Ш

1	STATE OF RHODE ISLAND			
2	EDMINDE MUDDAY ID (S.D. $\#2006$)	EDMUND F MURRAY IR (S.B. #3096)		
3	emurray@riag.state.ri.us RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL			
4	KHODE ISLAND DEFARTMENT OF ATTORNET GENERAL150 South Main StreetProvidence, RI 02903Telephone: (401) 274-4400 ext. 2401Facsimile: (401) 222-2995			
5 6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	10			
11	11 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA et al., Case No.: C 06-	4333 P.IH		
12				
13				
14 15	ORDER TO EX	ATION AND [PROPOSED] (TEND TIME NTERROGATORIES		
15				
10	17			
17		INFINEON TECHNOLOGIES AG et al.,		
10	Defendants.			
20		orney General and Defendants		
20		•		
21	an automaion of time in which the State of Dhode Island shall provide	an extension of time in which the State of Rhode Island shall provide answers to Defendant Hynix's		
22	interrogatories. Pursuant to a previous order of this court. Rhode Isla	nd's answers, as well as other		
23	states' answers, are due on October 7, 2008. After discussions with S	states' answers, are due on October 7, 2008. After discussions with Steven Bergman, Hynix'		
	counsel, Hynix has no objection to this Court granting Rhode Island an extension until November 7,			
25 26	2008 in which to answer Hymx interrogatories. As a basis for said c	2008 in which to answer Hynix' interrogatories. As a basis for said Stipulation Rhode Island states		
26 27				
27				
20	State of California, et al., vs. Infineon Technologies, AG Case No. C06-4333 PJH			

1	1. The information requested in Hynix' interrogatories relates to a period (1998		
2		2002) when the State had changed from Rhode Island Financial and	
3		Accounting System (RIFANS) to Rhode Island State Automated Information	
4		Link (RISAIL);	
5	2.	Many, if not all, of the State employees who were previously working in the	
		Division of Purchasing, IT and/or Accounts and Control are either no longer	
6		employed by the State or are employed in different State departments;	
7	3.	Providing the requested information is time consuming in that the answers	
8		require a determination of what relevant DRAM was in equipment that was	
9		purchased by the Department of Administration and other state agencies;	
10	4.	Retrieving the information requested for purchases prior to RISAIL (i.e. prior	
11		to 2002) is labor intensive in that the information is contained in purchase	
12		orders, invoices and statements. These documents are not segregated in any	
13		meaningful way with respect to the issues in this case. Therefore, personnel	
		must read each document in order to determine if it relates to the purchase of a	
14		product containing DRAM. This is the most time consuming aspect of the	
15	-	State's search and retrieval of relevant information.	
16	5.	The State of Rhode Island is attempting to eliminate a five hundred million	
17		dollar (\$500,000,000) budget deficit. In doing so, many State employees	
18		(approximately 9%) will have left State service by October 1, 2008. This	
19	makes finding additional personnel who are available to review documents		
20		impossible.	
	WHEREFOR	RE, the State of Rhode Island and Defendants Hynix Semiconductor Inc. and	
21		for America, Inc. agree and stipulate that the state of Rhode Island shall have an	
22	Extension until November 7, 2008 to Answer Defendant Hynix' Interrogatories.		
23			
24	DATED: <u>October 2, 2008</u>		
25			
26			
27			
28		2	
	State of California, et al., vs. Infineon Technologies, AG Case No. C06-4333 PJH		

1	Respectfully Submitted,		
2	State of Rhode Island,	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
3	By Its Attorney,	KENNETH R. O'ROURKE	
4	PATRICK C. LYNCH	MICHAEL F. TUBACH STEVEN H. BERGMAN	
5	ATTORNEY GENERAL	JANE Y. CHANG	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	By: <u>/Edmund F. Murray, Jr./</u> Edmund F. Murray, Jr. (#3096) Special Assistant Attorney General Pro Hac Vice Rhode Island Department of Attorney General 150 South Main Street Providence, RI 02903-2907 Tel: (401) 274-4400 x 2401 Fax: (401) 222-2995 emurray@riag.ri.gov	By: <u>/Steven H. Bergman/</u> Steven H. Bergman Attorneys for Defendants HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC. and HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC and with respect to this Stipulation only.	
13			
14 15	ORDER		
15	THE FOREGOING STIPULATION IS APPROVED AND IS SO ORDERED.		
17		NTES DISTRICT	
18 19 20	October 2, 2008 DATED:	TOSL IT IS SO ORDERED	
21		Judge Joseph C. Spero	
22		Provide States	
23		THRN DISTRICT OF CT	
24		CRA DISTRICT OF	
25			
26			
27			
28	State of California, et al., vs. Infineon Technologies, A	3 AG Case No. C06-4333 PJH	