IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE: INTEL CORP. MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST LITIGATION) MDL Docket No. 05-1717 (JJF))
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC. and AMD INTERNATIONAL SALES & SERVICE, LTD.)))
Plaintiffs,)) C.A. No. 05-441 (JJF)
v.) C.A. 140. (33-741 (331)
INTEL CORPORATION and INTEL KABUSHIKI KAISHA,)
Defendants.)
PHIL PAUL, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,) C.A. No. 05-485-JJF
Plaintiffs,) CONSOLIDATED ACTION)
v.)
INTEL CORPORATION,)
Defendant.)

AMENDED NOTICE OF SUBPOENA AD TESTIFICANDUM

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Rule 45 and Rule 30(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a subpoena *ad testificandum* has been or will be served on OfficeMax Inc., 263 Shuman Blvd., Naperville, Illinois 60563. A true and correct copy of the subpoena is attached hereto.

Defendant Intel Corporation will take the deposition upon oral examination of OfficeMax, Inc., regarding the subject matter set forth in the attached Exhibit A. The deposition will take place before an authorized court reporter, commencing at 11:00 A.M. on May 28, 2009

at the offices of OfficeMax, 263 Shuman Blvd., Naperville, Illinois 60563, or at such other time and place as agreed to by the parties. The deposition will continue from day to day until completed and shall be transcribed. You are invited to attend and cross-examine the witness.

OF COUNSEL:

David M. Balabanian Donn Pickett David C. Beach BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067 (415) 393-2000

Dated: May 20, 2009

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

By: /s/ Richard L. Horwitz.

Richard L. Horwitz (#2246) W. Harding Drane, Jr. (#1023) Hercules Plaza, 6th Floor 1313 North Market Street P.O. Box 951 Wilmington, DE 19899-0951 (302) 984-6000

<u>rhorwitz@potteranderson.com</u> wdrane@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Defendant INTEL CORPORATION

917400/29282

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
Northern District of Illinois

In re Intel Corp. Microprocessor Antitrust Litig.)
Plaintiff)
v.) Civil Action No. MDL No. 05-1717-JJF
) (If the action is pending in another district, state where:
Defendant	
Dejenaani) District of Delaware
•	TIFY AT A DEPOSITION MENTS IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: OfficeMax Inc., 263 Shuman Blvd., Naperville, IL 605	563
Place: OfficeMax Inc.	Date and Time:
263 Shuman Blvd.	05/28/2009 11:00 am
Naperville, IL 60563	
The deposition will be recorded by this method:	visual and/or stenographic means
	so bring with you to the deposition the following documents, ermit their inspection, copying, testing, or sampling of the
The provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c), relating to 45 (d) and (e), relating to your duty to respond to this subpattached.	your protection as a person subject to a subpoena, and Rule oena and the potential consequences of not doing so, are
Date: 05/20/2009	OR Call
Signature of Clerk or Deputy C	lerk Attorney's signature
The name, address, e-mail, and telephone number of the att	torney representing (name of party) Intel Corp. , who issues or requests this subpoena, are:
David C. Beach, Bingham McCutchen LLP, Three Embaro	

Civil Action No. MDL No. 05-1717-JJF

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 45.)

This subpoena for (nan	ne of individual and title, if any)		erimonama in a a in a a in a a a a a a a a a a a
received by me on (date)	v		
☐ I personally served	the subpoena on the individual at	(place)	
		On (date)	; or
☐ I left the subpoena	at the individual's residence or us		
	, a pe	erson of suitable age and discretion who	resides there
On (date)	, and mailed a copy to the	e individual's last known address; or	
☐ I served the subpoe	Π2 ΟΠ (name of individual)		, who is
designated by law to a	accept service of process on behal	f of (name of organization)	na – přeměnké v něm něm příře možně ži čení
***************************************		on (date)	; or
☐ I returned the subpo	oena unexecuted because		; (
		States, or one of its officers or agents, and the mileage allowed by law, in the ar	
Unless the subpoena w	s fees for one day's attendance, ar		
Unless the subpoena we tendered to the witness	s fees for one day's attendance, ar	d the mileage allowed by law, in the ar	
Unless the subpoena we tendered to the witness ees are \$ I declare under penalty	s fees for one day's attendance, ar	for services, for a total of \$	mount of
Unless the subpoena we tendered to the witness \$ees are \$	s fees for one day's attendance, ar for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	nount of

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 (c), (d), and (e) (Effective 12/1/07)

(c) Protecting a Person Subject to a Subpoena.

(1) Avoiding Undue Burden or Expense; Sanctions. A party or attorney responsible for issuing and serving a subpoena must take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to the subpoena. The issuing court must enforce this duty and impose an appropriate sanction — which may include lost earnings and reasonable attorney's fees — on a party or attorney who fails to comply.

(2) Command to Produce Materials or Permit Inspection.

- (A) Appearance Not Required. A person commanded to produce documents, electronically stored information, or tangible things, or to permit the inspection of premises, need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless also commanded to appear for a deposition, hearing, or trial.
- (B) Objections. A person commanded to produce documents or tangible things or to permit inspection may serve on the party or attorney designated in the subpoena a written objection to inspecting, copying, testing or sampling any or all of the materials or to inspecting the premises or to producing electronically stored information in the form or forms requested. The objection must be served before the earlier of the time specified for compliance or 14 days after the subpoena is served. If an objection is made, the following rules apply:
- (i) At any time, on notice to the commanded person, the serving party may move the issuing court for an order compelling production or inspection.
- (ii) These acts may be required only as directed in the order, and the order must protect a person who is neither a party nor a party's officer from significant expense resulting from compliance.

(3) Quashing or Modifying a Subpoena.

- (A) When Required. On timely motion, the issuing court must quash or modify a subpoena that:
 - (i) fails to allow a reasonable time to comply;
- (ii) requires a person who is neither a party nor a party's officer to travel more than 100 miles from where that person resides, is employed, or regularly transacts business in person except that, subject to Rule 45(c)(3)(B)(iii), the person may be commanded to attend a trial by traveling from any such place within the state where the trial is held;
- (iii) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter, if no exception or waiver applies; or
 - (iv) subjects a person to undue burden.
- (B) When Permitted. To protect a person subject to or affected by a subpoena, the issuing court may; on motion, quash or modify the subpoena if it requires:
- (i) disclosing a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information;
- (ii) disclosing an unretained expert's opinion or information that does not describe specific occurrences in dispute and results from the expert's study that was not requested by a party; or
- (iii) a person who is neither a party nor a party's officer to incur substantial expense to travel more than 100 miles to attend trial.
- (C) Specifying Conditions as an Alternative. In the circumstances described in Rule 45(c)(3)(B), the court may, instead of quashing or modifying a subpoena, order appearance or production under specified conditions if the serving party:
- (i) shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship; and
- (ii) ensures that the subpoenaed person will be reasonably compensated.

(d) Duties in Responding to a Subpoena.

- (1) Producing Documents or Electronically Stored Information. These procedures apply to producing documents or electronically stored information:
- (A) Documents. A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents must produce them as they are kept in the ordinary course of business or must organize and label them to correspond to the categories in the demand.
- (B) Form for Producing Electronically Stored Information Not Specified. If a subpoena does not specify a form for producing electronically stored information, the person responding must produce it in a form or forms in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a reasonably usable form or forms.
- (C) Electronically Stored Information Produced in Only One Form. The person responding need not produce the same electronically stored information in more than one form.
- (D) Inaccessible Electronically Stored Information. The person responding need not provide discovery of electronically stored information from sources that the person identifies as not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. On motion to compel discovery or for a protective order, the person responding must show that the information is not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. If that showing is made, the court may nonetheless order discovery from such sources if the requesting party shows good cause, considering the limitations of Rule 26(b)(2)(C). The court may specify conditions for the discovery.

(2) Claiming Privilege or Protection.

- (A) Information Withheld. A person withholding subpoenaed information under a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial-preparation material must:
 - (i) expressly make the claim; and
- (ii) describe the nature of the withheld documents, communications, or tangible things in a manner that, without revealing information itself privileged or protected, will enable the parties to assess the claim.
- (B) Infarmation Produced. If information produced in response to a subpoena is subject to a claim of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation material, the person making the claim may notify any party that received the information of the claim and the basis for it. After being notified, a party must promptly return, sequester, or destroy the specified information and any copies it has; must not use or disclose the information until the claim is resolved; must take reasonable steps to retrieve the information if the party disclosed it before being notified; and may promptly present the information to the court under seal for a determination of the claim. The person who produced the information must preserve the information until the claim is resolved.
- (e) Contempt. The issuing court may hold in contempt a person who, having been served, fails without adequate excuse to obey the subpoena. A nonparty's failure to obey must be excused if the subpoena purports to require the nonparty to attend or produce at a place outside the limits of Rule 45(c)(3)(A)(ii).

Exhibit A

DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

- 1. The terms You and Your shall mean OfficeMax, Inc., and any past or present predecessor, successor, parent, subsidiary, division or affiliate, and all persons (as defined below) acting on its behalf including, without limitation, present and former officers, directors, employees, attorneys, agents, and representatives.
- 2. The term **COMPUTER PRODUCTS** includes without limitation desktop computers, laptop computers, workstations and servers containing an x86 microprocessor.

DEPOSITION TOPICS

- 1. YOUR marketing and pricing strategies for COMPUTER PRODUCTS in any of the following segments: retail/consumer; small/medium business; corporate; or other customer groups to which you sell.
 - 2. The factors that You consider in pricing of COMPUTER PRODUCTS.
- The relationship in retail pricing between COMPUTER PRODUCTS containing
 AMD processors and those containing Intel processors.
- 4. A description, target, and duration of any types of price promotion programs that YOU offer regarding the sale of COMPUTER PRODUCTS.
- 5. YOUR strategic analyses or plans or competitive reviews regarding the retail market for COMPUTER PRODUCTS.
- 6. Any analyses or consideration that YOU give to differential pricing of COMPUTER PRODUCTS, whether geographical, platform- or business segment-based.

- 7. The time lag between the announcement of a change in the cost of a microprocessor and a change in the price of **YOUR COMPUTER PRODUCTS** containing the processor.
- 8. How frequently (daily, weekly, monthly) sales prices for YOUR COMPUTER

 PRODUCTS change, whether sales prices vary from store to store and why, and whether store managers have the discretion to change the sales price.
 - 9. The geographic locations of any business dealings between You and Intel.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Richard L. Horwitz hereby certify that on May 20, 2009, the attached document was hand delivered to the following persons and was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF which will send notification of such filing(s) to the following and the document is available for viewing and downloading from CM/ECF:

Jesse A. Finkelstein
Frederick L. Cottrell, III
Chad M. Shandler
Steven J. Fineman
Richards, Layton & Finger
One Rodney Square
920 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

James L. Holzman J. Clayton Athey Prickett, Jones & Elliott, P.A. 1310 King Street P.O. Box 1328 Wilmington, DE 19899

I hereby certify that on May 20, 2009, I have Electronically Mailed the documents to the following non-registered participants:

Charles P. Diamond
Linda J. Smith
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
cdiamond@omm.com
lsmith@omm.com

Mark A. Samuels
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
msamuels@omm.com

Salem M. Katsh
Laurin B. Grollman
Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman LLP
1633 Broadway, 22nd Floor
New York, New York 10019
skatsh@kasowitz.com
lgrollman@kasowitz.com

Daniel A. Small
Cohen, Milstein, Hausfeld & Toll, P.L.L.C.
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 500, West Tower
Washington, DC 20005
dsmall@cmht.com

Craig C. Corbitt
Judith A. Zahid
Zelle Hofmann Voelbel & Mason LLP
44 Montgomery Street
Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94104
ccorbitt@zelle.com
jzahid@zelle.com

Guido Saveri
R. Alexander Saveri
Saveri & Saveri, Inc.
706 Sansome Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
guido@saveri.com
rick@saveri.com

Michael P. Lehmann
Jon T. King
Hausfeld LLP
44 Montgomery Street
Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94104
mlehmann@hausfeldllp.com
jking@hausfeldllp.com

Steve W. Berman Anthony D. Shapiro Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro, LLP 1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101 steve@hbsslaw.com tony@hbsslaw.com

Michael D. Hausfeld Brent W. Landau Hausfeld LLP 1146 19th Street, NW Fifth Floor Washington, DC 20036 mhausfeld@hausfeldllp.com blandau@hausfeldllp.com

By: /s/ Richard L. Horwitz

Richard L. Horwitz (#2246)
W. Harding Drane, Jr. (#1023)
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
Hercules Plaza, 6th Floor
1313 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899-0951
(302) 984-6000
rhorwitz@potteranderson.com
wdrane@potteranderson.com
Attorneys for Defendants
Intel Corporation and Intel Kabushiki Kasiha