Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page1 of 23

Estrich Declaration

Exhibit 6

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page2 of 23 ¹⁶³⁸
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN JOSE DIVISION
4	
5	APPLE INC., A CALIFORNIA) C-11-01846 LHK
6	CORPORATION,)
7) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA PLAINTIFF,)
8) AUGUST 10, 2012 VS.)
9) VOLUME 6 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,)
10	LTD., A KOREAN BUSINESS) PAGES 1638-1988 ENTITY; SAMSUNG)
11	ELECTRONICS AMERICA,) INC., A NEW YORK)
12	CORPORATION; SAMSUNG) TELECOMMUNICATIONS)
13	AMERICA, LLC, A DELAWARE) LIMITED LIABILITY) COMPANY,)
14	DEFENDANTS.)
15	
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE LUCY H. KOH
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18	
19	
20	APPEARANCES ON NEXT PAGE
21	
22	
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: LEE-ANNE SHORTRIDGE, CSR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 9595
24	CERILFICATE NUMBER 9595
25	

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Doc	ument2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page3 of 23 ¹⁶³⁹
1	APPEARANCE	5:
2		MORRISON & FOERSTER BY: HAROLD J. MCELHINNY
3		MICHAEL A. JACOBS RACHEL KREVANS
4		425 MARKET STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105
5		
6	FOR COUNTERCLAIMANT	WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE AND DORR
7	АРРЦЕ.	BY: WILLIAM F. LEE
8		60 STATE STREET BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109
9		BY: MARK D. SELWYN
10		950 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94304
11	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART, OLIVER & HEDGES
12		BY: CHARLES K. VERHOEVEN 50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 22ND FLOOR
13		SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
14		BY: VICTORIA F. MAROULIS
15		KEVIN P.B. JOHNSON 555 TWIN DOLPHIN DRIVE
16		SUITE 560 REDWOOD SHORES, CALIFORNIA 94065
17		BY: MICHAEL T. ZELLER
18		WILLIAM C. PRICE 865 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET
19		10TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
20		BY: EDWARD J. DEFRANCO
21		51 MADISON AVENUE, 22ND FLOOR NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10010
22		
23		
24		
25		

ſ	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12	Page4 of 23 1640
1	INDEX OF MITTHECCEC	
1	INDEX OF WITNESSES	
2	PLAINTIFF'S	
3	HAL PORET CROSS-EXAM BY MR. PRICE (RES.)	P 1665
4	REDIRECT EXAM BY MR. JACOBS	
5	KENT VAN LIERE	- 1600
6	DIRECT EXAM BY MR. JACOBS CROSS-EXAM BY MR. PRICE	P. 1690 P. 1702
7	RAVIN BALAKRISHNAN	
8		P. 1769
9	REDIRECT EXAM BY MR. JACOBS RECROSS-EXAM BY MR. JOHNSON	
10	KARAN SINGH	
11	DIRECT EXAM BY MR. JACOBS CROSS-EXAM BY MR. DEFRANCO	
12	REDIRECT EXAM BY MR. JACOBS	
13	JOHN HAUSER DIRECT EXAM BY MR. JACOBS	
14		P. 1917 P. 1945
15	RECROSS-EXAM BY MR. PRICE	P. 1948
16	BORIS TEKSLER DIRECT EXAM BY MR. MUELLER	P. 1951
17	CROSS-EXAM BY MS. MAROULIS	P. 1964
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page5 of 23 ¹⁷¹³
1	HAVE USED? YOU COULD HAVE USED A MOTOROLA. YOU
2	COULD HAVE USED AN LG TABLET. YOU COULD HAVE USED
3	SOMETHING THAT LOOKED A LOT CLOSER TO THE IPAD THAN
4	THAT?
5	A NO, I DON'T AGREE WITH THAT.
6	Q OKAY. SO HAVE YOU SEEN OTHER TABLETS IN THE
7	MARKET AND WHAT THEY LOOK LIKE?
8	A YES.
9	Q OKAY. AND YOU DON'T AGREE THAT THE MOTOROLA
10	AND LG, WHICH WE'VE SEEN ALREADY HERE IN COURT AND
11	PASSED AROUND, YOU DON'T THINK THEY LOOK MORE LIKE
12	THE IPAD THAN THIS?
13	A YES, I THINK, IN FACT, THEY DO LOOK MORE LIKE
14	THE IPAD IN THE SENSE THAT THEY HAVE MORE ELEMENTS
15	OF THE ALLEGEDLY INFRINGING TRADE DRESS.
16	SO IN CHOOSING THE CONTROL, THE IDEA IS
17	TO GET A PRODUCT THAT'S IN THE SAME MARKET THAT HAS
18	THE SAME BASIC FUNCTIONALITY, BUT DOES NOT INCLUDE
19	THE ALLEGEDLY INFRINGING TRADE DRESS.
20	Q WELL, ACTUALLY SO ARE YOU SAYING THAT APPLE
21	IS CONTENDING THAT MOTOROLA AND LG, THAT THOSE
22	TABLETS INFRINGE APPLE'S TRADE DRESS AND THAT'S WHY
23	YOU DIDN'T USE THEM?
24	MR. JACOBS: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS ASKING
25	FOR A LEGAL CONCLUSION FROM THIS WITNESS AND LACKS

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page6 of 23 1714
-	
1	FOUNDATION.
2	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
3	BY MR. PRICE:
4	Q I'M ASKING YOUR UNDERSTANDING AS TO WHY YOU
5	DIDN'T USE THEM. OKAY?
6	IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING, WHICH WOULD BE
7	THE BASIS OF YOU NOT USING THE MOTOROLA AND THE LG,
8	IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU COULDN'T USE THEM
9	BECAUSE APPLE IS SAYING THAT THOSE INFRINGE ITS
10	TRADE DRESS?
11	MR. JACOBS: YOUR HONOR, YOU JUST
12	SUSTAINED AN OBJECTION TO THIS SAME QUESTION.
13	THE COURT: SUSTAINED.
14	BY MR. PRICE:
15	Q IF WE CAN LOOK BACK AT THAT 30.5, I THINK IT
16	WAS 30.5, 24.5. NO, I'M SORRY. 31.3. THIS IS
17	YOUR STUDY. I BELIEVE IT'S 31.3.
18	SO IS THIS THE STUDY THIS IS YOUR
19	RESULTS SHOWING THAT VIDEO, SHOWING THE NOOK, AND
20	YOU GOT 6 PERCENT IS POST-CONFUSION WITH THE
21	BRANDED, 19, AND YOU AVERAGED THOSE TO GET 12.
22	NOW, IF YOU REALLY WANTED TO COME UP WITH
23	AN AVERAGE THAT MEANT ANYTHING AS FAR AS THE REAL
24	WORLD, YOU'D HAVE TO WEIGHT THOSE NUMBERS; RIGHT?
25	A WELL, I THINK I UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION, AND

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page7 of 23 ¹⁷¹⁵
_	
1	THE FIRST OF ALL, THE 12 WAS NOT IT ISN'T
2	I DIDN'T AVERAGE THE TWO. I JUST SUMMED EVERYTHING
3	ACROSS THE TWO CONDITIONS AND THEY COME TO 12
4	PERCENT.
5	Q SO LET ME STOP YOU THERE.
6	SO THIS IS NOT AN OPINION YOU HAVE AS TO
7	NET CONFUSION RATE IN THE MARKET; RIGHT?
8	A NO. I BELIEVE THE CONFUSION THE OPINION I
9	OFFERED IN MY REPORT IS THAT IT'S SOMEWHERE BETWEEN
10	6 PERCENT AND 19 PERCENT WERE ACTUALLY CONFUSED BY
11	MY TEST.
12	Q AND THE 19 HERE, YOU DON'T KNOW HOW MANY,
13	QUOTE, "UNBRANDED" TABLETS WERE IN THE MARKET
14	COMPARED TO THE BRANDED ONES; RIGHT?
15	A WELL, TWO COMMENTS. ONE
16	Q CAN YOU ANSWER YES OR NO? BECAUSE I'M ON THE
17	CLOCK.
18	A I'M SORRY. I UNDERSTAND.
19	Q DO YOU KNOW HOW MANY
20	A ASK ME THE QUESTION AGAIN.
21	Q DO YOU KNOW IN THE MARKETPLACE HOW MANY
22	UNBRANDED VERSUS BRANDED THERE WERE?
23	A NO, I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY UNBRANDED VERSUS
24	BRANDED THERE WERE.
25	Q NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR PHONE ASSOCIATION

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page8 of 23 ¹⁷¹⁶
1	SURVEY.
2	AND, AGAIN, THIS IS NOT A SURVEY THAT
3	SHOWS CONSUMER CONFUSION AT ALL; CORRECT?
4	A LET ME JUST MENTALLY SHIFT GEARS.
5	SO YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT NOW MY PHONE
б	ASSOCIATION STUDY?
7	Q YES.
8	A YES, THAT STUDY WAS NOT DESIGNED TO MEASURE
9	LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION. THAT STUDY WAS DESIGNED
10	TO MEASURE ASSOCIATION.
11	Q OKAY. SO IF WE CAN LOOK AT YOUR STUDY AND
12	LOOK AT 3900.153, THIS IS THE QUESTION YOU ASKED.
13	3900.153. YOU SHOWED THE PICTURE OF ONE OF THE
14	SAMSUNG PHONES AND SAID, "DOES THE LOOK AND DESIGN
15	OF THIS PHONE BRING TO MIND OR CREATE ANY
16	ASSOCIATION FOR YOU WITH ANY OTHER PHONES?"
17	DO YOU SEE THAT?
18	A YES.
19	Q IN THE DEMONSTRATIVE YOU SHOWED THE JURY,
20	WHICH WAS THE QUESTION YOU ASKED, YOU DIDN'T
21	UNDERLINE "OTHER," BUT "OTHER" WAS UNDERLINED IN
22	THE ACTUAL SURVEY?
23	A YES.
24	Q THE PEOPLE WHO READ THIS KNEW THEY WERE
25	SUPPOSED TO THINK OF SOME OTHER PHONE FOR

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page9 of 23 ¹⁷¹⁷
1	ASSOCIATION; RIGHT?
2	A IT SUGGESTS THAT WE'RE ASKING THEM, FIRST,
3	YES, NO, OR DON'T KNOW, DOES IT BRING TO MIND ANY
4	ASSOCIATION? AT THIS STAGE WE'RE NOT TELLING THEM
5	THERE IS AN ASSOCIATION.
6	Q NOW, I WANT TO ASK YOU, IF SOMEONE ASKED YOU,
7	FOR EXAMPLE, SHOWED YOU A PICTURE OF A COKE AND
8	SAID, "DOES THIS BRING TO MIND OR CREATE ANY
9	ASSOCIATION WITH ANY OTHER SOFT DRINK, " YOU'D THINK
10	A LOT OF PEOPLE MIGHT SAY PEPSI; RIGHT? BECAUSE
11	THEY'RE THE TWO BIGGEST PLAYERS IN THE MARKET?
12	A I HAVEN'T DONE THAT STUDY, SO I WOULDN'T HAVE
13	AN OPINION ON HOW THAT MIGHT TURN OUT.
14	Q WELL, IF SOMEONE ASKED YOU, YOU KNOW, SHOWED A
15	PICTURE OF A BURGER KING, YOU KNOW, RESTAURANT AND
16	SAID, "DOES THE LOOK AND DESIGN OF THIS RESTAURANT
17	BRING TO MIND OR CREATE ANY ASSOCIATION WITH YOU OF
18	ANY OTHER RESTAURANT, " THEY'RE QUITE LIKELY TO SAY
19	MCDONALD'S; RIGHT?
20	A AGAIN, I HAVEN'T DONE THAT SURVEY. I DON'T
21	KNOW THAT TO BE THE CASE.
22	Q YOU DON'T KNOW THAT FROM COMMON SENSE?
23	A I DON'T KNOW THAT FROM COMMON SENSE AS YOU'VE
24	DESCRIBED IT.
25	Q WELL, IF YOU DID FIND THAT, HYPOTHETICALLY,

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page10 of 23 ¹⁷¹⁸
1	HYPOTHETICALLY YOU DID A SURVEY, "DOES THIS BURGER
2	KING RESTAURANT BRING TO MIND ANY OTHER FAST FOOD
3	RESTAURANT" AND THEY SAID MCDONALD'S, YOU CERTAINLY
4	COULDN'T CONCLUDE FROM THAT THAT THE ASSOCIATION
5	WAS BECAUSE THE DESIGNS ARE SIMILAR; RIGHT?
6	A AGAIN, YOU'RE ASKING ME ABOUT A HYPOTHETICAL
7	STUDY THAT I HAVEN'T CONDUCTED, SO
8	Q WELL, IN THIS CASE, YOU UNDERSTAND THAT
9	SAMSUNG AND APPLE ARE THE TWO LARGEST COMPETITORS
10	IN THIS MARKET; RIGHT?
11	A I UNDERSTAND THEY'RE TWO LARGE COMPETITORS IN
12	THIS MARKET.
13	Q AND YOU UNDERSTAND FROM KNOWING THE MARKET
14	THAT IF SOMEONE SHOWED YOU A SAMSUNG PHONE AND SAID
15	"WHAT OTHER PHONE DOES THIS REMIND YOU OF, " PEOPLE
16	ARE LIKELY TO SAY APPLE, AND VICE-VERSA, BECAUSE
17	THEY'RE THE TWO BIGGIES, JUST LIKE BURGER KING AND
18	MCDONALD'S AND COKE AND PEPSI?
19	A PERHAPS.
20	BUT TO THE EXTENT THAT THAT'S TRUE,
21	THAT'S ALSO HAPPENING IN THE CONTROL. SO IF THIS
22	WAS CREATING A DEMAND CHARACTERISTIC AS YOU
23	SUGGEST, THEN IT WOULD BE NETTED OUT IN THE CONTROL
24	CONDITION.
25	Q SO NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT THE CONTROL. THE

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page11 of 23 ¹⁷¹⁹
1	CONTROL I THINK IF WE CAN SHOW 3900.129.
2	IN SELECTING A CONTROL, YOU COULD HAVE
3	SELECTED FROM A NUMBER OF PHONES; RIGHT?
4	A YES.
5	Q AND YOU INSTEAD WELL, OF THE PHONES, YOU
6	SELECTED A BLACKBERRY?
7	A YES, A BLACKBERRY STORM.
8	Q AND IF WE COULD LOOK AT EXHIBIT 24, I GUESS
9	PAGE 4. AND AGAIN, A BLACKBERRY, YOU SAID THIS
10	CONTROL, THE BLACKBERRY CONTROL FOR THE FACT THAT
11	SAMSUNG AND APPLE JUST MIGHT BE NAMES ON THE TIPS
12	OF YOUR TONGUE.
13	IF SOMEONE SHOWED YOU A PICTURE OF A CAN
14	OF MOXIE, DO YOU THINK PEOPLE WOULD ASSOCIATE THAT
15	WITH COKE OR PEPSI?
16	A A CAN OF WHAT?
17	Q MOXIE. YOU DON'T KNOW MOXIE?
18	A I DON'T KNOW MOXIE.
19	Q OKAY. WELL, JUST AS WITH THE BLACKBERRY
20	AND BY THE WAY, IN THE REAL PICTURE, YOU CAN SEE
21	BLACKBERRY ACROSS THE TOP HERE; RIGHT?
22	A YES. IN ALL OF THE PHONES, THE PICTURES ARE
23	THE ACTUAL PRODUCTS THAT ARE IN THE MARKETPLACE AS
24	THEY WOULD LOOK.
25	Q AND BLACKBERRY AND RIM ARE, ARE PRETTY MUCH
_ 2	~

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page12 of 23 ¹⁷²⁰
1	AT THE TIME YOU TOOK THIS SURVEY, THEY'RE NOT ON
2	THE TONGUES OF MANY PEOPLE THINKING ABOUT
3	SMARTPHONES? THEY ARE HAVING SERIOUS TROUBLE AND
4	ALMOST DROPPING OUT OF THE MARKET; RIGHT?
5	A I DON'T HAVE THAT UNDERSTANDING DURING THE
6	PERIOD OF TIME OF THE SURVEY.
7	Q YOU DON'T HAVE IT ONE WAY OR THE OTHER?
8	A THAT'S CORRECT.
9	Q AND IS IT JUST A COINCIDENCE THAT BOTH YOU AND
10	DR. PORET USED A NOOK AND THE BLACKBERRY STORM FOR
11	YOUR CONTROLS? DID YOU GUYS GET TOGETHER AND TALK
12	ABOUT THIS?
13	A NO. I HAVE NO KNOWLEDGE OF MR. PORET'S WORK
14	BEFORE I CAME TO TRIAL AND HEARD ABOUT IT OTHER
15	THAN I KNEW HE HAD DONE SURVEYS.
16	Q DID YOU WERE YOU GIVEN THESE PHONES AND THE
17	BLACKBERRY AND THE NOOK TO USE AS THE CONTROLS?
18	A NO. I SELECTED THESE PHONES AND TABLETS WITH
19	MY STAFF FROM OUR REVIEW OF THE PRODUCTS THAT WERE
20	AVAILABLE.
21	Q SO YOU INTENTIONALLY SELECTED THE NOOK AS THE
22	TABLET TO USE AS A CONTROL; RIGHT?
23	A YES.
24	Q YOU'RE SAYING THAT?
25	A YES.

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page13 of 23 ¹⁷²¹
1	Q AND YOU INTENTIONALLY SELECTED THE BLACKBERRY
2	TO USE AS THE CONTROL; RIGHT?
3	A THE BLACKBERRY STORM.
4	Q AND YOU INTENTIONALLY DECIDED, IN THOSE
5	VIDEOS, NOT TO SHOW THE COMPLETE PRODUCT, THE
6	SAMSUNG TABLET? THAT WAS YOUR DECISION?
7	A WELL, IT WAS MY DECISION BASED ON MY
8	UNDERSTANDING FROM THE COMPLAINT, THAT AND
9	DISCUSSION WITH COUNSEL, THAT THE FRONT AND THE
10	SIDE VIEWS WAS WHAT MATTERED IN THE TABLET SETTING.
11	Q AND WITH RESPECT TO THE SAMSUNG PHONES, YOU
12	TESTED JUST TWO OF THE PHONES?
13	A YES, I TESTED TWO OF THE, WHATEVER THE NUMBER
14	OF PHONES IS.
15	Q SO, FOR EXAMPLE, YOU DIDN'T TEST THE PHONE
16	THAT MS. KARE SAID HAD A CHIN, THE DROID CHARGE?
17	A NO, I DIDN'T TEST THAT SPECIFIC DEVICE.
18	MR. PRICE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
19	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE TIME IS
20	10:19.
21	MR. PRICE: I'M SORRY. I MEANT TO MOVE
22	IN THE NOKIA I MEAN THE NOOK.
23	MR. JACOBS: YOUR HONOR, AGAIN, THAT IS
24	LISTED ON THE LIST OF DEMONSTRATIVES.
25	THE COURT: IS THAT 2526?

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page14 of 23 ¹⁹⁶³
_	
1	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OVERRULED.
2	BY MR. MUELLER:
3	Q MR. TEKSLER, IF YOU COULD, PLEASE TURN TO TAB
4	2 IN YOUR BINDER, AND THIS IS PDX 32. IF WE COULD
5	ALSO PUT THAT ON THE SCREEN.
6	MR. TEKSLER, THIS SHOWS SEVEN PATENT
7	COVERS. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THESE PATENTS?
8	A IAM.
9	Q WHAT ARE THEY?
10	A THESE ARE THE PATENTS
11	MS. MAROULIS: OBJECTION, CALLS FOR
12	OPINION TESTIMONY. LACKS FOUNDATION.
13	THE COURT: WHAT ARE YOU ASKING?
14	MR. MUELLER: I MERELY WANTED TO GET
15	ACROSS THAT THESE ARE THE ASSERTED PATENTS IN THIS
16	CASE.
17	THE COURT: IS THERE ANY QUESTION ABOUT
18	THAT SO FAR?
19	MR. MUELLER: I CAN REPHRASE IF YOU IF
20	I MIGHT, YOUR HONOR.
21	Q ARE THESE THE SEVEN ASSERTED PATENTS?
22	A YES, THEY ARE.
23	Q WHERE DO THESE FALL, THESE SEVEN PATENTS,
24	WITHIN THE CATEGORIES YOU DESCRIBED EARLIER IN THE
25	APPLE PORTFOLIO?

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page15 of 23 ¹⁹⁶⁴
1	A CERTAINLY. SO THERE'S FOUR DESIGN PATENTS,
2	AND ALL FOUR DESIGN PATENTS FALL INTO APPLE'S
3	UNIQUE USER EXPERIENCE.
4	AND THEN THE THREE UTILITY PATENTS THAT
5	ARE LISTED HERE GENERALLY RELATE TO USER INTERFACE
6	AND FEATURES THAT WE WOULD ALSO PUT IN THAT SAME
7	CATEGORY OF APPLE'S UNIQUE USER INTERFACE, OR USER
8	EXPERIENCE.
9	MR. MUELLER: THANK YOU, SIR.
10	NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
11	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE TIME IS NOW
12	4:22.
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION
13 14	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MAROULIS:
14	BY MS. MAROULIS:
14 15	BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU?
14 15 16	BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU? A GOOD AFTERNOON.
14 15 16 17	BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU? A GOOD AFTERNOON. Q MY NAME IS VICTORIA MAROULIS. I'M COUNSEL FOR
14 15 16 17 18	BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU? A GOOD AFTERNOON. Q MY NAME IS VICTORIA MAROULIS. I'M COUNSEL FOR SAMSUNG. AND SEEING HOW IT'S LATE FRIDAY
14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU? A GOOD AFTERNOON. Q MY NAME IS VICTORIA MAROULIS. I'M COUNSEL FOR SAMSUNG. AND SEEING HOW IT'S LATE FRIDAY AFTERNOON, I'LL BE VERY BRIEF.</pre>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU? A GOOD AFTERNOON. Q MY NAME IS VICTORIA MAROULIS. I'M COUNSEL FOR SAMSUNG. AND SEEING HOW IT'S LATE FRIDAY AFTERNOON, I'LL BE VERY BRIEF. YOU TESTIFIED THAT YOU PREPARED A</pre>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU? A GOOD AFTERNOON. Q MY NAME IS VICTORIA MAROULIS. I'M COUNSEL FOR SAMSUNG. AND SEEING HOW IT'S LATE FRIDAY AFTERNOON, I'LL BE VERY BRIEF. YOU TESTIFIED THAT YOU PREPARED A POWERPOINT FOR A MEETING BETWEEN APPLE AND SAMSUNG
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU? A GOOD AFTERNOON. Q MY NAME IS VICTORIA MAROULIS. I'M COUNSEL FOR SAMSUNG. AND SEEING HOW IT'S LATE FRIDAY AFTERNOON, I'LL BE VERY BRIEF. YOU TESTIFIED THAT YOU PREPARED A POWERPOINT FOR A MEETING BETWEEN APPLE AND SAMSUNG IN AUGUST 2010. IS THAT CORRECT?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>BY MS. MAROULIS: Q GOOD AFTERNOON, MR. TEKSLER. HOW ARE YOU? A GOOD AFTERNOON. Q MY NAME IS VICTORIA MAROULIS. I'M COUNSEL FOR SAMSUNG. AND SEEING HOW IT'S LATE FRIDAY AFTERNOON, I'LL BE VERY BRIEF. YOU TESTIFIED THAT YOU PREPARED A POWERPOINT FOR A MEETING BETWEEN APPLE AND SAMSUNG IN AUGUST 2010. IS THAT CORRECT? A I BELIEVE THAT WAS KEY NOTE, BUT YES.</pre>

