

1 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
2 KAREN G. JOHNSON-MCKEWN (SBN 121570)  
3 kjohnson-mckewan@orrick.com  
4 ANNETTE L. HURST (SBN 148738)  
5 ahurst@orrick.com  
6 GABRIEL M. RAMSEY (SBN 209218)  
7 gramsey@orrick.com  
8 405 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105  
9 Tel: 1.415.773.5700 / Fax: 1.415.773.5759  
10 PETER A. BICKS (*pro hac vice*)  
11 pbicks@orrick.com  
12 LISA T. SIMPSON (*pro hac vice*)  
13 lsimpson@orrick.com  
14 51 West 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, New York, NY 10019  
15 Tel: 1.212.506.5000 / Fax: 1.212.506.5151  
16 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
17 DAVID BOIES (*pro hac vice*)  
18 dboies@bsfllp.com  
19 333 Main Street, Armonk, NY 10504  
20 Tel: 1.914.749.8200 / Fax: 1.914.749.8300  
21 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)  
22 sholtzman@bsfllp.com  
23 1999 Harrison St., Ste. 900, Oakland, CA 94612  
24 Tel: 1.510.874.1000 / Fax: 1.510.874.1460  
25 ORACLE CORPORATION  
26 DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)  
27 dorian.daley@oracle.com  
28 DEBORAH K. MILLER (SBN 95527)  
deborah.miller@oracle.com  
1 ORACLE CORPORATION  
2 MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (SBN 211600)  
3 matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com  
4 500 Oracle Parkway,  
5 Redwood City, CA 94065  
6 Tel: 650.506.5200 / Fax: 650.506.7117  
7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
8 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.  
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 FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.  
v.  
GOOGLE INC.  
Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA  
**ORACLE'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
ITS MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE  
RULE 706 EXPERT**  
Date: November 19, 2015  
Time: 8:00 a.m.  
Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor  
Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup

## **ARGUMENT**

The central facts here are not in dispute. Dr. Kearl testified in a patent case involving Android software. In that case, Google had control over litigating at least two of the patents. Google and Samsung were so inseparable, the same attorneys who represented Samsung also represented Google. Whether the lawsuit was really an attack on Android, whether Dr. Kearl's analysis was intended to aid the Google/Samsung defense, and whether Google's developers were too skilled to ever resort to copying were all issues at trial.

Under these circumstances, Dr. Kearl should not be the Court's neutral expert. And the Court need not replace him because the parties' experts will sufficiently present the damages issues to the jury through the normal adversary process.

**I. Given The Undisputed Facts, Dr. Kearl Should No Longer Serve As A Rule 706 Expert.**

Google and Dr. Kearl's responses are telling more for what they do not say than for what they do. Neither denies the key facts. Google and Dr. Kearl do not dispute that:

- Apple sued Samsung based on certain software features that were in Google’s Android, Mot. 3<sup>1</sup>;
- Google agreed to indemnify Samsung for certain patents in the suit, and thus had a duty to pay litigation costs and a potential damages award, Mot. 4;
- Google was in control of litigating at least two patents in suit, Mot. 4.;
- Quinn Emanuel represented both Samsung and Google in *Apple v. Samsung*, Mot. 4;
- Samsung’s oft-repeated theme during its opening statement and closing argument was that *Apple v. Samsung* was really *Apple v. Google*, Mot. 3;
- One of Samsung’s main defenses against infringement was that Google’s engineers are so skilled that they would never copy, Mot. 3;
- Apple was seeking over \$2 billion in damages, while Samsung sought \$6 million, Mot. 4-5;

<sup>1</sup> Oracle's Motion is ECF 1340. Dr. Kearl's Response is ECF 1351. Google's Response is ECF 1352.

