

# **EXHIBIT 6**

**FILED UNDER SEAL**

ORIGINAL

**In The Matter Of:**

*APPLE INC., et al.*

*v.*

*SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., et al.*

---

*HYEON-WOO LEE, Ph.D. - Vol. 1*

*November 13, 2011*

---

***HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS'  
EYES ONLY***

**MERRILL CORPORATION**

**LegalLink, Inc.**

101 Arch Street  
3rd Floor  
Boston, MA 02110  
Phone: 617.542.0039  
Fax: 617.542.2119

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY  
HYEON-WOO LEE, Ph.D. - 11/13/2011

Page 109

1 are in fact the same as that which was filed in the 15:48:06  
2 U.S. 15:48:10

3 MR. WINER: Q. If you look on the first 15:48:12  
4 page of Exhibit 9, do you see in the lower left-hand 15:48:13  
5 corner there's a date? 15:48:16

6 A. Yes. 15:48:33

7 Q. And does it look like it's September 17, 15:48:33  
8 2003? Correction: September 19, 2003. 15:48:38

9 MR. TUNG: Objection. The document speaks 15:48:56  
10 for itself. 15:48:58

11 THE WITNESS: Yes. 15:49:02

12 MR. WINER: Q. And did you personally 15:49:02  
13 tell anyone at ETSI prior to September 19, 2003 that 15:49:08  
14 the technology described in the '604 patent was or 15:49:19  
15 was likely to become essential -- was or was likely 15:49:25  
16 to become standards essential? 15:49:31

17 MR. TUNG: Objection. Vague. Lacks 15:50:00  
18 foundation. 15:50:01

19 THE WITNESS: Again, we're talking about 15:50:32  
20 something from quite some time ago so who knows what 15:50:34  
21 the case may have been, but still, it remains that 15:50:37  
22 these sorts of things did not fall under my purview, 15:50:40  
23 and the likelihood of my making any representations 15:50:43  
24 of any kind vis-a-vis ETSI is pretty much nil, I 15:50:46  
25 think. 15:50:50

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY  
HYEON-WOO LEE, Ph.D. - 11/13/2011

Page 110

1 MR. WINER: Q. And are you aware of 15:50:57  
2 anybody else at Samsung advising ETSI prior to 15:50:58  
3 September 2003 that the technology described in the 15:51:03  
4 '604 patent was or was likely to become standards 15:51:08  
5 essential? 15:51:11

6 MR. TUNG: Objection. Vague. Lacks 15:51:39  
7 foundation. 15:51:40

8 THE WITNESS: No, when it comes to that, 15:51:47  
9 there's nothing that I recollect. 15:51:48

10 MR. WINER: Q. Do you see on the first 15:51:50  
11 page of Exhibit 9 there's the name Chun Kyong-Joon? 15:51:51

12 A. Yes. 15:52:02

13 Q. Who is he? 15:52:02

14 A. He was the gentleman serving as the head 15:52:09  
15 of the telecommunications R&D center. 15:52:11

16 Q. What is the relationship, if any, between 15:52:18  
17 the telecommunication R&D center and the 15:52:20  
18 patent-handling department that we've been 15:52:22  
19 discussing? 15:52:24

20 MR. TUNG: Objection. Vague. Lacks 15:52:40  
21 foundation. 15:52:42

22 THE WITNESS: Again, it depends on the 15:52:55  
23 time frame. For at some point in time the patent 15:52:56  
24 team belonged to the R&D center, and during other 15:53:00  
25 periods, it didn't. 15:53:03

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY  
HYEON-WOO LEE, Ph.D. - 11/13/2011

Page 111

1 MR. WINER: Q. Do you know at what point 15:53:07

2 in time the patent team belonged to the R&D center? 15:53:08

3 A. No, I cannot exactly place as to what 15:53:45

4 those timeframes may have been, but in more 15:53:47

5 instances than not I would think -- I would believe 15:53:52

6 that the time that the patent team belonged to the 15:53:55

7 R&D center was greater or longer than otherwise. 15:54:00

8 Q. Did you ever come to the conclusion that 15:54:14

9 the technology described in the '604 patent was 15:54:15

10 standards essential? 15:54:23

11 MR. TUNG: Objection. Calls for a legal 15:54:37

12 conclusion. 15:54:39

13 I caution the witness not to reveal the 15:54:40

14 substance of any attorney-client communications that 15:54:43

15 may have led to this conclusion. 15:54:46

16 THE WITNESS: Given that I'm not a legal 15:55:16

17 expert, I wouldn't know what to say on the legal 15:55:19

18 front of things. But speaking as a researcher, as 15:55:21

19 an inventor, indeed, I firmly believe that the '604 15:55:25

20 patent or the technology thereunder is part of the 15:55:29

21 standard. 15:55:32

22 MR. WINER: Q. And when did you come to 15:55:33

23 that belief? 15:55:35

24 A. Well, I think it would be a little tough 15:56:30

25 for me to nail that particular point in time down 15:56:33

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY  
HYEON-WOO LEE, Ph.D. - 11/13/2011

Page 112

1 precisely, but I am thinking that when you look at, 15:56:36  
2 say, the draft of the 3GPP standards, I think there 15:56:40  
3 was something there that led me to believe that the 15:56:44  
4 invention by me and my co-inventors as was patented 15:56:48  
5 was shown to be part of the standard. 15:56:54

6 Q. Do you remember Samsung making a proposal 15:57:13  
7 to 3GPP relating to the technology described in the 15:57:17  
8 '604 patent? 15:57:22

9 MR. TUNG: Objection. Vague. 15:57:37

10 THE WITNESS: Well, now, actually it's 15:58:11  
11 unclear to me as to whether this would be during 15:58:13  
12 something in 1998 at ETSI or something in 1999 as 15:58:17  
13 part of 3GPP, but I recall something about there 15:58:22  
14 being a technical proposal. 15:58:25

15 (Exhibit 11 was marked for 15:58:34  
16 identification.) 15:58:34

17 MR. WINER: Let me show you what's marked 15:58:35  
18 as Exhibit 11 which is a document Bates-stamped 15:58:37  
19 APLNDC-WHA10064 through -85. 15:58:40

20 (Exhibit 12 was marked for 15:58:53  
21 identification.) 15:58:53

22 MR. WINER: And I have as Exhibit 12 an 15:58:54  
23 excerpt in Korean. 15:58:57

24 MR. TUNG: Exhibit 12 was not previously 15:59:09  
25 provided to us. We have not had a chance to review 15:59:10