

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
5

6
7
8 **IN RE INTEL CORPORATION SECURITIES**
9 **LITIGATION**
10

CASE No. 18-cv-00507-YGR
ORDER SETTING COMPLIANCE HEARING

11
12 **IN RE INTEL CORPORATION SHAREHOLDER**
13 **DERIVATIVE LITIGATION**
14

CASE No. 18-cv-01489-YGR

15
16
17 **ELVIS ALVIRA,**
18 **Plaintiff,**
19 **vs.**
20 **INTEL CORPORATION, ET AL.,**
21 **Defendants.**
22

CASE No. 18-cv-03416-YGR

23 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**


24 On June 12, 2018, this Court issued an order relating *In re Intel Corporation Securities*
25 *Litigation*, 18-cv-00507-YGR (the “*Intel Securities Litigation*”) and *In re Intel Corporation*
26 *Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, 18-cv-01489-YGR (the “*Intel Derivative Litigation*”). (*Intel*
27 *Securities Litigation*, Dkt. No. 51; *Intel Derivative Litigation*, Dkt. No. 33.) That same day, *Elvis*
28 *Alvira v. Intel Corporation, et al.*, 18-cv-03416-YGR (“*Alvira*”) was transferred to the undersigned

1 from the Central District of California. (*Alvira*, Dkt. No. 41.) The three actions appear to arise from
2 the same series of events, including similar allegations of misstatements by Intel and certain of its
3 senior officers, and to involve overlapping parties, and in the case of the *Intel Securities Litigation*
4 and the *Alvira* action, the two actions appear to assert similar claims.

5 In order for the Court to better understand the overlapping nature of the lawsuits, the Court
6 **SETS** a compliance hearing, to be held on **Friday, July 6, 2018** on the Court's **9:01 a.m.** calendar, in
7 the Federal Building, 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California in Courtroom 1. No later than **June 29,**
8 **2018**, the parties shall **MEET AND CONFER** and file a **JOINT STATEMENT**, not to exceed five (5) pages
9 Such statement shall address the potential consolidation of the three cases, how the cases might
10 otherwise operate in tandem, or any other mechanism to increase efficiency for the parties and the
11 Court. It shall also address why the pending motion to dismiss in the *Intel Derivative Litigation*
12 (Dkt. No. 15) should not be granted with leave to amend in the context of a new operative complaint
13 in a consolidated action.¹ If compliance is complete, the parties need not appear and the compliance
14 hearing will be taken off calendar.

15
16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: June 15, 2018

18 
19 **YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**
20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE**

21
22
23
24
25
26
27

¹ While defendants in the *Intel Derivative Litigation* have re-noticed the hearing on said
28 motion to dismiss for July 3, 2018, the Court notes that date is closed to further settings. The Court
will reset the hearing, if necessary, once it receives the parties' joint statement.