

Exhibit 50

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 SAN JOSE DIVISION
4

5 APPLE INC., a California)
Corporation,)
6)
Plaintiff,)
7)

vs.) No. 11-CV-01846-LHK

8)
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. ,)
9 a Korean business entity;)
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,)
10 INC., a New York corporation;)
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
11 AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware)
limited liability company,)

12)
Defendants,)
13)
_____)

14
15 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY
16 DEPOSITION OF TIMOTHY BENNER
17 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2012
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 REPORTED BY: JUDIE A. NICHOLAS, CSR NO. 12229
25 JOB NO: 46809

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 SAN JOSE DIVISION
4

5 APPLE INC., a California)
6 Corporation,)
7 Plaintiff,)

8 vs.) No. 11-CV-01846-LHK

9 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. ,)
10 a Korean business entity;)
11 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,)
12 INC., a New York corporation;)
13 SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
14 AMERICA, LLC, a Delaware)
15 limited liability company,)

16 Defendants,)
17 _____)

18 BE IT REMEMBERED, that on Wednesday,
19 February 22, 2012, commencing at the hour of 9:12
20 a.m. thereof, at the offices of Morrison & Foerster,
21 755 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, California, before
22 me, Judie A. Nicholas, a Certified Shorthand
23 Reporter of the State of California, there
24 personally appeared.

25 TIMOTHY BENNER,
called as a witness by the Plaintiff, who, being by
me first duly sworn, was thereupon examined and
testified as hereinafter set forth.

1 relative importance. It is an aspect. 09:45

2 Q. Isn't it true, Mr. Benner, that surveys 09:46

3 that Samsung had received show that the single most 09:46

4 important reason why consumers purchase a 09:46

5 particular smartphone brand is because they like 09:46

6 its overall physical appearance? 09:46

7 MS. CARUSO: Objection: Mischaracterizes 09:46

8 the record; lacks foundation. 09:46

9 THE WITNESS: Can you show me which 09:46

10 surveys you're referring to? 09:46

11 MR. ROBINSON: Q. Do you -- did you 09:46

12 understand the question, sir? 09:46

13 A. I did understand the question. 09:46

14 Q. Do you not know how to answer the question 09:46

15 without looking at a document? 09:46

16 A. I have many surveys which show different 09:46

17 things among different consumer groups, so I cannot 09:46

18 answer the question as phrased because it is too 09:46

19 broad. 09:46

20 Q. Can you name, sir, one survey that Samsung 09:47

21 has received which shows that the physical 09:47

22 appearance of a particular smartphone -- strike 09:47

23 that. 09:47

24 Mr. Benner, can you name a single survey 09:47

25 which Samsung has received that shows that the 09:47

1 physical appearance of a smartphone is unimportant 09:47
2 to consumer purchasing behavior? 09:47

3 MS. CARUSO: Objection: Vague. 09:47

4 THE WITNESS: I cannot. 09:47

5 MR. ROBINSON: Q. Why is that, sir? 09:47

6 A. Because appearance is an aspect of choice 09:47
7 in almost every decision. 09:47

8 Q. Are there any surveys, to your knowledge, 09:47
9 that show the physical appearance of a smartphone 09:47
10 is not an important consideration driving consumer 09:47
11 purchases of smartphones? 09:47

12 MS. CARUSO: Objection: Asked and 09:47
13 answered, and vague. 09:47

14 THE WITNESS: I answered that question. 09:47
15 That was the same question. 09:47

16 MR. ROBINSON: Q. And your answer was no; 09:47
17 is that right? 09:47

18 MS. CARUSO: Objection: Mischaracterizes 09:47
19 the prior testimony. 09:47

20 THE WITNESS: My answer was no to the 09:47
21 previous question. 09:47

22 MR. ROBINSON: Q. The answer is no, you 09:47
23 can't think of a single survey which shows that the 09:48
24 physical appearance of a smartphone is unimportant 09:48
25 to consumer purchasing decisions; is that right? 09:48

1 I, JUDIE A. NICHOLAS, a Certified
2 Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, duly
3 authorized to administer oaths, do hereby certify:

4 That the foregoing proceedings were taken
5 before me at the time and place herein set forth;
6 that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings,
7 prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that a record
8 of the proceedings was made by me using machine
9 shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my
10 direction; that the foregoing transcript is a true
11 record of the testimony given.

12 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to
13 the original transcript of a deposition in a
14 Federal Case, before completion of the proceedings,
15 review of the transcript (X) was () was not
16 required.

17 I further certify that I am neither
18 financially interested in the action nor a relative
19 or employee of any attorney or party to this
20 action.

21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date
22 subscribed my name.

23 Dated: 2/23/2012

24 _____
25 JUDIE A. NICHOLAS, CSR #12229