MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

1201 NORTH MARKET STREET
P.O. BOX 1347
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19899-1347

(302) 658-9200
(302) 658-3989 FAX

RODGER D. SMITH II
(302) 351-9205
(302) 498-6209 FAX
rsmith@mnat.com

March 28, 2017

The Honorable Gregory M. Sleet
United States District Court
For the District of Delaware
844 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

*VIA ELECTRONIC FILING*

Re: *Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. ASUStek Computer Inc., et al.*, C.A. Nos. 15-1125-GMS, 15-1126-GMS, 15-1127-GMS, 15-1128-GMS, 15-1130-GMS, 15-1131-GMS and 15-1170-GMS

Dear Judge Sleet:

In anticipation of the conference scheduled for Thursday, March 30 at 2:00 pm EDT, in the above-referenced related matters, the parties jointly submit this letter agenda, pursuant to paragraph 5(a) of the Scheduling Order (e.g., D.I. 45 in C.A. No. 15-1125) to apprise the Court of the following disputed issues:

- Whether Plaintiffs should be required to make available for deposition the four testifying experts who submitted declarations regarding claim construction, and whether Plaintiffs' failure to do so requires any adjustment to the claim construction schedule to allow for depositions and orderly presentation of the results to the Court;

- Whether Defendants should be required to provide substantive responses to Philips' Interrogatory Nos. 1, 2, and 5 (which relate to information concerning the accused products such as specifications and sales data), and 4 and 6 (which relate to non-infringement issues) by a date certain;

- With respect to Philips' First Set of Requests for the Production of Documents and Things, whether certain Defendants should be required to begin making rolling productions by a date certain, and whether all Defendants shall be (i) required to produce source code for all accused products; or (ii) precluded from relying at trial on any argument that a product advertised as complying with

or including a particular operating system is materially different from the corresponding publicly available version of that operating system.

- Whether Defendants should be required to provide discovery on products that are not separately identified by model number in Philips' second amended identification of accused products, but which run an operating system that Philips has accused of infringement in its infringement contentions.

Counsel are available at the Court's convenience should Your Honor have any questions in advance of the March 30, 2017 conference.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Rodger D. Smith II*

Rodger D. Smith II

RDS/rah

cc: Clerk of Court (via hand delivery)
All Counsel of Record (via electronic mail)