

T H E
C R I T E R I O N
J O U R N A L O N I N N O V A T I O N

VOL. 6



2020

Monopoly, Innovation, and Due Process:
FTC v. Qualcomm and the Imperative to Destroy

*J. Gregory Sidak**

INTRODUCTION	32
A. Mobile Communications and Standard-Essential Patents.....	36
B. The FTC’s Case Against Qualcomm.....	39
C. Judge Koh’s Apparent Resources, Patience, Attention, and Temperament at Trial in January 2019	42
1. The Apparent Constraints on Judge Koh’s Time and Institutional Resources.....	43
2. Reading Judge Koh’s Derogatory Statements Toward Qualcomm’s Lawyer in Light of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges	45
3. Judge Koh’s Decision to Forgo Further Submissions on Facts or Law	48
4. Judge Koh’s Apparent Confusion About Patent Exhaustion.....	50
5. Was Qualcomm Blameworthy for Pursuing Its Preferred Strategy to Defend Against the FTC’s Allegations?.....	53
6. Wi-Fi in the Courtroom and the Value of Cellular Broadband	54
7. Was Judge Koh’s Eventual Opinion Attentive to the Testimony Presented at Trial?.....	56
D. Professor Carl Shapiro’s Role as the FTC’s Expert Economic Witness	58
E. What Patents Did Qualcomm License, and What Were the Supposedly “Unreasonably High” Royalties Actually Paid for an Exhaustive License to Qualcomm’s Portfolio of Cellular SEPs?	60

* A.B. 1977, A.M., J.D. 1981, Stanford University. Chairman, Criterion Economics, Washington, D.C.
Email: jgsidak@criterioneconomics.com. Copyright 2020 by J. Gregory Sidak. All rights reserved.
For Richard Posner—scholar, jurist, mentor, friend.

1.	The Relative Shares of Cellular SEPs, Non-Cellular SEPs, and Non-SEPs in Qualcomm’s Patent Portfolio	60
2.	What Creates Value in a Smartphone? Apple’s Design Patents Versus Qualcomm’s Foundational Cellular SEPs	62
3.	The \$7.50 Royalty Per iPhone That Apple Actually Paid to Qualcomm.....	64
4.	The Conjecture, Propagated by Qualcomm’s Detractors, of a \$120 Per Unit Aggregate Royalty.....	67
5.	Qualcomm’s Clarification and Reduction of Its Royalties in November 2017	68
F.	Were the Empirically Testable Hypotheses Concerning Harm to Competition in the Modem Industry Substantiated or Refuted?	69
1.	Did the Quality-Adjusted Price of Modems Increase?	70
2.	Did the Output of Modems Decrease?.....	73
G.	Judge Koh’s Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in May 2019	75
H.	The Ninth Circuit’s Reversal of Judge Koh’s Judgment and Its Vacatur of Both Her Permanent, Worldwide Injunction and Her Grant to the FTC of Partial Summary Judgment.....	77
I.	Two Dimensions of Judicial Misadventure	80
1.	Due Process, Discretion, and the Quality of Justice	81
a.	Why Did Judge Koh Ignore Testimony Establishing the Breadth of Qualcomm’s Foundational Innovations?.....	83
b.	Suppression of Professor Shapiro’s Expert Economic Testimony at Trial	86
c.	Suppression of Materially Exculpatory Portions of Professor Shapiro’s Trial Testimony—the <i>Brady</i> Rule Analogy for Bench Trials	88
d.	The Absence of Findings of Fact on Professor Nevo’s Probative Testimony Rebutting Professor Shapiro’s Theory of the Royalty “Surcharge” and the Modem “Tax”	91
e.	The Consequences of Legal Rules for Future Economic Behavior.....	93
f.	Reliance on a Utopian Counterfactual Conditional to Denigrate, as Market Failures, the Market Successes Actually Observed in the Presence of Qualcomm’s Challenged Practices.....	95
g.	Repudiation of <i>Grinnell</i>	99
h.	Reversal of the Burden of Production, the Burden of Persuasion, and the Presumption of Innocence	100

i.	Why the Multiple Links in the Chain of Causation for Professor Shapiro's Theory of Anticompetitive Harm Made It Improbable That a Preponderance of the Evidence Ultimately Supported Judge Koh's Finding of Liability.....	102
2.	The Application of Erroneous Antitrust Principles	105
a.	Judge Koh's Failure to Apply the Supreme Court's Controlling Precedent on Monopolization	105
b.	The Lack of Substantial Evidence Supporting a Finding of Liability Even Under Judge Koh's Mistaken Statement of the Applicable Antitrust Principles	109
J.	The Structure of the Analysis That Follows	111
I.	THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF <i>FTC v. QUALCOMM</i>	119
A.	Did Apple Seek to Devalue Qualcomm?	120
1.	Judge Curiel's Ruling That It Was a Triable Question of Fact for the Jury Whether Apple Induced the FTC's Informal Investigation of Qualcomm	121
2.	Common Interest Agreements Involving Apple, Intel, and the FTC	122
3.	Did Apple Business Records Disclosed in Litigation Reveal a Strategy to Devalue Qualcomm's SEPs?	125
4.	Litigation by Qualcomm Alleging That Apple Misappropriated Qualcomm's Technology to Help Establish Intel as a Second Supplier of Modems to Apple	130
5.	Did Apple, Acting Alone or in Concert with Competitors or Other Firms, Induce Foreign Agencies to Investigate Qualcomm?	131
6.	The Relationship of the NDRC's Rectification Plan in China to Qualcomm's November 2017 Announcement of Rates for Its 5G Patents and the Reduction of Its Rates for Patents Reading on Earlier Standards	134
7.	Apple's 2016 Proposal to Qualcomm to Arbitrate the Validity, Infringement, and Essentiality of Every One of Qualcomm's Thousands of Cellular SEPs	138
B.	Consulting or Testifying Engagements for Apple, Intel, and the FTC.....	140
C.	The Relevance to the Political Economy of <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> of the IEEE's Amendment of Its Bylaws in 2015 to Suppress RAND Royalties to SEP Holders	143
1.	The IEEE's 2015 Bylaw Amendments and the Antitrust Division's Devaluation of Standard-Essential Patents.....	143

	2. The Established Law on Monopsony and Collusive Oligopsony.....	147
	D. The Direct Implications of Donald Trump’s Election as President for the FTC’s Prosecution of Qualcomm	151
II.	IS QUALCOMM INNOVATIVE AND UNIQUE?	153
	A. Alex Rogers’ Testimony Explaining Why Qualcomm’s Business Model Was Innovative and Unique.....	155
	1. Mr. Rogers’ Testimony on QTL’s Relation to Qualcomm and Its Chip Business	155
	2. The Absence of Simultaneity Between an OEM’s Negotiations for an Exhaustive License to Qualcomm’s Cellular SEPs and the OEM’s Negotiations for a Modem Supply Agreement with Qualcomm.....	159
	3. Mr. Rogers Testified That QTL Interpreted Qualcomm’s FRAND Obligation Consistently with the IPR Policy of the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI).....	160
	4. Qualcomm Publicly Announced Its 5G Royalty Rates Before 3GPP Had Adopted the 5G Standard	161
	5. Mr. Rogers’ Testimony of Qualcomm’s Expectations as of the Cutoff of Fact Discovery in March 2018 Concerning Competition in 5G Modems.....	162
	6. Qualcomm’s License Negotiation with Samsung Leading to Their 2018 Amended Agreement.....	163
	B. Was the Testimony of the FTC’s Licensing Expert, Richard Donaldson, Probative Evidence in <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> ?	168
	C. Business Innovation: Judge Koh Versus the Nature of the Firm.....	170
	1. Objective Knowledge and the Evolutionary View of the Firm	170
	2. What Makes a Particular Business Model Succeed?	171
	3. The FTC’s and Judge Koh’s “Imperative” View of the Firm.....	172
	4. Economies of Scope Between Basic Research and Product Development	172
	5. Whether All That Is Not Permitted Is Forbidden.....	174
III.	PATENT EXHAUSTION AND QUALCOMM’S APPARENT BUSINESS PURPOSE FOR NOT OFFERING EXHAUSTIVE LICENSES TO ITS CELLULAR SEPs TO RIVAL MODEM MANUFACTURERS.....	175
	A. Patent Exhaustion.....	175
	1. Distinguishing a Nonexhaustive “License” Before <i>Quanta</i> from an Exhaustive License After <i>Quanta</i>	176

2.	The Rationale for Avoiding Patent Exhaustion	178
3.	Qualcomm's July 2012 Meeting with the Internal Revenue Service	180
B.	Did the FTC Have Any Basis to Contend That the Avoidance of Patent Exhaustion Was Not a Legitimate Business Justification for Qualcomm's Licensing Practices?	181
1.	Is a Firm's Unilateral Conduct Intended to Minimize the Applicability of the Doctrine of Patent Exhaustion Unlawful?	182
2.	Did Any Controlling Authority Support the FTC's Argument?	183
C.	The Supreme Court's Refinement of the Doctrine of Patent Exhaustion	184
1.	The Supreme Court's Adumbration of the Doctrine of Patent Exhaustion	186
2.	The Origin of the Patent Exhaustion Defense	187
3.	The Federal Circuit's Decision in <i>Quanta</i>	188
4.	Patent Exhaustion After <i>Quanta</i>	190
D.	Did the Supreme Court's Refinement of the Doctrine of Patent Exhaustion Affect How Qualcomm Structured Its Commercial Agreements with Rival Modem Manufacturers?	193
E.	Did <i>Quanta</i> and Subsequent Federal Circuit Precedent Affect How Qualcomm Achieved Patent Peace with Rival Modem Manufacturers?	196
F.	Why Was Offering Exhaustive Licenses Only to OEMs More Lucrative for Qualcomm Than Offering Exhaustive Licenses to Rival Modem Manufacturers?	199
G.	Which of Judge Koh's Conclusions Were Predicated on Her Legally Erroneous Depiction of Patent Exhaustion?	200
1.	Did Judge Koh Make Credibility Determinations on the Basis of Qualcomm's Refusal to Sell Modems to Unlicensed OEMs and Its Refusal to Offer Exhaustive Licenses to Its Cellular SEPs to Rival Modem Manufacturers?	201
2.	Why Did Qualcomm Avoid Selling Modems to Unlicensed OEMs and Offering Exhaustive Licenses to Its Cellular SEPs to Rival Modem Manufacturers?	204
3.	Did Qualcomm's Business Practice of Not Offering Exhaustive Licenses to Its Cellular SEPs to Rival Modem Manufacturers Affect Judge Koh's Permanent, Worldwide Injunction?	208

IV.	PROFESSOR SHAPIRO'S TESTIMONY.....	209
A.	Unredacted Expert Economic Opinions That Professor Shapiro Disclosed in His Reports, and a Summation of His Economic Theory of Harm at Trial	210
1.	Professor Shapiro's Initial Expert Report	212
a.	Qualifications and Compensation.....	212
b.	Assignment	214
c.	Opinions About Market Definition and Monopoly Power	214
d.	Opinions About Qualcomm's Licensing Practice	215
e.	Opinions About Anticompetitive Harm	217
f.	The Assumption That Qualcomm's Royalties for an Exhaustive License to Its Portfolio of Cellular SEPs Were "Unreasonably High"	219
g.	The Conjecture Why Rival Modem Manufacturers Had Not Resorted to Litigation or Arbitration to Obtain an Exhaustive License to Qualcomm's Portfolio of Cellular SEPs.....	219
h.	Calculation of Qualcomm's Market Share of "Premium" LTE Modems	220
2.	Professor Shapiro's Rebuttal Expert Report	221
3.	Professor Shapiro's Summation of His Economic Theory of Harm in His Live Direct Testimony During Judge Koh's Bench Trial.....	222
a.	Professor Shapiro's Testimony About Qualcomm's Practice of Selling Modems Only to Licensed OEMs.....	224
i.	Testimony About Qualcomm's FRAND Royalties	224
ii.	Testimony About the Alleged Royalty "Surcharge" That Supposedly Became a "Tax" on the "All-In Price" That OEMs Paid for Rivals' Modems.....	225
iii.	Testimony About the Effects of the Alleged Modem "Tax" on Competition and Modem Prices.....	228
b.	Professor Shapiro's Testimony About Qualcomm's Policy of Refusing to Offer Exhaustive Licenses to Its Cellular SEPs to Rival Modem Manufacturers.....	229
i.	"What the World Would Look Like" Under Professor Shapiro's Counterfactual Conditions	230
ii.	The Amount of Royalties Due Qualcomm Versus the Level in the Chain of Production at Which Qualcomm Chose to License Its Cellular SEPs Exhaustively	231

c.	Professor Shapiro’s Testimony About Qualcomm’s Allegedly Exclusive Agreements with Apple	233
B.	Was Professor Shapiro’s Testimony Concerning the Supposed Royalty “Surcharge” on an Exhaustive License to Qualcomm’s Portfolio of SEPs Specious?.....	236
1.	Did Professor Shapiro’s Testimony Mask an Accusation of Patent Holdup and Ignore Patent Exhaustion?	236
a.	What Distinguished Professor Shapiro’s Testimony About Monopoly in <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> from His Prior Writings Concerning Patent Holdup?	237
i.	The Threat of an Injunction or a Supply Interruption.....	238
ii.	The Royalty “Overcharge” or Royalty “Surcharge” That Supposedly Gave Rise to a Modem “Tax”	238
iii.	The Supposed Effect of the Royalty “Surcharge” on Innovation	239
b.	Is Patent Holdup a Hoax?	240
i.	The Key Assumptions of Williamson’s Holdup Theory.....	241
ii.	Can One Infer the Patent-Holdup Conjecture from Williamson’s Holdup Theory?.....	242
c.	Did the Allegedly Supra-FRAND Royalty in <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> Result from Patent Holdup or a Monopoly Price?	243
i.	Disambiguating a Monopoly Price from a Price That Results from Patent Holdup	244
ii.	Patent Holdup and the Exercise of Monopoly Power	245
iii.	Monopoly Power, Patent Holdup, and Exit in <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i>	245
2.	The 2013 Lemley-Shapiro Definition of a FRAND Royalty as the Result of a Hypothetical Negotiation Before Standard Adoption.....	246
3.	The Fallacies of the “ <i>Ex Ante</i> Incremental Value” Methodology for Calculating a FRAND or RAND Royalty.....	247
a.	Why the <i>Ex Ante</i> Incremental Value Approach for Patent-Infringement Cases Involving SEPs Misapplies the Standard Hypothetical Negotiation Framework.....	248
i.	The Mistaken Timing of the Hypothetical Negotiation in the <i>Ex Ante</i> Incremental Value Approach.....	249
ii.	The Neglected Costs of Acquiring the Next-Best Noninfringing Alternative	250

iii. The Failure to Disaggregate the Increment of the Implementer’s Bargaining Power Attributable to the Implicit But Erroneous Assumption That Implementers May Lawfully Negotiate Collectively as a Monopsonist	251
iv. The Inapplicability to Standard Setting of a Static Bertrand Pricing Game Without Capacity Constraints	253
b. Do Courts Actually Rely on the <i>Ex Ante</i> Incremental Value Approach?	255
4. Did Professor Shapiro Fail to Apply His Own Definition of a FRAND Royalty to the Facts of the Case?	256
a. Professor Shapiro’s Testimony Mistakenly Assumed That None of Qualcomm’s Licenses Had Been Negotiated Before Standard Adoption, Which the 2013 Lemley-Shapiro Article Considered Evidence That a Royalty Was FRAND	256
b. The Inconsistency Between the 2013 Lemley-Shapiro Article and Professor Shapiro’s Testimony That a FRAND Royalty Must Decline Over Time	257
c. The Inherent Fallacy of Professor Shapiro’s Testimony That a FRAND Royalty Must Decline Over Time	259
d. Summation on Professor Shapiro’s Definition of a FRAND Royalty	260
C. Professor Shapiro’s Incorrect Conclusions About Qualcomm’s Alleged Modem “Tax” That Supposedly Resulted from Qualcomm’s Alleged Royalty “Surcharge”	260
1. Invoking the Nomenclature of Public Finance to Justify Evading the Cost of Consuming a Necessary Input or Factor of Production	260
2. Professor Shapiro’s Mistaken Tax Analogy	261
3. The Supposed “Wedge” Was Incompatible with the Monopolistic Market That the FTC Alleged Existed	263
4. What Was the Probative Value of Professor Shapiro’s Testimony on the Supposed Modem “Tax” That He Characterized as a “Wedge”?	264
a. The Supposed “Wedge” Arising from an OEM’s Purchase of a Rival’s Modem	264
b. Did Qualcomm’s Exhaustive Licensing of Its Cellular SEPs to OEMs Give Rise to a “Wedge”?	265
c. Does the “Tax” Jargon Help or Confuse the Fact Finder’s Analysis of the Economics of the Demand for Two Complementary Inputs?	266

d. Did Professor Shapiro’s Novel “Tax” Theory Rely on the Seventh Edition of Professor Mankiw’s Undergraduate Microeconomics Textbook?	268
5. Patent Royalties and Pigouvian Taxes	269
a. A Pigouvian Tax on Air Pollutants.....	270
b. Is a Royalty for an Exhaustive License to Qualcomm’s Cellular SEPs a “Tax”?.....	271
c. Did the Supposed Modem “Tax” Reduce Rivals’ Modem Sales to OEMs?	272
6. The FTC’s Citation of Irrelevant Economic Authority.....	272
D. Would a Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” Harm Competition?	274
1. The Omission of Any Analysis of the Doctrine of Patent Exhaustion.....	275
2. Was It Plausible That Modem Manufacturers Relied on Free Cash Flow from Operations to Fund Their Investments in R&D?	276
3. Was Qualcomm’s Alleged Royalty “Surcharge” or Modem “Tax” Asymmetric?.....	279
a. Professor Shapiro’s Incorrect Definition of Cost	281
b. Professor Shapiro’s Assumption That Qualcomm Need Not Recoup the Costs of Its Investments	282
c. Could a Reduction in Rivals’ Margins and Rivals’ Sales Have Harmed Competition?	283
d. Would a Modem “Tax” That Raises Prices for OEMs Be Anticompetitive?	286
4. Did the FTC’s Own Theory of the Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” Contradict Professor Shapiro’s Actual Trial Testimony?.....	288
E. Did Professor Shapiro’s Theoretical Bargaining Model Include Any Empirical Analysis?	290
1. Professor Shapiro Did Not Examine Any Empirical Evidence to Determine a FRAND Royalty or a Range of FRAND Royalties for Qualcomm’s Cellular SEPs	290
2. Professor Shapiro Conceded Multiple Times During His Testimony That He Had Assumed the Existence of a Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” and Testified Merely That He Had “Reason to Believe” That the Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” Were “Substantial”.....	295

3.	Professor Shapiro Did Not Quantify Any of the Effects of His Assumed Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” on Modem Manufacturers.....	299
a.	Was Professor Shapiro’s Testimony About the Effect That the Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” Had on Modem Manufacturers Based Solely on His Own “Illustrative” Examples?	299
b.	Professor Shapiro Did Not Examine the Actual Effect That Qualcomm’s Alleged Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” Had Had on the Operating Profits of Modem Manufacturers.....	302
c.	Professor Shapiro Did Not Quantify Any of the Effects of His Assumed Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” on R&D Investment by Rival Modem Manufacturers.....	302
i.	Did Professor Shapiro Conduct Any Empirical Analysis on the Effects of Qualcomm’s Alleged Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” on Rivals’ R&D Investments?.....	303
ii.	Why Did Professor Shapiro’s Rebuttal Report Not Disclose Opinions Purporting to Rebut Dr. Chipty’s Empirical Analysis of Rivals’ R&D Investments During the Period When Qualcomm’s Allegedly Anticompetitive Conduct Assertedly Occurred?	305
iii.	Did Professor Shapiro Consider Dr. Chipty’s Empirical Analysis of Rivals’ R&D Investments in the Course of Preparing His Rebuttal Testimony?	306
d.	Professor Shapiro Testified That It Was Unnecessary for Him to Examine Empirical Evidence of the Effects That Qualcomm’s Alleged Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” Had Actually Had on Rival Modem Manufacturers.....	307
4.	Professor Shapiro Merely Assumed, Rather Than Quantified, Harm to Final Consumers	308
5.	Blackboard Economics.....	310
F.	Professor Shapiro Failed to Examine Evidence About Harm to Competition	311
1.	Predictions About First Derivatives in Professor Shapiro’s Testimony on Theoretical Harm to Competition.....	311
2.	Did Empirical Evidence Contradict the Predictions of Professor Shapiro’s Theoretical Bargaining Model?	312
a.	Predicted Market Shares of Modem Manufacturers.....	313
b.	Predicted “All-In Prices” for Modems	313

c. Predicted R&D Investment by Rival Modem Manufacturers.....	314
3. Professor Shapiro’s Utopian Counterfactual Conditional Was Specious, and He Conducted No Analysis of His “But-For” World	316
a. Professor Shapiro Testified That the Modem Industry Would Have Grown “a Bit Faster” Absent Qualcomm’s Challenged Conduct	316
b. Professor Shapiro Conducted No Empirical Analysis to Prove or Disprove the Predictions of His Utopian Counterfactual Conditional.....	317
c. Professor Shapiro Conceded That Real-World Evidence Showed “Great Improvement” in the Modem Industry During the Period of Qualcomm’s Allegedly Anticompetitive Conduct.....	319
d. Professor Shapiro’s Change of Message on Recross Examination	320
4. Professor Shapiro Was Critical of Other Expert Witnesses for Assuming Various Figures, Yet He Admitted That His Entire Testimony Was Built on Assumptions	321
G. Parallels Between Professor Shapiro’s Testimony in <i>United States v. AT&T</i> and in <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i>	324
1. The D.C. Circuit’s Affirmance of Judge Leon’s Finding in <i>United States v. AT&T</i> That Professor Shapiro’s Theoretical Bargaining Model Lacked Both “Reliability and Factual Credibility”	326
2. In <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> , Did Professor Shapiro Stand by His Testimony in <i>United States v. AT&T</i> That Judge Leon (and, Later, the D.C. Circuit) Found Unreliable?	331
H. Ignoring Repeated Interactions	334
1. Professor Shapiro’s Prior Writings on the Evolution of Game-Theoretic Responses in Repeated Interactions Between Firms	334
2. Professor Shapiro’s Unsupported Expectations About Qualcomm’s Future Practices.....	336
I. Professor Shapiro’s Testimony About a Sabotaged Kayak Race.....	339
1. Analogizing Qualcomm to an Imaginary Saboteur in a Kayak Race	339
a. The Accusation of Kayak Sabotage	340
b. Did the Presence of Rocks Affect the Kayaks?	341

c.	Was It Plausible That the Accused Cheater Repeatedly Escaped Detection?	342
d.	The Marginal Effect of the Hidden Rocks on the Contestant's Probability of Winning.....	342
e.	Can Analogy Substitute for Economic Analysis?	343
2.	Was Professor Shapiro's "Analogy" Coherent?	343
a.	Where in the Sabotaged Kayaks Would the Hidden Rocks Repose, Undetected?.....	343
b.	Was Professor Shapiro Correct That Kayaks Weighed Down by Rocks Are Slower and More Likely to Capsize Than Their Unburdened Rivals?	345
c.	The Parameters of the Metaphorical Race	346
d.	Would or Would Not the Rocks Be Kayak Agnostic?	347
e.	Did Professor Shapiro's Analogy Presume That Qualcomm Had Engaged in Criminal Misconduct?.....	348
f.	Was Professor Shapiro's Testimony on His Kayak "Analogy" Evidence Properly Admitted at Trial?.....	349
3.	Professor Shapiro's Selective Reliance on Deductive Reasoning, Inductive Reasoning, and Analogical Reasoning.....	350
a.	Distinguishing Deductive Arguments from Inductive Arguments in Professor Shapiro's Testimony	350
b.	Professor Shapiro's Fallacious Reliance on a Mere Metaphor When He Claimed to Be Arguing by Analogy	352
J.	Professor Shapiro's Specious Analysis of Market Definition	353
K.	Professor Shapiro's Specious Analysis of Qualcomm's Market Power	356
1.	Market Shares	356
2.	Barriers to Entry	357
L.	Professor Shapiro's Confusing Discussion of Apple's Allegedly Exclusive Use of Qualcomm Modems.....	359
1.	Did Professor Shapiro Ever Actually Testify That Qualcomm's Contracts with Apple Were Exclusive?.....	360
a.	"When I Use a Word, It Means Just What I Choose It to Mean".....	360
b.	Preference and Constraint	361
2.	Professor Shapiro's Tendentious Nomenclature of "Payments at Risk"	363

3.	Did Professor Shapiro’s Economic Analysis Suffice to Determine Whether or Not Qualcomm’s TA and FATA Agreements with Apple Were Capable of Having an Anticompetitive Effect?.....	364
a.	Which Test Did Professor Shapiro Perform to Evaluate the Effects That Qualcomm’s Agreements with Apple Had on Competition?.....	366
b.	Did Professor Shapiro’s Equally-Efficient-Competitor Test Enable Him to Identify Whether Qualcomm’s Agreements Foreclosed a Significant Portion of the Relevant Market?	367
c.	Did Substantial Evidence Refute Professor Shapiro’s Assumption That Intel Was an Equally Efficient Competitor to Qualcomm?	369
d.	Did Professor Shapiro Examine What Portion of the Relevant Markets Qualcomm’s Agreements with Apple Foreclosed?	370
V.	DID JUDGE KOH DENY QUALCOMM DUE PROCESS BY OMITTING ANY FINDINGS CONCERNING PROFESSOR SHAPIRO’S EXCULPATORY EXPERT TESTIMONY ON THE FTC’S THEORY OF A ROYALTY “SURCHARGE” AND A MODEM “TAX”?	371
A.	The Similarities Between Judge Koh’s Findings of Fact and Professor Shapiro’s Testimony.....	373
B.	The Absence of Any Mention of Professor Shapiro’s Testimony in Judge Koh’s Opinion.....	375
C.	Did Judge Koh’s Omission of Any Discussion of Professor Shapiro’s Expert Economic Testimony Violate Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52(a)(1)?	378
1.	Appellate Review of Findings of Fact.....	378
2.	<i>Sua Sponte</i> Examination of Compliance with Rule 52(a)(1)	380
3.	Remand to a Different District Judge	381
4.	The Trial Court’s Subsidiary Findings and Analytical Process.....	382
D.	Was Judge Koh Correct in Finding That Qualcomm’s Licensing Practices Imposed an Anticompetitive “Surcharge” on the “All-in Price” of Rivals’ Modems?	383
1.	Did Judge Koh Coherently Define a Modem’s “All-In Price”?	385
2.	Would the OEM’s Payment of the Modem’s “All-In Price” Harm Competition in the Relevant Markets for Modems?	386
a.	Was It Reasonable for Qualcomm to Charge Royalties for Its Cellular SEPs to OEMs That Used Non-Qualcomm Modems?.....	387

b.	The Lack of Synchronization Between the OEM’s Contracting for an Exhaustive License to Qualcomm’s Cellular SEPs and the OEM’s Negotiation for the Purchase of Modems for a Particular Release of Smartphone	388
c.	Did the “All-In Price” Favor Qualcomm Modems Over Non-Qualcomm Modems?	389
3.	What Facts Supported Judge Koh’s Finding That Qualcomm Charged OEMs That Used Non-Qualcomm Modems a Higher Royalty for an Exhaustive License to Its Portfolio of Cellular SEPs?.....	390
a.	Why Did Judge Koh Rely on the Solitary Instance of the 2004 SULA Between LGE and Qualcomm to Find, as a General Matter, That Qualcomm Charged OEMs Higher Royalty Rates for an Exhaustive License to Its Cellular SEPs When OEMs Purchased Rivals’ Modems Than When OEMs Purchased Qualcomm’s Modems?	390
b.	Why Did Judge Koh’s Findings Not Explain the Significance of the Fact That, Following Qualcomm’s Voluntary Renegotiation in 2007 of Its 2004 SULA with LGE, the Factual Record Was Devoid of Evidence That Qualcomm’s Exhaustive Licensing of Its Portfolio of Cellular SEPs Treated Any OEM Asymmetrically on the Basis of Whether It Also Bought a Qualcomm Modem?	391
c.	Why Did Judge Koh Rely on Stale Evidence from the Distant Past While Pretending to Be Prescient Years into the Future?.....	393
4.	Did Qualcomm’s Payments to OEMs Result in Discriminatory Royalties?.....	395
5.	Did Professor Shapiro Err in Assuming in His Theoretical Bargaining Model of Competitive Harm That OEMs Would Not Pay the Same Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” on Purchases of Qualcomm Modems, Such That No Asymmetric Harm Would Result, and Why Did Judge Koh Not Acknowledge That the Asymmetry Assumption Was Outcome-Determinative?	397
E.	If They Did Exist, Would a Royalty “Surcharge” and a Modem “Tax” Be Lawful Under Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit Precedent?.....	398
1.	The Controlling Authority of <i>linkLine</i>	399
2.	The Controlling Authority of <i>Abbott Labs</i>	400
3.	Judge Koh’s Reliance on Irrelevant Decisions	402
a.	The Irrelevance of <i>Premier</i>	402
b.	The Irrelevance of <i>Caldera</i>	403

	4. Did Judge Koh Misapply the Law?	404
VI.	DID JUDGE KOH'S PEREMPTORY FINDINGS ON HARM TO COMPETITION VIOLATE THE SUPREME COURT'S BURDEN-SHIFTING FRAMEWORK IN <i>AMERICAN EXPRESS</i> ?	405
	A. The Burden of Production and the Burden of Persuasion in the American Law of Evidence	405
	B. The Supreme Court's Affirmation in <i>American Express</i> of the Burden of Production and the Burden of Persuasion Under Section 2 of the Sherman Act	406
	C. Does It Violate <i>American Express</i> to Make a Defendant Bear the Burden of Production and the Burden of Persuasion to "Construct a Hypothetical Marketplace That Would Have Existed"?	407
	1. Did Judge Koh's Assumption About Harm to Competition Violate the Presumption of Innocence Protected by the Due Process Clause?	409
	2. Did Judge Koh Disparage the Expert Testimony of Qualcomm's Three Expert Witnesses Because They Did Not Help the FTC Carry Its Initial Burden of Persuasion Pursuant to <i>American Express</i> ?	410
	D. Did Judge Koh Make Specific Findings Concerning Qualcomm's Procompetitive Rationales?	411
	1. Judge Koh's Addition of "Pretextual" as a Gloss on <i>American Express</i>	412
	2. What Did Judge Koh Mean When She Condemned Qualcomm's Procompetitive Rationales as "Pretextual"?	414
	3. Did Judge Koh's Finding That Qualcomm's Procompetitive Rationales Were "Pretextual" Obviate Weighing the Evidence?	416
	E. Did the Ninth Circuit Recognize That Judge Koh Had Erroneously Applied the Three-Part Burden Shifting Framework of <i>American Express</i> ?	417
VII.	DID QUALCOMM CHARGE "UNREASONABLY HIGH" ROYALTIES FOR ITS CELLULAR SEPs?	418
	A. Did Qualcomm Charge OEMs "Unreasonably High" Royalties for an Exhaustive License to Its Portfolio of Cellular SEPs?	419
	B. Did Judge Koh Identify Expert Economic Testimony to Support Her Finding That Qualcomm's Royalties Were "Unreasonably High"?	420
	C. Did Judge Koh Rely on Anecdotal Evidence to Support Her Finding That Qualcomm's Royalties Were "Unreasonably High"?	422

1. Statements Contained in Qualcomm’s Internal Documents	422
a. Did Qualcomm’s Large Market Share for Certain Modems Enable It to Charge a Premium on CDMA Modems?.....	423
b. Were Statements in Documents from 2007 and 2008 Evidence Probative of the Reasonableness of Qualcomm’s Royalties for an Exhaustive License to Its Cellular SEPs?.....	424
2. Qualcomm’s Licensing Conduct.....	425
a. Did Qualcomm’s Decision Not to Provide Claim Charts to Potential Licensees Have Any Bearing on the Reasonableness of Its Royalties for an Exhaustive License to Its Cellular SEPs?.....	426
b. Did Judge Koh’s Finding That Qualcomm Sold Components Other Than Modems on an Exhaustive Basis Support Her Conclusion That Qualcomm’s Royalties for an Exhaustive License to Its Portfolio of SEPs Were “Unreasonably High”?	427
c. Were Provisions in Qualcomm’s Licenses That Required OEMs to Cross-License Their Own Patents to Qualcomm “Unusual”?.....	429
3. Qualcomm’s Contribution to Industry Standards	430
a. Are SEPs Complements to, or Substitutes for, One Another?	431
b. Are All Cellular SEP Portfolios Equally Valuable?.....	431
c. Did Judge Koh Analyze the Material Components of Consideration Exchanged in Qualcomm’s License Agreements?	431
d. Did Judge Koh Distinguish Qualcomm’s Cellular SEP Portfolio from Its Portfolios of Non-Cellular SEPs and Non-SEPs?	432
4. Qualcomm’s Use of a Royalty Base	434
a. Did Judge Koh’s Discussion of the Proper Royalty Base Erroneously Imply That Qualcomm’s Royalties Per Handset Were Vastly Higher Than They Actually Were?.....	435
b. Was Qualcomm’s Selection of a Particular Royalty Base Evidence That Its Royalty Was “Unreasonably High”?	436
c. Was Qualcomm’s Selection of a Particular Royalty Base Unlawful Under Federal Circuit Precedent?.....	436
d. Why Would OEMs Prefer to Compel Qualcomm to Use the Price of the Modem as the Royalty Base for an Exhaustive License to Qualcomm’s Portfolio of Cellular SEPs?	439

5.	Was It Relevant Whether or Not Qualcomm’s Royalty Rates for an Exhaustive License to Its Cellular SEPs Had Been “Tested” in Litigation?	441
D.	Was Qualcomm’s Supposedly “Unreasonably High” Royalty for an OEM’s Exhaustive License to Its Cellular SEPs Evidence Probative of Antitrust Liability?	443
E.	Did the Absence of Substantial Evidence That Qualcomm’s Royalty for an Exhaustive License to Its Cellular SEPs Was “Unreasonably High” Invalidate the Theory of the Royalty “Surcharge” and Modem “Tax” That the FTC and Professor Shapiro Advanced?	444
F.	Did Qualcomm’s Payments to OEMs Bolster Qualcomm’s Supposedly “Unreasonably High” Royalties for an Exhaustive License to Its Cellular SEPs?	446
G.	Did Qualcomm’s Refusal to Offer Exhaustive Licenses to Its Portfolio of Cellular SEPs to Rival Modem Manufacturers Increase Qualcomm’s Market Share, Increase Its Royalty Rates, or Generate Exclusivity?	448
VIII.	DID EVIDENCE OF QUALCOMM’S SUPPOSEDLY ANTICOMPETITIVE INTENT OBIVATE PROOF OF ANTICOMPETITIVE EFFECTS?	449
A.	Judge Koh’s Misreading of <i>Aspen Skiing</i> and <i>Alcoa</i> on Specific Intent, General Intent, and Anticompetitive Effect	450
1.	Judge Learned Hand’s Analysis of Specific Intent to Monopolize a Market	450
2.	The Supreme Court’s Respectful Overruling of Judge Learned Hand’s Analysis of Margin Squeezes.....	451
B.	Did the FTC Introduce Preponderant Evidence That Qualcomm Had Anticompetitive Intent?	451
1.	Is Knowledge of One’s Risk of Being Sued on an Antitrust Claim Evidence of One’s Own Anticompetitive Intent?	452
2.	Judge Koh’s Apparent Smoking Gun	453
3.	The Unconfirmed Provenance of Judge Koh’s Apparent Smoking Gun	455
4.	Who Is or Was Jeremy Blair, and Why Were the FTC and Judge Koh So Incurious About Him?.....	457
5.	Was Judge Koh’s Apparent Smoking Gun a Mere Draft?	459
6.	The Irrelevance of Judge Koh’s Apparent Smoking Gun Under Antitrust Law.....	460
C.	Was Judge Koh’s Use of the Existence of Foreign Government Investigations of Qualcomm to Infer Anticompetitive Intent Under American Antitrust Law Relevant, Reliable, and Proper?	462

1.	Did Judge Koh's Recitation of Foreign Investigations Flout <i>American Express</i> and Reverse the Presumption of Innocence in an American Courtroom?	463
2.	Did the Foreign Investigations Apply the Same Substantive Legal Rules on Monopolization and Afford the Same Due Process of Law That Would Guide an American Court?	465
3.	Does the FTC Want to Trade Due Process of Law and the American Jurisprudence on Monopolization for the Laws of the Foreign Nations Whose Investigations It Cited Approvingly?.....	466
IX.	JUDGE KOH'S DISPARAGEMENT OF QUALCOMM'S WITNESSES: CREDIBILITY, RELIABILITY, AND UNJUSTIFIED HARM TO REPUTATION	467
A.	Judge Koh's Disparagement of Qualcomm's Founder, Dr. Irwin Jacobs.....	473
1.	Did Dr. Jacobs' Rapid Answers to Direct-Examination Questions Believably Support Judge Koh's Disparagement of His Character for Truthfulness?	474
2.	Did Dr. Jacobs' Slowness to Answer Cross-Examination Questions Believably Support Judge Koh's Disparagement of His Character for Truthfulness?	476
3.	The Character for Truthfulness and "the Spirit of Innovation"	477
B.	Judge Koh's Reliability Findings Concerning Qualcomm's Expert Economic Witnesses	479
1.	Professor Aviv Nevo	479
2.	Dr. Tasneem Chipty	480
3.	Professor Edward Snyder	482
C.	Judge Koh's Finding That Testimony Concerning the Technical Achievements of Qualcomm's Patents Was "Inapposite"	484
D.	Were Judge Koh's Findings That All of Qualcomm's Expert Economic Witnesses Were Unreliable Clearly Reasoned and Persuasively Communicated?	486
1.	Is <i>Daubert</i> Inherent in Due Process?	486
2.	Considering That Judge Koh Was Not Performing a Gatekeeper Function with Respect to a Jury, What Was Her Rationale for Finding That Qualcomm's Expert Economic Witnesses Were Unreliable?.....	487
3.	Did Judge Koh Implicitly Announce an Unprecedented Inquisitorial Rule for Assessing the Reliability of Expert Economic Witnesses?.....	489

4.	Why Did Judge Koh Not Appoint Her Own Neutral Economic Expert Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 706?	490
E.	Did Judge Koh Suppress Exculpatory Evidence When Reporting Her Findings of Fact Concerning Testimony Given by Dirk Weiler and Ilkka Rahnasto in Qualcomm’s Defense as Percipient Witnesses on Behalf of Nokia (a Third Party)?	492
1.	The Relevance of Patent Exhaustion to Nokia—and Ericsson.....	492
a.	Was Nokia’s 2006 Pleading to the European Commission “Diametrically Opposed” to Mr. Weiler’s Trial Testimony and Nokia’s Position in Its <i>Amicus</i> Brief in <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> ?	492
b.	Was Mr. Weiler’s Testimony Concerning ETSI’s IPR Policy Relevant for Purposes of Judge Koh’s Evaluation of the Credibility of a Witness Representing an Entirely Different Company, Ericsson?	495
c.	The Exhaustive Licensing of Cellular SEPs at the Component Level and the “Car Wars”	496
2.	Judge Koh’s Trope of “Made-for-Litigation” Evidence	497
3.	Mr. Weiler’s Direct Examination Concerning ETSI’s Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy	498
a.	ETSI’s IPR Special Committee	498
b.	ETSI’s IPR Policy and FRAND Licensing of SEPs	500
c.	Clause 6.1 of the ETSI IPR Policy and the Prevalence of Exhaustive Licensing of SEPs to OEMs	501
d.	Did ETSI’s IPR Special Committee Ever Reach Consensus to Change ETSI’s IPR Policy to Make a Specific Royalty Base Compulsory in Exhaustive SEP Licenses?	503
e.	Clause 6.1 of the ETSI IPR Policy and Exhaustive Licensing at the Component Level	505
4.	Mr. Weiler’s Cross Examination	506
a.	Does Nokia License SEPs?	506
b.	Clause 6.1 of ETSI’s IPR Policy and the Specific Commercial Terms of Exhaustive SEP Licenses	507
c.	Does ETSI’s IPR Policy Trump the IPR Policies of ATIS and the TIA If the Former Differs in Some Respect from the Latter?	509
5.	Judge Koh’s Disparagement of Mr. Weiler	511
a.	Injury to Mr. Weiler and to Nokia	512
b.	Ilkka Rahnasto’s Testimony About Nokia’s Licensing Practices	512

