EXHIBIT 1

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
355 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE
THIRTY-FIFTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-1560
TELEPHONE (213) 683-9100
FACSIMILE (213) 687-3702

33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-9781
TELEPHONE (415) 512-4000
FACSIMILE (415) 512-4077

October 29, 2002

WRITER'S DIRECT LINE
(213) 683-9299
(213) 683-4099 FAX
nguyentn@mto.com

BY EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Richard Rosen, Esq.
Arnold & Porter
555 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004-1206

Re: Subpoena to Smart Modular in the *Matter of Rambus, Inc.*, before the Federal Trade Commission
File No. Docket No. 9302

Dear Mr. Rosen:

This letter is to confirm our understanding reached in our discussion on October 28, 2002, with respect to the subpoena issued by Rambus and served on Micron Technology, Inc. in connection with the above-referenced proceeding. We agreed to a production date of November 19, 2002, for the production of all documents pertaining to our JEDEC-related document requests nos. 15-30, 37, and 45-52[1] for those documents that are responsive and that were not previously produced in the Delaware litigation before the December 31, 2000 cut-off date ("supplemental JEDEC production"). We also agreed to a production date of November 22, 2002 for a privilege log for all documents withheld with respect to this supplemental JEDEC production. It is my understanding that our generous extension of the dates is premised on your intention to produce responsive documents and a privilege log by those dates and not for the purpose of filing objections, or moving to limit or quash the subpoena. If this is not a correct understanding, please let me know immediately, as we will need to renegotiate the dates for compliance with respect to this topic.

[1] In your letter dated October 28, 2002, you inadvertently omitted requests no. 15 and 37 from your identified JEDEC-related document requests. We understand, however, that only subpart (a) of request no. 15 is implicated.

In addition, we agreed that I would attempt to ascertain whether we would agree to further narrowing our document requests with respect to the Rambus/Rambus IP-related document requests, withdraw our requests, or move to compel. We understand your position to be that all responsive documents had been previously produced, any supplemental production of documents after December 31, 2000, and a search for any responsive documents that have not been previously produced that may potentially be responsive to the new requests would be overly burdensome, in light of its marginal relevance in this litigation. We agreed to discuss this category of documents in a later discussion this week, after appropriate discussions with our client.

With respect to the DRAM chip pricing issue, we still do not appear to be any nearer to an agreement. I expressed to you our willingness to significantly narrow our requests on this topic to capture the narrow issue regarding the effect of Rambus and Rambus's royalties on DRAM chip pricing. Nevertheless, it was your initial position, and still continues to be your position, that documents relating to the effect, if any, that Rambus's royalties, or pricing, with respect to its technology had "marginal relevance," if any, on DRAM chip pricing in the industry. You expressed your belief that you did not anticipate that your client would possess a wealth of documents regarding this subject. I indicated that we would accept a statement from you asserting that you had no such documents in your possession after conducting a good faith search, or a stipulation to the effect of your current representation that Rambus's royalties, or pricing, with respect to its technology had no effect on DRAM chip pricing in the industry. You indicated that your client would likely be willing to stipulate to the fact that they have not paid any royalties to Rambus, but that you were unsure whether they would agree to a stipulation with respect to the effect of Rambus's royalties or pricing on the DRAM market, or the lack of its relevance to the litigation. However, you agreed to check with your client and get back to us later this week.

Furthermore, with respect to the nine technologies listed in document request no. 12 of Attachment A to the subpoena, we agreed to submit a more narrow document request in order to ensure that we capture documents which may not have been previously produced. I agreed that as drafted, the request could be a bit overbroad, as we are not seeking all documents in the possession of Micron engineers regarding testing or implementation of products that utilize any of these technological features.

You indicated that you believed that a significant, if not complete, production had been done in the *Micron* litigation with respect to the very same nine technologies listed. I iterated that only a few of those terms may have been at issue in the *Micron* litigation and that you should make a good faith effort to search for documents relating to the other technologies listed that may or may not have been considered relevant in the *Micron* litigation by your client. You agreed to check with your client on this issue and get back to us after you received a narrow request. In that regard, I submit to you the following document request in lieu of prior request nos. 12-13:

12. For each of the following technologies:[2]

(1) programmable CAS latency,

(2) programmable burst length,

(3) on-chip PLL or on-chip DLL,

(4) dual-edge clocking,

(5) multi-bank design,

(6) externally supplied reference voltage,

(7) low-voltage swing,

(8) source-synchronous clocking, and

(9) auto pre-charge,

produce:

a. all documents describing, analyzing, or referring to the technology as a feature or possible feature of DRAMS;

b. all documents describing, analyzing, or referring to the possible inclusion of the technology in any JEDEC standard;

c. all documents relating to the importance of the technology to any DRAM design or architecture, including SDRAM, DDR SDRAM, DDR 2 SDRAM, and RDRAM;

d. all documents constituting, discussing or relating to any patents or patent applications covering or potentially covering the technology;

e. all documents listing, describing, or evaluating alternative technologies or features to perform the same functions as the technology, either in a synchronous or asynchronous system;

f. all documents constituting, discussing or relating to any patents or patent applications for any alternative technologies or features that might be used to perform the same functions as the technology;

g. all documents describing how the technology operates or is used in JEDEC- compliant SDRAM or JEDEC-compliant DDR SDRAM products;

---

[2] Note we have combined document requests nos. 12 and 13 into one request.

h. all documents listing, describing, or evaluating how the technology is described in any patent description written or issued with a priority date prior to January 1, 1999;

i. all documents describing or referring to any patents or patent applications containing claims that relate to the technology;

j. all documents describing, memorializing, reflecting or referring to any meetings, conferences, or communications relating to any patents, or patent applications containing claims that relate to the technology or feature; and

k. all documents describing, analyzing, or referring to any assertion or possible assertion by Rambus of any intellectual property rights with respect to the technology.

l. all documents describing, analyzing, or referring to any assertion or possible assertion by Rambus of any intellectual property rights with respect to that technology or feature.

Finally, you called today and asked whether we would be willing to extend the previously agreed-to response date of October 30, 2002, by one week, to November 6, 2002, on the non- supplemental JEDEC production. We will agree to such an extension for a response date, with the understanding that any further extensions requested will need to be accompanied with a firm production date, not merely as a good-will extension to extend time in which for you to move to limit or quash. Of course, I'd like to reiterate that we prefer to work cooperatively to reach compromise in achieving some kind of meaningful document production, rather than engage in expensive and time-consuming motion practice. However, as this matter is currently scheduled for trial on February 26, 2003, we have very little choice as to our flexibility with respect to significantly elongating deadlines for the completion of discovery. From our prior discussions, I hope and believe that you understand our position and am sympathetic to it.

Thanks for your assistance and cooperation in this matter. Please do not hesitate to call if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

Truc-Linh N. Nguyen

cc: Greg Stone
868016.1