

1 HAROLD J. MCELHINNY (CA SBN 66781)
 hmcclhinny@mofo.com
 2 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
 mjacobs@mofo.com
 3 RACHEL KREVANS (CA SBN 116421)
 rkrevans@mofo.com
 4 JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368)
 jtaylor@mofo.com
 5 ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363)
 atucher@mofo.com
 6 RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425)
 rhung@mofo.com
 7 JASON R. BARTLETT (CA SBN 214530)
 jasonbartlett@mofo.com
 8 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 425 Market Street
 9 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
 Telephone: (415) 268-7000
 10 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

WILLIAM F. LEE
 william.lee@wilmerhale.com
 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
 HALE AND DORR LLP
 60 State Street
 Boston, MA 02109
 Telephone: (617) 526-6000
 Facsimile: (617) 526-5000

MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180)
 mark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com
 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
 HALE AND DORR LLP
 950 Page Mill Road
 Palo Alto, California 94304
 Telephone: (650) 858-6000
 Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

11
 12 Attorneys for Plaintiff and
 Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.

13
 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 16 SAN JOSE DIVISION

17
 18 APPLE INC., a California corporation,
 19 Plaintiff,
 20 v.
 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 (PSG)

**APPLE'S RESPONSE TO
 SAMSUNG'S MOTION TO STAY
 DAMAGES JUDGMENT
 PENDING RESOLUTION OF
 POST-TRIAL MOTIONS**

1 Samsung contends that the damages judgment based on the jury verdict of approximately
 2 \$1.049 billion should be stayed until post-trial motions are resolved. Samsung relies on Federal
 3 Rule of Civil Procedure 62(b), which provides that “[o]n appropriate terms for the opposing
 4 party’s security,” the Court may stay execution of a judgment pending resolution of post-trial
 5 motions (Dkt. No. 1941 at 4.) Samsung also asserts that Rule 62(d) entitles Samsung to stay the
 6 judgment by filing a notice of appeal and posting a bond. (*Id.*) Samsung requests that the Court
 7 issue a stay without any security, but states that “Samsung is prepared to post a bond in the full
 8 amount of the jury’s verdict” as a condition to a stay. (*Id.* at 6.)

9 Apple does not oppose a stay if Samsung posts an adequate bond, but opposes a stay
 10 without a bond. As Samsung notes, Rule 62(b) conditions a stay pending resolution of post-trial
 11 motions “[o]n appropriate terms for the opposing party’s security.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(b). This is
 12 consistent with Rule 62(d), which authorizes a stay pending appeal on the filing of “a supersedeas
 13 bond.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(d). Having cited Rules 62(b) and (d) as the basis for its motion,
 14 Samsung cannot plausibly argue that a stay should be granted without the required security.

15 Samsung contends that it should not be required to post a bond because the precise
 16 amount of the judgment may be adjusted and a bond will involve some costs. (Dkt. No. 1941 at
 17 4-6.) Samsung cites no authority, however, for waiving a bond on these grounds, which could
 18 apply in every case. Nor does Samsung explain why the amount of the bond cannot be adjusted
 19 later, or why this Court should stay the judgment without requiring Samsung to provide security.

20 “Appropriate terms” for Apple’s security include, at a minimum, a bond for the full
 21 amount of the jury verdict.¹ An appropriate proposed order is submitted herewith.

22
 23 Dated: August 31, 2012

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

24 By: /s/ Michael A. Jacobs
 25 Michael A. Jacobs
 26 Attorneys for Plaintiff APPLE INC.

27 ¹ Apple is entitled to a bond for the full amount of the judgment, interest, costs, and other
 28 damages from delay. Apple limits its request for a bond pending post-trial motions to the amount
 of the verdict, but reserves the right to seek additional amounts after those motions are resolved.