

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

APPLE INC., a California corporation

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD., a
Korean business entity; SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York
corporation; SAMSUNG
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,
a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendants.

Case No.: 12-CV-0630-LHK (PSG)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
COMPEL AND MOTION TO
ENFORCE**

(Re: Docket No. 669)

In this patent infringement case between Plaintiff Apple, Inc. (“Apple”) and Defendants Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC (collectively “Samsung”), Samsung moves to compel Apple to produce certain financial documents and to enforce the court’s April 12, 2013 discovery order. Apple opposes. On August 13, 2013, the court held a hearing. By this point, the parties and the community at large are well-versed in the background of this case, and so the court delves directly into the latest disputes.

I. LEGAL STANDARDS

1 Rule 26(b) provides that parties “may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter
2 that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense.” The relevant information “need not be admissible
3 at trial if the discovery appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
4 evidence.” Relevance under Rule 26(b) is broadly defined, “although it is not without ultimate and
5 necessary boundaries.”¹

6
7 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2) provides one such a limit, mandating that the court limit the
8 frequency or extent of discovery if: (1) “the discovery sought is unreasonably cumulative or
9 duplicative, or can be obtained from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome,
10 or less expensive;” (2) “the party seeking discovery has had ample opportunity to obtain the
11 information by discovery in the action;” or (3) “the burden or expense of the proposed discovery
12 outweighs its likely benefit.” Upon a motion to compel brought pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.
13 37(a)(3), the moving party has the burden of demonstrating relevance.²

II. DISCUSSION

A. Samsung’s request that Apple produce U.S. financial data according to specific product.

14
15
16
17
18 Samsung asks the court to compel further responses to its Requests for Production
19 (“RFPs”), which seek financial documents from Apple regarding: (1) units sold, gross and net
20 revenue, gross and net margin, and gross and net profits for each Apple product (RFPs 101, 197,
21 543,-546, 860-861); (2) reports and projections of U.S. sales, profitability margins, and financial
22 performance for each version of the iPhone and iPad (RFPs 547-556, 863-865); and (3) all costs
23
24

25
26
27 ¹ See *Gonzales v. Google Inc.*, 234 F.R.D. 674, 680 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (internal citations and
quotations omitted).

28 ² See *Soto v. City of Concord*, 162 F.R.D. 603, 610 (N.D. Cal. 1995).

1 comprising costs of goods sold and all costs other than standard costs for each of the accused
2 products (RFP 854). In its reply, Samsung further elaborates that these documents would include:

- 3 • System billings on a per-product basis;
- 4 • Revenue adjustments – amortization, deferrals, commissions, and carrier subsidies – on a per-product basis;
- 5 • Standard margins for the U.S. market;
- 6 • Advertising and marketing expenses for “hero products” for the U.S. market;
- 7 • Gross margins on a per-product basis;
- 8 • Projected iPhone revenues on a per-product basis for the U.S. market; and
- 9 • Projected gross margins on a per-product basis for the U.S. market.

10 On April 15, 2013, Apple produced certain documents responsive to Samsung’s requests.

11 Samsung objects that this production was deficient in two broad respects. First, most of the data
12 presented was worldwide rather than U.S.-specific. Second, the data was compiled at the “product
13 line level” (e.g., iPhone and iPad) rather than the “model level” (e.g., iPhone 4S, iPhone 5). Apple
14 refused to present more “granular” financial data, claiming that it does not maintain reports of such
15 data in its “ordinary course of business.”

16 Apple does not dispute that the data is relevant under the generous Rule 26 standard.

17 Indeed, the U.S.-specific, model level data is highly relevant to both Samsung’s own damages
18 claims as well as Samsung’s defenses against Apple’s damages claim. To calculate its own
19 damages, Samsung must limit its damages figures to infringement that occurred in the U.S. only.³

20 Samsung also requires data specific to each accused product; generalized data spread across several
21 different models will not suffice.⁴ Not all generations of Apple’s products are accused of
22 infringing the same patents – for example, the ‘239 patent is asserted against several iPhone
23

24 ³ See 35 U.S.C. § 271 (“whoever without authority makes, uses, offers to sell, or sells any patented
25 invention, within the United States or imports into the United States any patented invention during
26 the term of the patent therefor, infringes the patent”).

27 ⁴ An expert must “carefully tie” his assessment of damages to “the claimed invention’s footprint in
28 the market place.” *ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 632 F.3d 1292, 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2011).
Additionally, several of the *Georgia-Pacific* factors used to calculate a reasonable royalty focus on
the profitability of each particular product. See *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp.*, 318
F. Supp. 1116, 1120 (S.D.N.Y. 1970).

1 models, but not the iPhone 3GS.⁵ Different generations of iPhone products, priced anywhere from
2 “free” to \$199, are almost guaranteed to have different profit margins. Model-specific data is
3 especially important in light of Judge Koh’s recent case management order, which requires
4 Samsung to reduce its current list of 22 accused products to 10 accused products.⁶ Should
5 Samsung decide to trim several generations of the iPhone product, the aggregated data currently
6 provided would include products no longer in the case. For similar reasons, the data sought by
7 Samsung are also relevant to rebut Apple’s damages claim. Again, because different patents are
8 asserted against different iPhone models, each likely to have different profit margins, model-
9 specific financial data is crucial to computing lost profits accurately. Moreover, as some iPhone
10 products are “free,” Samsung may argue that those models are ineligible for lost profits to the
11 extent that they are not competitively priced.⁷ Samsung is entitled to develop these defenses.

12
13 It is therefore uncontroversial that if Apple had reports of the data at issue, or could
14 generate such reports with only reasonable efforts, Apple would have to produce them. But Apple
15 insists that it does not have reports of the nature Samsung would like and that only a herculean
16 effort could produce even a subset of the reports demanded. Samsung presents evidence
17 insinuating otherwise, submitting Apple documents showing that it does report at least some of the
18 data at issue that is specific to the U.S. market and to individual product models.⁸ Apple also
19 admits that it maintains “systems billings” and other “revenue line items” on a model-specific
20 basis, but argues these are imperfect representations of revenue.⁹

21
22
23 ⁵ See Docket No. 669-2 ¶ 13.

24 ⁶ See Docket No. 471 at 2.

25 ⁷ See *BIC Leisure Products, Inc. v. Windsurfing Int’l, Inc.* 1 F.3d 1214, 1218-19 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

26 ⁸ See, e.g., Docket No. 669, Ex. 12-14 (tracking financial data, including revenue estimates and
27 costs, for different generations of iPhones).

28 ⁹ See Docket No. 711 at 6.

1 What emerges from the parties' arguments is that Apple does have financial databases that
2 it could query to generate at least some of the reports sought by Samsung.¹⁰ While this court has
3 held that a party should not be required to create completely new documents,¹¹ that is not the same as
4 requiring a party to query an existing dynamic database for relevant information.¹² Courts
5 regularly require parties to produce reports from dynamic databases, holding that "the technical
6 burden... of creating a new dataset for the instant litigation does not excuse production."¹³
7 Compelling production here would therefore not violate any established discovery principles.

8
9 The court may nevertheless limit production if the producing party shows that the
10 electronically-stored information is "not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost."¹⁴
11 To demonstrate undue burden or cost, Apple must make a "particular and specific demonstration of
12 fact, as distinguished from stereotyped and conclusory statements."¹⁵ Apple argues broadly that it
13 would be immensely burdened by an order requiring it to compile the reports required by
14 Samsung's demands because doing so would engage "multiple financial groups" in what is "likely

15
16
17
18
19 ¹⁰ Mark Buckley, Apple's 30(b)(6) witness, provided a roadmap for querying the database to
20 generate the financial figures. See Docket No. 720-2 at 42:7-17, 51:19-52:1, 45:18-46:8.

21 ¹¹ See *Van v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, Case No. 08-5296, 2011 WL 62499, at *1 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Jan.
22 7, 2011) (denying motion to compel because it would require defendant to relabel existing floor
23 plans).

24 ¹² See *Gonzales*, 234 F.R.D. at 683 (notwithstanding general rule that parties "are not required to
25 create documents that do not exist," compelling Google to produce requested information by using
26 a new code to "format and extract query and URL data from many computer banks").

27 ¹³ *In re eBay Seller Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. C 07-1882 JF(RS), 2009 WL 3613511, at *1
28 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2009) (requiring, under Rule 34 ESI production guidelines, that the defendant
produce records regarding certain transactional data from its dynamic database).

¹⁴ Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

¹⁵ *Gulf Oil Co. v. Bernard*, 452 U.S. 89, 102 n.16 (1981). See also *Kennedy v. Jackson Nat'l Life
Ins. Co.*, Case No. C07-0371 CW MEJ, 2010 WL 1644944, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2010).

1 [to be] several months of coordinated effort.”¹⁶ The court is generally dubious of such generalized
2 claims of burden in complying with discovery obligations.

3 But there is an additional, more persuasive reason to limit Apple’s production – the court is
4 required to limit discovery if “the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely
5 benefit.”¹⁷ This is the essence of proportionality – an all-to-often ignored discovery principle.
6 Because the parties have already submitted their expert damages reports, the financial documents
7 would be of limited value to Samsung at this point. Although counsel was not able to shed light on
8 exactly what was done, Samsung’s experts were clearly somehow able to apportion the worldwide,
9 product line inclusive data to estimate U.S. and product-specific damages. It seems, well, senseless
10 to require Apple to go to great lengths to produce data that Samsung is able to do without. This the
11 court will not do.

12
13 One other matter gives the court pause. To be sure, Samsung’s damages experts are still
14 open to an attack by Apple for their failure to use more granular financial data, either at pretrial
15 hearings or at the trial itself. While Apple clearly could not impeach Samsung with any newly-
16 compiled financial data that was not produced,¹⁸ in fairness it also is precluded more broadly from
17 challenging Samsung’s damages experts for failing to allocate geographically or by product model
18 in any way that could have been supported by the reports disputed here that were requested but not
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 ¹⁶ Docket No. 711 at 7 (citing Docket No. 711-5 ¶ 5-9).

26 ¹⁷ *Id.* section (b)(2)(C).

27 ¹⁸ *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1) (“If a party fails to provide information or identify a witness as
28 required by Rule 26(a) or (e), the party is not allowed to use that information... to supply evidence
on a motion, at a hearing, or at a trial”).

1 produced.¹⁹ This is enough to protect Samsung from any undue prejudice arising from Apple's
2 reporting limitations.

3 **B. Samsung's request to enforce the court's April 12, 2013 order regarding pricing
4 documents**


5 In its April 12, 2013 order, the court agreed with Samsung in ruling that the following
6 pricing documents were relevant and had to be produced: "(1) internal analysis by Apple of how it
7 determines pricing for its products; (2) price elasticity/price sensitivity studies relating to the
8 accused products; (3) documents discussing any price premiums for products that incorporate the
9 patented features; and (4) discussions of pricing with wireless carriers, who heavily subsidize
10 Apple's products."²⁰ The court found such strategy documents relevant to Samsung's reasonable
11 royalty and entire market value theories.²¹ The parties represented to the court at the hearing that
12 since the briefing this issue was resolved and did not require further court intervention. The court
13 accordingly does not address this issue further.

14
15 **IV. CONCLUSION**

16 Apple need not produce the financial documents sought by Samsung. But Apple is
17 estopped from challenging Samsung's experts on any ground that would be rebutted by reference
18 to documents that Samsung requested but did not receive.

19
20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Dated: August 14, 2013



22 PAUL S. GREWAL
23 United States Magistrate Judge

24
25 ¹⁹ Cf. *Texas Instruments Inc. v. Powerchip Semiconductor Corp.*, Case No.
26 06CIV2305(SHS)(RLE), 2007 WL 1541010, at *11 (S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2007) (imposing fact
preclusion sanction based on failure to produce required database reports).

27 ²⁰ Docket No. 404 at 11 (internal quotations omitted).

28 ²¹ See Docket No. 450 at 8-10.