

1 *Parties listed on signature page*

2

3

E-FILED - 9/29/11

4

5

6

7

8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

9

10

11

12

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., et al.,

CASE NO. CV 00-20905 RMW

13

Plaintiffs,

**STIPULATION AND []
ORDER EXTENDING SCHEDULE FOR
BRIEFING WITH REGARD TO HYNIX'S
BILL OF COSTS**

14

vs.

15

RAMBUS INC.,

16

Defendant.

Judge: Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
Ctm: 6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 WHEREAS, Hynix filed its Bill of Costs Pursuant to Fed. Rules App. Proc., Rule
2 39(e) on May 27, 2011;

3 WHEREAS, the Court entered a Stipulation and Order Regarding Schedule for
4 Briefing with Regard to Hynix’s Bill of Costs on June 23, 2011 (“June 23 Order”);

5 WHEREAS, the mandate of the Federal Circuit issued in this case on August 9,
6 2011;

7 WHEREAS, Hynix filed a Supplemental Bill of Costs on August 24, 2011;

8 WHEREAS, Rambus’s Objections to Hynix’s Bill of Costs and Supplemental Bill
9 of Costs is currently due on September 15, 2011 pursuant to the briefing schedule set forth in the
10 June 23 Order;

11 WHEREAS, on August 18, 2011 and September 7, 2011, Hynix provided Rambus
12 with certain additional documents related to certain items in its Bill of Costs, including foreign-
13 language documents;

14 WHEREAS, Hynix has agreed to provide Rambus with English-language
15 translations of the foreign-language documents provided on September 7, 2011 as soon as they
16 become available;

17
18 NOW, THEREFORE, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE COURT, IT IS
19 HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and among the undersigned counsel for Hynix and
20 Rambus, that:

21 (1) Rambus has through and including September 19, 2011 to file its Objections
22 to Hynix’s Bill of Costs and Supplemental Bill of Costs;

23 (2) Hynix has through and including October 3, 2011 to file papers in response
24 to Rambus’s Objections;

25 (3) Hynix and Rambus have through and including October 3, 2011 to file a
26 statement identifying any cost items or objections that have been withdrawn based upon their
27 meet and confer efforts, and also to identify the cost items that remain in dispute;

28

1 (4) The schedule set forth above is subject to modification by Court order, either
2 upon motion from either party demonstrating good cause or on the Court's own initiative, or by
3 agreement of the parties subject to Court approval.

4 DATED: September 14, 2011

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

5 By: /s/ Fred A. Rowley, Jr.
6 Fred A. Rowley, Jr.

7 Counsel for Rambus Inc.

8 FRED A. ROWLEY, JR. (SBN 192298)
9 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
10 355 South Grand Avenue, 35th Floor
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
12 Telephone (213) 683-9100
13 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702
14 Email: Fred.Rowley@mto.com

12 DATED: September 14, 2011

KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP

13 By: /s/ Theodore G. Brown, III
14 Theodore G. Brown, III

15 Counsel for Hynix Semiconductor Inc.; Hynix
16 Semiconductor America Inc.; Hynix Semiconductor
17 U.K. Ltd.; and Hynix Semiconductor Deutschland
18 GmbH

17 Theodore G. Brown, III (SBN 114672)
18 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
19 1080 Marsh Road
20 Menlo Park, CA 94025
21 Telephone (650) 326-2400
22 Facsimile: (650) 326-2422
23 Email: tbrown@kilpatricktownsend.com

22 O R D E R

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 DATED: September ____, 2011

26
27 Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
28 United States District Court Judge