	c. Was Judge Koh's Apparent Reason for Disparaging Mr. Weiler Believable, Considering Dr. Rahnasto's Testimony About Nokia's Licensing Practices?.....	515
	F. What Private Remedy Exists for a Witness Whose Reputation a Judge Has Unjustifiably Impugned?	516
X.	DID QUALCOMM HAVE A CONTRACTUAL DUTY TO OFFER EXHAUSTIVE LICENSES TO ITS CELLULAR SEPs TO RIVAL MODEM MANUFACTURERS?	519
	A. Did Judge Koh's Findings on Partial Summary Judgment and in Her Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Encompass Qualcomm's Contracts with SSOs Other Than ATIS and the TIA?....	520
	B. Did Judge Koh Improperly Assume That the Verb "License" Denoted "License on an Exhaustive Basis" in the RAND Contracts Between Qualcomm and Each of ATIS and the TIA, Even Though Qualcomm Had Never Granted an Exhaustive License to Any Rival Modem Manufacturer?.....	522
	1. Two Alternative Interpretations of the Verb "License"	522
	2. Rejecting the Interpretation That Would Produce an Absurd Economic Result That No Reasonable SEP Holder Would Have Accepted	523
	3. The Optimal Level of Due Process and Judge Koh's Implicit Interpretation of the Verb "License" in Her Partial Summary Judgment Order	524
	C. Did Judge Koh's Findings About Qualcomm's Contractual Duties Apply to All SEPs?.....	525
	1. Did Judge Koh's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> Predetermine the Outcome in <i>Continental v. Avanci</i> ?	525
	a. The Close Relationship Between <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> and <i>Continental v. Avanci</i>	526
	b. Continental's Contention That Exhaustive SEP Licensing Only at the OEM Level Violated the FRAND Obligation and U.S. Antitrust Law	527
	c. What Were the Consequences for <i>Continental v. Avanci</i> of Judge Koh's Finding of Fact That the Testimony of Nokia's Dirk Weiler in <i>FTC v. Qualcomm</i> Was Not Credible?	528
	2. Do the Specific Provisions of Each FRAND or RAND Contract, Which Are Controlled by Various Bodies of Law, Compel SEP Holders to Offer Exhaustive Licenses to Their Cellular SEPs to Component Manufacturers?	529
	D. The FRAND Contract and the RAND Contract.....	531
	1. Is the FRAND or RAND Contract Enforceable?	532

2. What Obligations Does the FRAND or RAND Contract Impose on the Parties and on Possible Intended Third-Party Beneficiaries?	534
E. Is a RAND Commitment Legally Equivalent to a FRAND Commitment?	535
F. Was Summary Judgment Appropriate?	537
1. The Standard for Granting a Motion for Summary Judgment	537
2. The Controlling Law for Interpreting the RAND Contracts of ATIS and the TIA	539
G. Qualcomm's RAND Commitment to ATIS.....	541
1. The Language of the ATIS RAND Contract.....	543
a. Implementation of Less Than the Whole Standard	543
b. "Complying with" Versus "Implementing" the Standard, and the Relationship of Either to Infringing an SEP.....	543
c. Precatory Statements by ATIS About Benefit to the Public and Respect for Intellectual Property Rights	545
2. Evidence Probative of Existing Industry Practice.....	545
a. One Outbound SEP "License" from Qualcomm to an Unidentified Rival Modem Manufacturer	545
b. Qualcomm's Receipt of SEP "Licenses"	547
3. The Indiscretion of Summary Judgment on Component-Level Licensing Under the ATIS RAND Contract	549
4. Previous Court Decisions	550
a. Did Judge Koh Treat Ninth Circuit Dicta as Controlling Precedent?	551
i. Why the Ninth Circuit's Dicta Are Not Authoritative	551
ii. What Professor Lemley Actually Wrote Did Not Support Either the Ninth Circuit's Reasoning in <i>Microsoft I</i> or Judge Koh's Reasoning in Her Partial Summary Judgment	552
iii. Judge Koh's Misplaced Reliance on <i>Microsoft II</i> , in Which the Ninth Circuit in Dicta Erroneously Equated a RAND Contract to a FRAND Contract	554
b. Was the Ninth Circuit Interpreting Contracts with Different Language That Were Governed by Different Laws?	555
H. Qualcomm's RAND Commitment to the TIA.....	556
1. The Language of the TIA RAND Contract.....	558

	2. The TIA Guidelines	559
	I. The Consequences of Judge Koh's Order Granting the FTC Partial Summary Judgment for the Exhaustive Licensing of Cellular SEPs at the Component Level	563
XI.	DID QUALCOMM HAVE MONOPOLY POWER?	563
	A. "Direct" and "Indirect" Evidence of Market Power	565
	B. Did Judge Koh Examine Direct Evidence of Qualcomm's Market Power?	569
	C. Did Judge Koh Correctly Examine Indirect Evidence of Market Power?	571
	i. Did Judge Koh Correctly Apply the Hypothetical Monopolist Test (HMT) to Define the Relevant Product Market?	572
	a. Did Judge Koh Correctly Define "Premium" LTE Modems?	573
	b. Did the Reported Evidence Support Judge Koh's Definition of the Relevant Product Market?	574
	i. Industry Taxonomy Does Not Trump Consumer Preferences	574
	ii. Court Decisions Recognizing "Premium" Product Markets in Entirely Unrelated Industries Reveal Nothing About Consumer Demand for Supposedly "Premium" Modems	575
	iii. Judge Koh's Erroneous Reliance on an Implicit Theory of Veblen Goods to Define Relevant Markets in Antitrust Law	576
	iv. OEM Testimony Tended to Contradict Rather Than Confirm Judge Koh's Theory of Market Definition Predicated on Price Tiers	577
	v. The Closeness of Demand Substitutes When the Functionalities of Branded Products Advance Over Time	578
	c. How Does One Define a Relevant Product Market When Competition Occurs at the Design Stage of Product Development?	579
	i. Competition as a Tournament When an OEM Awards a Supply Contract for Modems on the Basis of a "Design Win"	579
	ii. How the Horizontal Merger Guidelines Would Analyze Competition from "Rapid Entrants" in Design-Win Markets	580

