

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 Kathleen M. Sullivan (Cal. Bar No. 242261)
kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com
6 Kevin P.B. Johnson (Cal. Bar No. 177129)
kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com
7 Victoria F. Maroulis (Cal. Bar No. 202603)
victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com
8 555 Twin Dolphin Drive 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, California 94065
9 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

10 Susan R. Estrich (Cal. Bar No. 124009)
susanestrich@quinnemanuel.com
11 Michael T. Zeller (Cal. Bar No. 196417)
michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com
12 865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor
13 Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
14 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

15 Attorneys for Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.,
Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung
16 Telecommunications America, LLC

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

19 APPLE INC., a California corporation,

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

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

26 Defendants.
27
28

CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF
SUSAN R. ESTRICH IN SUPPORT OF
SAMSUNG’S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT
AS A MATTER OF LAW, NEW TRIAL
AND/OR REMITTITUR PURSUANT TO
FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE 50 AND 59**

1 I, Susan R. Estrich, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a member of the bar of the State of California, admitted to practice before this
3 Court, and a partner at Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, counsel for Samsung
4 Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung Telecommunications
5 America, LLC (collectively “Samsung”). Unless otherwise indicated, I have personal knowledge
6 of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called upon as a witness, I would testify to such
7 facts under oath.

8 2. I submit this declaration in support of Samsung’s Notice of Motion and Motion for
9 Judgment as a Matter of Law, New Trial, and/or Remittitur (the “Motion”).

10 3. In response to Samsung’s motion detailing Velvin Hogan’s failure to reveal his
11 litigation with Seagate during *voir dire* and its impact on the integrity of the trial and the verdict,
12 Apple demanded that Samsung disclose the timing of its knowledge regarding those facts. A true
13 and correct copy of Apple’s email, along with further correspondence between counsel for the
14 parties that resulted in Apple’s agreement that any such disclosures would not constitute a waiver
15 of any privilege, is attached hereto as Exhibit A. By way of separate declaration, Samsung is
16 confirming to Apple that it did not know of Mr. Hogan’s undisclosed litigation against Seagate
17 until after the verdict. To date, Apple has not revealed whether it was aware of Mr. Hogan’s
18 litigation against Seagate prior to the verdict or prior to Samsung’s Motion.

19 4. After Samsung filed its Motion on September 21, 2012, Reuters published an
20 account of an additional interview given by Mr. Hogan. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true
21 and correct copy of an article entitled “Samsung goes after jury foreman in bid to reverse Apple
22 verdict.” This copy of the article was printed on October 1, 2012 from the website *Thomson*
23 *Reuters* at the following URL: [http://newsandinsight.thomsonreuters.com/Legal/News/2012/09_-](http://newsandinsight.thomsonreuters.com/Legal/News/2012/09_-_September/Samsung_goes_after_jury_foreman_in_bid_to_reverse_Apple_verdict/)
24 [_September/Samsung_goes_after_jury_foreman_in_bid_to_reverse_Apple_verdict/](http://newsandinsight.thomsonreuters.com/Legal/News/2012/09_-_September/Samsung_goes_after_jury_foreman_in_bid_to_reverse_Apple_verdict/).

25 5. According to the article, Mr. Hogan stated “that he didn’t mention the 1993 Seagate
26 case” during *voir dire* because “he wasn’t asked specifically to disclose every case he’d ever been
27 involved in.” Further, the article states that Mr. Hogan said that he sued Seagate for fraud.

28 //

