

1 Harrison J. Frahn IV (SBN 206822)  
 hfrahn@stblaw.com  
 2 SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP  
 2550 Hanover Street  
 3 Palo Alto, CA 94304  
 4 Telephone: (650) 251-5000  
 Facsimile: (650) 251-5002  
 5

6 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
*Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation,*  
 7 *Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc., and*  
*CMO Japan Co., Ltd.*  
 8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
 12

13  
 14 IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL)  
 ANTITRUST LITIGATION  
 15

CASE NO. 3:11-cv-00711-SI

MDL NO. 3:07-md-1827-SI

16 This Document Relates to Individual  
 Case No. 3:11-cv-00711-SI  
 17

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

18 THE STATE OF NEW YORK,  
 19 Plaintiff,  
 20 vs.  
 21 AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, *et al.*,  
 22 Defendants.  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 The undersigned counsel, on behalf of their respective clients, hereby respectfully request  
2 an extension of the deadline for Defendants Chimei Innolux Corporation (f/k/a Chi Mei  
3 Optoelectronics Corporation), Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc., and CMO Japan Co., Ltd.  
4 (collectively, the “Chi Mei Defendants”), and Defendants Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd., and  
5 Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc. (collectively, the “Hitachi Defendants”), to respond to the  
6 amended complaint filed by Plaintiff State of New York on March 15, 2011, in the above-captioned  
7 litigation (the “Amended Complaint”).

8 WHEREAS the Chi Mei Defendants and Hitachi Defendants, jointly with other Defendants  
9 in this action, filed a motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint on May 5, 2011;

10 WHEREAS the Court entered an order granting in part and denying in part Defendants’  
11 joint motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint on August 9, 2011 (the “August 9, 2011 Order”);

12 WHEREAS on August 25, 2011, the Court entered an order extending Defendants’ deadline  
13 to answer the Amended Complaint to September 14, 2011;

14 WHEREAS on September 14, 2011, the Court entered an order extending Defendants’  
15 deadline to answer the Amended Complaint to October 25, 2011;

16 WHEREAS on October 21, 2011, Plaintiff, the Chi Mei Defendants, and the Hitachi  
17 Defendants filed a joint stipulation to extend the Chi Mei and Hitachi Defendants’ deadline to  
18 answer the Amended Complaint to November 22, 2011;

19 WHEREAS on October 26, 2011, the Court entered an order modifying the pretrial and trial  
20 schedule in the above-captioned litigation;

21 WHEREAS on November 15, 2011, the Court entered an order (i) granting Plaintiff’s  
22 motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration and (ii) granting in part and denying in part  
23 reconsideration of the August 9, 2011 Order.

24 WHEREAS on November 23, 2011, the Court entered an order extending the Chi Mei and  
25 Hitachi Defendants’ deadline to answer the Amended Complaint to December 9, 2011;

26 WHEREAS Plaintiff State of New York and the Chi Mei Defendants have agreed to a  
27 settlement in principle of the above-captioned litigation;

28

1           WHEREAS Plaintiff State of New York and the Hitachi Defendants have agreed to a  
2 settlement in principle of the above-captioned litigation, subject to board approval;

3           WHEREAS the parties would benefit from additional time to finalize the settlement;

4           WHEREAS further extending the time for the Chi Mei Defendants and Hitachi Defendants  
5 to answer the Amended Complaint would not alter the date of any other event or deadline already  
6 fixed by the Court;

7           THEREFORE, Plaintiff State of New York and the Chi Mei Defendants and Hitachi  
8 Defendants, by their respective counsel, stipulate and agree as follows:

9           The Chi Mei Defendants and Hitachi Defendants will have until January 13, 2012 to answer  
10 the Amended Complaint.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Dated: December 6, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

2 ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN  
3 Attorney General of the State of New York

4 By: /s/ Richard L. Schwartz  
Richard L. Schwartz

5 Richard L. Schwartz\*  
6 Acting Bureau Chief, Antitrust Bureau  
7 Amy McFarlane\*  
8 Assistant Attorney General  
9 120 Broadway, 26th Floor  
10 New York, New York 10271  
11 (212) 416-8282 (voice)  
12 (212) 416-6015 (fax)  
13 Richard.Schwartz@ag.ny.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New York*

14 \* Automatic *Pro Hac Vice* Admission Pursuant to Pretrial  
15 Order No. 1, Dated July 3, 2007 (Waiving Civil L.R. 11-3)

16 SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP

17 By: /s/ Harrison J. Frahn IV  
Harrison J. Frahn IV

18 Harrison J. Frahn IV (SBN 206822)  
19 hfrahn@stblaw.com  
20 SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP  
21 2550 Hanover Street  
22 Palo Alto, CA 94304  
23 Telephone: (650) 251-5000  
24 Facsimile: (650) 251-5002

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

25 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

26 By: /s/ Kent. M. Roger  
27 Kent M. Roger (SBN 95987)

28 Kent M. Roger (SBN 95987)

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

One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 442-1001  
Facsimile: (415) 442-1001

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

1 Pursuant to General Order 45, Part X-B, the filer attests that concurrence in the filing of this  
2 document has been obtained from all parties whose signatures are indicated by a “confirmed”  
3 signature (/s/) within this e-filed document.

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

Dated: December 6, 2011


/s/ Harrison J. Frahn IV  
Harrison J. Frahn IV (SBN 206822)

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**

Having considered the foregoing stipulation, and for good cause appearing, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 12/12, 2011

By   
HON. SUSAN ILLSTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE