

Exhibit A

1 HAROLD J. MCELHINNY (CA SBN 66781)
hmcclhinny@mofo.com
2 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
mjacobs@mofo.com
3 RACHEL KREVANS (CA SBN 116421)
rkrevans@mofo.com
4 ERIK OLSON (CA SBN 175815)
jtaylor@mofo.com
5 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
6 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: (415) 268-7000
7 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

8
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff and
Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.

WILLIAM F. LEE
william.lee@wilmerhale.com
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 526-6000
Facsimile: (617) 526-5000

MARK D. SELWYN (SBN 244180)
mark.selwyn@wilmerhale.com
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
950 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304
Telephone: (650) 858-6000
Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14
15 APPLE INC., a California corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG
19 ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New
York corporation; and SAMSUNG
20 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

21 Defendants.
22

Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK (PSG)

**APPLE'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
ITS ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION
SEEKING AN APRIL 3 CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

1 Apple’s motion is simple and straightforward: It asks the Court to hold a case
2 management conference on April 3, with joint statements to be filed on March 27, 2013.

3 Samsung’s lengthy opposition does not engage Apple’s request. Samsung does not assert
4 that a case management conference is inappropriate. To the contrary, by arguing its positions
5 about the scope and procedures for the new trial required by the Court’s March 1 Order re:
6 Damages, Samsung confirms the need for a conference. And Samsung previously indicated that
7 it would agree to a conference, just not earlier than late April. (*See* Dkt. No. 2283-1 ¶ 4.)

8 Nor can Samsung credibly take the position that April 3—over a month after the Court
9 issued its March 1 Order—is too soon. Samsung clearly has developed its views about whether
10 and how the case should proceed, and it will have filed its reply on its motion for partial judgment
11 by March 29. Samsung’s preference for delay, which allows it to avoid the consequences of the
12 jury’s verdict that was rendered eight months ago, is no reason for the Court to defer a conference
13 to determine how to proceed.

14 The procedures for a case management conference require the parties to meet and confer
15 about their respective positions and then present their areas of agreement and dispute in a joint
16 statement. Thus, although Apple disagrees with many of the positions Samsung has now
17 articulated about the scope and procedures for a new trial, Apple will address those disagreements
18 in the meet and confer process and joint statement, not here.

19
20 Dated: March 24, 2013

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

21
22 By: /s/ Michael A. Jacobs
Michael A. Jacobs

23 Attorneys for Plaintiff
24 APPLE INC.