

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

E-filed: 2/3/2008

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

RAMBUS INC.,	No. C-05-00334 RMW
Plaintiff,	ORDER OVERRULING NANYA'S OBJECTIONS AND REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OF JUDGE AMBLER'S DECEMBER 13, 2007, ORDER REGARDING DEPOSITION OF DR. JIH LIEN
v.	[Re Docket No. 943]
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC.,	
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR, L.P.,	
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION U.S.A.,	
Defendants.	

Nanya¹ objects to a Special Master's order imposing discovery sanctions for Nanya's failure to produce Dr. Jih Lien for a deposition, namely, that Dr. Jih Lien may not be called as a witness at trial in any capacity. Rambus opposes the objection. The court has reviewed the papers and considered the arguments of counsel. The court overrules Nanya's objections to the discovery

¹ "Nanya" collectively refers to all of the Nanya entities sued in these cases, namely Nanya Technology Corporation and Nanya Technology Corporation U.S.A.

1 sanction.

2 Under the Joint Case Management Order, the court reviews the Special Master's orders as it
3 would review a magistrate judge's order and will modify them "only if clearly erroneous or contrary
4 to law." *See* Docket No. 174, C-05-00334, ¶ 2(c) (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2007). Nanya does not
5 address the standard of review in its papers, but suggests that Judge Ambler's imposition of
6 discovery sanctions was "not justified."

7 Preventing a witness from testifying is an appropriate sanction for failure to produce him for
8 a deposition. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(B); Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(A)(ii). Judge Ambler's order
9 is therefore not "contrary to law." After reviewing the facts underlying Judge Ambler's order and
10 the difficulties that occurred in producing Dr. Lien for his deposition, the court does not find that
11 Judge Ambler's order was "clearly erroneous."

12 Accordingly, Nanya's objections and request for modification are overruled.

13
14 DATED: 2/3/2008



RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:**

2 **Counsel for Plaintiff(s):**

3	Craig N. Tolliver	ctolliver@mckoolsmith.com
	Pierre J. Hubert	phubert@mckoolsmith.com
4	Brian K. Erickson	berickson@dbllp.com,
	David C. Vondle	dvondle@akingump.com
5	Gregory P. Stone	gregory.stone@mto.com
	Carolyn Hoecker Luedtke	luedtkech@mto.com
6	Peter A. Detre	detrepa@mto.com
	Burton Alexander Gross	burton.gross@mto.com,
7	Steven McCall Perry	steven.perry@mto.com
	Jeannine Y. Sano	sanoj@howrey.com

8 **Counsel for Defendant(s):**

9	Matthew D. Powers	matthew.powers@weil.com
10	David J. Healey	david.healey@weil.com
	Edward R. Reines	Edward.Reines@weil.com
11	John D Beynon	john.beynon@weil.com
	Jared Bobrow	jared.bobrow@weil.com
12	Leeron Kalay	leeron.kalay@weil.com
	Theodore G. Brown, III	tgbrown@townsend.com
13	Daniel J. Furniss	djfurniss@townsend.com
	Jordan Trent Jones	jtjones@townsend.com
14	Kenneth L. Nissly	kennissly@thelenreid.com
	Geoffrey H. Yost	gyost@thelenreid.com
15	Susan Gregory van Keulen	svankeulen@thelenreid.com
	Patrick Lynch	plynch@omm.com
16	Jason Sheffield Angell	jangell@orrick.com
	Vickie L. Feeman	vfeeman@orrick.com
17	Mark Shean	mshean@orrick.com
	Kai Tseng	hlee@orrick.com

18
19 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not
20 registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

21 **Dated:** 2/3/2008

TSF
Chambers of Judge Whyte

22
23
24
25
26
27
28