

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

[COUNSEL LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGE]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

APPLE INC., a California corporation,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a  
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG  
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New  
York corporation; and SAMSUNG  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,  
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,  
  
Defendants.

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

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT  
STATEMENT**

Date: December 10, 2015  
Time: 1:30 PM  
Place: Courtroom 1, 5th Floor  
Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

1 Pursuant to the Court’s September 18, 2015, Order (Dkt. 3289), the parties submit this  
2 Joint Case Management Statement in connection with the Case Management Conference  
3 (“CMC”) scheduled for December 10, 2015.

4 **I. STATUS UPDATE**

5 **A. Enforcement of partial final judgment and costs.**

6 **Apple statement:**

7 After the Court entered partial judgment in Apple’s favor of \$548,176,477 on September  
8 18, 2015, Samsung appealed on September 21. Samsung’s appeal was docketed on September  
9 30. The same day, Apple filed a motion for summary affirmance. The Federal Circuit granted  
10 Apple’s motion and summarily affirmed this Court’s partial final judgment two weeks later, on  
11 October 13. Samsung filed a petition for rehearing en banc, which the court denied on November  
12 19. The mandate issued on November 30, 2015. Samsung’s motion for approval of a  
13 supersedeas bond and temporary stay pending appeal (Dkt. 3294) is therefore moot.

14 Apple’s motions to enforce surety liability with respect to the \$548 million partial  
15 judgment and \$1.8 million costs judgment remain pending, as well as Samsung’s parallel motion  
16 to vacate the Court’s costs judgment, all of which are set for hearing the same day as the case  
17 management conference.

18 Samsung has confirmed to Apple that it will pay Apple the \$548 million partial judgment  
19 directly. Samsung indicates that payment should be complete within 10 days of delivery of  
20 Apple’s invoice to Samsung, which will take place on December 4. Payment should therefore be  
21 complete by Monday, December 14. Once payment is received, Apple will withdraw the motion  
22 to enforce with respect to the partial judgment. If Apple has not withdrawn the motion by  
23 Wednesday, December 16, Apple requests that the Court grant the motion to enforce, as no  
24 substantive opposition has been filed. Apple notes that Samsung purports to reserve rights to  
25 obtain partial reimbursement in the future of judgment amounts it has paid. Apple disputes  
26 Samsung’s asserted rights to reimbursement.

1 Samsung has indicated that it does not intend to pay Apple the \$1.8 million costs  
2 judgment. For the reasons stated in Apple’s briefing, the Court should grant Apple’s motion to  
3 enforce with respect to costs. (*E.g.*, Dkt. 3306.)

4 **Samsung’s statement:**

5 With respect to the partial judgment, Samsung has made arrangements to complete  
6 payment to Apple. Samsung informed Apple that it intends to make the payment 10 days after  
7 receipt of the original invoice from Apple, which has not yet taken place. Samsung has told  
8 Apple that it will make the payment by December 14 if Apple delivers the original invoice to  
9 Samsung no later than December 4 KST. Samsung is paying the full amount of the judgment at  
10 this time without deducting withholding taxes. Samsung acknowledges that an involuntary  
11 obligation to pay arises from the issuance of the Federal Circuit’s mandate and expiration of the  
12 stay of execution. Nonetheless, Samsung continues to reserve all rights to obtain reimbursement  
13 from Apple and/or payment by Apple of all amounts required to be paid as taxes. Samsung  
14 requests that the Court release its supersedeas bond (Dkt. 3036) as soon as the judgment is paid.

15 Samsung further reserves all rights to reclaim or obtain reimbursement of any judgment  
16 amounts paid by Samsung to any entity in the event the partial judgment is reversed, modified,  
17 vacated or set aside on appeal or otherwise, including as a result of any proceedings before the  
18 USPTO addressing the patents at issue or as a result of any petition for writ of certiorari filed with  
19 the Supreme Court. Samsung notes that the Patent Trial and Appeal Board has issued a final  
20 decision of invalidity on the ’915 Patent, and Apple filed a notice of appeal to the Federal Circuit  
21 in the USPTO last week. The appeal has not been docketed at the time of this filing.