- 1     • Samsung argued that the way “Dr. Kearn calculated [\$6 million in] damages” shows  
2         that Apple’s “billion dollar numbers are completely unsupported,” Mot. 5;
- 3     • Dr. Kearn highlighted in the *Apple v. Samsung* case that he was hired in *this* case  
4         neither for a plaintiff nor for a defendant but for the Court, Mot. 6;
- 5     • Samsung emphasized Dr. Kearn’s neutrality in our case as a reason for his reliability,  
6         Mot. 6.<sup>2</sup>

7

8         These undisputed facts show that Dr. Kearn should no longer serve as a neutral Rule 706  
9         expert due to his connection to Google and Android in *Apple v. Samsung*. Dr. Kearn, however,  
10         states he “did not side with Google” and his opinions “in no way concerned . . . Apple versus  
11         Google.” Kearn Resp. 2-3. Google adds that because “Dr. Kearn worked only on Samsung’s  
12         counterclaims[,] which related only to Apple iOS platform, not Android[,] that should end the  
13         discussion.” Google Resp. 3. But it does not.

14         First, Google was intimately involved in the case. Google was obligated to indemnify  
15         Samsung for costs and damages; Samsung gave Google control over litigating at least two  
16         patents; and the same lawyers represented Google and Samsung. That Quinn Emanuel  
17         represented both Google and Samsung shows that the important strategic decisions—like  
18         asserting counterclaims—likely served the best interests of both companies. Quinn’s dual  
19         representation also renders Google’s argument that it did not “participate in litigation regarding  
20         Samsung’s counterclaims against Apple” unconvincing. *See id.* at 4. It would have been  
21         impossible for Google’s attorneys to participate in some parts of the litigation while only  
22         Samsung’s attorneys handled other parts. Google’s attorneys were Samsung’s attorneys.

23         Second, Dr. Kearn helped the Samsung/Google team by offering his analysis of Samsung’s  
24         counterclaims at trial. Google had two ways to lower Apple’s damages, and thereby its liability:

---

25         <sup>2</sup> The only fact Dr. Kearn calls into question is Apple’s statement about why Samsung would pay  
26         its experts \$5 million for a \$6 million claim. Kearn Resp. 3. At trial, Dr. Kearn was present for  
27         the testimony of Samsung’s other experts, and heard how much they were paid. *Samsung* Tr.  
2671:14-20. Dr. Kearn was asked whether it was correct that “Samsung has paid, in total, about --  
28         more than \$4 million . . . to their expert witnesses.” *Id.* at 2671:21-23. Dr. Kearn responded:  
“Yes.” *Id.* at 2672:5.

1 on defense, by undermining Apple's expert's analysis; and on offense, by convincing the jury that  
 2 smartphone patents are not worth much. To execute the offensive strategy, Samsung  
 3 counterclaimed for \$6 million to argue that Apple's \$2 billion demand was overstated. When Dr.  
 4 Kearl testified about Samsung's counterclaims, he also helped to defend Google. In other words,  
 5 Samsung's offense was also Google's defense.

6 Dr. Kearl's work in *Apple v. Samsung* means that he can no longer fulfill the role the  
 7 Court prescribed for him. The Court appointed Dr. Kearl to assist the jury by providing an "an  
 8 independent, professional view as opposed to the views of experts that are retained and paid for  
 9 by the competing sides." ECF 350 at 5; *see also* ECF 236 at 2 ("neutral explanation and  
 10 viewpoint"). Because Dr. Kearl helped to defend Google, he can no longer provide such a view  
 11 to the jury. Dr. Kearl was aware that the Court wanted a conflict-free expert and that he had to  
 12 disclose any close professional relationship with Google. *See* ECF 350 at 32-38. He did not do  
 13 that. Indeed, it was Oracle, not Dr. Kearl, who brought this issue to the Court's attention. ECF  
 14 1273 at 9. And we now know that that Dr. Kearl was not "an independent expert," "Court  
 15 appointed," or "not your ordinary expert," in *Apple v. Samsung*. ECF 1280 at 46.

16 Google suggests that Oracle should simply not raise the *Apple v. Samsung* issue at trial  
 17 because "[t]he jury will not know about Dr. Kearl's work for Samsung unless one of the parties  
 18 chooses to tell them about it." Google Resp. 3. But that's just the problem. The combination of  
 19 Dr. Kearl's work in *Apple v. Samsung* and his status as an extension of the Court puts Oracle in  
 20 an impossible bind. Oracle can raise the issue at trial, but that risks suggesting to the jury that the  
 21 Court has approved of Google's side. In fact, Google itself warned that a Rule 706 "expert will  
 22 have a powerful stamp of Court approval . . ." ECF 235 at 2. Dr. Kearl and Samsung even used  
 23 this Court's endorsement to bolster Dr. Kearl's credibility in *Apple v. Samsung*. *See* Mot. 6.  
 24 Oracle's other option is to forgo raising the issue, which would mean Oracle could not present a  
 25 bias argument to the jury that it could for any normal expert hired by one of the parties. On cross-  
 26 examination, Oracle will therefore face unique prejudice, a problem that does not "affect[] both  
 27 parties equally." *See* Google Resp. 4.

28

1       **II. A Rule 706 Expert Is Not Necessary For The Jury To Understand The Damages**  
 2       **Issues.**

3           The adversarial process is at the center of our legal system. It is “grounded on the notion  
 4       that truth will most likely be served” by the “forceful argument by both sides.” *United States v.*  
 5       *Thompson*, 827 F.2d 1254, 1258 (9th Cir. 1987). In short: “The adversary process helps us get at  
 6       the truth.” *Id.* at 1259. “Inquisitorial proceedings, where the judge takes an active role in  
 7       ferreting out the truth . . . are decidedly alien to our way of thinking.” *Id.* at 1258.

8           Using a Rule 706 expert is an exception to the normal adversary process. An extension of  
 9       the Court is taking an active role in ferreting out the truth. Unlike a technical advisor, a Rule 706  
 10      expert can be called to testify and relied on as an independent source of evidence. *Fed. Trade*  
 11      *Comm'n v. Enforma Natural Prods., Inc.*, 362 F.3d 1204, 1213 (9th Cir. 2004). Accordingly, the  
 12      “use of Rule 706 should be reserved for exceptional cases in which the ordinary adversary  
 13      process does not suffice.” *Monolithic Power Sys., Inc. v. O2 Micro Int'l Ltd.*, 558 F.3d 1341,  
 14      1348 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (quoting *In re Joint E. & S. Dists. Asbestos Litig.*, 830 F. Supp. 686, 693  
 15      (E.D.N.Y. 1993)). A court invoking this exception should therefore do so sparingly and with  
 16      great care. As Oracle previously explained, this is not the case for that exceptional procedure.  
 17      See Mot. 6-7; ECF 1329 at 5-7.

18           Google argues that the Court should still use a Rule 706 expert (Dr. Kearl or someone  
 19       else), because the damages issues have some level of complexity. Google Resp. 1. But all  
 20       Google has shown is that the *parties* should be permitted to put experts on the stand because those  
 21       experts have “specialized knowledge [that] will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence.”  
 22       Fed. R. Evid. 702(a). Take, for example, Google’s statement that the recovery of Google’s profits  
 23       is “the most complex of any of the damages theories at play” because it involves determining  
 24       Google’s revenue, costs, and an apportionment based on the profits that are attributable to the  
 25       infringement. Google Resp. 2. That merely describes the infringer’s profits analysis in any  
 26       copyright case. Google’s own expert will counter the opinions of Oracle’s expert on these “most  
 27       complex” damages issues.

28           For the Court to appoint its own expert on top of the parties’, the standard must be higher.

1 Otherwise, a court would appoint an expert in any case where there is a party expert. The fact  
2 that an issue has enough complexity that the jury would be aided by the parties' experts does not  
3 mean that the Court should also appoint its own expert and disrupt the traditional adversary  
4 process. No Rule 706 expert is necessary.

5 **CONCLUSION**

6 Dr. Kearn should not serve as a Rule 706 expert, and no expert should be appointed to  
7 replace him.

8  
9  
10  
11 Dated: November 4, 2015

KAREN G. JOHNSON-MCKEwan  
ANNETTE L. HURST  
GABRIEL M. RAMSEY  
PETER A. BICKS  
LISA T. SIMPSON  
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP

12  
13  
14  
15 By: /s/ Peter A. Bicks  
16 PETER A. BICKS

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
18 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28