

EXHIBIT 3

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2007 WL 3034372 (N.D.Cal.)
(Cite as: 2007 WL 3034372 (N.D.Cal.))

H

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,
N.D. California.
State of CALIFORNIA, et al., Plaintiffs,
v.
INFINEON TECHNOLOGIES AG, et al., Defendants.

No. C 06-4333 PJH.
Oct. 16, 2007.

Charles M. Kagay, Spiegel Liao & Kagay, LLP, Kathleen E. Foote, Emilio Eugene Varanini, IV, Sangeetha M. Raghunathan, Office of the Attorney General, San Francisco, CA. Clyde E. Sniffen, Jr State of Alaska, Department of Law, Anchorage, AK, Nancy M. Bonnell Phoenix, AZ, Bradford Justus Phelps, Office of the Attorney General of Arkansas, Little Rock, AR, Michael Andrew Undorf, Delaware Department of Justice, Wilmington, DE, Emilian Bucataru, Lizabeth A. Leeds, Patricia A. Conners, Antitrust Division Office of the Attorney General State of Florida, Tallahassee, FL, Rodney I. Kimura, Department of the Attorney General, Honolulu, HI, Brett Talmage Delange, Office of the Attorney General, Boise, ID, Blake Lee Harrop, Office of the Attorney General, Antitrust Bureau, Chicago, IL, Jane Bishop Johnson, Louisiana Department of Justice, Baton Rouge, LA, John Robert Tennis, Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Baltimore, MD, D.J. Pascoe, Michigan Department of Attorney General, Lansing, MI, Kristen Marie Olsen, Office of the Attorney General, St. Paul, MN, Bridgette W. Wiggins, Sondra S. McLemore, Mississippi Attorney General's Office, Antitrust, Jackson, MS, Deyonna D. Young, Albuquerque, NM, Todd A. Sattler, North Dakota Office of Attorney General, Bismarck, ND, Thomas A. Bates, Oklahoma Attorney General's Office, Oklahoma City, OK, Tim David Nord, Oregon Department of Justice, Financial Fraud/Consumer Protection, Salem, OR, Alexis Leslie Barbieri, James A. Do-

nahue, III, Jennifer Jane Kirk, Office of the Attorney General, Pennsylvania Antitrust Section, Harrisburg, PA, C. Havird Jones, Jr., South Carolina Attorney General's Office, Columbia, SC, Victor J. Domen, Jr., Nashville, TN, Ronald J. Ockey, Office of the Attorney General of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, Sarah Oxenham Allen, Office of the Atty. General, Antitrust & Consumer, Richmond, VA, Brady R. Johnson, Attorney General of Washington, Seattle, WA, Douglas Lee Davis, Attorney General, Consumer Protection and Antitrust, Charleston, WV, Eric J. Wilson, Wisconsin Department of Justice, Gwendolyn J. Cooley, Wisconsin Attorney General, Madison, WI, Christina Moylan, Maine Office of the Attorney General, Augusta, ME, Edmund F. Murray, Jr., Rhode Island Department of Attorney General, Providence, RI, K.D. Sturgis, Western Division, Raleigh, NC, Maryellen Buxton Myneer, Kentucky Attorney General, Consumer Protection, Frankfort, KY, for Plaintiffs.

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands by its Attorney General Matthew T. Gregory, pro se.

Joshua Stewart Stambaugh, Kaye Scholer LLP, Peter Bruce Nemerovski, Steven H. Bergman, Kenneth Ryan O'Rourke, O'Melveny & Myers LLP, Los Angeles, CA, Joel Steven Sanders, George Charles Nierlich, III, Joshua David Hess, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, Emilio Eugene Varanini, IV, State Attorney General's Office David C. Brownstein, Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP, Jonathan Edward Swartz, Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP, San Francisco, CA, Harrison J. Frahn, IV, Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, Palo Alto, CA, for Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON, United States District Judge.

*1 Before the court is plaintiffs' motion for cla-

Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2007 WL 3034372 (N.D.Cal.)
(Cite as: 2007 WL 3034372 (N.D.Cal.))

rification with respect to the court's August 31, 2007 order granting in part and denying in part defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiffs' complaint. Plaintiffs' motion, which is unopposed, seeks clarification that plaintiff State Maryland has authority under Maryland's Antitrust Act ("MATA") to seek monetary damages for the indirect purchases of the state and its political subdivisions, and that the court was not actually dismissing the claims for damages brought on behalf of the state and its political subdivisions. For the reasons that follow, plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED.

First, clarification is warranted with respect to those indirect purchaser claims seeking money damages on behalf of the State. Plaintiffs have properly noted that the court's order could potentially create confusion as to the actual claims being dismissed, since the order (1) begins discussion of plaintiffs' MATA claims by noting that defendants specifically do not target claims on behalf of the state; but then (2) generally concludes that "plaintiffs' indirect purchaser claims pursuant to MATA" are dismissed, without distinction as to claims brought on behalf of the state, and other indirect purchasers' claims. See August 31, 2007 Order at 32:26-27, 34:7-8. In view of this, plaintiffs are entitled to clarification that the court's August 31, 2007 order was intended to exempt from dismissal all indirect purchaser claims brought on behalf of the state pursuant to MATA, in view of the fact that (1) defendants did not seek to dismiss such claims; and (2) MATA expressly grants the State Attorney General the ability to bring such claims, per the exception stated in [Md. Com. Law Code Ann. § 11-209\(b\)\(2\)\(ii\)](#).

Second, clarification is also warranted with respect to indirect purchaser claims seeking money damages brought on behalf of political subdivisions. Plaintiffs argue that defendants never actually moved to dismiss the State Attorney General's indirect purchaser claims on behalf of political subdivisions or "governmental purchasers." Plaintiffs furthermore argue that the exception contained in

[Md. Com. Law Code § 11-209\(b\)\(2\)\(ii\)](#)-which defendants relied on when they expressly declined to seek dismissal of plaintiffs' claims on behalf of the state-also applies to claims on behalf of "political subdivisions."

The court's order did not directly address whether indirect purchaser claims brought on behalf of political subdivisions can qualify under the limited exception for indirect purchaser standing codified at [section 11-209\(b\)\(2\)\(ii\)](#) of MATA. This is because, upon review of the parties' original arguments, the matter was not sufficiently highlighted by the parties. Indeed, defendants' motion was unclear as to whether defendants even sought to dismiss indirect purchaser claims brought on behalf of political subdivisions or government entities in the first place. Regardless, upon review of plaintiffs' arguments here, in conjunction with the language of the statute and defendants' non-opposition to this motion, the court agrees with plaintiffs that the indirect purchaser claims "on behalf of political subdivisions" are permissible, as an exception to MATA's general prohibition on indirect purchaser suits (as recognized in [Davidson v. Microsoft Corp.](#), 143 Md.App. 43, 792 A.2d 336, 344 (Md.Ct.Spec.App.2002)). The exception is codified at [section 11-209\(b\)\(2\)\(ii\)](#).

*2 In sum, therefore, the court hereby GRANTS plaintiffs' motion for clarification, and holds that the court's August 31, 2007 order does not contemplate dismissal of plaintiffs' indirect purchaser claims under MATA, brought on behalf of either the State or its government entities pursuant to [Md. Com. Law Code § 11-209\(b\)\(2\)\(ii\)](#).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

N.D.Cal.,2007.
California v. Infineon Technologies AG
Not Reported in F.Supp.2d, 2007 WL 3034372
(N.D.Cal.)

END OF DOCUMENT