

1	HAROLD J. MCELHINNY (CA SBN 66781)	WILLIAM F. LEE	
2	hmcelhinny@mofo.com MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)	william.lee@wilmerhale.com WILMER CUTLER PICKERING	
3	mjacobs@mofo.com RACHEL KREVANS (CA SBN 116421)	HALE AND DORR LLP 60 State Street	
4	rkrevans@mofo.com JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368)	Boston, MA 02109 Telephone: (617) 526-6000	
5	jtaylor@mofo.com MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	Facsimile: (617) 526-5000	
6	425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105-2482	MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180) mark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com	
7	Telephone: (415) 268-7000 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522	WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff and	950 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, California 94304	
9	Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.	Telephone: (650) 858-6000 Facsimile: (650) 858-6100	
10			
11 12			
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
16	ADDIE INC. a California acomporation	Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK	
17	APPLE INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff,	APPLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE	
18	V.	MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION	
19	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a	TO ENLARGE PAGE LIMIT FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION AND	
20	Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New	ENHANCED DAMAGES REPLY	
21	York corporation; and SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,		
22	LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,		
23	Defendants.		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	APPLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LEAVE T	FO EII E REDI VISO ENI ARGED DAGE I IMIT	
	APPLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY ISO ENLARGED PACCASE NO. 11-CV-01846-LHK		

sf-3211664

Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2099 Filed10/28/12 Page2 of 2

1	Apple requests leave to file a reply to Samsung's Opposition to Apple's Administrative	
2	Motion to Enlarge Page Limit for Reply in Support of Motion for Permanent Injunction and for	
3	Enhanced Damages (Dkt. No. 2098) because Samsung's Opposition misrepresents what Apple	
4	said at the hearing after the jury verdict was announced. Samsung pretends that Apple "accepted"	
5	page limits for the permanent injunction briefs and that Apple "assur[ed] the Court" that it would	
6	narrow the scope of its motion to a subset of the infringing Samsung products only. In fact, as	
7	explained in the Reply attached hereto as Exhibit A, Apple's comments were in the context of a	
8	preliminary injunction that would be briefed on a highly expedited schedule and limited to certain	
9	products only.	
10	Apple requests leave to file the accompanying Reply in order to correct Samsung's	
11	misrepresentations and to ensure that the factual record is correct. Samsung has declined to	
12	stipulate to this request, as confirmed in the accompanying declaration of Richard Hung.	
13		
14	Dated: October 28, 2012 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	
15	By: /s/ Michael A. Jacobs	

Michael A. Jacobs

Michael A. Jacobs

Attorneys for Plaintiff
APPLE INC.