

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIEL LUNA, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated

Plaintiff,

v.

MARVELL TECHNOLOGY GROUP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

No. C 15-05447 WHA  
(Consolidated)

**NOTICE RE ORAL  
ARGUMENT**

For tomorrow's oral argument, the parties shall please be prepared to address what the operative complaint or the documents properly subject to judicial notice in our record say in response to the following questions:

- What was specifically wrong with the alleged improper pull-in transactions?
- How many allegedly improper pull-in transactions occurred?
- What proportion of the revenue recognized via pull-in transactions was *improperly* recognized?
- What allegations specifically indicate that the premature revenue recognition was not an innocent mistake?
- Was the prematurely recognized revenue just enough to meet quarterly targets?
- What is the source of the allegation that Sutardja and Dai were fired *because of* the conclusions of the investigation into the pull-in transactions?

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

- How many of the pull-in transactions became unpaid receivables, and how many were paid in full at the initially negotiated rate?

Dated: May 3, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE