

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

In the Matter of

RAMBUS INC.,

a corporation.

Docket No. 9302

**RESPONDENT RAMBUS INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS
FOR ADMISSIONS TO THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

Pursuant to section 3.32 of the Federal Trade Commission's Rules of Practice, Respondent hereby requests that Complainant Federal Trade Commission respond to the following requests for admission. Each of the documents referenced in these requests is known to be in Complaint Counsel's possession, custody or control. Responses are due 10 days after service of the non-public version of these requests.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:

Admit that JEDEC's Manual of Organization and Procedure JEP 21-H was first published in 1988. [JDC 013328-47].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:

Admit that JEDEC's Manual of Organization and Procedure JEP 21-H contains no reference to the disclosure by JEDEC members of patents. [JDC 013328].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:

Admit that JEDEC's Manual of Organization and Procedure JEP 21-H contains no reference to the disclosure by JEDEC members of patent applications. [JDC 013328].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:

Admit that Rambus and Hewlett-Packard signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about January 1990. [R 196023; RF 0137623].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:

Admit that Rambus and Siemens signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about February 1990. [R 157965; I 252092].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:

Admit that Rambus and Mitsubishi signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about January 1990. [R 196023; RF 0138777].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:

Admit that Rambus and Micron Technology signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about March 1990. [R 202037].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:

Admit that Rambus and Toshiba signed a Semiconductor Technology License Agreement in or about April 1990. [R 26994; WGSR 006832; RF 0140403].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:

Admit that Rambus and Motorola signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about April 1990. [R 196023; RF 0138895].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:

Admit that Rambus and NEC entered into a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about April 1990. [PTX 117].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:

Admit that Rambus filed a patent application with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on April 18, 1990, and that that application was given the number 07/510,898. [R 12896].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

Admit that Rambus and Philips signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about

May 1990. [PTX 117; RF 0139328].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that Rambus and Intel signed a Technology License Agreement in or about July 1990. [R 107597].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:

Admit that Rambus and Hitachi signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about August 1990. [PTX 117; RF 0137666].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that Rambus and Sony signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about September 1990. [PTX 117].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that Rambus and Toshiba entered into a technology license in or about October 1990. [PTX 267].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:

Admit that Rambus and Texas Instruments entered into a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about October 1990. [RF 0140248; PTX 117].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that Rambus and Fujitsu entered into a Technology License Agreement in or about October 1990. [R 24137; WSGR 006896].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that Rambus and Hewlett-Packard signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about January 1991. [R 69918].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20:

Admit that Rambus and NEC signed a Semiconductor Technology License Agreement in or about July 1991. [R 108454].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 21:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:

Admit that Rambus' International Patent Application number WO 91/16680 became publicly available in or about October 1991. [MR 0054322; I 243728].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:

Admit that IBM obtained a copy of Rambus' publicly available International Patent Application on or prior to December 16, 1991. [R 205153].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 26:

Admit that IBM reviewed Rambus' International Patent Application in 1991 and 1992 to look for technical contents that could be of interest to IBM. [R 205153].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 27:

Admit that after reviewing Rambus's International Patent Application, IBM offered to pay Rambus \$10,000,000 to license the technology referenced therein.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 28:

Admit that JEDEC's 42.3 subcommittee met in Seattle, Washington on or about February 27, 1992. [JDC 001099].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 29:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 30:

Admit that Rambus and Samsung signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement in or about March 1992. [PTX 117].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 31:

Admit that an IBM employee informed a Siemens employee in or about April 1992 that Rambus had demanded \$10,000,000 from Samsung because of similarities between SDRAMs and the architecture of Rambus memory. [I 247961].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 32:

Admit that Siemens' JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee representative Willibald Meyer and Siemens' employee N. Wirth wrote on or about April 30, 1992 that "[t]he original idea of the SDRAM is based on the basic principles of a simple clock input (IBM toggle pin) and the complex Rambus structure." [I 252164].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 33:

Admit that Siemens' JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee representative Willibald Meyer and Siemens' employee N. Wirth wrote on or about April 30, 1992 that "NEC (Rambus licensee) was the first to suggest a leaner "public domain" version based on this: maintain a synchronous control, 2 banks, 4-fold internal data bus, 4 word register at the data output, and possibly LOW level interface (similar to GTL) from the RAMBUS while leaving off the proprietary RAMBUS control protocol." [I 252164].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 34:

Admit that Siemens' JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee representative Willibald Meyer and Siemens' employee N. Wirth wrote on or about April 30, 1992 that "it has become clear that a RAMBUS memory can easily be converted into a SDRAM (1 or 2 banks) or conventional DRAM." [I 252164].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 35:

Admit that on or about May 6, 1992, Siemens' JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee

representative Willibald Meyer prepared a chart comparing the “pros” and “cons” of synchronous DRAMs, cached DRAMs and Rambus DRAMs, and that one of the two “cons” listed with respect to synchronous DRAMs was that “2-bank sync may fall under Rambus patents.” [I 252065].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 36:

Admit that on or about May 6, 1992, the JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee met in New Orleans, Louisiana.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 37:

Admit that during the May 6, 1992 New Orleans meeting, IBM representative Gordon Kelley asked Richard Crisp if he would care to comment regarding possible Rambus patent claims with respect to 2 bank synchronous DRAM designs, and Mr. Crisp declined to comment. [R 200474].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 38:

Admit that if a JEDEC representative refused to respond to a request to state his or her company’s patent position with respect to technology being considered by JEDEC for standardization, the refusal to respond was a violation of the JEDEC patent policy.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 39:

Admit that the facts set forth in Request For Admission No. 38 were well known to JEDEC 42.3 representatives between 1992 and 1996.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 40:

Admit that at the May 1992 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting in New Orleans, issues regarding possible Rambus intellectual property claims to SDRAM devices were raised and not resolved. [JDC 001196; R 200474; I 211400].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 41:

Admit that at the May 1992 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting in New Orleans, NEC representative Howard Sussman stated that he had reviewed the publicly available copy of Rambus’ International Patent Application and that, in his opinion, many of

Rambus' claims were anticipated by prior art. [R 200474].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 42:

Admit that at the May 1992 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting, NEC's Howard Sussman stated that Motorola's patent with respect to synchronous DRAMs predated Rambus' patent application with respect to synchronous DRAMs. [I 211400; R 200474].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 43:

Admit that Siemens' JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee representative Willibald Meyer wrote a May 15, 1992 "Summary of JEDEC Meeting" that stated in part that "Siemens and Philips concerned about patent situation with regard to Rambus and Motorola. No comments given. Motorola patents have priority over Rambus'. Rambus patents filed but pending." [I 211400].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 44:

Admit that at the May 1992 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting in New Orleans, subcommittee chairman Jim Townsend presented viewgraphs that quoted in part, as follows, from EIA Publication EP-3-F, the Manual for Committee, Subcommittee, and Working Group Chairman and Secretaries:

"No program of standardization shall refer to a product on which there is a known patent (underline mine) unless all the technical information covered by the patent is known to the Formulating Committee."

[JDC 001202].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 45:

Admit that at the May 1992 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting in New Orleans, the ANSI patent policy implementation guide was shown to subcommittee members.

[JDC 001196].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 46:

Admit that at and after the May 1992 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting, the

“Patent Tracking List” prepared by the subcommittee chairman listed a Motorola “sync DRAM” patent. [various minutes].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 47:

Admit that on or about June 9, 1992, IBM’s JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee representative prepared a chart entitled “COMPARE ALTERNATIVES for Future High Performance, High Volume DRAM Designs,” that the chart listed “Pros” and “Cons” of Sync DRAMs, Rambus DRAMs, and Cached DRAMs, and that one of the two “cons” listed for Sync DRAMs was “Patent Problems? (Motorola/Rambus).” [I 252142].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 48:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 49:

Admit that in or about September 1992, Siemens’ JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee representative Willibald Meyer prepared a memo or chart that stated in part that Rambus was “[a] deadly menace to the established computer industry.” [I 247957].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 50:

Admit that on or about October 12, 1992, JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee chairman Jim Townsend circulated to various JEDEC representatives an article from the October 1992 issue of IEEE Spectrum magazine entitled “Don’t Lose Your Patent Rights,” which article stated in part as follows:

“KEEP IT UNDER YOUR HAT. In the United States, if an invention is publicly disclosed more than one year before a patent application is filed, one is not entitled to the patent—the invention is considered to be in the public domain.

* * *

Moreover, premature disclosure can severely jeopardize non-U.S. rights. While the inventor may enjoy a one-year grace period in the United States, many countries – including Belgium, Greece, Great Britain, Spain and Taiwan – require absolute novelty. Any disclosure before the filing of a patent application will bar rights to a patent.”

[I 189547].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 51:

Admit that prior to the adoption of the JEDEC SDRAM standard in 1993, Rambus had no claims in any pending patent application that, if issued, would have necessarily been infringed by the manufacture or use of any device manufactured in accordance with the JEDEC SDRAM standard.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 52:

Admit that between 1991 and 1996, Rambus’s outside counsel repeatedly advised Rambus that its patent applications were confidential and should not be disclosed.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 53:

Admit that on or about December 9, 1992, Motorola took the position that it would only agree to the JEDEC patent policy with respect to those JEDEC standards which were “voted for by Motorola for standardization.” [JDC 001660].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 54:

Admit that Motorola’s position as stated in request no. 53 was consistent with the JEDEC patent policy in effect at the time.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 55:

Admit that at the March 3, 1993 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting in Scottsdale, Arizona, an IBM representative stated that IBM’s “view has been to ignore patent disclosure rule because their attorneys have advised them that if they do then a listing may be construed as complete.” [JDC 001538].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 56:

Admit that IBM's position as stated in request no. 55 was consistent with the JEDEC patent policy in effect at the time.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 57:

Admit that at the May 19, 1993 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting in Chicago, the committee approved SDRAM standard 21-C after it learned of a Hitachi patent (no. 5,083,296) that in part "covers the basic specification for SDRAM." [JDC 001622].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 58:

Admit that IBM stated in or about August 1993 that it would not discuss, confirm, or deny its patent rights with respect to ball grid assays at JEDEC meetings and that it was instead the responsibility of DRAM manufacturers to evaluate those rights. [JDC 013782].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 59:

Admit that IBM's position as stated in request no. 58 was consistent with the JEDEC patent policy in effect at the time.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 60:

Admit that in September 1993, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued U.S. Patent No. 5,243,703 (hereinafter "the '703 Patent") to Rambus. [R 12644].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 61:

Admit that Complaint Counsel makes no claim in this matter that the '703 Patent is invalid.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 62:

Admit that the issuance of the '703 Patent was disclosed by Rambus at the September 23, 1993 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting in Boston, Massachusetts. [JDC 001684].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 63:

Admit that after its disclosure to JEDEC, Rambus's '703 Patent appeared on Mr.

Townsend's Patent Tracking List and was characterized as involving "sync clock." [JDC 001782].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 64:

Admit that after the disclosure of the '703 Patent to JEDEC, no EIA officer, representative or employee asked any questions of Rambus regarding the scope, application or validity of the '703 Patent.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 65:

Admit that after the disclosure of the '703 Patent to JEDEC, no JEDEC officer, representative or employee asked any questions of Rambus regarding the scope, application or validity of the '703 Patent.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 66:

Admit that EIA Secretary Ken McGhee sent a letter in March 1994 to Jim Townsend, the chair of JEDEC's 42.3 subcommittee, that stated in part that JEDEC's legal counsel "didn't think it was a good idea to require people at JEDEC standards meetings to sign a document assuring anything about their company's patent rights for the following reasons:

- 1) It would have a chilling effect at future meetings
- 2) A general assurance wouldn't be worth that much anyway
- 3) It needs to come from a VP or higher within the company – engineers can't sign such documents
- 4) It would need to be done at each meeting slowing down the business at hand."

[JDC 014052].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 67:

Admit that in or about March 1994, Siemens' representative to JEDEC's 42.3 subcommittee wrote a memo that stated in part that "[o]ne day all computers will (have to) be built like this, but hopefully without the royalties going to Rambus." [I 251805].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 68:

Admit that in or about August 1994, Siemens' JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee representative Willibald Meyer sent a memorandum entitled "IP Rights vs Memory Derivatives" that referenced Rambus's '703 Patent next to "SDRAM." [PTX883].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 69:

Admit that SDRAM modules were not widely deployed until late 1997. [McAfee Appendix, p. 107].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 70:

Admit that the DRAM industry's crossover from asynchronous DRAM to SDRAM did not occur until on or after mid-1998. [McAfee Appendix, p. 107].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 71:

Admit that in or about November 1994, Rambus and Samsung signed a Semiconductor Technology License Agreement. [R 160154].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 72:

Admit that the JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee met in or about May 24, 1995 in New Orleans. [JDC 002200].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 73:

Admit that at the May 24, 1995 New Orleans meeting, a SyncLink-related presentation was made to the 42.3 subcommittee, and that during the presentation, Committee Chairman Jim Townsend asked Rambus representative Richard Crisp whether any Rambus patents related to the SyncLink presentation. [JDC 002200; DTX 37].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 74:

Admit that on or about June 9, 1995, Rambus JEDEC representative Richard Crisp informed Hewlett-Packard JEDEC representative Hans Wiggers that "RamLink has numerous patent issues associated with it," and Mr. Wiggers forwarded Crisp's comment to, among others, Gordon Kelley of IBM and David James of Apple. [R 157055; R157053].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 75:

Admit that on or about June 13, 1995, Rambus employee Richard Crisp informed Hewlett-Packard employee Hans Wiggers that:

“[r]egarding patents, I have stated to several persons that my personal opinion is that the Ramlink/SyncLink proposals will have a number of problems with Rambus intellectual property. We were the first out there with high bandwidth, low pincount, DRAMs, our founders were busily at work on their original concept before the first Ramlink meeting was held, and their work was documented, dated and filed properly with the US patent office. Much of what was filed has not yet issued, and I cannot comment on specifics as these filings are confidential. I was asked at the last JEDEC meeting to report on our patent coverage relative to SyncLink as proposed at JEDEC at the next meeting in Crystal City in September. Our attorneys are currently working on this, so I think I will be in a position to make some sort of official statement at that time and plan to do so. In the meantime, I have nothing else to say to you or the rest of the committee about our patent position. If you want to search for issued patents held by Rambus, then you may learn something about what we clearly have covered and what we do not. But I must caution you that there is a lot of material that is currently pending and we will not make any comment at all about it until it issues.”

[R 157058].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 76:

Admit that the minutes of the August 21, 1995 meeting of the IEEE 1596.7 task group state in part as follows:

“Richard Crisp, of RamBus, informed us that in their opinion both RamLink and SyncLink may violate RamBus patents that date back as far as 1989. Others commented that the RamLink work was public early enough to avoid problems, and thus might invalidate such patents to the same extent that they appear to be violated. However, the resolution of these questions is not a feasible task for this committee, so it must continue with the technical work at hand.”

[HR905_081903].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 77:

Admit that at a September 11, 1995 JEDEC meeting in Crystal City, Virginia, Rambus provided the following prepared statement:

“At the last JEDEC meeting it was noted that the subject of the Synclink DRAM proposal bears a strong resemblance to Rambus DRAMs and so I was asked to make a comment about the Rambus intellectual property position as it may relate to the Synclink proposal.

The first Rambus patents were filed more than five years ago, with development starting years before. We have confirmed that the first Ramlink and Syclink committee meetings and draft proposals occurred years after Rambus began development.

Today there is no finalized Synclink specification or DRAMs to analyze for potential infringement. Best case, it will be

several years before they will exist. So to fully determine Synlink patent risk, this committee should look not just to Rambus but also internally.

For example, we are aware of 13 US patents relating to SDRAMs which were issued to member companies of this committee. All were active participants in the SDRAM standardization process. Included in this list are Hitachi, Mitsubishi, Mosaid, Motorola, Oki, Samsung, TI and Toshiba.

Additionally, Synlink is being sponsored by an organization with a less stringent patent policy than JEDEC. Under the bylaws of the IEEE working groups, attendees represent themselves only, not their employers. Furthermore they are free to patent whatever they desire, and are not bound to relinquish any of their rights to their patents by presenting their ideas for standardization.

Therefore, we conclude that products defined by committees are not guaranteed to be free of patent encumbrances.

At this time, Rambus elects to not make a specific comment on our intellectual property position relative to the Synlink proposal. Our presence or silence at committee meetings does not constitute an endorsement of any proposal under the committee's consideration nor does it make any statement regarding potential infringement of Rambus intellectual property.”

[JDC 002265].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 78:

Admit that the following individuals were present both at the August 21, 1995 IEEE 1596.7 task group meeting and the September 11, 1995 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting:

Solomon Alemayehu (Hitachi employee);

Sam Chen (Mitsubishi employee);

Adrian Cosoroaba (Fujitsu employee);

Farhad Tabrizi (Hyundai employee); and

Danny Yeung (Hitachi employee).

[HR905_081903].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 79:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 80:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 81:

Admit that on or about December 7, 1995, Rambus and Micron signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement. [MR 0084894].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 82:

Admit that Rambus attended its last JEDEC meeting when its representative

Richard Crisp attended the 42.3 subcommittee meeting in December 1995 in Dallas, Texas. [JDC 002308].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 83:

Admit that the minutes of the January 11, 1996 meeting of the SyncLink Consortium contain the following statement:

“Rambus has 16 patents already with more pending. Rambus says their patents may cover our SyncLink approach even though our method came out of early RamLink work. Micron is particularly concerned to avoid the Rambus patents, though all of us share this concern.”

[HR905_135808].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 84:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 85:

Admit that the minutes of the May 13, 1996 meeting of the SyncLink Consortium contain the following statement:

“We need a JEDEC-like clause (which is similar to ANSI clause, which is similar to IEEE clause, which is to be changed because of problems with today’s patent realities,

which requires ANSI clause to be changed for the same reason, so the situation is murky).”

[HR905_136287].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 86:

Admit that the ANSI Patent Policy did not in 1996 require the disclosure of patent applications.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 87:

Admit that the ANSI Patent Policy has never required the disclosure of patent applications.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 88:

Admit that the ANSI Patent Policy does not today require the disclosure of patent applications.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 89:

Admit that in January 1996, the EIA informed the FTC in writing that “allowing patented technology in standards is procompetitive.” [1/22/96 letter to FTC].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 90:

Admit that in January 1996, the EIA informed the FTC in writing that “[b]oth EIA and TIA encourage the early, voluntary disclosure of patents that relate to the standards in work.” [1/22/96 letter to FTC].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 91:

Admit that in January 1996, the EIA informed the FTC in writing that:

“The early disclosure policies of EIA and TIA have worked well to highlight possible patents and ensure that they will be available for licensing by the time the standard is published. Even if knowledge of a patent comes later in time due to the pending status of a patent while the standard was being

created, the important issue is the license availability to all parties on reasonable, non-discriminatory terms.”

[1/22/96 letter to FTC].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 92:

Admit that the EIA has refused to opine as to whether patent license terms and royalty rates are or are not “reasonable.”

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 93:

Admit that JEDEC has refused to opine as to whether patent license terms and royalty rates are or are not “reasonable.”

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 94:

Admit that in January 1996, the EIA informed the FTC that the “EIA, TIA, and ANSI IPR policies relate to essential patents.” [1/22/96 letter to FTC].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 95:

Admit that as of January 1996, Rambus held no issued U.S. patents that were essential to the manufacture or use of any device manufactured in compliance with any JEDEC standard.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 96:

Admit that in a videotaped presentation at a JEDEC Council meeting in May 1996, Jim Townsend stated that no JEDEC representative ever disclosed the nature of the claims contained in a patent application because such disclosure would corrupt his company’s ability to prosecute those claims. [McGhee videotape].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 97:

Admit that on or about June 17, 1996, Rambus sent a letter to EIA Secretary Ken McGhee that stated in part as follows:

“I am writing to inform you that Rambus Inc. is not renewing its membership in JEDEC.

Recently at JEDEC meetings the subject of Rambus patents has been raised. Rambus plans to continue to license its proprietary technology on terms that are consistent with the business plan of Rambus, and those terms may not be consistent with the terms set by standards bodies, including JEDEC. A number of major companies are already licensees of Rambus technology. We trust that you will understand that Rambus reserves all rights regarding its intellectual property. Rambus does, however, encourage companies to contact Dave Mooring of Rambus to discuss licensing terms and to sign up as licensees.

To the extent that anyone is interested in the patents of Rambus, I have enclosed a list of Rambus U.S. and foreign patents. Rambus has also applied for a number of additional patents in order to protect Rambus technology.”

[R 157080].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 98:

Admit that no JEDEC Manual prior to July 1996 contained any written requirement that a member must disclose to JEDEC an intention “to amend a patent application [where it] believe[s] that, by doing so, it possibly could succeed in covering some aspect or implementation of JEDEC’s standards or its standard-setting work.”

[Complaint Counsel’s Response and Objections to Respondent Rambus Inc.’s First Set of Interrogatories, at 58].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 99:

Admit that no JEDEC representative prior to July 1996 ever disclosed to JEDEC an intention “to amend a patent application [where it] believe[s] that, by doing so, it possibly could succeed in covering some aspect or implementation of JEDEC’s standards

or its standard-setting work.” [Complaint Counsel’s Response and Objections to Respondent Rambus Inc.’s First Set of Interrogatories, at 58].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 100:

Admit that JEDEC members other than Rambus in the period 1990-1996 held, but did not disclose to JEDEC, pending patent applications that related to or might have been involved in JEDEC’s work.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 101:

Admit that no JEDEC Manual prior to July 1996 contained any written description of the information that a member should provide when disclosing a patent or patent application to JEDEC pursuant to JEDEC’s patent policy.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 102:

Admit that a disclosure to JEDEC in the time period 1990-1996 of an intention to file or amend a patent application might have resulted in the disclosure of a JEDEC member’s trade secrets to its competitors and/or customers.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 103:

Admit that Complaint Counsel are not aware of any standards setting organization other than JEDEC that, prior to 1997, required any disclosure of an intention to file a patent application or to amend a patent application.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 104:

Admit that prior to July 1996, Rambus had no claims in any pending patent application that, if issued, would have necessarily been infringed by the manufacture or use of any device manufactured in accordance with any JEDEC standard.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 105:

Admit that on or about September 9, 1996, the SyncLink Consortium issued a press release that stated in part that SyncLink DRAMs, or “SLDRAMs,” would be “royalty-free.” [R128271].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 106:

Admit that news reports in the latter half of 1996 stated that SyncLink DRAMs, or “SLDRAMs,” would be available on a royalty-free basis following IEEE ratification, contradicting earlier reports suggesting that the SyncLink consortium was seeking to patent at least some of its design and would pursue licensing royalties from nonmembers. [McAfee Appendix, p. 37].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 107:

Admit that on or about September 17, 1996, a Texas Instruments patent counsel named Gary Honeycutt sent a letter to Farhad Tabrizi about the SyncLink Consortium’s September 9, 1996 press release, which letter stated that Tabrizi had confirmed that SLDRAMs would be royalty free only in the sense that copies of the specification could be obtained for free. [R128270].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 108:

Admit that the minutes of the October 1, 1996 meeting of the SyncLink Consortium stated in connection with SyncLink’s September 9, 1996 press release that:

“[w]e said this is a royalty free architecture. We didn’t mean individual companies would not be able to collect royalties for the use of their property, we just meant that users won’t have to pay royalties to the Consortium.”

[HR905_136650].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 109:

Admit that since it was founded, Rambus has been in the business of designing, but not manufacturing, high-bandwidth memory and memory interface technologies.

[McAfee Appendix, p. 17].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 110:

Admit that the facts set out in Request no. 109, above, were known to Rambus’s licensees in the early 1990’s.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 111:

Admit that the business history of Rambus is essentially a history of its efforts to secure license agreements with vendors for the development of its designs and to convince equipment manufacturers to incorporate such licensed Rambus designs in their products. [McAfee Appendix, p. 18].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 112:

Admit that on or about November 15, 1996, Intel and Rambus signed a License Agreement. [R 107530]

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 113:

Admit that the November 1996 announcement by Intel of its License Agreement with Rambus fed the perception of Rambus as the heir apparent for main memory and significantly heightened vendor fears regarding the selection of a proprietary design. [McAfee Appendix, p. 42].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 114:

Admit that by virtue of its considerable influence in the manufacture of processors and chipsets, Intel's selection of Rambus threatened unilaterally to establish the Rambus DRAM as a de facto industry standard. [McAfee Appendix, p. 44].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 115:

Admit that in late 1996, the threat of Rambus becoming a bottleneck for DRAM design and a tollbooth for the collection of royalties was a widespread concern for DRAM vendors of main memory. [McAfee Appendix, p. 45].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 116:

Admit that in late 1996, Intel's choices were basically as follows – (1) select Rambus and work with it to make needed modifications, (2) support JEDEC and the DRAM vendors in the development of DDR SDRAM, (3) join the SyncLink consortium and shape its path, or (4) develop its own new DRAM architecture. [McAfee Appendix, p. 53].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 117:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 118:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 119:

Admit that the minutes of the December 3, 1996 SyncLink Consortium meeting state in part that:

“Many suppliers are paranoid over the prospect of a single customer, e.g. Intel having control of market. We can’t resist such a possibility individually. We need some united strategy.”

[HR905_130814].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 120:

Admit that the minutes of the December 3, 1996 SyncLink Consortium contained the address of a “reflector” that could be used by DRAM manufacturers to communicate

among themselves. [HR905_130814].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 121:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 122:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 123:

Admit that at the January 10, 1997 Tokyo meeting of DRAM manufacturers, a Siemens executive stated that Rambus was “not acceptable.” [HR905_136982].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 124:

Admit that one of the attendees at the January 10, 1997 Tokyo meeting of DRAM manufacturers said that “[d]epending on Intel for business is worse than getting on drugs – it’s like someone is sleeping with your wife, and they want you to pay the hotel bill!” [HR905_136982].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 125:

Admit that the minutes of the February 11, 1997 meeting of SLDRAM Inc. (formerly the SyncLink Consortium) stated in part that “Intel won’t change course unless Rambus fails.” [HR905_137061].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 126:

Admit that prior to July 1996, there was no proposed standard balloted for approval by a JEDEC committee subcommittee that included an on-chip PLL.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 127:

Admit that prior to July 1996, there was no proposed standard balloted for

approval by a JEDEC committee subcommittee that included an on-chip DLL.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 128:

Admit that prior to July 1996, there was no proposed standard balloted for approval by a JEDEC committee subcommittee that included a dual-edged clocking scheme.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 129:

Admit that in or about March 1997, Rambus and Micron signed a Semiconductor Technology Licensing Agreement. [R 25780]

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 130:

Admit that the minutes of the March 13, 1997 JEDEC 42.3 subcommittee meeting stated, in connection with a presentation regarding dual data rate (“DDR”) technology, that “[s]ome on the committee felt that Rambus had a patent on that type of clock design. Others felt that the concept predated Rambus by decades Rambus has also told JEDEC that they do not intend to comply with JEDEC patent policies.” [JDC 002565].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 131:

Admit that Micron has listed on its privilege log a March 25, 1997 e-mail from Micron employee Jeff Mailloux to Micron in-house counsel David Westergard containing a “confidential communication regarding SGRAM DDR and Rambus.” [Micron Privilege Log, hereinafter “MPL,” at 1007].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 132:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 133:

Admit that Micron has listed on its privilege log a March 26, 1997 e-mail from M. Munn, Esq. to two of Micron’s JEDEC representatives that contains a “confidential communication regarding Rambus patents.” [MPL 184].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 134:

Admit that Micron has listed on its privilege log an April 11, 1997 e-mail from Kevin Ryan to Terry Lee and a Micron in-house lawyer that contains a “confidential communication regarding Rambus patents.” [MPL 191].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 135:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 136:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 137:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 138:

Admit that Micron has listed on its privilege log an e-mail dated May 28, 1997 from Micron employee D. Cathey to Micron in-house counsel David Westergard containing a “[c]onfidential communication regarding persons knowledgeable about Rambus patents.” [MPL 1044].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 139:

Admit that Micron has listed on its privilege log an e-mail dated July 11, 1997 from Micron employee Jeff Mailloux to Micron in-house counsel David Westergard and others containing a “[c]onfidential communication regarding Rambus development and SyncLink.” [MPL 1056].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 140:

Admit that in 1997, there was as yet no clear industry consensus on the next generation DRAM architecture. [McAfee Appendix, p. 117].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 141:

Admit that over the 1997-1998 time period, despite Intel’s stated choice of Rambus for next-generation PC main memory, industry development of DDR SDRAM and SLDRAM generally kept pace with that of DRDRAM. [McAfee Appendix, p. 65].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 142:

Admit that in March 1998, SLDRAM received JEDEC approval for its packaging pinout specifications. [McAfee Appendix, p. 68].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 143:

Admit that in 1997 and 1998, supplier resistance to the royalty fees and bottleneck of design control promised in a Rambus-mandated memory market manifested itself as an energized effort in the industry to establish open standards and develop alternative technologies. [McAfee Appendix, p. 49].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 144:

Admit that DRAM manufacturers had a large and increasing resistance to the

payment of intellectual property royalties on their manufactured products over the 1990s. [McAfee Appendix, p. 182].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 145:

Admit that DRAM manufacturers hold dozens of issued patents relating to the manufacture or use of JEDEC-compliant SDRAM devices.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 146:

Admit that DRAM manufacturers hold dozens of issued patents relating to the manufacture or use of JEDEC-compliant DDR SDRAM devices.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 147:

Admit that DRAM manufacturers have little concern regarding the intellectual property described in request nos. 145 and 146 because of patent pools and cross-licenses between and among the DRAM manufacturers.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 148:

Admit that an industry analyst named Bert McComas gave a seminar on April 13, 1998 regarding “Rambus Strategies For DRAM Manufacturers.” [HR 905_127819; Inquest 843].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 149:

Admit that one of the strategies described by Bert McComas at his April 13, 1998 seminar was to “tape out but do not fully productize or cost reduce DRDRAM.” [Inquest 843].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 150:

Admit that after Mr. McComas gave his Rambus strategy seminar on April 13, 1998, he was invited by SLDRAM, Inc. to speak to SLDRAM, Inc. company executives at a meeting in Monterey, California on or about June 25, 1998. [Tabrizi, p. 175, 178; HR 905_114285].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 151:

Admit that executives from Korean and Japanese DRAM manufacturers were

present for Mr. McComas's June 25, 1998 presentation to SLDRAM, Inc. company executives. [Tabrizi, p. 178].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 152:

Admit that at the June 25, 1998 presentation, Mr. McComas stated that he wanted to receive DRAM manufacturers' DRDRAM production estimates in order to create and then send to DRAM manufacturers a combined DRDRAM forecast. [Tabrizi, p. 179].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 153:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 154:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 155:

Admit that after SLDRAM, Inc. became AMI, AMI attempted to provide the same service to its member companies that is referenced in Request No. 154 above. [Tabrizi, p. 180]

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 156:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 157:

REDACTED.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 158:

Admit that it was well known to DRAM manufacturers in 1998 and 1999 that Intel would be unsuccessful in ramping up RDRAM sales unless the cost of RDRAM came very close to that of SDRAM. [Tabrizi, pp. 172-3].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 159:

