Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page1 of 10

EXHIBIT 8 FILED UNDER SEAL

_	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page2 of 10
1	
2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	SAN JOSE DIVISION
5	
6	APPLE, INC.,) CV-11-1846-LHK)
7	PLAINTIFF,) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA)
8	VS.)) JANUARY 19, 2012
9	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS, CO.,) LTD., ET AL,)
10) PAGES 1-276 DEFENDANT.)
11	
12	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAUL S. GREWAL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT UUDGE
15	APPEARANCES:
16	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP BY: MICHAEL JACOBS
17	JASON BARTLETT HAROLD MCELHINNY
18	MIA MAZZA 425 MARKET STREET, 34TH FL
19	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
20	FOR THE DEFENDANT: QUINN EMANUEL
21	BY: DIANE HUTNYAN 865 S. FIGUEROA ST., 10TH FL
22	LOS ANGELES, CA 90017
23	(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE)
24	
25	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: SUMMER FISHER, CSR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 13185
	1

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 F	Filed10/02/12 Page3 of 10
_		
1	BY: MARK	SELWYN
2	950 PAGE M	IILL ROAD
3		
4	BY: VICTO	ORIA MAROULIS
5	JOBY	L KASSABIAN MARTIN
6	SCOTI	'HALL
7	REDWOOD SH	OOLPHIN DRIVE, 5TH FL IORES, CA 94065
8		
9	ALSO PRESENT: CHRISTOPHE	R KELLY
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		2

_	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page4 of 10
1	PRIVILEGED EVENT.
2	THE DIRECTION FROM A MANAGER TO AN
3	ENGINEER CREATES THE BLUE GLOW EFFECT, IS NOT A
4	PRIVILEGED EVENT. IT MAY BE THERE WAS LEGAL ADVICE
5	IN REACHING THE DECISION TO IMPLEMENT THE DESIGN
6	AROUND, AND SOME DAY WE WILL GET TO PRIVILEGE LOGS,
7	BUT THAT CAN'T BE RIGHT.
8	AND THEN, OF COURSE, IF THEY'RE GOING TO
9	ARGUE NON INFRINGING ALTERNATIVES AND THAT THEY
10	HAVE SOMETHING IN THE WORKS AND IT WOULD HAVE BEEN
11	TRIVIAL TO DESIGN OF THE PATENTS, THAT SHOULD BE
12	DOCUMENTED.
13	THE ISSUE OF FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS IS A
14	KNOTTY ONE. IT'S KNOTTY BECAUSE OUR BURDEN IN ONE
15	SENSE IS FAIRLY EASY, AND IN ANOTHER SENSE IT'S
16	FAIRLY CHALLENGING.
17	WE ARE ENTITLED, FOR DESIGN PATENT
18	INFRINGEMENT, TO SAMSUNG'S PROFITS. BUT SAMSUNG IS
19	A GLOBAL COMPANY WITH LOTS OF OPPORTUNITY TO MOVE
20	REVENUES INTO A SUBSIDIARY IF IT'S TAX ADVANTAGED
21	OR NOT OR ALLOCATE COSTS IN PARTICULAR WAYS.
22	AND WE HAVE TO REVERSE ENGINEER THAT FROM
23	THE UNDERLYING DOCUMENTATION AND WE HAVE TO CREATE
24	A DAMAGES MODEL THAT CREATES AN APPROPRIATELY
25	ALLOCATED MODELLING OF SAMSUNG'S PROFITS.

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page5 of 10
1	IT'S NOT MERELY WHAT SAMSUNG REPORTS AS,
2	SAY, PROFITS FOR THE HANDSET DIVISION, BECAUSE SOME
3	PRODUCTS INFRINGE THE DESIGN PATENTS, WE ALLEGE,
4	AND SOME PRODUCTS DO NOT. SO WE NEED TO GET DOWN
5	TO A FAIRLY GRANULAR LEVEL HERE.
6	NOW AGAIN, WE ARE NOT EXACTLY SURE WHAT
7	SAMSUNG HAS PROMISED TO DO BUT IT DOES HAVE TO BE
8	QUITE COMPLETE, IT DOES HAVE TO BE GLOBAL AND IT
9	DOES HAVE TO BE DOWN TO THE PRODUCT IN A
10	MONTH-BY-MONTH LEVEL.
11	THE COURT: DOESN'T THE CHAN DECLARATION,
12	OR EXHIBIT 1 TO IT, LAY OUT THAT JANUARY 10TH
13	LETTER WHAT THEY'VE AGREED TO PRODUCE?
14	MR. JACOBS: YES.
15	AND I THINK IT'S THE THE SHORT ANSWER
16	IS IT'S INCOMPLETE.
17	SO I DON'T THINK WE ARE TRULY GETTING
18	AMONG THE THINGS THAT WE'VE SPOTTED, WE NEED TO GET
19	THIS FROM ALL THE ENTITIES THAT ARE INVOLVED IN THE
20	SALES.
21	SO WE NEED IT AT THE SUBSIDIARY AND AT
22	THE PARENT LEVEL. WE NEED IT AT THE MONTH-BY-MONTH
23	LEVEL BECAUSE PRODUCTS ARE BEING ROLLED IN AND OUT.
24	WE NEED IT AT THE PRODUCT LEVEL BECAUSE IT'S A
25	PRODUCT-BY-PRODUCT ASSESSMENT. WE NEED THE BUILD

155

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page6 of 10
1	OF MATERIALS, WE NEED THE GNA ALLOCATION. WE NEED
2	A PRETTY COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF THE INCOME AND COSTS
3	STRUCTURE OF SAMSUNG'S MOBILE PHONE GROUP DOWN TO
4	THOSE LEVELS OF GRANULARITY.
5	THE COURT: YOU ARE ASKING FOR THE BILL
6	OF MATERIALS FOR EACH OF THE INDIVIDUAL UNITS THAT
7	INFRINGE?
8	MR. JACOBS: OH, YES. AND WE HAVE GIVEN
9	THAT ON THE APPLE'S SIDE, YOUR HONOR.
10	THE COURT: HOW MANY BILLS OF MATERIAL
11	ARE THERE?
12	MR. JACOBS: WELL, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF
13	ACCUSED PRODUCTS. FOR THIS PURPOSE, I DON'T THINK
14	IS THAT HUGE.
15	SO THAT'S AN AREA THAT'S PROBABLY WORTH A
16	LITTLE FURTHER EXPLORATION.
17	THOSE ARE THE ONES I WANTED, THAT I
18	THOUGHT IMPORTANT TO HIGHLIGHT, YOUR HONOR.
19	WE'VE ACTUALLY, WE COVERED A LOT OF
20	TOPICS WITH THIS MOTION. WE THINK IT'S IMPORTANT
21	THAT WE GET AN ORDER FROM YOUR HONOR ORDERING
22	SAMSUNG TO DO WHAT IN MANY CASES, NOW ON THE EVE OF
23	THE LAST MINUTE IT SAID IT WAS WILLING TO DO,
24	BECAUSE ONLY WITH AN ORDER DO WE REALLY GET THEIR
25	ATTENTION.

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page7 of 10
1	DEAL WITH THIS. SO IT'S AN AMBUSH TO SHOW UP AT
2	LEAD COUNSEL MEET AND CONFER WHEN WE, THE LOWER
3	LEVEL LAWYERS, HAVEN'T EVEN HAD A CHANCE TO DISCUSS
4	IT.
5	THAT'S ALL I MEANT, YOUR HONOR. I'M NOT
6	SAYING THEY SHOULDN'T BE, INVOLVED THEY MUST BE
7	INVOLVED. BUT IT'S NOT EFFICIENT AND IT SEEMS LIKE
8	IT'S A CHECK THE BOX, OKAY, LEAD COUNSEL HAS MET
9	AND CONFERRED, WE GET TO BOTHER JUDGE GREWAL ABOUT
10	THIS.
11	THAT'S NOT HOW IT SHOULD WORK. THERE
12	SHOULD BE A MEANINGFUL DISCUSSION AND IF WE ARE
13	LEARNING ABOUT SOMETHING AT THE FIRST TIME LEAD
14	COUNSEL MEET AND CONFER, WE HAVE NO TIME TO CONSULT
15	WITH OUR CLIENT, NO TIME TO REACH AGREEMENT.
16	SO LET ME QUICKLY MOVE ON. FINANCIAL
17	DOCUMENTS.
18	MR. JACOBS MENTIONED THREE THINGS.
19	SUBSIDIARY AND PARENT, HE SAID, I'M FINE WITH
20	SAMSUNG'S PROPOSAL BUT IT'S MISSING THREE THINGS.
21	HE SAID, WE WANT A BREAKDOWN BETWEEN SUBSIDIARIES
22	AND PARENTS.
23	I'M NOT SURE WHAT HE'S TALKING ABOUT. I
24	DON'T THINK ANYONE HAS MADE THAT DISTINCTION. WE
25	CERTAINLY HAVEN'T. I DON'T RECALL SEEING APPLE
	167

