

Exhibit 2

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TEXARKANA DIVISION**

MAXELL, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS

DECLARATION OF ILHWAN (JUSTIN) PARK

I, Ilhwan (Justin) Park, hereby declare, pursuant to section 1746 of title 28 of the United States Code, as follows:

1. My name is Ilhwan (Justin) Park. I am over 21 years of age, and I am fully competent to make this declaration. The facts stated herein are within my personal knowledge and are true and correct. Accordingly, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the following.

2. I am a partner at DLA Piper LLP (US) (the “Firm” or “DLA”), with an office address of 500 Eighth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20004. I obtained my Juris Doctor degree from the University of Minnesota, and my LL.B. from Korea University. I am licensed to practice law in California and in the District of Columbia.

3. I joined DLA in January 2020. Prior to joining the Firm, I was employed as an of counsel and then partner in the Washington, DC office of Mayer Brown LLP (“Mayer Brown”). While employed at Mayer Brown, one of the clients for which I did some work was Maxell, Ltd. (“Maxell”).

4. Since joining DLA, I have not worked on any matters for Maxell, nor on any matters adverse to Maxell. Since joining DLA, I also have not worked on any matter for Apple nor

communicated with any DLA lawyers or paralegals representing Apple (or anyone else) about the substance of any dispute between Maxell and Apple, including the above-captioned matter (the “EDTX Matter”), a matter pending before the International Trade Commission (“ITC”) between Maxell and Apple (the “ITC Matter”), and a matter between Maxell and Apple pending before the Western District of Texas (“WDTX Matter”). I have not had any communications or meetings regarding the substance of any work I may have done for Maxell while I was at Mayer Brown with anyone employed by Apple or DLA.

5. I have not disclosed any information regarding Maxell, including confidential or privileged information that I learned while representing Maxell, to anyone at DLA, including to members of the team of lawyers and paralegals representing Apple in the ITC Matter, the EDTX Matter, and the WDTX Matter (the “DLA Apple Team”). Nor have I been asked by anyone at DLA to disclose any information relating to Maxell. Of course, I would not have provided any such disclosure or information even if I had been asked.

6. On July 28, 2020, I communicated very briefly with Patrick Park about Jamie Beaber and his trial team. Patrick Park and I have been friends for many years, and we participated in Bar events together when I worked in Los Angeles. During a brief portion of what was otherwise a personal conversation, Mr. Park asked if I knew Jamie Beaber, and I told him that Mr. Beaber and his team were good lawyers. I did not believe it was necessary to report my communication with Mr. Park to anyone at the Firm at the time, despite Maxell’s suggestion otherwise, as it was just a casual communication which did not involve any confidential client information or, for that matter, any substance at all. And certainly, at no time did I disclose to Mr. Park any Maxell privileged or confidential information.

7. To be very clear, I had no communications with Patrick Park, anyone on the DLA Apple Team, anyone else at DLA, anyone employed by Apple, or anyone representing Apple

pertaining in any way to the substance or merits of any dispute between Apple and Maxell. Nor have I had any communications or meetings with any of the foregoing people pertaining in any way to my prior work for Maxell while I was at Mayer Brown, or pertaining to any privileged or confidential information I might be able to recall arising out of my prior work for Maxell.

8. On July 30, 2020, I received a telephone call from Jamie Beaber, who is a friend and a partner at Mayer Brown. During that call, Mr. Beaber mentioned that other attorneys at DLA were representing Apple adverse to Maxell. (I have since learned that he was referring to the ITC Matter.) Mr. Beaber advised me that Maxell had no intention of seeking to disqualify the Firm from representing Apple. We agreed that I should ask DLA to establish an ethical wall due to my prior work for Maxell. I did not have any knowledge about the ITC Matter; nor did I know whether the ITC Matter had any relationship to any matter I had worked on while I was at Mayer Brown. At the time of this July 30 phone call, I believed that Mr. Beaber was aware that I was not working on the ITC Matter or anything else related to it, and that I certainly had not disclosed and would not disclose anything privileged, confidential, or otherwise substantive regarding Maxell to anyone at DLA. Of course, I already understood upon my arrival at DLA that all of the matters for multiple clients that I worked on while I was at Mayer Brown were confidential and should not be discussed with anyone unless the client and the matter followed me to DLA. I have fully complied with my obligation to maintain the confidentiality of those matters at all times, including but not limited to Maxell.

9. Shortly after my call with Mr. Beaber, and on that same day, I sent an email to Mr. Fowler, who is the U.S. Vice Chair of the Intellectual Property and Technology practice group at DLA, alerting him to my discussion with Mr. Beaber regarding an ethical wall. Mr. Fowler then forwarded my email to Peter Lindau, a member of the Firm's OGC, and asked him to work with me on the implementation of the ethical wall. Mr. Lindau communicated with me that evening about the ethical wall, and at that time I fully understood that I could not speak with anyone working on the ITC Matter about

Maxell and could not disclose any information I knew regarding Maxell or any Maxell matter to anyone representing Apple. This was fully consistent with the understanding that I had before and on July 30, as well as the understanding I have had at all times after July 30, concerning my ethical obligations. I have fully complied (and will continue to comply) with that understanding.

10. On August 10, 2020, Mr. Beaber and I communicated by text about matters having nothing to do with Maxell or Apple. Mr. Beaber initiated that text exchange by asking me about my recent trip to Korea. Although Mr. Beaber did not reference Apple or Maxell during the exchange, I said that I had contacted “Fowler and the in house counsel re Chinese wall so we are good.” A true and correct copy of that portion of our text dialogue is attached to this declaration as Exhibit A. Mr. Beaber did not respond to my comment about the ethical wall. Instead, the remaining portions of the text exchange between myself and Mr. Beaber on August 10 discussed other personal matters such as vacations and family. Those remaining portions had nothing to do with Maxell or Apple. As a result, based on Mr. Beaber’s silence in response to my comment about having contacted DLA’s OGC about an ethical wall, I understood no further communications or notices were necessary regarding an ethical wall or anything else about Maxell and Apple. He did not suggest to me that he wanted a formal response from DLA; nor did he ask to have DLA provide him any further information, either in this text exchange or in any other form at any time thereafter.

11. On August 18, 2020, I received a formal ethical screen notification from the Firm’s OGC. Even before I reviewed that notification, I understood that I should not communicate with, nor provide any information to, any member of the DLA Apple Team about Maxell. As stated above, it has always been my understanding that I should not disclose any privileged or confidential information about any client of mine while I was at Mayer Brown, unless that client elected to move its matter and files to DLA with me. Accordingly, I understood that (1) I was to have no communications with any member of the DLA Apple Team on any matter related to

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.