22 Motions for costs have been set for hearing during the December 10 Case Management  
23 Conference. As explained in Samsung’s motion, because the Federal Circuit did not discuss costs  
24 in its opinion partially reversing the judgment, the costs award was vacated  
25 automatically. Controlling Ninth Circuit precedent establishes a default rule that “[w]here a  
26 reviewing court reverses a district court’s judgment for the prevailing party . . . both the  
27 underlying judgment and the taxation of costs undertaken pursuant to that judgment are  
28 reversed.” *Amarel v. Connell*, 102 F.3d 1494, 1523 (9th Cir. 1997) (citing *Farmer v. Arabian*

1 *American Oil Co.*, 379 U.S. 227 (1964), disapproved of on other grounds by *Crawford Fitting Co.*  
2 *v. J.T. Gibbons, Inc.*, 482 U.S. 437, 443 (1987)) In the alternative, vacatur of the costs award is  
3 warranted because the factual bases for the award no longer apply in light of the Federal Circuit's  
4 decision reducing the damages award by over \$380 million and reversing the judgment for Apple  
5 on its trade dress claims. The question of costs should be addressed after remand proceedings are  
6 completed. *See Amarel*, 102 F.3d at 1024 (“[i]nstead of attempting to award partial costs at this  
7 juncture, the district court should await the outcome of the [remaining] claim [on remand] to  
8 ascertain whether allocation of costs is necessary.”)

9 For the reasons stated in Samsung's Opposition to Apple's Motion to Enforce Surety  
10 Liability With Respect to Costs Judgment (Dkt. 3298) and Samsung's Motion to Confirm Vacatur  
11 of Costs Award or, in the Alternative, for an Order Holding the Costs Award is Vacated Pursuant  
12 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(5) (Dkt. 3279), the Court should deny Apple's Motion to  
13 Enforce and confirm that its prior costs award (Dkt. 3193) has been vacated. In the event  
14 Samsung is ordered to pay costs, it will pay directly.

15 **B. Status of expert discovery regarding remand trial.**

16 The parties exchanged expert reports on November 6, 2015. Depositions of the parties'  
17 experts proceeded on December 2 and December 3. Pursuant to the schedule set by the Court, the  
18 parties will file motions to strike on December 18.

19 **C. Supplemental damages and prejudgment interest**

20 **Apple's Statement:**

21 Apple seeks leave to file a motion for supplemental damages and interest. As Apple set  
22 out in the parties' joint submission on October 9, 2015 (Dkt. 3316), the products for which Apple  
23 is entitled to supplemental damages were included in the damages verdict. Samsung has  
24 indicated that it wants to press new noninfringement arguments, but it could have made those  
25 arguments at the 2012 trial. Moreover, Samsung did not challenge the Court's methodology on  
26 appeal. As a result, as Apple suggested in the September 11, 2015, joint case management  
27 statement, the Court may now do an accounting for supplemental damages and prejudgment  
28 interest via motion. No additional discovery is required.

1           **Samsung’s Statement:**

2           Samsung opposes Apple’s request for leave to file for supplemental damages at this time.  
3 Samsung agrees with the Court’s repeated statements that it would be more appropriate to address  
4 supplemental damages after the March 2016 trial rather than before.

5           As shown in Samsung’s submissions to the Court, Samsung’s design arounds are not new,  
6 and Apple has been fully aware of them for years. Some design arounds were introduced in the  
7 prior trial, while others existed earlier, although they were barred from it, and one did not exist at  
8 the time of trial but was the subject of discovery in the post-trial injunction phase. In the October  
9 9, 2015 filing (Dkt. 3316), Apple does not dispute any of the non-infringing design arounds as  
10 specifically identified by Samsung. Instead, Apple argues that Samsung waived the right to  
11 defend itself against Apple’s request for excessive and unjustified supplemental damages—which  
12 it did not—and that this Court intended to award supplemental damages based on the model  
13 number used on the phone, no matter that there is no dispute that the phone does not infringe  
14 Apple’s IP (such as damages on white phones for a patent covering only black phones).

15       **II.    ADR**

16           The parties participated in a settlement conference with Magistrate Judge Spero on  
17 November 2, 2015. That process is complete and did not result in settlement.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Dated: December 3, 2015

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
HAROLD J. McELHINNY (CA SBN 66781)  
hmcelhinny@mofo.com  
RACHEL KREVANS (CA SBN 116421)  
rkrevans@mofo.com  
ERIK OLSON (CA SBN 175815)  
ejolson@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
Telephone: (415) 268-7000  
Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

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

By: /s/ Harold J. McElhinny  
Harold J. McElhinny

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim-  
Defendant APPLE INC.

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,  
LLP  
Charles K. Verhoeven (Cal. Bar No. 170151)  
charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Kevin P.B. Johnson (Cal. Bar No. 177129)  
kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com  
Victoria F. Maroulis (Cal. Bar No. 202603)  
victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, California 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Michael T. Zeller (Cal. Bar No. 196417)  
michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com  
865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

By: /s/ Victoria F. Maroulis  
Victoria F. Maroulis

Attorneys for Defendants and  
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs SAMSUNG  
ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG  
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. and  
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
AMERICA, LLC

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**ATTESTATION OF E-FILED SIGNATURE**

I, Harold J. McElhinny, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this Joint Case Management Statement. In compliance with Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that Victoria F. Maroulis has concurred in this filing.

Dated: December 3, 2015

/s/ Harold J. McElhinny  
HAROLD J. MCELHINNY