

1 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
 2 KENT M. ROGER, State Bar No, 95987  
 3 HERMAN J. HOYING, State Bar No. 257495  
 4 JENNIFER L. CALVERT, State Bar No. 258018  
 5 One Market, Spear Street Tower  
 6 San Francisco, CA 94105-1126  
 7 Tel: 415.442.1000  
 8 Fax: 415.442.1001  
 9 kroger@morganlewis.com  
 10 hhoying@morganlewis.com  
 11 jennifer.calvert@morganlewis.com

12 Attorneys for Defendants  
 13 HITACHI, LTD., HITACHI DISPLAYS, LTD.,  
 14 HITACHI ELECTRONIC DEVICES (USA), INC.

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 17 (SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION)

18 STATE OF OREGON, *ex rel.* John Kroger,  
 19 Attorney General,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, *et al.*,

23 Defendants.

This Document Relates to Individual Case No.  
 3:10-cv-4346 SI

Master File No. 3:07-md-1827

MDL No. 1827

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER  
 REGARDING TIME TO RESPOND TO  
 AMENDED COMPLAINT**

1           WHEREAS plaintiff State of Oregon (“Oregon”) filed the above captioned lawsuit on  
2 August 10, 2010;

3           WHEREAS Oregon filed a first amended complaint on April 15, 2011 (“Amended  
4 Complaint”);

5           WHEREAS Defendants Hitachi Displays, Ltd., Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.  
6 and Hitachi, Ltd. (collectively, the “Hitachi Defendants”) and Defendants Chi Mei Corporation,  
7 Chi Mei Innolux Corporation, CMO Japan Co., Ltd., and Chi Mei Optoelectronic USA, Inc.  
8 (collectively, the “Chi Mei Defendants”) jointly filed with other defendants a motion to dismiss  
9 Count III in its entirety and Count IV to the extent it seeks “disgorgement of profits” as a remedy  
10 on June 6, 2011;

11           WHEREAS the Court denied Defendants’ joint motion to dismiss Counts III and IV of the  
12 Amended Complaint on July 12, 2011;

13           WHEREAS all defendants, including the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants,  
14 entered into a stipulation with Oregon on July 21, 2011 that Defendants’ deadline to answer the  
15 Amended Complaint was August 12, 2011;

16           WHEREAS on July 21, 2011, the Court entered an order extending Defendants’ deadline  
17 to answer the Amended Complaint until August 12, 2011;

18           WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation  
19 with Oregon on August 11, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants’ and Chi Mei Defendants’ deadline  
20 to answer the Amended Complaint is September 12, 2011;

21           WHEREAS on August 24, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi  
22 Defendants’ and Chi Mei Defendants’ deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until  
23 September 12, 2011;

24           WHEREAS on August 24, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi  
25 Defendants’ and Chi Mei Defendants’ deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until  
26 September 12, 2011;

1           WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation  
2 with Oregon on September 9, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants'  
3 deadline to answer the Amended Complaint is September 26, 2011;

4           WHEREAS on September 13, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi  
5 Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until  
6 September 26, 2011;

7           WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation  
8 with Oregon on September 23, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants'  
9 deadline to answer the Amended Complaint is November 4, 2011;

10           WHEREAS on September 28, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi  
11 Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until  
12 November 4, 2011;

13           WHEREAS the Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants entered into a stipulation  
14 with Oregon on November 3, 2011 that the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants'  
15 deadline to answer the Amended Complaint is December 9, 2011;

16           WHEREAS on November 4, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Hitachi  
17 Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' deadline to answer the Amended Complaint until  
18 December 9, 2011;

19           WHEREAS extending the Hitachi Defendants' and Chi Mei Defendants' time to respond  
20 to the Amended Complaint will not alter the date of any other event or deadline already fixed by  
21 the Court;

22           NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and among the  
23 undersigned counsel, on behalf of their respective clients, Oregon, on the one hand, and the  
24 Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants on the other hand, as follows:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Hitachi Defendants and Chi Mei Defendants will have until January 13, 2012 to answer Oregon's Amended Complaint.

Dated: December 6, 2011

HAGLUND KELLEY HORNGREN JONES & WILDER  
LLP

/s/ Michael K. Kelley  
Michael E. Haglund (SBN 772030)  
Michael K. Kelley (SBN 853782)  
Shay S. Scott (SBN 934214)  
HAGLUND KELLEY HORNGREN JONES & WILDER  
LLP  
200 SW Market Street, Suite 1777  
Portland, OR 97201  
Tel: (503) 225-0777  
Fax: (503) 225-1257  
mhaglund@hk-law.com

*Counsel for State of Oregon*

OREGON SENIOR ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Tim D. Nord (SBN 882800)  
1162 Court Street, NW  
Salem, OR 97301-4096  
Tel: (503) 947-4333  
Fax: (503) 225-1257  
tim.d.nord@state.or.us

*Counsel for State of Oregon*

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

/s/ Kent M. Roger  
Kent M. Roger (SBN 95987)  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: (415) 442-1000  
Fax: (415) 442-1001  
kroger@morganlewis.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd., and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP

/s/ Harrison J. Frahn IV

---

Harrison J. Frahn IV (SBN 206822)  
SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP  
2550 Hanover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
Tel: (650) 251-5000  
Fax: (650) 251-5002  
*hfracn@stblaw.com*

*Attorneys for Defendants Chi Mei Corporation,  
Chimei Innolux Corporation, Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA,  
Inc., and CMO Japan Co., Ltd.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**FILER’S ATTESTATION**

I, Kent M. Roger, am the ECF user whose identification and password are being used to file this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order. In compliance with General Order 45.X.B, I hereby attest that Michael M. Kelley and Harrison J. Frahn IV concur in this filing.

/s/ Kent M. Roger  
Kent M. Roger

*Attorneys for Defendants Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd., and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation set forth above and pursuant to Rule 6-1(a) of the Civil  
Local Rules, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 12, 2011

By   
HON. SUSAN ILLSTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE