

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC. and)	
AMD INTERNATIONAL SALES & SERVICE,)	
LTD.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	C.A. No. 05-441 (JJF)
v.)	
)	
INTEL CORPORATION and)	
INTEL KABUSHIKI KAISHA,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

IN RE:)	
)	
INTEL CORP. MICROPROCESSOR)	MDL Docket No. 05-1717 (JJF)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION)	
)	

PHIL PAUL, on behalf of himself)	
and all others similarly situated,)	C.A. No. 05-485-JJF
)	
Plaintiffs,)	CONSOLIDATED ACTION
)	
v.)	
)	
INTEL CORPORATION,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**UNOPPOSED MOTION OF DEFENDANTS' INTEL CORPORATION AND INTEL
KABUSHIKI KAISA FOR LEAVE TO SERVE A SUBPOENA DUCES
TECUM ON ATI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.**

Defendants Intel Corporation and Intel Kabushiki Kaisha (collectively "Intel"), respectfully file this unopposed motion to leave to serve a subpoena duces techum on ATI Technologies, Inc. ("ATI") after the June 15, 2006 deadline for serving "comprehensive" third-

party subpoenas set forth in paragraph 5(g) of Case Management Order No. 1. [D.I. 123] (the “CMO Deadline”).¹ The reasons for this motion are as follows:

1. On July 24, 2006, plaintiff Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. (“AMD”) and ATI announced that AMD would acquire ATI in a transaction valued at approximately \$5.4 billion (“ATI Acquisition”). Upon knowledge and belief, there was no public announcement of the ATI Acquisition prior to July 24, 2006.
2. According to a press release dated July 24, 2006, posted on the AMD website (“the Press Release”), the “combination will create a processing powerhouse by bringing AMD’s technology leadership in microprocessors together with ATI’s strengths in graphics chipsets and consumer electronics.” A copy of the Press Release is attached as Exhibit A hereto. In the Press Release, AMD Chairman and CEO Hector Ruiz is quoted as saying: “Bringing these two great companies together will allow us to transcend what we have accomplished as individual businesses and reinvent our industry as the technology leader and partner of choice. We believe that AMD and ATI will drive differentiated solutions and empowering our customers to choose what is best for them.”
3. In light of the July 24, 2006 announcement of the ATI Acquisition, and its stated purposes to expand AMD’s ability to compete in the microprocessor business and the substantial technological scope and dollar value of the transaction, it is likely that ATI has within its possession or control documents that are relevant to claims or defenses of the parties in this action. As a result, Intel seeks to leave to serve a subpoena that requests production by ATI of the categories of documents set forth in Exhibit B hereto. By way of example only, Intel seeks documents concerning:
 - The transaction’s strategic rationale, growth opportunities, and financial projections of the transaction’s actual or potential effect on any aspect of either company’s or the combined company’s business performance.;

¹ By stipulation of the parties, the CMO Deadline was extended by one week to June 22, 2006. [D.I.168].

- Any potential or actual effect of AMD's acquisition of ATI on competition in chipsets, graphics processors and/or microprocessors;
- The potential or actual effect of AMD's acquisition of ATI on Intel's or AMD's business or business practices;
- Any actual or perceived underperformance by AMD in the consumer, corporate, and/or mobile market segments prior to AMD's acquisition of ATI;
- The potential or actual effect of AMD's acquisition of ATI on AMD's competitiveness, and the actual or perceived benefits AMD expects to enjoy in the consumer, corporate, and/or mobile market segments by acquiring ATI.

These requested documents relate specifically to AMD's past and future capabilities to compete with Intel, and thus are directly relevant to its claims that Intel is responsible, at least in part, for claimed competitive challenges, and to Intel's defense that AMD, not Intel, has been responsible for AMD's business failures and successes.

4. Because the ATI transaction was not publicly announced prior to July 24, 2006, Intel was not on notice prior to such date that ATI might have documents, such as the documents enumerated in Exhibit B hereto, that are relevant to claims or defenses of the parties in this action. Therefore, Intel did not have reason to serve a subpoena on ATI requesting such documents prior to July 24, 2006, more than a month after the CMO Deadline for serving third-party subpoenas.
5. Counsel for AMD and counsel for the class plaintiffs have stated that their clients do not object to the relief requested in the present motion, although plaintiffs have reserved all substantive objections to the requests.

WHEREFORE, Intel respectfully requests that the Court grant Intel leave to serve a subpoena duces tecum on ATI Technologies, Inc. ("ATI"), as requested herein.

OF COUNSEL:

Robert E. Cooper
Daniel S. Floyd
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 900071
(213) 229-7000

Peter E. Moll
Darren B. Bernhard
Howrey LLP
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue
N.W. Washington, DC 20004
(202) 783-0800


POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

By: /s/ Richard L. Horwitz
Richard L. Horwitz (#2246)
W. Harding Drane Jr. (#1023)
Hercules Plaza, 6th Floor
1313 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899-0951
(302) 984-6000
rhowitz@potteranderson.com
wdrane@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Defendants
Intel Corporation and Intel Kabushiki Kaisha

Dated: August 10, 2006
744892

SO ORDERED this 14 day of August, 2006



Vincent Poppiti, Special Master