Exhibit 1

```
Page 1
 1
              UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
      NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION
 3
 4
      APPLE INC., a California
                                     )
      corporation,
 5
              Plaintiff,
 6
         vs.
                                     ) Case No.
 7
                                     ) 11-CV-01846-LHK
      SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,
 8
      LTD., a Korean business
                                     )
      entity; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
                                     )
 9
      AMERICA, INC., a New York
      corporation; SAMSUNG
10
      TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,
                                     )
      LLC, a Delaware limited
                                     )
      liability company,
11
12
              Defendants.
13
        HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
14
15
       VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF KARAN SINGH, PH.D.
                 Redwood Shores, California
16
17
                  Thursday, April 26, 2012
                          Volume I
18
19
20
21
     Reported by:
     Danielle de Gracia
     CSR No. 13650
22
23
    Job No. 143641
24
25
     PAGES 1 - 285
```

			Page 2
1	UNITED STATES DISTR	RIC'	I COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFOR	RNI	A, SAN JOSE DIVISION
3			
4	APPLE INC., a California	)	
	corporation,	)	
5		)	
	Plaintiff,	)	
6		)	
	vs.	)	Case No.
7		)	11-CV-01846-LHK
	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,	)	
8	LTD., a Korean business	)	
	entity; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS	)	
9	AMERICA, INC., a New York	)	
	corporation; SAMSUNG	)	
10	TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,	)	
	LLC, a Delaware limited	)	
11	liability company,	)	
		)	
12	Defendants.	) 	
13 14			
15	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION	)N	of KARAN SINGH, PH.D.,
16	Volume I, taken on behalf of		·
17	Dolphin Drive, Suite 560, Red		•
18	beginning at 11:03 a.m. and e	end	ing at 8:37 p.m. on
19	Thursday, April 26, 2012, bef	or	e Danielle de Gracia,
20	Certified Shorthand Reporter	No	. 13650.
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

## Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2027-2 Filed10/05/12 Page4 of 11

			Page 8
1	1	Foerster, also for Apple.	
2	2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter today	
3	3	is Danielle de Gracia of Veritext. Would the	
4	4	reporter please swear in the witness?	
5	5		11:04:52
6	6	KARAN SINGH PH.D.,	
7		having been administered an oath, was examined and	
8	8	testified as follows:	
9	9		
10	10	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Please begin.	11:05:02
11	11		
12	12	EXAMINATION	
13	13	BY MR. BRIGGS:	
14	14	Q Good morning.	
15	15	A Good morning.	11:05:04
16	16	Q Please state your name for the record.	
17	17	A Karan Singh. My passport has my first name	
18	18	as Karansher.	
19	19	Q What is your business address?	
20	20	A My university address?	11:05:16
21	21	Q Yes.	
22	22	A 40 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario,	
23	23	University of Toronto.	
24	24	Q Do you live in Toronto?	
25	25	A Yes.	11:05:29

	Pag	ge 108
1	A It I believe the '163 patent does provide	
2	enough evidence in in in its context and in	
3	in the specifications to that a person of ordinary	
4	skill in the art would be able to to to	
5	implement such functionality of determination.	02:44:02
6	Q But but my question	
7	A (Inaudible.)	
8	Q was a little bit different.	
9	A Okay.	
10	Q Does the '163 patent define what determining	02:44:09
11	a first box means?	
12	A It provides examples to indicate what it	
13	means, yes.	
14	Q But it doesn't provide an explicit	
15	definition other than the examples?	02:44:25
16	A It provides enough of a definition it	
17	provides enough evidence that that a	
18	person of ordinary skill in the art would be able	
19	would would be able to would be able to	
20	construe construct a determination as the patent	02:44:52
21	intends.	
22	Q What is the meaning of the term	
23	"substantially centered" as used in the claims of the	
24	'163 patent?	
25	MR. MONACH: Object that it calls for a	02:45:16

	Page 109
1	legal conclusion. You can give your understanding.
2	THE WITNESS: Without giving a legal
3	opinion, I the the patent given the given
4	the overall design goals of the patent,
5	"substantially centered" essentially means mostly 02:45:40
6	centered.
7	BY MR. BRIGGS:
8	Q When does a box or strike that. When is
9	a box mostly centered versus not mostly centered?
10	How do you draw the line? 02:45:56
11	MR. MONACH: Object to the form of the
12	question.
13	THE WITNESS: So I think I think a person
14	of ordinary skill in the art would draw the line
15	based on what the what the intended what the 02:46:06
16	intended positioning and and what the rationale
17	behind the intended positioning of of the box was.
18	So if the ra notion of substantial
19	centering essentially teaches to the the the
20	rationale of the or or the design goal of the 02:46:30
21	'163 patent, which is to maximize the readability of,
22	in this case, the determined box, the the
23	particular box.
24	So as long as that notion is being is
25	is is what is being practiced, then it it it 02:46:52

212-267-6868

	Page 110	
1	pertains to this claim element.	
2	BY MR. BRIGGS:	
3	Q So if I were to design a a program that	
4	enlarged a first box but did not substantially center	
5	it, how could I do that? 02:47:12	
6	MR. MONACH: Objection. Incomplete	
7	hypothetical.	
8	THE WITNESS: As in how could you write such	
9	a program?	
10	BY MR. BRIGGS: 02:47:19	,
11	Q Well, where would the box have to appear on	
12	the screen for it to be not substantially centered?	
13	A You that's actually I would not be	
14	able to answer the question the way you asked it	
15	because you would have to as I said, you you 02:47:37	
16	have to provide the design the the	
17	design rationale for for your placement. And then	
18	I can answer the question for you as in would I	
19	consider this substantially centered or not?	
20	Q So to determine where something is 02:47:54	:
21	substantially centered or not, you would have to look	
22	at the design rationale for that particular product?	
23	MR. MONACH: Object	
24	THE WITNESS: No, not for that particular	
25	product. You would have to look at design rationale 02:48:07	

	Page 111
1	of the the the patent and as to as and
2	and and what the what the centering algorithm
3	or the placement algorithm was attempting to do.
4	BY MR. BRIGGS:
5	Q So what is the design rationale of the 02:48:23
6	patent?
7	A The design rationale of the patent, as I
8	said, is to maximize enable and maximize the
9	efficient readability of structured electronic
10	documents on portable electronic devices. 02:48:45
11	Q So I'm just trying to get a little bit
12	clearer picture of how that ties into the definition
13	of of "substantially centered." So again I'll ask
14	my question.
15	If if I wanted to hypothetically create a 02:49:05
16	product that displayed a first window that enlarged
17	the first window, how would I know whether the first
18	window was substantially centered or not in view of
19	the '163 patent?
20	A I I believe I've I may have provided 02:49:23
21	some additional examples, or or or or I may
22	have pointed to certain things in my in my report
23	that might might help provide more clarity.
24	Q Okay.
25	A If I can take a look? I I'm not certain, 02:49:38

212-267-6868

	Page 112
1	but but there may be such. It may either be here
2	or in my validity report. Sorry, which claim element
3	is substantial oh, okay.
4	Right. So here's here's an example. So
5	there are some examples provided in in Figure 11A, 02:50:27
6	12, I guess 12.
7	Q And where are you looking right now?
8	A Sorry. Am I I'm looking in my
9	infringement report. Oh, sorry, where exactly in it?
10	I'm looking at page 25. Oh, sorry, it's not figures. 02:50:47
11	I was I was it said the figures below.
12	There are also some videos that have been
13	attached. I don't have access to those videos right
14	now. But it's showing you it's showing examples
15	of of substantial centering. In addition, the 02:51:06
16	figure what is it? Figure 5 5C of the patent
17	actually shows an enlarged and substantially
18	centered, substantially centered box.
19	To my eyesight, you know, the the
20	the the difference from the edge of the the 02:51:43
21	the box on the left is a little bit larger than the
22	one on the right, but semantically to me, that is
23	a a substantially centered box.
24	So I think you might also find I believe
25	there is inventor testimony that also provides 02:52:04

	Page 113	
1	further examples of substantial centering. I I	
2	I'm not exactly positive of who it was or or where	
3	in the deposition or whatever, but I I I	
4	seem to recall some an example that, for instance,	
5	said that, you know, one instance where the the 02:52:33	
6	box might not be sort of would be substantially	
7	centered, would be one where maybe there was some	
8	interface elements on one side of of of your	
9	window which would require the centering to be with	
10	respect to whatever was left of the screen real 02:52:54	
11	estate of the window real estate, which would be	
12	which which is what it would be centered with	
13	respect to, rather than the overall overall	
14	window. And that is one example where where your	
15	box happens to be substantially centered. 02:53:12	
16	And so I I believe that this is something	
17	that, you know, the inventors clearly, you know, as	
18	people of skill in the art clearly understand, and	
19	and I believe that's the message that a person of	
20	ordinary skill in the art would take as well. 02:53:29	
21	Q So let's let's look at Figure 5C since	
22	you pointed to that, and I think you were talking	
23	about Block 5 as as the box that is substantially	
24	centered; is that correct?	
25	A Yes. 02:53:44	

# 

	Page 285
1	I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
2	Reporter of the State of California, do hereby
3	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 placed under oath; that a
8	verbatim record of the proceedings was made by me
9	using machine shorthand which was thereafter
10	transcribed under my direction; further, that the
11	foregoing transcript is an accurate transcription
12	thereof.
13	I further certify that I am neither
14	financially interested in the action nor a relative
15	or employee of any attorney or party to this action.
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date
17	subscribed my name.
18	
19	Dated: April 30, 2012
20	
21	
22	
	Danielle de Gracia
23	CSR No. 13650
24	
25	