

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
Charles K. Verhoeven (Cal. Bar No. 170151)
2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
3 San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
4 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

5 Kevin P.B. Johnson (Cal. Bar No. 177129)
kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com
6 Victoria F. Maroulis (Cal. Bar No. 202603)
victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com
7 555 Twin Dolphin Drive 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, California 94065
8 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

9 Michael T. Zeller (Cal. Bar No. 196417)
10 michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com
865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor
11 Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
12 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

13 Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
14 AMERICA, INC. and SAMSUNG
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC
15

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

18 APPLE INC., a California corporation,

19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

21 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a
Korean business entity; SAMSUNG
22 ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New
York corporation; SAMSUNG
23 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

24 Defendants.
25

CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK

**SAMSUNG'S COMMENT ON FINAL
VERDICT FORM**

1 Samsung hereby submits this comment in response to the Verdict Form filed by the Court
2 this evening. (Dkt. No. 1878.) As discussed at the hearing earlier today, Samsung Electronics
3 America, Inc. (“SEA”) is only accused of selling one of the products at issue in this litigation, the
4 Galaxy Tab 10.1 (WiFi). Thus, Samsung believes that the Court intended to either omit or black-
5 out SEA from Questions 5-7 and 15-17, and black-out SEA from all rows in Question 3 other than
6 the row for the Galaxy Tab 10.1. (WiFi). For the same reason, SEA should be blacked-out from
7 the top three rows in Question 19.

8 Additionally, Samsung believes that the Verdict Form contains the following typographical
9 errors:

- 10 • Question 9 should read “would induce SEA or STA to infringe the D’677, D’087,
11 D’305 and/or D’889 patents.”
- 12 • Questions 27 and 28 should read “the total dollar amount that Samsung is entitled to
13 receive from Apple for Samsung’s utility patent infringement claims . . .”

14 Finally, Samsung requests that the Court add “if any” after the term “claims” in Question
15 22.

16
17 DATED: August 20, 2012

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

18
19 By /s/ Victoria F. Maroulis

Charles K. Verhoeven

Victoria F. Maroulis

Kevin P.B. Johnson

Michael T. Zeller

Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS

CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS

AMERICA, INC., and SAMSUNG

TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC