

# **EXHIBIT C**

**SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER; CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –  
OUTSIDE ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY INFORMATION**

HAROLD J. MCELHINNY (CA SBN 66781)  
hmcclhinny@mofo.com  
MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)  
mjacobs@mofo.com  
JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368)  
jtaylor@mofo.com  
ALISON M. TUCHER (CA SBN 171363)  
atucher@mofo.com  
RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425)  
rhung@mofo.com  
JASON R. BARTLETT (CA SBN 214530)  
jasonbartlett@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

Attorneys for Plaintiff and  
Counterclaim-Defendant APPLE INC.

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)

**APPLE INC.’S CORRECTED  
AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND  
RESPONSES TO SAMSUNG  
ELECTRONICS CO. LTD.’S  
INTERROGATORY NOS. 4, 6, 7,  
16, 17, 18 TO APPLE INC.**

**SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER; CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –  
OUTSIDE ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY INFORMATION**

1 In accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Apple refers to the following  
2 documents because the burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer to this Interrogatory from  
3 the produced business records is substantially the same for Apple as for Samsung: APLNDC-  
4 X0000007220, APLNDC00013715, and APLNDC00013690.

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

6 Separately for each of the APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT, APPLE TRADE DRESS and  
7 APPLE TRADEMARKS state all facts supporting any contention by APPLE that Samsung has  
8 willfully infringed, diluted, or falsely designated the origin of its products for each patent, trade  
9 dress, and trademark, including when and how APPLE asserts Samsung had actual notice of the  
10 APPLE PATENTS-IN-SUIT, APPLE TRADE DRESS, and APPLE TRADEMARKS.

11 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

12 Apple objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably  
13 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Apple objects to this Interrogatory as  
14 premature to the extent that it: (a) conflicts with the schedule entered by the Court, (b) conflicts  
15 with the obligations imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules  
16 and/or the Patent Local Rules of this Court, and/or any other applicable rule; (c) seeks  
17 information that is the subject of expert testimony; (d) seeks information and/or responses that are  
18 dependent on the Court’s construction of the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit; or (e) seeks  
19 information and/or responses that are dependent on depositions and documents that have not been  
20 taken or produced. Apple further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information  
21 that: (i) requires the disclosure of information, documents, and things protected from disclosure  
22 by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, common interest doctrine, joint defense  
23 privilege, or any other applicable privilege, doctrine, or immunity; (ii) would require Apple to  
24 draw a legal conclusion to respond; (iii) is outside of Apple’s possession, custody, or control; or  
25 (iv) can be obtained as easily by Samsung, is already in Samsung’s possession, or is publicly  
26 available.

27 Subject to and incorporating its General Objections and its specific objections, Apple  
28 responds as follows:

**SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER; CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –  
OUTSIDE ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY INFORMATION**

1 Samsung manufactured, distributed, imported into the United States, used in the United  
2 States, offered for sale in the United States, and sold in the United States products that infringed  
3 the Apple patents, trade dress, and trademarks at issue in this lawsuit despite an objectively high  
4 likelihood that its actions constituted infringement of valid patents, trade dress, and trademarks.  
5 Moreover, this objectively high likelihood of infringement was known to Samsung, or so obvious  
6 that it should have been known to Samsung. Samsung’s objectively reckless infringement of the  
7 Apple patents, trade dress, and trademarks at issue in this lawsuit began before Apple commenced  
8 this action and continues to this day. There is no objectively reasonable non-infringement  
9 argument with respect to the accused products; nor is there any objectively reasonable argument  
10 that the Apple patents, trade dress, and trademarks at issue in this lawsuit are invalid.

11 For instance, starting in July 2010, Apple representatives provided notice to Samsung that  
12 it infringed Apple’s patents and designs. On or about August 4, 2010, Apple representatives met  
13 with Samsung in Korea and showed a presentation titled “Samsung’s Use of Apple Patents in  
14 Smartphones.” This presentation emphasized Samsung’s copying of the iPhone and identified  
15 two of the patents-in-suit (the ‘002 and ‘381 patents), giving Samsung actual notice of at least  
16 these patents, and many more.

17 On or about August 26, 2010, Apple sent Samsung an electronic archive file containing  
18 claim charts further illustrating Samsung’s infringement of Apple patents. A presentation  
19 document that accompanied these claim charts identified the ‘002 and ‘381 patents as two patents  
20 that Samsung products infringed, and it substantiated these allegations with text from the patents  
21 and photographs of Samsung devices illustrating infringing functionality. Apple later presented  
22 these slides to Samsung at a meeting in Cupertino, California on or about September 9, 2010.

23 Moreover, even after Samsung indisputably had actual notice of its infringement of all of  
24 the Apple patents-in-suit as a result of the filing of this lawsuit, it continued the development,  
25 manufacture, importation, distribution and sale of electronic devices as to which there was no  
26 objectively reasonable theory of non-infringement. Samsung continues its willful infringing  
27 activities to the present.

**SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER; CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –  
OUTSIDE ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY INFORMATION**

1           During the August 4, 2010 presentation mentioned above, Apple also informed Samsung  
2           that Samsung’s smart phones were infringing Apple’s designs.

3           Moreover, with respect to the design patents-in-suit, and specifically with respect to  
4           D’889, Samsung was aware of this patent at least as early as April 14, 2008 when it was cited  
5           during the prosecution of U.S. Design Patents Nos. D578,983 and D583,342, which are assigned  
6           to Samsung. The D’889 was also cited during the prosecution of U.S. Design Patents  
7           Nos. D632,688 and D635,976. Specifically with respect to the D’790 patent, Samsung was aware  
8           of this patent at least as early as February 3, 2011 when it was cited during the prosecution of  
9           U.S. Design Patent No. D634,734, which is assigned to Samsung. Specifically with respect to the  
10          D’305 patent, Samsung was aware of this patent at least as early as November 27, 2009 when it  
11          was cited during the prosecution of U.S. Design Patent No. D618,700, which is assigned to  
12          Samsung. Moreover, there is substantial evidence of Samsung’s copying of Apple’s iPhone and  
13          iPad products, as shown by the numerous design similarities between Apple’s and Samsung’s  
14          phone and tablet products.

15          Furthermore, with respect to the trade dress and trademarks asserted in the lawsuit, Apple  
16          announced the original iPhone on January 9, 2007 and released the product on June 29, 2007;  
17          Apple announced the iPhone 3G on June 9, 2008 and released the product on July 11, 2008;  
18          Apple announced the iPhone 3GS on June 8, 2009 and released the product on June 19, 2009; and  
19          Apple announced the iPhone 4 on June 7, 2010 and released the product on June 24, 2010.  
20          Samsung was put on notice of Apple’s distinctive Original iPhone Trade Dress, iPhone 3G Trade  
21          Dress, iPhone 4 Trade Dress, and iPhone Trade Dress upon the announcements of these  
22          respective products. Samsung was put on notice of the trade dress shown in the Trade Dress  
23          Registrations upon the announcement of the original iPhone. Samsung was put on notice of the  
24          trade dress shown in U.S. Application Serial No. 85/299,118 upon the announcement of the  
25          iPhone 4. Apple announced the iPad on January 27, 2010 and released the product on April 3,  
26          2010, and Apple announced the iPad 2 on March 2, 2011 and released the product on March 11,  
27          2011. Samsung was put on notice of Apple’s distinctive iPad Trade Dress and the trade dress  
28          shown in U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/921,838, 77/921,829, and 77/921,869 upon the

**SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER; CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –  
OUTSIDE ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY INFORMATION**

1 announcement of the iPad, and it was put on notice of Apple’s distinctive iPad 2 Trade Dress  
2 upon the announcement of the iPad 2. Samsung was put on notice of the marks shown in U.S.  
3 Registration Nos. 3,886,196; 3,889,642; 3,886,200; 3,889,685; and 3,886,169 upon the  
4 announcement of the original iPhone. Samsung was put on notice of the mark shown in U.S.  
5 Registration No. 3,886,197 at least as early as June 19, 2009. Samsung was put on notice of the  
6 Purple iTunes Store Trademark at least as early as June 2008. Samsung was put on notice of the  
7 iTunes Eighth Note and CD Design Trademark at least as early as January 9, 2001.

8 In accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Apple refers to the following  
9 documents because the burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer to this Interrogatory from  
10 the produced business records is substantially the same for Apple as for Samsung:

11 SAMNDCA00036232, SAMNDCA00176053, SAMNDCA00191811, SAMNDCA00196646,  
12 SAMNDCA00201351, SAMNDCA00201771, SAMNDCA00202212, SAMNDCA00202336,  
13 SAMNDCA00203016, SAMNDCA00203092, SAMNDCA00203268, SAMNDCA00203727,  
14 SAMNDCA00203811, SAMNDCA00203880, SAMNDCA00214274, SAMNDCA00217372,  
15 SAMNDCA00221705, SAMNDCA00228887, SAMNDCA00228934, SAMNDCA00228981,  
16 SAMNDCA00229011, SAMNDCA00229396, SAMNDCA00229399, SAMNDCA00229410,  
17 SAMNDCA00229440, SAMNDCA00229449, SAMNDCA00232190, SAMNDCA00237929,  
18 SAMNDCA00237976, SAMNDCA00238251, SAMNDCA00238432, SAMNDCA00249029,  
19 SAMNDCA00251506, SAMNDCA00507826, SAMNDCA00508318, SAMNDCA00512454,  
20 SAMNDCA00514511, SAMNDCA00514571, SAMNDCA00515899, SAMNDCA00525347,  
21 SAMNDCA00530675, SAMNDCA00533129, SAMNDCA00533366, SAMNDCA10042955,  
22 SAMNDCA10154003, SAMNDCA10190890, SAMNDCA10244357, SAMNDCA10244604,  
23 SAMNDCA10247373, SAMNDCA10247537, SAMNDCA10247549, SAMNDCA10275576,  
24 SAMNDCA10403697, SAMNDCA10524415, SAMNDCA10806650, SAMNDCA10806707,  
25 SAMNDCA10807316, SAMNDCA10807388, SAMNDCA10808682, SAMNDCA10809390,  
26 SAMNDCA10809734, SAMNDCA10824971, all documents referenced in Apple’s briefing on  
27 its motion for sanctions, all documents that Samsung has produced, and continues to produce,  
28