

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 JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (CA SBN 161368)  
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

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

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

10  
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.

Case No. 11-cv-01846-LHK

**APPLE'S RESPONSE TO  
SAMSUNG'S STATEMENT OF  
RECENT DECISION**

1           On March 29, 2013, the USPTO issued what it terms a Final Office Action on the *Ex*  
2 *Parte* Reexamination of U.S. Patent. No. 7,469,381. On April 1, Samsung submitted a Statement  
3 of Recent Decision attaching a copy of that Office Action. (ECF No. 2291.) Samsung states that  
4 the Office Action “finally” rejects multiple claims of the ’381 patent, but the suggestion that the  
5 reexamination is finished and the USPTO has rendered a dispositive decision is incorrect.

6           A “final” office action does not signal the end of reexamination at the USPTO, much less  
7 the end of consideration of the patentability of the claims under reexamination. Rather, “finality”  
8 is primarily a procedural construct that limits the right to amend claims and introduce evidence as  
9 a matter of right in reexamination. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In *ex parte* reexaminations, a USPTO  
10 examiner may designate an Office Action “final” when a rejection is presented more than once  
11 (*i.e.*, a second or subsequent rejection on the merits). See 37 C.F.R. § 1.113. Apple is entitled to  
12 file a response to a “final” rejection, which may result in a withdrawal of the rejection or  
13 allowance/certification of the claims under reexamination. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In fact, the  
14 Office Action states on its face that Apple may respond within two months. (ECF No. 2291-1 at  
15 4.)

16           Moreover, once the *ex parte* reexamination proceeding is concluded, Apple is entitled to  
17 several appeal options. A patent owner is entitled to appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
18 (PTAB). See 35 U.S.C. § 306. Even if appeal to the PTAB is unsuccessful, Apple may seek  
19 judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the United States  
20 District Court for the District of Columbia. See 35 U.S.C. §§ 141, 145.

21           In short, reexamination of the ’381 patent is far from conclusion.

22  
23 Dated: April 2, 2013

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

24  
25 By:           /s/ Michael A. Jacobs            
MICHAEL A. JACOBS

26 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
27 APPLE INC.  
28