

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

---

IN RE )  
INTEL CORPORATION )  
MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST )  
LITIGATION )

---

MDL No. 1717-JJF

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., a )  
Delaware corporation, and AMD )  
INTERNATIONAL SALES & SERVICES, LTD., )  
a Delaware corporation, )

Plaintiffs, )

v. )

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, )  
and INTEL KABUSHIKI KAISHA, a Japanese )  
corporation, )

Defendants. )

C.A. No. 05-441-JJF

---

PHIL PAUL, on behalf of himself )  
and all others similarly situated, )

Plaintiffs, )

v. )

INTEL CORPORATION, )

Defendants. )

C.A. No. 05-485-JJF

CONSOLIDATED ACTION

**AMD'S RESPONSE TO MOTION (1) TO INTERVENE FOR PURPOSE OF  
UNSEALING JUDICIAL RECORDS AND (2) FOR PARTIAL REASSIGNMENT**

On August 21, 2008, the New York Times Company, Situation Publishing Ltd., Dow Jones & Co., Inc., the Washington Post, the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, and

Computer & Communications Industry Association (“Movants”) filed a Motion (1) to Intervene for the Purpose of Unsealing Judicial Records and for (2) Partial Reassignment (D.I. No. 840) (“Motion to Intervene”). Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. and AMD International Sales & Service, Ltd. (collectively “AMD”) do not oppose the Movant’s motion to unseal the Parties’ Preliminary Cases Statements (D.I. Nos. 625, 627, 628, 629, 634, 635, 645, 646, 648) and transcripts of teleconferences and hearings currently under seal (D.I. Nos. 633, 647,683). Moreover, the transcript of the hearing held on June 5, 2008 (D.I. No. 683) should not have been designated as sealed (and inexplicably is designated “For Intel’s Eyes Only”) because it was not conducted on that basis. Indeed, Intel has quoted portions of that transcript in two public filings thereafter. Intel and AMD agree on this point and agree that the transcript should be unsealed.

The public’s right of access to these judicial records cannot be denied absent compelling justification and showing of clearly defined and serious harm. *See, e.g., In re Cendant Corp.*, 260 F.3d 183, 192-94 (3d Cir. 2001) (noting that the right of public access is particularly compelling where members of the public are also plaintiffs in the class action).<sup>1</sup> As a party, AMD, believes there is no compelling justification or showing of clearly defined and serious harm here that warrants denying the public access to the those documents. Thus, the materials filed under seal in this case (D.I. Nos. 625, 627, 628, 629, 633,634, 635, 645, 646, 647,648, 683) should be unsealed. That said, should the Court determine that any documents should remain

---

<sup>1</sup> *See* Motion to Intervene at 4 (“a party seeking to maintain under seal documents filed with a court has the burden of demonstrating (i) that there is a compelling interest warranting sealing, (ii) that sealing will result in a clearly defined and serious injury, and (iii) the private interest in secrecy outweighs the strong presumption of public access.”) (citing *In re Cendant Corp.*, 260 F.3d at 193-94; *Littlejohn v. BIC Corp.*, 851 F.2d 673, 678 (3d Cir. 1988); *Miller v. Indiana Hosp.*, 16 F.3d 549, 551 (3d Cir. 1994); *Publicker Indus., Inc. v. Cohen*, 733 F.2d 1059, 1066-71 (3d Cir. 1984)). No such showing has been made here.

under seal, AMD asks that its material be accorded the same treatment as that of Intel and the third parties.

OF COUNSEL:

Charles P. Diamond  
Linda J. Smith  
Mark A. Samuels  
O'Melveny & Myers LLP  
400 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

Dated: September 5, 2008

/s/ Frederick L. Cottrell, III

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)  
Chad M. Shandler (#3796)  
Steven J. Fineman (#4025)  
Richards, Layton & Finger  
One Rodney Square  
920 North King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
(302) 651-7836  
cottrell@rlf.com  
shandler@rlf.com  
fineman@rlf.com

*Attorneys for Advance Micro Devices, Inc. and  
AMD International Sales & Service, Ltd.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on September 5, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF and have sent by Hand Delivery to the following:

**BY HAND DELIVERY**

Richard L. Horwitz, Esquire  
Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP  
1313 North Market Street  
P. O. Box 951  
Wilmington, DE 19899

**BY HAND DELIVERY**

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

I hereby certify that on September 5, 2008, I have sent by Electronic Mail the foregoing document to the following non-registered participants:

Darren B. Bernhard, Esquire  
Howrey LLP  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004-2402

Robert E. Cooper, Esquire  
Daniel S. Floyd, Esquire  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90071-3197

Daniel A. Small, Esquire  
Cohen Milstein, Hausfeld & Toll, L.L.C.  
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 500 - West Tower  
Washington, DC 20005

I further certify that on September 5, 2008, I have sent by Hand Delivery the foregoing document to the following non-registered participant:

David L. Finger, Esquire  
Finger & Slanina, LLC  
One Commerce Center, Suite 725  
1201 North Orange Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

/s/ Frederick L. Cottrell, III  
Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)