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page8 of 10
1	MEET AND CONFER LETTERS TALKING ABOUT THAT.
2	BUT THERE CERTAINLY IS AN AGREEMENT AND
3	WE'VE MADE CLEAR OUR OFFER THAT FOR THE ACCUSED
4	DEFENDANTS WHICH WOULD INCLUDE STA WHICH IS A
5	SUBSIDIARY OF SCC, THAT ALL THOSE FINANCIAL
6	DOCUMENTS ARE GOING TO BE PRODUCED AND HAVE BEEN
7	AND WE HAVE AGREED TO PRODUCE THEM.
8	SO I DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT POINT BUT I
9	DON'T THINK THAT IT MATTERS BECAUSE THERE'S NOT
10	BEEN A REFUSAL ON SAMSUNG'S PART TO PRODUCE
11	DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE FINANCIAL CATEGORIES
12	INVOLVED FOR THE THREE NAMED DEFENDANTS.
13	HE ALSO SAID, WE WANT INFORMATION AT THE
14	PRODUCT LEVEL AND SAMSUNG HASN'T OFFERED THAT, AND
15	THAT'S JUST COMPLETELY NOT TRUE.
16	IN OUR BRIEF IT LISTS OUT THE EXACT
17	CATEGORIES THAT HAVE BEEN AGREED TO AND IT INCLUDES
18	AT THE PRODUCT LEVEL.
19	SO I'M NOT SURE WHERE HE GOT THAT BUT
20	IT'S DEFINITELY NOT SOMETHING THAT WE REFUSED TO
21	PRODUCE.
22	THE NEXT THING HE IDENTIFIED IS BILLS OF
23	MATERIALS. I AGREE WITH YOU THAT I THINK THAT'S
24	OVERKILL BY A LARGE MARGIN WHEN THERE ARE SUMMARY
25	FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS AT COMPANIES THIS LARGE. BUT

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page9 of 10
1	TO TRY TO STAVE OFF A MOTION, WE AGREED TO DO IT,
2	AND WE ARE GOING TO TRY TO GET TO THOSE AND LOOK
3	FOR THEM.
4	SO THAT'S TOO HE'S INCORRECT THAT THAT
5	WAS MISSING FROM OUR OFFER. SO EVERYTHING HE'S
6	SAYING IS WRONG WITH OUR OFFER, I DON'T AGREE WITH.
7	AND I THINK THE OFFER SPEAKS FOR ITSELF WHICH IS IN
8	THE JANUARY 10TH LETTER AND ALSO LISTED AGAIN IN
9	OUR OPPOSITION BRIEF.
10	THE COURT: DOES YOUR OFFER INCLUDE SALES
11	DATA, REVENUE DATA OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES?
12	MS. KASSABIAN: FOR THE PRODUCTS THAT ARE
13	SOLD OUTSIDE, YES, WE AGREED TO THAT AND STILL THIS
14	MOTION WAS FILED.
15	MOST OF THESE PRODUCTS AREN'T SOLD
16	ANYWHERE ELSE, BUT THINGS LIKE THE TAB ARE. SO
17	YES, IF IT'S SOLD AGAIN, I DON'T KNOW WHY WE ARE
18	HERE ON THIS ISSUE.
19	THE COURT: WELL, IF IT'S NOT SOLD
20	OUTSIDE THE U.S. THERE IS NO DATA.
21	MS. KASSABIAN: THAT'S RIGHT.
22	SO WE CAN'T AGREE TO PRODUCE ANYTHING
23	THAT DOESN'T EXIST. BUT FOR THE PRODUCTS SOLD
24	ABROAD, WE AGREED TO PRODUCE WORLDWIDE DATA FOR
25	THOSE PRODUCTS WHICH THE TAB IS AN EXAMPLE.

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2020-9 Filed10/02/12 Page10 of 10
1	
2	
3	
4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
5	
6	
7	
8	I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT
9	REPORTER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
10	THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH
11	FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY
12	CERTIFY:
13	THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT,
14	CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, CONSTITUTES A TRUE, FULL AND
15	CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES TAKEN AS
16	SUCH OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE PROCEEDINGS
17	HEREINBEFORE ENTITLED AND REDUCED BY COMPUTER-AIDED
18	TRANSCRIPTION TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	SUMMER A. FISHER, CSR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 13185
24	
25	
	276
	270