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page16 of 23 ¹⁹⁶⁵
1	A NO, I DID NOT.
2	Q YOU CANNOT TELL US FROM YOUR PERSONAL
3	KNOWLEDGE ANYTHING ABOUT THAT MEETING AND WHAT WAS
4	PRESENTED; CORRECT?
5	A I KNOW THAT THAT WAS PRESENTED. WE LATER SENT
6	SAMSUNG THE PRESENTATION AND, IN SUBSEQUENT
7	MEETINGS WITH SAMSUNG, WE REFERRED BACK TO THAT
8	PRESENTATION AND TO THE DIALOGUE THAT HAPPENED THAT
9	DAY. SO THAT'S
10	Q BUT FROM PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE, YOU DO NOT KNOW
11	WHAT OCCURRED AT THAT MEETING AND WHAT WAS SHOWN
12	AND WHAT WAS NOT SHOWN; CORRECT?
13	A OKAY, CERTAINLY.
14	Q AND THE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION THAT YOU
15	PREPARED IS EXHIBIT 52 IN EVIDENCE; CORRECT? IF
16	YOU CAN LOOK IN YOUR CROSS-EXAMINATION BINDER AT
17	TAB 52, DO YOU SEE THAT?
18	A I DO.
19	Q IF YOU LOOK AT PAGES 12 THROUGH 14, DO YOU SEE
20	A VARIETY OF PATENTS LISTED THERE?
21	A YES, I DO.
22	Q OKAY. AND DO YOU REMEMBER, ON DIRECT, JOE
23	ASKED YOU ABOUT THE SEVEN PATENTS ASSERTED IN THIS
24	CASE; CORRECT?
25	A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page17 of 23 ¹⁹⁶⁶
1	Q FOUR OF THEM WERE DESIGN PATENTS?
2	A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
3	Q ONE OF THOSE DESIGN PATENT PATENTS WAS D'677;
4	RIGHT?
5	A I BELIEVE THAT'S CORRECT, YES.
6	Q THAT PATENT IS NOWHERE IN THIS PRESENTATION;
7	IS THAT CORRECT?
8	A IT'S NOT ENUMERATED.
9	Q IT'S NOT MENTIONED AT ALL AS A PATENT, THE
10	D'677; RIGHT?
11	A SO I THINK WHAT I WOULD SAY IS I AGREE THAT
12	IT'S NOT ENUMERATED IN THE PRESENTATION.
13	WHEN WE WERE PREPARING THE, THE POINTS
14	THAT WE WANTED TO GET ACROSS AND I BELIEVE THAT
15	WAS BACK IN SLIDE 17 OF THIS PRESENTATION WE DID
16	SAY THAT THERE WAS A REMARKABLE SIMILARITY BETWEEN
17	THE PRODUCTS AND, IN DOING SO, WE DID TALK ABOUT
18	DESIGN PATENTS.
19	Q SIR, THIS PRESENTATION DOES NOT MENTION THE
20	WORD "DESIGN PATENT" AT ALL; CORRECT?
21	A I AGREE.
22	Q AND DESIGN PATENT '087 THAT YOU REVIEWED WITH
23	COUNSEL IS ALSO NOT MENTIONED IN THIS PRESENTATION;
24	IS THAT RIGHT?
25	A I AGREE.

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page18 of 23 ¹⁹⁶⁷
1	Q AND DESIGN PATENT '889 IS SIMILARLY NOT
2	MENTIONED IN THIS PRESENTATION; CORRECT?
3	A I AGREE.
4	Q AND SO IS D'305, THAT IS ALSO NOT MENTIONED IN
5	THE PRESENTATION; RIGHT?
6	A I AGREE.
7	Q YOU ALSO LOOKED AT SEVERAL UTILITY PATENTS
8	WITH COUNSEL; IS THAT RIGHT?
9	A I DID.
10	Q ONE OF THEM WAS '163 PATENT; CORRECT?
11	A I BELIEVE THAT'S CORRECT, YES.
12	Q THAT PATENT IS NOT ENUMERATED ANYWHERE IN THIS
13	PRESENTATION WE JUST LOOK AT; RIGHT?
14	A THAT'S CORRECT.
15	Q AND THE '915 PATENT THAT YOU ALSO LOOKED AT IN
16	YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IS ALSO NOWHERE MENTIONED;
17	CORRECT?
18	A THAT'S CORRECT.
19	Q THIS PRESENTATION THAT YOU PREPARED FOR
20	SAMSUNG DOES NOT HAVE ANY MENTION OF TRADE DRESS;
21	RIGHT?
22	A AGAIN, I THINK I WOULD PUT IT INTO THE SAME
23	CATEGORY OF BULLET POINTS THAT WE TALKED ABOUT.
24	Q SIR, YOU'RE A LICENSING PROFESSIONAL. YOU
25	KNOW WHAT A REGISTERED TRADE DRESS IS; CORRECT?

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page19 of 23 ¹⁹⁶⁸
1	A IAM, YES.
2	Q SO NOWHERE IN THIS PRESENTATION IS THERE
3	MENTION OF A REGISTERED TRADE DRESS FOR AN IPHONE;
4	CORRECT?
5	A I AGREE THAT THERE IS NOT.
6	Q AND THERE'S NO MENTION OF UNREGISTERED TRADE
7	DRESS FOR IPHONE AS WELL; CORRECT?
8	A I AGREE THAT IT'S NOT WRITTEN ON THE SLIDES.
9	Q AND THERE'S NO UNREGISTERED TRADE DRESS FOR
10	IPAD; CORRECT?
11	A I AGREE.
12	Q EXHIBIT 52 DOESN'T SAY ANYWHERE THAT APPLE
13	WOULD NOT LICENSE ITS DESIGN PATENTS TO SAMSUNG; IS
14	THAT RIGHT?
15	A I AGREE.
16	Q AND THE PRESENTATION DOES NOT IDENTIFY ANY
17	UTILITY PATENTS THAT APPLE WOULD NOT LICENSE TO
18	SAMSUNG; IS THAT RIGHT?
19	A I AGREE.
20	Q PLEASE TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT DX 586 IN YOUR
21	BINDER. THIS IS A PRESENTATION THAT YOU MADE TO
22	SAMSUNG IN OCTOBER 2010; CORRECT?
23	A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
24	Q YOU PREPARED IT YOURSELF?
25	A I DID.

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page20 of 23 ¹⁹⁶⁹
1	Q AS PART OF DOING BUSINESS AS A LICENSING
2	OFFICER AT APPLE; CORRECT?
3	A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
4	MS. MAROULIS: YOUR HONOR, I MOVE EXHIBIT
5	586 INTO EVIDENCE.
6	MR. MUELLER: NO FURTHER OBJECTIONS, YOUR
7	HONOR, SUBJECT TO THE LIMITING INSTRUCTION THAT
8	YOUR HONOR MENTIONED.
9	THE COURT: RIGHT. AND THERE IS A
10	THIS IS ADMITTED.
11	(WHEREUPON, DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT NUMBER
12	586, HAVING BEEN PREVIOUSLY MARKED FOR
13	IDENTIFICATION, WAS ADMITTED INTO
14	EVIDENCE.)
15	THE COURT: YOU MAY CONSIDER THIS YOU
16	MAY NOT CONSIDER THIS EVIDENCE TO PROVE OR DISPROVE
17	THE VALIDITY OR INVALIDITY OF THE CLAIM OR THE
18	AMOUNT OF THE DISPUTED CLAIM.
19	HOWEVER, YOU MAY CONSIDER THIS EVIDENCE
20	FOR SOME OTHER PURPOSE, FOR EXAMPLE, WHETHER OR NOT
21	SAMSUNG LACKED NOTICE OF APPLE'S INFRINGEMENT
22	CLAIMS.
23	OKAY. GO AHEAD, PLEASE.
24	BY MS. MAROULIS:
25	Q MR. TEKSLER, NOWHERE IN EXHIBIT 586 DOES APPLE

I
D ?

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page22 of 23 ¹⁹⁷¹
-	
1	TO SAMSUNG; CORRECT?
2	A SUBJECT TO THE SAME, YOU KNOW, POINT THAT I
3	MADE EARLIER, YES.
4	Q LET'S PUT UP 586, PAGE 13, PLEASE.
5	AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE, IT SAYS "WE WILL
б	PROVIDE SAMSUNG WITH A NUMBER OF OPTIONS FOR
7	OBTAINING A COST-EFFECT LICENSE TO OUR PATENT
8	PORTFOLIO."
9	DID I READ THIS CORRECTLY?
10	A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
11	Q AND THIS REFERS TO LICENSING PATENT PORTFOLIO;
12	RIGHT?
13	A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
14	Q IT DOES NOT SAY "PATENT PORTFOLIO EXCEPT
15	DESIGN PATENTS." CORRECT?
16	A NO, I AGREE THE SLIDE DOESN'T SAY THAT.
17	Q AND IT DOESN'T SAY "EXCEPT FOR CERTAIN UTILITY
18	PATENTS." CORRECT?
19	A THAT'S CORRECT.
20	Q IN EXHIBIT 586, APPLE PROPOSED CERTAIN
21	DISCOUNTS ON THE LICENSE FEES BASED ON CERTAIN
22	ELEMENTS; CORRECT?
23	A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
24	Q AND ONE OF THOSE ELEMENTS WERE PROPRIETARY,
25	SO-CALLED PROPRIETARY FEATURES?

	Case5:11-cv-01846-LHK Document2126-6 Filed11/09/12 Page23 of 23
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	/ S /
22	LEE-ANNE SHORTRIDGE, CSR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 9595
23	CERILFICALE NUMBER 9595
24	DATED: AUGUST 11, 2012
25	