Admit that in 1998 and 1999, Rambus's development of RDRAM memories capable of achieving bandwidth of 1.6 GBps and better was just one condition for Intel's selection of the Rambus technology for PC main memory, and that Intel also required that commercial quantities of RDRAM and RDRAM-compatible system elements be widely available by its targeted introduction dates, which meant that much of Rambus's fate lay in the hands of the manufacturers responsible for successfully implementing cost-effective fabrication of the products in sufficient volumes to meet demand. [McAfee Appendix, p. 88].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 160:

Admit that by late 1998, the trade press was reporting that the price premium associated with DRDRAM relative to other memory architectures would keep OEMs from including DRDRAMs in all but the most performance-driven PCs. [McAfee Appendix, p. 100].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 161:

Admit that RDRAM production difficulties were less of a concern to DRAM manufacturers in 1998 and 1999 than the royalties associated with the use of RDRAM. [McAfee Appendix, p. 108].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 162:

Admit that in 1998, Intel became increasingly worried that RDRAM and its

system elements would not be available in commercial quantities from multiple sources by Intel's target dates. [McAfee Appendix, p. 111].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 163:

Admit that in 1998, there was as yet no clear industry consensus on next-generation DRAM architecture. [McAfee Appendix, p. 117].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 164:

Admit that in the spring of 1999, trade press reports stated that DRAM manufacturers were applying financial and staffing resources "that could have been spent on bringing the cost of Rambus memory down" to the development of other memory technologies. [McAfee Appendix, pp. 133-4].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 165:

Admit that in the spring of 1999, a trade press report stated that "[c]hip companies, from NEC to Toshiba, said they will refrain from building a large amount of Direct RDRAM production capacity to avoid a possible market glut later this year." [McAfee Appendix, p. 144].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 166:

Admit that in the summer of 1999, a Micron marketing manager told the press that he did not "realistically see how we can sell [RDRAM chips] for less than 50 percent premium any time soon." [McAfee Appendix, pp. 130-1].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 167:

Admit that trade press reports in September 1999 stated that prices for Rambus memory were typically around double that of SDRAM prices. [McAfee Appendix, p. 133].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 168:

Admit that in 1998 and 1999, the price premium for RDRAM compared to SDRAM threatened the commercial viability of the Rambus architecture. [McAfee Appendix, p. 134].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 169:

Admit that in 1999 and 2000, a volume supply of DRDRAM was a necessary condition to drive down the price premium associated with the Rambus technology. [McAfee Appendix, p. 135].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 170:

Admit that in 1999 and 2000, the failure of DRAM manufacturers to ramp up DRDRAM capacity had the potential to devastate Rambus commercially. [McAfee Appendix, p. 145].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 171:

Admit that in 1999 and 2000, the failure of DRAM manufacturers to ramp up DRDRAM capacity was in part the result of concerted action among at least some of the DRAM manufacturers.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 172:

Admit that in the fall of 1999 and thereafter, Micron and other DRAM manufacturers were predicting that any price premium of DDR SDRAM over SDRAM would be 5% or less. [McAfee Appendix, p. 155].

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 173:

Admit that in order to reduce the premium of DDR SDRAM over SDRAM in the fall and winter of 2000, Micron and other DRAM manufacturers engaged in concerted action that was intended to, and did, raise SDRAM prices.

DATED: January 6, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory P. Stone
Steven M. Perry
Sean P. Gates
Peter A. Detre
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
355 South Grand Avenue, 35th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
(213) 683-9100

A. Douglas Melamed
Jay Palansky
Kenneth A. Bamberger
WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING
2445 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 663-6000

Sean C. Cunningham
John M. Guaragna
Gray, Cary, Ware & Freidenrich LLP
401 "B" Street, Suite 2000
San Diego, California 92101
(619) 699-2700

PROOF OF SERVICE BY FEDERAL EXPRESS

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 355 South Grand Avenue, 35th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071.

On January 6, 2003, I served the foregoing document described as: **RESPONDENT RAMBUS INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS TO THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION** on the parties in this action by Federal Express overnight courier service. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for delivery to an employee of Federal Express. Under that practice it would be delivered to an employee of Federal Express on that same day at Los Angeles, California with charges to be billed to Munger, Tolles & Olson's account for delivery to the office of the addressee on January 7, 2003 in the ordinary course of business.

M. Sean Royall, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room H-372
Washington, D.C. 20580

Hon. James P. Timony
Administrative Law Judge
Federal Trade Commission
Room H-112
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20580

Geoffrey Oliver, Esq.
Malcolm L. Catt, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
601 New Jersey Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20001

Richard B. Dagen, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
601 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room 6223
Washington, D.C. 20580

Executed on January 6, 2003, at Los Angeles, California.

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Eunice Ikemoto