

1 GREGORY P. STONE (State Bar No. 078329)  
2 KELLY M. KLAUS (State Bar No. 161091)  
3 ANDREA W. JEFFRIES (State Bar No. 183408)  
4 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
5 355 South Grand Avenue  
6 Thirty-Fifth Floor  
7 Los Angeles, California 90071-1560  
8 Telephone: (213) 683-9100  
9 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

6 PETER A. DETRE (State Bar No. 182619)  
7 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
8 33 New Montgomery Street  
9 Nineteenth Floor  
10 San Francisco, California 94105-9781  
11 Telephone: (415) 512-4000  
12 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077

10 Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant  
11 Rambus Inc.

**ORIGINAL FILED**

MAR 0 1 2004  
Richard W. Wiering  
Clerk, U.S. District Court  
Northern District of California  
San Jose

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14 HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC.;  
15 HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA  
16 INC.; HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR U.K.  
17 LTD.; and HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR  
18 DEUTSCHLAND GMBH,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 RAMBUS INC.,

20 Defendant.

21  
22 RAMBUS INC.,

23 Counterclaimant

24 v.

25 HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC.;  
26 HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA  
27 INC.; HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR U.K.  
28 LTD.; and HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR  
DEUTSCHLAND GMBH,

Counterclaim-Defendants

CASE NO. CV-00-20905 RMW

**NOTICE OF DECISION OF THE  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION IN IN  
THE MATTER OF RAMBUS INC.**

1                   Rambus Inc. (“Rambus”) submits this Notice to advise the Court that on February  
2 23, 2004, the United States Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Administrative Law Judges,  
3 issued its decision in *In the Matter of Rambus Inc.* A copy of the opinion of the Chief  
4 Administrative Law Judge is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

5                   In short, Chief Administrative Law Judge Stephen J. McGuire found that “A  
6 review of the three violations alleged in the Complaint shows that although Respondent is in  
7 possession of monopoly power in the relevant markets, Complaint Counsel have failed to  
8 demonstrate that Respondent engaged in a pattern of exclusionary, anticompetitive conduct which  
9 subverted an open standards process, or that Respondent utilized such conduct to capture an  
10 unlawful monopoly in the technology-related markets. Analyzing the challenged conduct under  
11 established principles of economics and antitrust law and utilizing the preponderance of evidence  
12 standard, Complaint Counsel have not proven the elements necessary to support a finding of  
13 liability.” Exh. A at 329. Because Complaint Counsel failed to sustain its burden of establishing  
14 liability, the Complaint against Rambus was dismissed. *Id.* at 334.

15  
16 DATED: March 1, 2004

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

17  
18 By:   
19 Peter A. Detre

20 Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant  
21 Rambus Inc.