

**Student's name**

**Institution**

**Date**

### **Issue**

The issue is a case between Apple Inc. and Samsung America American electronic companies. The two companies are involved in a case in which the complainant, Apple Inc. company, is suing Samsung over the patent right of the design copied or taken by the Samsung company. According to Apple, Samsung has stolen the configuration by copying several phone, iPad, and laptop designs. The company claims to use some of its creations to produce its products.

### **Rule**

According to the law of patents and copyrights, another organization or individual does not have the right to use another company's or an individual's legally patented product or service. The law prohibits such practice, and the parent company is liable to sue and get legal compensation for it. In this case, Apple is responsible for a payment if the court establishes that Apple's claims are valid.

### **Analysis**

Upon establishing the claim made by the complement, this court will compel the plaintiff to compensate and stop using Apple's patented design. From the case, the two significant designs that Apple patented are likely to be drawn from the market and the production of the same stopped if the court established the truth concerning the claim.

### **Conclusion.**

The solution to the issue is that the court has to establish the truth of the matter. In this case, Samsung is liable to pay for the liability of the design copy. This case is an appeal from the denial of a preliminary injunction. While there is a substantial issue of the request by law and facts, the decision of whether the preliminary injunction on the CA between the two telecommunication industries will proceed lies at the court's discretion. This will determine the outcome of the patent issue that Apple is making against Samsung.

### **References**

APPLE, INC., Plaintiff-Appellant v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., Samsung  
Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC,  
DefendantsAppellees 678 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012)