple)
13		D'305 Patent	Yes	_(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
14						
15	5.	Which of the Samsung	entities do you fine	d liable for pate	nt infringem	ient?
16		Samsung Electronics	Co., Ltd.	Yes	No	
17		Samsung Electronics	America, Inc.	Yes	No	
18		Samsung Telecommu	nications America, L	LC Yes	No	
19						
20 21						
21 22						
22						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	CASE	e's Second Revised Draft c No. 11-CV-01846-LHK 547512	F PROPOSED SPECIAL VI	erdict Form		

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document1825-1 Filed08/18/12 Page6 of 12
1	APPLE'S TRADE DRESS CLAIMS AGAINST SAMSUNG
2	Apple's Registered Trade Dress:
3 4	6. Has Samsung proven that it is more likely than not that Apple's <u>registered</u> iPhone- related trade dress is not valid?
5	Yes (for Samsung) No (for Apple)
6	Apple's Unregistered Trade Dress:
7 8	7. Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Apple's <u>unregistered</u> iPad-related trade dress is valid?
9	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
10	8. Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Apple's <u>unregistered</u> iPhone 3G
11 12	trade dress is valid?
12	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
14 15	9. Has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Apple's <u>unregistered</u> combination iPhone trade dress is valid?
15 16	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
10	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	APPLE'S SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM
	APPLE S SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM CASE No. 11-CV-01846-LHK pa-1547512 4

## Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document1825-1 Filed08/18/12 Page7 of 12

1

2

3

## For each of the following products, has Apple proven that it is more likely than not 10. that Samsung diluted and/or infringed the indicated Apple trade dress?

(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Apple), or with an "N" for "no" (for Samsung). You do not have to provide an answer for any cell that has gray shading.)

Accused Samsung Product	iPhone 3G Trade Dress Dilution	Combination iPhone Trade Dress Dilution	0
Vibrant (JX1010)			
Captivate (JX1011)			
Epic 4G (JX1012)			
Fascinate (JX1013)			
Galaxy S (i9000) (JX1007) [SEC only]			
Galaxy S II (AT&T) (JX1031)			
Galaxy S II (i9100) (JX1032) [SEC only]			
Galaxy S II (T-Mobile) (JX1033)			
Galaxy S II (Epic 4G Touch) (JX1034)			
Galaxy S II (Skyrocket) (JX1035)			
Galaxy S (Showcase i500) (JX1017)			
Mesmerize (JX1015)			
Continuum (JX1016)			
Galaxy S 4G (JX1019)			
Galaxy Prevail (JX1022)			
Galaxy Ace (JX1030) [SEC only]			
Droid Charge (JX1025)			
Infuse 4G (JX1027)			
Accused Samsung Proc	luct	iPad Trade Dress Dilution	iPad Trade Dress Infringement
Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi and 4G LTE	E)		8
(JX1037 & JX1038)			
Apple's Second Revised Draft of Proposed S Case No. 11-CV-01846-LHK pa-1547512	Special Verdict F	FORM	

	Ca	se5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document1825-1 Filed08/18/12 Page8 of 12
1	11.	Which of the Samsung entities do you find liable for Apple's trade dress claims?
2		Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. Yes No
3		Samsung Electronics America, Inc. Yes No
4		Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC Yes No
5	12.	
6 7	14.	If in response to Question No. 10 you found that Samsung has infringed or diluted any Apple trade dress, has Apple proven that it is more likely than not that Samsung's infringement was willful?
8		Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
9		
10	DAN	MAGES TO APPLE FROM SAMSUNG
11	13.	What is the dollar amount that Apple is entitled to receive from Samsung on the claims on which you have miled in favor of Apple?
12		claims on which you have ruled in favor of Apple?
13		\$
14		
15		
16		FINDINGS ON SAMSUNG'S CLAIMS
17	<u>SAN</u>	ASUNG'S UTILITY PATENT CLAIMS AGAINST APPLE
18	14.	For each of the following products, has Samsung proven that it is more likely than not
19		that Apple infringed the indicated Samsung utility patent claims?
20		(Please answer in each cell with a "Y" for "yes" (for Samsung), or with an "N" for "no" (for Apple). You do not have to provide an answer for any cell that contains gray shading.)
21		(101 Apple). Tou do not have to provide an answer for any cent that contains gray shading.)
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	CASE	E'S SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM NO. 11-CV-01846-LHK 547512 6

Accused Apple Product	'516 I	Patent	'941 I	Patent	'711 Patent	'893 Patent	'460 Patent
Trouuct	Claim 15	Claim 16	Claim 10	Claim 15	Claim 9	Claim 10	Claim 1
iPhone 3G (JX1053)							
iPhone 3GS (JX1054 & JX1076)							
iPhone 4 (JX1055 & JX1056)							
iPad 2 3G (JX1050 & JX1051)							
iPod Touch 4 <sup>th</sup> Generation (JX1057 & JX1077)							

Apple's Second Revised Draft of Proposed Special Verdict Form Case No. 11-CV-01846-LHK

-	-	•	_	ple has infringed any Samsun able that Apple's infringemen
	Yes	(for Samsung)	No	(for Apple)
16. Has Apple p claims are in		t is highly probabl	e that Sai	nsung's asserted utility paten
<u>'516 Patent</u>				
Claim 15: Claim 16:		(for Apple) (for Apple)		
<u>'941 Patent</u>				
Claim 10: Claim 15:		(for Apple) (for Apple)		
<u>'711 Patent</u>				
Claim 9:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
'893 Patent				
Claim 10:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
'460 Patent				
Claim 1:	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
DAMAGES TO	<u>SAMSUNG</u>	FROM APPLE		
		e		to receive from Apple for • '516 and '941 patents?
\$				
Ŧ				

18.	What is the dollar amount that Samsung is entitled to receive from Apple for Samsung's utility patent infringement claims on the '711, '893, and '460 patents?
	\$
	FINDINGS ON APPLE'S COUNTERCLAIMS AGAINST SAMSUNG
<u>BR</u>	EACH OF CONTRACT CLAIMS AND ANTITRUST
19.	Has Apple proven that Samsung breached its contractual obligations by failing to timely disclose its intellectual property rights ("IPR") during the creation of the UMTS standard or by failing to license its "declared essential" patents on fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory ("FRAND") terms?
	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
20.	Has Apple proven that Samsung has violated Section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act by monopolizing one or more technology markets related to the UMTS standard?
	Yes (for Apple) No (for Samsung)
21.	If you answered "Yes" to Question No. 19 or Question No. 20, what is the dollar amount that Apple is entitled to receive from Samsung for Samsung's antitrust violation and/or breach of contract?
	\$
CASE	E'S SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM No. 11-CV-01846-LHK 547512

				ung is barred by pa ing Samsung patent
(Please answer in Samsung).)	n each cell with	a "Y" for "yes" (fo	or Apple),	or with an "N" for "r
Samsung Pate	ent	Exhaustion	]	Equitable Estoppel
'516 Patent				
'941 Patent				
<u>'941 Patent</u>	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
<u>'941 Patent</u>	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
<u>'941 Patent</u>	Yes	(for Apple)	No	(for Samsung)
			No	(for Samsung)
lave the presiding jurc	or sign and date	this form.		
ave the presiding jurc	or sign and date	this form.		(for Samsung)
lave the presiding jurc	or sign and date	this form.		
lave the presiding jurc	or sign and date	this form.		
lave the presiding jurc	or sign and date	this form.		
<u>'941 Patent</u> Have the presiding jurc	or sign and date	this form.		

APPLE'S SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM CASE NO. 11-CV-01846-LHK pa-1547512