2.	Did Judge Koh Correctly Analyze Evidence of Qualcomm’s Market Power in the Relevant Market?	581
a.	Did Qualcomm “Own” a Market Share?	582
b.	Judge Koh’s Findings of High Market Share Ignored Design-Win Competition to Supply the Market	583
i.	The Unreliable Inference of Market Power from Market Share Alone in Technologically Dynamic Industries.....	584
ii.	Dynamic Competition Among Modem Manufacturers to Supply OEMs.....	585
iii.	Did Judge Koh Ignore the Antitrust Significance of Dynamic or “Schumpeterian” Competition?	586
3.	Potential Competition and Barriers to Entry.....	586
a.	Rival Suppliers of “Premium” LTE Modems.....	587
b.	Were Competitors Unable to Increase Their Output?	590
c.	Did Judge Koh Correctly Examine Potential Competition?.....	681
d.	Did Judge Koh Correctly Identify Barriers to Entry?	594
i.	Did Incumbents Also Face “Onerous Front-End Investments”?	594
ii.	Delayed Entry Is Still Entry.....	595
iii.	Ongoing R&D Investments Are Not Barriers to Entry.....	596
iv.	Stiglerian Barriers to Entry.....	597
v.	Salvageable R&D Investment Is Not a Barrier to Entry	599
vi.	Actual Entry Absolutely Refutes the Contention That Barriers to Entry Exist.....	600
e.	Did Judge Koh Correctly Examine the Competitive Constraints That Qualcomm Faced in Her Relevant Markets?	600
4.	When Assessing Market Power, Did Judge Koh Consider How Complementarity of Demand Constrains the Profit-Maximizing Price for a Modem Because Qualcomm Is a Multiproduct Firm That Also Exhaustively Licenses a Portfolio of Cellular SEPs to OEMs?	602
5.	Did Judge Koh Incorrectly Reject Qualcomm’s Claims About Buyers’ Power?	605
XII.	DID QUALCOMM WILLFULLY ACQUIRE OR MAINTAIN MONOPOLY POWER?	606
A.	Did Qualcomm Engage in Anticompetitive Conduct Against OEMs?	607

1.	Can Qualcomm Engage in Anticompetitive Conduct Against OEMs?	608
2.	Did Qualcomm Need to Justify Its Licensing Practice to Avoid Antitrust Liability?	610
B.	Did Qualcomm Violate Antitrust Law by Refusing to Offer Exhaustive Licenses to Its Cellular SEPs to Rival Modem Manufacturers?	611
1.	Does a Patent Holder's Refusal to Offer an Exhaustive License to a Competitor Violate Antitrust Law?	613
2.	The <i>Aspen Skiing</i> Exception.....	615
3.	Did Qualcomm's Conduct Fit the <i>Aspen Skiing</i> Exception?	617
a.	Did Qualcomm Change Its Licensing Practice?	619
b.	The Absence of Evidence of an Existing Course of Dealing Between Qualcomm and Any of the Firms That Judge Koh Identified.....	621
c.	The Absence of Evidence That Qualcomm Would Earn Economic Profit by Adopting a Strategy of Licensing Its Cellular SEPs Exhaustively to Rival Modem Manufacturers.....	623
d.	The Absence of Evidence of Qualcomm's Willingness to Forsake Short-Term Profits to Achieve an Anticompetitive End	626
e.	The Absence of Evidence of Qualcomm's Refusal to Deal Even If Compensated at the Retail Price: Judge Koh's Focus on the Wrong Opportunity Cost of Exhaustive Licensing of Qualcomm's SEPs	628
f.	Would <i>Aspen Skiing</i> Require at Most That Qualcomm Deal with "Smaller Rivals"?	631
g.	Does <i>Aspen Skiing</i> Encompass Intellectual Property?.....	632
h.	The Uncertain Virtue of Forced Sharing	632
4.	Did a FRAND or RAND Contract Impose an Antitrust Duty on Qualcomm to Offer Exhaustive Licenses to Its Cellular SEPs to Rival Modem Manufacturers?	633
XIII.	DID QUALCOMM ENGAGE IN UNLAWFUL EXCLUSIVE DEALING?	636
A.	When Are Exclusive Dealing Contracts Unlawful?.....	639
B.	Did the TA and the FATA Have Anticompetitive Effects?	640
1.	What Evidence of Allegedly Exclusive Dealing Did Judge Koh Identify and Weigh?.....	641

2.	Upon What Legal Authority Did Judge Koh Rely to Find That the TA and the FATA Were <i>De Facto</i> Exclusive Dealing Agreements?	641
3.	Did Qualcomm Achieve “Substantial Foreclosure”?	643
4.	Did the Lost Benefits of Working with Apple That Rival Modem Manufacturers Supposedly Experienced Constitute Injuries-in-Fact?.....	645
5.	Did Qualcomm Coerce Apple Through the Duration or Termination Provisions of the TA and the FATA?.....	647
a.	Was Judge Koh’s Analysis of the Duration of the TA and the FATA Inconclusive?	648
b.	Was It Commercially Feasible for Apple to End the TA and the FATA with Qualcomm?	649
6.	Were Judge Koh’s Additional Anticompetitive Indicia in the TA and the FATA Legally Irrelevant Because They Did Not Concern Markets in Which She Had Found Qualcomm to Possess Monopoly Power?	650
7.	Did Qualcomm’s Agreements with Other OEMs Compound the Supposedly Anticompetitive Effects of the TA and the FATA?	650
C.	Did Qualcomm “Coerce” Apple to Accept Lower Prices for Modems?	651
D.	Did the TA and the FATA Have Procompetitive Effects?	654
1.	The Benefits of Low Prices	654
a.	Was Apple “Free to Choose” Its Modem Supplier?.....	655
b.	Intel’s Cost Disadvantage Relative to Qualcomm in Modem Supply to Apple.....	656
c.	The Misapplication of Monopolization Principles	657
2.	The Potential Benefits of the TA and the FATA	658
a.	The TA and the FATA as Mechanisms for Qualcomm’s Recovery of Its Relationship-Specific Investment to Design Thin Modems for Apple	659
b.	Qualcomm’s Lawsuit in November 2017 Alleging That Apple Had Misappropriated Trade Secrets Concerning Qualcomm’s Modems and Had Given That Confidential Information to Intel to Assist Its Development of Competing Modems.....	660
c.	Taking Seriously the Transaction Costs Savings of Achieving Customer Loyalty	661

3.	Was Exclusivity Necessary to Support Qualcomm's Relationship-Specific Investment?	662
a.	Investment Without Uncertainty	662
b.	Judge Koh's <i>Ex Post</i> Reinterpretation of Qualcomm's <i>Ex Ante</i> "Target Payback Ratio" for Investment in Modems	662
c.	Judge Koh's Imposition of a Retroactive Prudency Review of Qualcomm's Sunk Investment in Risky Innovation	664
d.	Judge Koh's Failure to Compare the Marginal Revenue That Qualcomm Gained from Apple's Exclusivity with the Marginal Cost to Qualcomm of Making the Relationship-Specific Increment of Investment Necessary to Support Its Supply Relationship with Apple	665
4.	Did Qualcomm Sacrifice Short-Term Profit and Thereby Harm Competition?	666
E.	Summation: Did a Preponderance of the Evidence Support Judge Koh's Conclusion That the TA and FATA Were Anticompetitive Exclusive Dealing Agreements?	669
XIV.	DID QUALCOMM HARM INVESTMENT IN R&D?	670
A.	The Productivity of Investment in R&D Achieved by Qualcomm and by Rival Modem Manufacturers	670
1.	Did Qualcomm or Rival Modem Manufacturers Have the Stronger Claim to the Need to Finance R&D Investment with Net Free Cash Flows from Operations?	671
2.	Did Judge Koh Ignore Substantial Evidence That Qualcomm's R&D Investment Was More Productive Than the R&D Investment of Rival Modem Manufacturers?	672
B.	Did Judge Koh Recognize That Investment in Developing New Technologies Increases Dynamic Efficiency More Than Does Investment in Commercializing Existing Technologies?	673
C.	Did Judge Koh Recognize That Qualcomm's Innovation Epitomized the "Business Acumen" That the Supreme Court Said May Lawfully Create and Sustain a Monopoly?	676
D.	The Role of Bain & Company in Advising Intel on Competitive Strategy vis-à-vis Qualcomm	677
1.	Was Mr. Johnson a Hostile Witness?	678
2.	Bain's Competitive Strategy Engagements for Intel	679
a.	Bain's Evaluation of the Respective Productivity of R&D Investment of Intel and Qualcomm	680

	b. Bain’s Conclusion That Qualcomm’s Productivity of R&D Investment in SoCs Was Three Times That of Intel’s	681
	3. Did Judge Koh Cite Mr. Johnson for the Asymmetry Between Qualcomm’s and Intel’s Productivity of R&D Investment in SoCs?	683
XV.	THE MEANING OF EXIT	683
	A. Transcendent “Exit” Versus Existential “Exit”	684
	B. Did Judge Koh Distinguish Between Transcendent “Exit” and Existential “Exit”?	685
	C. Exit and the Shutdown Decision	685
	D. Exit, Dynamic Capabilities, and the Mobility of Complementary Factors of Production	687
	1. Will an Exiting Firm Redeploy Capital to Reduce Its Costs of Exit?	688
	2. Is It Credible That Intel Had Failed, by the Time of Trial, to Discern the Possibility of Selling Its Modem Business to Apple?	689
	a. Was It Reasonably Foreseeable in January 2019 That Apple Might Purchase Intel’s Modem Business If Intel Chose to “Exit” the Modem Industry?	689
	b. The Representation by Intel’s CEO That Intel Sold Its Modem Business Because It Could Not Achieve “Attractive Returns” from Selling Modems to Its Single Customer, Apple	691
	c. Did Mr. Swan’s Statements About the Sale of Intel’s Modem Business to Apple Comport with Ms. Evans’ Testimony About Existential “Exit”?	692
	3. Do Firms Spontaneously Combust When They “Exit”?	694
XVI.	JUDGE KOH AND PROXIMATE CAUSATION	695
	A. Did the FTC Prove Proximate Causation?	697
	1. Judge Koh’s Use of the Word “Promote” Apparently to Signal a Diminution of the Burden of Production and the Burden of Persuasion on Proximate Causation with Respect to the “Exit” of Rivals	698
	2. Was Judge Koh Correct That the FTC Did Not Need to Prove Proximate Causation?	699
	B. Did Preponderant Evidence Establish the Superiority of Qualcomm’s Modems?	700

1. Evidence Establishing the Superiority of Qualcomm's Modems	700
2. Adverse Testimony Conceding the Superiority of Qualcomm's Modems	701
3. Judge Koh's Findings Conceding the Superiority of Qualcomm's Modems	702
C. Did Qualcomm's Refusal to Offer Exhaustive Licenses to Its Cellular SEPs to Rival Modem Manufacturers Cause Them to "Exit" the Modem Industry?	703
1. Did Judge Koh Make Findings of Fact That Each Modem Manufacturer Whose "Exit" She Attributed to Qualcomm's Actions in Fact Competed in Her Relevant Product Markets?	703
2. Were the Statements by Executives of Rival Modem Manufacturers Credible and Preponderant Evidence That Qualcomm Had Proximately Caused Those Manufacturers to "Exit" or to Experience Other Attenuated Harms?	703
a. Broadcom's "Exit"	704
b. The "Exit" of Freescale, ST-Ericsson, and Texas Instruments	705
c. MediaTek's Inadequate Investment and Slow Modem Deployment	706
d. Did Qualcomm's Refusal to License Its Patents Exhaustively to Huawei's HiSilicon Modem Subsidiary Harm Competition?	707
3. Summation: Judge Koh's Findings of Fact Concerning "Exit" or Other Attenuated Harms	709
D. Judge Koh's "Intel-Welfare" Standard	710
1. Ms. Evans' Testimony That Intel's Sales of Modems to Apple Had Never Been Profitable	712
a. Intel's Margins on Sales of Modems to Apple	712
b. Ms. Evans' Admission to the FTC When Testifying Under Oath in September 2016 That She Could Not Answer One Way or the Other Whether Intel Would Benefit from Receiving an Exhaustive License to Qualcomm's Cellular SEPs	713
2. Bain's Understanding of the Strategic Ramifications of Qualcomm's Licensing Practices	714
a. Bain's Understanding of Customers of Thin Modems and SoCs	714

b.	Bain's Understanding of the Strategic Implications of Patent Exhaustion and the FRAND Contract for Qualcomm's Licensing Practices	722
i.	Bain's Apparently Erroneous Strategic Assessment of the Legal Constraints Facing Qualcomm	723
ii.	Bain's Understanding of Qualcomm's Collection of Royalties	725
c.	Summation Concerning Bain's Apparent Factual Foundation for Its Strategic Advice to Intel	726
E.	Which Kind of "Competition" Does Antitrust Law Seek to Protect?	726
1.	The Competitor-Protection View of Antitrust Law	727
2.	Consumer Welfare.....	727
F.	Does the Sherman Act Arrest in Time the Institutional Structure of Production?.....	729
XVII.	DID QUALCOMM KILL WiMAX?.....	730
A.	Was Judge Koh's Characterization of the Testimony of Dr. Jacobs Faithful to a Plain Reading of His Words?	731
1.	Why Did Qualcomm Decide Not to Pursue WiMAX?.....	731
2.	Was Judge Koh's Depiction of Dr. Jacobs' Testimony Complete?	733
B.	Was Judge Koh's cursory conclusion about the cause of the demise of WiMAX disproven by the expert engineering testimony of Professor Andrews?	734
C.	Judge Koh's incidental adjudication, in 425 words, of the alleged antitrust issues surrounding the commercial and technical failure of WiMAX.....	736
XVIII.	JUDGE KOH'S INVENTION OF COMBINATORIAL LIABILITY: WERE QUALCOMM'S INDIVIDUALLY LAWFUL PRACTICES "COLLECTIVELY" UNLAWFUL?.....	737
A.	Ignoring <i>linkLine</i> to fashion a consolation-prize theory of antitrust liability.....	737
B.	Judge Koh's invention of combinatorial liability.....	738
1.	Can the combined effects of interrelated practices that are individually lawful give rise "collectively" to Sherman Act liability?	739
2.	The perils of the theory of anticompetitive harm based on the totality of the circumstances	740
C.	The FTC's advocacy at trial concerning combinatorial liability.....	741

	D. Was Judge Koh's Imposition of Liability on the Basis of the Totality of the Circumstances and Her Theory of Combinatorial Liability Unconstitutionally Vague?	742
XIX.	DOES THE MARKET FOR CORPORATE CONTROL MAKE JUDGE KOH'S FINDINGS OF COMPETITIVE HARM UNBELIEVABLE?	744
	A. The Market for Corporate Control as a Means to Resolve Commercial Disputes, Including Allegations of Monopolization	745
	1. Transaction Costs and Acquisition of Corporate Control	746
	2. Institutional Investors and Corporate Control	747
	3. The Imposition of Incentive Compatibility Through Corporate Control	748
	B. The Significance of Apple's Massive Cash Holdings to Its Ready Ability to Use the Market for Corporate Control as a Mechanism to Defeat Anticompetitive Behavior	749
	C. The Corporate Control Premium	751
	D. The Expiration of Qualcomm's Poison Pill	752
	E. Was the Absence of a Corporate Control Transaction for Qualcomm by Apple Evidence of the Nonexistence of Qualcomm's Alleged Monopolization?	753
	F. What Can One Infer About Qualcomm's Alleged Monopoly from Broadcom's Unsuccessful Attempt to Acquire Qualcomm and from Apple's Acquisition of Intel's Modem Business?	754
XX.	WAS JUDGE KOH'S PERMANENT, WORLDWIDE INJUNCTION UNLAWFUL?	755
	A. Did Judge Koh's Permanent, Worldwide Antitrust Injunction Violate <i>eBay</i> ?	758
	1. Was Judge Koh Authorized to Deviate from Established Equitable Practice?	759
	2. Does Proving Irreparable Harm Require Proving a "Strong Causal Nexus" Between the Allegedly Unlawful Act and the Alleged Harm?	760
	3. Did Judge Koh Erroneously Invoke the Less Demanding Standard for Granting the FTC a Preliminary Injunction, Pursuant to Section 13(b)(2) of the FTC Act?	762
	B. Did Judge Koh Erroneously Exclude Post-Discovery Evidence of Qualcomm's Alleged Market Power?	765
	1. Judge Koh's Refusal to Hear Exculpatory Evidence on Qualcomm's Materially Diminished Share of LTE Modem Sales in 2018	765

2. Apple's Announcement in July 2019 That It Would Acquire Intel's Modem Business Was Substantial Evidence That Qualcomm's Market Power, to the Extent That It Was Proven or Assumed at Trial Ever to Have Existed, Had Materially Diminished	767
CONCLUSION	768