

**09-290 CMU v. Marvell**  
**Appendix A**

<b><i>D-Demo No.</i></b>	<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>Information Contained</i></b>	<b><i>Marvell Argument as to Potential Harm</i></b>	<b><i>Court's Ruling</i></b>
<b>D-Demo 1</b>	<b>Marvell Opening Slides</b>			
Slide 80	Total Chip Sales by Customer	Lists total unit chips sales between March 6, 2003 to July 28, 2012 in total and by customer (Fujitsu, Hitachi, Maxtor, Samsung, Seagate, Toshiba, Western Digital, "Other Customers").	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disclosure of these sales figures would cause Marvell competitive harm by allowing competitors to use the per-customer production data, revenue data, sales numbers and production numbers to calibrate their pricing and distribution methods so as to undercut Marvell's position in the marketplace to these individual customers.</li> <li>• Disclosure would harm Marvell's largest customers in that their competitors could compare publicly provided revenue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>

			information with the number of units shown in this chart.	
<b>D-Demo 7</b>	<b>Marvell Damages Expert Hoffman Slides</b>			
Slide DDX7-7	End Customer and Units	Lists total MNP/NLD unit sales in total and by customer (Fujitsu, Hitachi, Maxtor, Samsung, Seagate, Toshiba, Western Digital, “Other Customers”). Same information as D-Demo 1 Slide 80.	See D-Demo 1, ¶ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>D-Demo 11</b>	<b>Slides used in Cross Examination of Lawton</b>			
Slide CL-11	End Customer and Units (Slide CL-11)	Lists total MNP/NLD unit sales in total and by customer (Fujitsu, Hitachi, Maxtor, Samsung, Seagate, Toshiba, Western Digital, “Other Customers”). Same graphic as D-Demo 7 Slide 7. Same	See D-Demo 1, ¶ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs</li> </ul>

		information D-Demo 1 Slide 80		the public's interest in accessing them.
Slide CL-14	Samples Sold to Toshiba Had \$0.06 Operating Profit Differential (Slide CL-14)	Marvell per unit premiums of C7500 v. C7500M, and C5575 and C5575M. (Non Accused and Accused Models). List of Infringing Chips that Ms. Lawton looked at to determine a difference in estimated operating profit delta between models with and without the MNP. Lawton Table 13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disclosure of this data will permit customers and suppliers to gain unfair leverage against Marvell in pricing and supply agreement negotiations.</li> <li>• Publication will disclose to Marvell's customers the difference in price per chip Marvell charges its customers and would jeopardize Marvell's positions and relationships with these customers.</li> <li>• Disclosure will cause Marvell competitive harm by allowing competitors to use the per-customer pricing data to calibrate their own pricing so as to undercut Marvell's position in the marketplace to these individual customers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>D-Demo 15</b>	<b>Hoffman Re-Direct</b>			
	Gross Margin	Lawton Schedule 38	See D-Demo 11 (Slide CL-	• DENIED.

	Data	blurred in background. Slides give Total Gross Margin on ALL SOCs vs Accused Infringing SOCs, and All Read Channels vs Accused Infringing Read Channels.	14), ¶¶ 1,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>D-Demo 16</b>				
	End Customer, Units and Royalty	Lists total unit sales and royalty (based on \$0.50) in total and by customer (Fujitsu, Hitachi, Maxtor, Samsung, Seagate, Toshiba, Western Digital, “Other Customers”). Same information generally as D-Demo 1 Slide 80.	See D-Demo 1, ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>D-Demo 17</b>	<b>Marvell Closing Slides</b>			
Slide 115	End Customer and Units	Lists total MNP/NLD unit sales in total and by customer (Fujitsu, Hitachi, Maxtor, Samsung, Seagate,	See D-Demo 1, ¶ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this</li> </ul>

		Toshiba, Western Digital, “Other Customers”). Same graphic as D-Demo 7 Slide 7. Same information D-Demo 1 Slide 80		<p>information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 120	Total Chip Sales by Customer	Lists total unit chips sales between March 6, 2003 to July 28, 2012 in total and by customer (Fujitsu, Hitachi, Maxtor, Samsung, Seagate, Toshiba, Western Digital, “Other Customers”). Same graphic as D-Demo 1 Slide 80	See D-Demo 1, ¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>DX-1608</b>	<b>Admitted Trial Exhibit</b>			
	Price Comparison of Marvell’s “Production Volume” and “Non-Production Volume” Chips	Lists sales of 88C7500M to Maxtor in 2005 and Seagate from 2005 to 2008, by revenue, unit and average selling price (ASP), divided into sales to Asia and Sales to North America.	See D-Demo 1, ¶ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As an exhibit offered by the Defendants during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>

<b>DX-1609</b>	<b>Admitted Trial Exhibit</b>			
	Price Comparison of Accused & Non-Accused Products Sales to Western Digital	Lists sales of Accused SOC 88i6540 and non-accused SOC 88i5540 for Q4 2004 to Q4 2005 by Revenue, Unit, Gross Margin, ASP and GM per unit.	See D-Demo 1, ¶ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As an exhibit offered by the Defendants during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>P-Demo 9</b>	<b>Proposed Slides for Ms. Lawton</b>			
Slide 4	Marvell Storage Revenue and Operating Profit FY2000-2013	Graph of Marvell Storage Revenue and Operating Profit by Year from 2000-2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disclosure would cause Marvell competitive harm by permitting customers and suppliers to gain unfair leverage against Marvell in pricing and supply agreement negotiations.</li> <li>• Disclosure would allow competitors to undercut Marvell’s prices and would disadvantage Marvell’s competitive position.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 5	Marvell	Graph of Marvell	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> </ul>

	MNP/NLD Revenue and Operating Profit: 3/6/2003-7/28/2012	MNP/NLD Revenue and Operating Profit by year from 2004-2013.	1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 6	Marvell Shipments of MNP/NLD Chips	Graph of Marvell Shipments of MNP/NLD Chips by year from 2003-2012.	Disclosure would allow competitors insight into Marvell’s production and shipping schedules, thus allowing them to undercut Marvell’s position in the marketplace.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 7	Calculation of Marvell’s Average Sales Price and Operating Profit	Showing revenue per chip calculation and operating profit per chip calculation.	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>

Slide 8	Calculation of Marvell's Average Sales Price and Operating Profit	Same as Slide 7 except numbers are shortened (i.e. 10,346,408,755 to 10.35 Billion)	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 10	Marvell's Operating Profit Per Chip and Sales Price Per Chip	Chart of Marvell's Operating Profit per chip to Marvell's Sales Price per chip	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 11	Marvell's Operating Profit Per Chip and Sales Price Per Chip with Reasonable Royalty to CMU	Same graph of Slide 10 with addition of bar for reasonable royalty amount.	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>



				the public's interest in accessing them.
Slides 58, 101, 113	Marvell Monthly Read Channel and SOC Shipments by Technology-Units	Monthly Shipments of chips from 2000 to May 2012 by Non infringing, MNP, EMNP, and NLV type. Lawton Chart 5. (P-Demo 13 (Slide 1)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 133	Read Channel Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD read channel chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 22. (P-Demo 13 (Slide 2)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 134	SOC Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD SOC chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 23. (P-Demo 13 (Slide 3)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes</li> </ul>

				the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.
Slide 152	Marvell 3/2003 HDD Forecast v. Actual Trendfocus Data	Line chart comparing Marvell Consumer Market Forecast and HDD Market Forecast to Trendfocus Actual Data. Lawton Chart 21. (P-Demo 16 (Slide 1)).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would allow competitors insight into Marvell's positions and analysis regarding the future of the read channel and hard drive markets.</li> <li>• Disclosure of actual sales figures for certain years would allow competitors to alter their sales, pricing and production strategies based upon Marvell's past manufacturing data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 156	Marvell RC & SOC Gross Margins, Operating Profits & Excess Profits	Bar Chart comparing Total Gross Margin, Gross Margin in excess of targets, Total RC-SOC Operating profits, and Total GM in MNP/NLD in excess of targets by year from 2000-2013. Lawton Chart 27. (P-Demo 16 (Slide 2)).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would permit customers and suppliers to gain unfair leverage against Marvell in pricing and supply agreement negotiations.</li> <li>• Would allow competitors to use Marvell's profit margins to calibrate their own pricing and undercut Marvell's position in the marketplace.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>

Slide 157	Marvell's Excess Profits	<p>Calculation of Excess Profits, Profit per Unit, and Total Excess Profits.</p> <p>The same as Slide 10 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would permit customers and suppliers to gain unfair leverage against Marvell in pricing and supply agreement negotiations</li> <li>• Would allow competitors to use Marvell's profit margins to calibrate their own pricing so as to undercut Marvell's position in the marketplace</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 158	Total Reported Sales FY2003-2010 & FY2003-2004	Sales by Unit, Revenue, Cost, and Gross Margin of C7500, C7500M, C5575, C5575M from 2003-2010. Lawton Table 12. (P-Demo 16 (Slide 4)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 162	Sales price, sales price delta, gross margin delta, estimated operating profit delta for	Marvell per unit premiums of C7500 v. C7500M, and C5575 and C5575M. (Non Accused and Accused Models). List of Infringing Chips that	See D-Demo 11 (Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> </ul>

	one of Marvell's chip lines differentiated by end-customer	Ms. Lawton looked at to determine a difference in estimated operating profit delta between models with and without the MNP. Lawton Table 13. Same as D Demo 11 Slide 14.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 164	E-mail Re: Budgetary Channel Pricing from Marvell	Internal Marvell emails regarding 7500M pricing. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 164)).  The same as Slide 17 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would disclose to Marvell's customers the difference in price per chip</li> <li>• See D-Demo (Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 2,3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 168	Accused Infringing Chip / Sales Price Delta	7500M chips with actual sales and ASP. Lawton Schedule 47. (P-Demo 16, Slide 3).	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 169	Top 44 MNP/NLD	Line Graph of Top 44 MNP/NLD Chips –	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> </ul>

	Chips – Fiscal Quarter Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Fiscal Quarter DirectMargin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. Lawton Chart 28. (P-Demo 16, Slide 6).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 170	All Marvell Sales - Fiscal Quarter Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Line Graph of all Marvell Sales – Fiscal Quarter Direct Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013.  The same as Slide 23 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 171	RC & SOC Direct Margin per Unit (FY1999 Q4 – FY2013 Q2)	Line graph of RC & SOC direct Margin per Unit (FY1999 Q4 – FY2013 Q2).  The same as Slide 24 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs</li> </ul>

				the public's interest in accessing them.
Slide 172	Marvell's excess profit and operating profit	Marvell's excess profit and operating profit per chip amounts conclusions.  The same as Slide 25 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 187	First Design Win Date and Units Sold by Chip (44 MNP/NLD Infringing Chips)	Bar Chart of First Design Win Date and Units Sold by Chip (44 MNP/NLD Infringing Chips) from 2003 to 2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would allow competitors to unfairly emulate Marvell's design timelines and predict future Marvell design timelines based on internal performance figures</li> <li>• See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶ 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 188	First Design Win Date and Units Sold by Chip (44 MNP/NLD Infringing Chips)	Same as Slide 187 between 2003-2009.	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 187) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes</li> </ul>

				the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.
<b>P-Demo 11</b>	<b>Lawton Flip Chart</b>			
	Total MNP& NLD Chips (operating profit and revenue calculations)	Catherine Lawton hand drawn Flip Chart showing operating profit calculation	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>P-Demo 13</b>	<b>Charts used During Lawton Testimony</b>			
Slide 1	Marvell monthly Read Channel and SOC Shipments by Technology-Units	Monthly Shipments of chips from 2000 to May 2012 by Non infringing, MNP, EMNP, and NLV type. Lawton Chart 5	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 2	Read Channel Chip Families with and	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD read	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the</li> </ul>

	without MNP/NLD	channel chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 22		<p>objection to future sealing is waived</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 3	SOC Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD SOC chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 23	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 9	Marvell Monthly Shipments of 88C7500 and 88C7500M (June ‘02-December ‘04)	Bar Chart of Monthly Shipments of 88C7500 and 88C7500M (June ‘02-December ‘04). Lawton Chart 25	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>P-Demo</b>	<b>Lawton Flip</b>			



14	Chart			
	Excess Profits & Operating Profit Premium	Lawton hand drawn flip chart listing excess profit and operating profit premium per unit and the number of chips by patent	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>P-Demo 16</b>	<b>Charts used During Lawton Testimony</b>			
Slide 1	Marvell 3/2003 HDD Forecast v. Actual Trendfocus Data	Line chart comparing Marvell Consumer Market Forecast and HDD Market Forecast to Trendfocus Actual Data. Lawton Chart 21. Same as P-Demo 9 (Slide 152).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 152) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 2	Marvell RC & SOC Gross Margins, Operating Profit & Excess Profits	Bar Chart comparing Total Gross Margin, Gross Margin in excess of targets, Total RC-SOC Operating profits, and Total GM	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 156) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> </ul>

		in MNP/NLD in excess of targets by year from 2000-2013. Lawton Chart 27. Same as P-Demo 9 (Slide 156).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 3	Accused Infringing Chip – Sales price Delta	7500M chips with actual sales and ASP. Lawton Schedule 47. See P-Demo 9 (Slide 168).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 4	Total Reported Sales FY2003-FY2010	Sales by Unit, Revenue, Cost, and Gross Margin of C7500, C7500M, C5575, C5575M from 2003-2010. Lawton Table 12. Same as P-Demo 9 (Slide 158).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would allow Marvell’s business partners an unfair advantage during future negotiations and sales or supply agreements.</li> <li>• Would allow Marvell’s competitors to use the per-chip production data, revenue data and sales and production numbers to calibrate their own pricing and undercut Marvell’s position in the marketplace.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>

Slide 5	Sales price, sales price delta, gross margin delta, estimated operating profit delta for one of Marvell's chip lines differentiated by end-customer	Marvell per unit premiums of C7500 v. C7500M, and C5575 and C5575M. (Non Accused and Accused Models). List of Infringing Chips that Ms. Lawton looked at to determine a difference in estimated operating profit delta between models with and without the MNP. Lawton Table 13. Same as D Demo 11 Slide 14.	See D-Demo 11 (Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 1 -3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 6	Top 44 MNP/NLD Chips – Fiscal Quarter Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Line Graph of Top 44 MNP/NLD Chips – Fiscal Quarter DirectMargin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. Lawton Chart 28. Same as P-Demo 9 at 169	See D-Demo 9 ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>P-Demo 20</b>	<b>Lawton Rebuttal Testimony</b>			
	Accused Infringing Chips –	Chart of Device, Customer, Sample Date, first Operating	Disclosure would allow competitors to determine Marvell's and its	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> </ul>

	Summary of Sample (ES) Date; First MAPL Order Date, 1 Million Units Date	Unit Order, Date of Million Units. Lawton Schedule 24	customers' sales dates and shipping information allowing those competitors to undercut Marvell's position in the marketplace.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>P-Demo 21</b>	<b>Lawton Rebuttal Testimony</b>			
	Marvell SOC Unit Shipments to Hitachi, Fujitsu, Samsung, Toshiba and Western Digital 2000 - 2002	Bar Chart of Marvell SOC Unit Shipments to Hitachi, Fujitsu, Samsung, Toshiba and Western Digital 2000 – 2002. Lawton Chart 8/ Schedule 19	Disclosure would allow competitors insight into Marvell's production and shipping schedules and each individual customer's specific needs allowing them to undercut Marvell's position in the marketplace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>P-Demo 22</b>	<b>Closing Statement</b>			
Slide 1	Read Channel Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD read channel chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 22. P-Demo 9 Slide 133, P-Demo 13 Slide 2.	Disclosure would allow competitors insight into Marvell's production and shipping schedules, allowing them to undercut Marvell's position in the marketplace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling</li> </ul>

				reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.
Slide 2	SOC Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD SOC chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 23. Same as P-Demo 9 Slide 134, P-Demo 13 Slide 3.	See P-Demo 22 (Slide 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 3	Reasonably Royalty	Lawton Hand Written Flip Chart showing Calculation of royalty base* rate =total royalty.	See D-Demo 1 ¶ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 4	Marvell Monthly Read Channel and SOC Shipments by Technology-Units	Monthly Shipments of chips from 2000 to May 2012 by Non infringing, MNP, EMNP, and NLV type. Lawton Chart 5. Same as P-Demo 9 Slide 58, P-Demo 13	See P-Demo 22 (Slide 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> </ul>

		Slide 1.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 5	Top 44 MNP/NLD Chips – Fiscal Quarter Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Line Graph of Top 44 MNP/NLD Chips – Fiscal Quarter DirectMargin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. Lawton Chart 28. Same as P-Demo 9 at 169, P-Demo 16 Slide 6.	See D-Demo 11(Slide CL-14) ¶ 1 See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶ 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Slide 6	Paul Yasuda e-mail correspondence (April 2002) & Read Channel Block Diagram		Marvell no longer asks the Court to file this slide under seal	Moot
Slide 7	Sutardja trial testimony		Marvell no longer asks the Court to file this slide under seal	Moot
Slide 8	Wooldridge trial testimony		Marvell no longer asks the Court to file this slide under seal	Moot
Slide 9	Kryder trial testimony		Marvell no longer asks the Court to file this slide under seal	Moot
Slide 10	Lawton trial		Marvell no longer asks the	Moot

	testimony		Court to file this slide under seal	
<b>DKT. #708.1 &amp; DKT. #708.2</b>				
Page 6	Marvell Storage Revenue and Operating Profit FY2000-2013	Graph of Marvell Storage Revenue and Operating Profit by Year from 2000-2013 (P-Demo 9 (Slide 4))	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 7	Marvell Accused Revenue and Operating Profit: 3/6/2003 – 7/28/2012	Calculation of Marvell’s Average Sale’s price and operating profit	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 8	Marvell shipments of Accused chips containing	Graph of Marvell Shipments of MNP/NLD Chips by year from 2003-2012	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> </ul>

	MNP or NLD	(P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 9	Calculation of Marvell’s Average Sales Price and Operating Profit	Showing revenue per chip calculation and operating profit per chip calculation. (P-Demo 9 (Slide7)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 10	Calculation of Marvell’s Average Sales Price and Operating Profit	Same as Slide 7 except numbers are shortened (ie 10,346,408,755 to 10.35 Billion) (P-Demo 9 (Slide 8)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 12	Marvell’s	Chart of Marvell’s	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> </ul>



	Operating Profit Per Chip and Sales Price Per Chip	Operating Profit per chip to Marvell's Sales Price per chip. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 10)).	1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 13	Marvell's Operating Profit Per Chip and Sales Price Per Chip with Reasonable Royalty to CMU	Same graph of Slide 10 with addition of bar for reasonable royalty amount. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 11)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 60, 103, 115	Marvell Monthly Read Channel and SOC Shipments by Technology-Units (Docket No. 708.1 & 708.2 p. 60, 102, 115)	Monthly Shipments of chips from 2000 to May 2012 by Non infringing, MNP, EMNP, and NLV type. Lawton Chart 5. Same as (P-Demo 9 (Slides 58, 101, 113)), (P-Demo 13 (Slide 1)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>

Page 135	Non-Accused Read Channel Chip Families and Total Accused Read Channels	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD read channel chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 22. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 133)), (P-Demo 13 (Slide 2)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 136	Non-Accused SOC Chip Families and Total Accused SOCs	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD SOC chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 23. Same as P-Demo 9 Slide 134, P-Demo 13 Slide 3.	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 154	Marvell 3/2003 HDD Forecast v. Actual Trendfocus Data	Line chart comparing Marvell Consumer Market Forecast and HDD Market Forecast to Trendfocus Actual Data. Lawton Chart 21. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 152)), (P-Demo 16 (Slide 1)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 152) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs</li> </ul>

				the public's interest in accessing them.
Page 158	Marvell RC & SOC Gross Margins, Operating Profits & Excess Profits	Bar Chart comparing Total Gross Margin, Gross Margin in excess of targets, Total RC-SOC Operating profits, and Total GM in MNP/NLD in excess of targets by year from 2000-2013. Lawton Chart 27. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 156)), (P-Demo 16 (Slide 2)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 159	Marvell’s Excess Profits	<p>Calculation of Excess Profits, Profit per Unit, and Total Excess Profits (P-Demo 9 (Slide 157)).</p> <p>The same as Slide 10 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.</p>	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 160	Total Reported Sales FY2003-2010 & FY2003-2004	Sales by Unit, Revenue, Cost, and Gross Margin of C7500, C7500M, C5575, C5575M from 2003-2010. Lawton Table 12. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 158)).	See P-Demo 16 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling</li> </ul>

		The same as Slide 11 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.		reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.
Page 164 * Missing from hand delivery to the Court for review. Purportedly the same as P-Demo 9 Slide 162	Contains sales price, sales price delta, gross margin delta and estimated operating profit delta for one of Marvell’s chip lines differentiated by customer	Marvell per unit premiums of C7500 v. C7500M, and C5575 and C5575M. (Non Accused and Accused Models). List of Infringing Chips that Ms. Lawton looked at to determine a difference in estimated operating profit delta between models with and without the MNP. Lawton Table 13. Same as D Demo 11 Slide 14	See D-Demo 11(Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 166	E-mail Re: Budgetary Channel Pricing from Marvell	Internal Marvell emails regarding 7500M pricing. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 164)).  The same as Slide 17 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See D-Demo 11(Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 2,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 170	Accused	7500M chips with	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> </ul>

	Infringing Chip – Sales Price Delta	actual sales and ASP. Lawton Schedule 47. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 168)), (P-Demo 16 (Slide 3)).	1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 171	Top 44 Accused Chips – Fiscal Quarter Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Line Graph of Top 44 MNP/NLD Chips – Fiscal Quarter Direct Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. Lawton Chart 28. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 169)) P-Demo 16 Slide 6.  The same as Slide 22 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 172	All Marvell Sales – Fiscal Quarter margin percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Line Graph of all Marvell Sales – Fiscal Quarter Direct Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 170)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> </ul>

		The same as Slide 23 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 173	RC & SoC Direct Margin per Unit (FY1999 Q4 – FY2013 Q2)	<p>Line graph of RC &amp; SoC direct Margin per Unit (FY1999 Q4 – FY2013 Q2). (P-Demo 9 (Slide 171)).</p> <p>The same as Slide 24 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.</p>	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 174	Marvell’s excess profit and operating profit	<p>Marvell’s excess profit and operating profit per chip amounts conclusions. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 172)).</p> <p>The same as Slide 25 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.</p>	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>DKT. #708.3</b>				
Page 3	First Design Win Date and Units Sold by	Bar Chart of First Design Win Date and Units Sold by Chip	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding,</li> </ul>

	Chip (44 Accused Infringing Chips)	(44 MNP/NLD Infringing Chips) from 2003 to 2011 (P-Demo 9 (Slide 187)).		<p>the objection to future sealing is waived</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>DKT. #708.8</b>				
Page 7	Marvell Storage Revenue and Operating Profit FY2000-2013	Graph of Marvell Storage Revenue and Operating Profit by Year from 2000-2013 (P-Demo 9 (Slide 4)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 8	Marvell MNP/NLD Revenue and Operating Profit: 3/6/2003-7/28/2012	Graph of Marvell MNP/NLD Revenue and Operating Profit by year from 2004-2013. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 5)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs</li> </ul>

				the public's interest in accessing them.
Page 9	Marvell Shipments of MNP/NLD Chips	Graph of Marvell Shipments of MNP/NLD Chips by year from 2003-2012 (P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 10	Calculation of Marvell’s Average Sales Price and Operating Profit	Showing revenue per chip calculation and operating profit per chip calculation. (P-Demo 9 (Slide7)). .	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 11	Calculation of Marvell’s Average Sales Price and Operating Profit	Same as Slide 7 except numbers are shortened (i.e. 10,346,408,755 to 10.35 Billion) (P-Demo 9 (Slide 8)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes</li> </ul>



				the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.
Page 13	Marvell's Operating Profit Per Chip and Sales Price Per Chip	Chart of Marvell's Operating Profit per chip to Marvell's Sales Price per chip. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 10)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 14	Marvell's Operating Profit Per Chip and Sales Price Per Chip with Reasonable Royalty to CMU	Same graph of Slide 10 with addition of bar for reasonable royalty amount. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 11)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown in an open public proceeding, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Pages 61, 104, 116	Marvell Monthly Read Channel and SOC Shipments by Technology-Units (Docket No. 708.8 p. 61,	Monthly Shipments of chips from 2000 to May 2012 by Non infringing, MNP, EMNP, and NLV type. Lawton Chart 5. (P-Demo 9 (Slides 58, 101, 113)), (P-Demo 13 (Slide 1)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling</li> </ul>

	104,116)			reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.
Page 136	Read Channel Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD read channel chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 22. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 133)), (P-Demo 13 (Slide 2)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 137	SOC Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD SOC chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 23. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 134)), (P-Demo 13 (Slide 3)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 155	Marvell 3/2003 HDD Forecast v. Actual Trendfocus Data	Line chart comparing Marvell Consumer Market Forecast and HDD Market Forecast to Trendfocus Actual Data. Lawton Chart 21 (P-Demo 9 (Slide 152)), (P-Demo 16	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 152) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> </ul>

		(Slide 1)).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 159	Marvell RC & SOC Gross Margins, Operating Profits & Excess Profits	Bar Chart comparing Total Gross Margin, Gross Margin in excess of targets, Total RC-SOC Operating profits, and Total GM in MNP/NLD in excess of targets by year from 2000-2013. Lawton Chart 27. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 156), (P-Demo 16 (Slide 2))).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 160	Marvell’s Excess Profits	<p>Calculation of Excess Profits, Profit per Unit, and Total Excess Profits (P-Demo 9 (Slide 157.)</p> <p>The same as Slide 10 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.</p>	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 161	Total Reported Sales FY2003-2010 & FY2003-2004	Sales by Unit, Revenue, Cost, and Gross Margin of C7500, C7500M, C5575, C5575M from 2003-2010. Lawton	See P-Demo 16 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> </ul>

		Table 12. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 158.), (P-Demo 16 (Slide 4)).  The same as Slide 11 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 167	E-mail Re: Budgetary Channel Pricing from Marvell	Internal Marvell emails regarding 7500M pricing. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 164)).  The same as Slide 17 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See D-Demo 11 (Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 171	Accused Infringing Chip / Sales Price Delta	7500M chips with actual sales and ASP. Lawton Schedule 47. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 168.), (P-Demo 16, Slide 3).	See P-Demo 9(Slide 4) ¶¶ 1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 172	Top 44 Accused	Line Graph of Top 44 MNP/NLD Chips –	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> </ul>

	Chips – Fiscal Quarter Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Fiscal Quarter DirectMargin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. Lawton Chart 28. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 169.), (P-Demo 16, Slide 6).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 173	All Marvell Sales – Fiscal Quarter margin percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Line Graph of all Marvell Sales – Fiscal Quarter Direct Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 170.)  The same as Slide 23 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 174	RC & SOC Direct Margin per Unit (FY1999 Q4 – FY2013 Q2)	Line graph of RC & SOC direct Margin per Unit (FY1999 Q4 – FY2013 Q2). (P-Demo 9 (Slide 171.),  The same as Slide 24 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs</li> </ul>

		requested to be sealed.		the public's interest in accessing them.
Page 175	Marvell's excess profit and operating profit	Marvell's excess profit and operating profit per chip amounts conclusions. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 172.))  The same as Slide 25 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
<b>DKT. #708.9</b>				
Pages 38, 58, 69	Marvell Monthly Read Channel and SOC Shipments by Technology-Units (Docket No. 708.9 p.38, 58, 69).	Monthly Shipments of chips from 2000 to May 2012 by Non infringing, MNP, EMNP, and NLV type. Lawton Chart 5. (P-Demo 9 (Slides 58, 101, 113)), (P-Demo 13 (Slide 1)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 89	Read Channel Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD read channel chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 22. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 133)), (P-Demo 13	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> </ul>

		(Slide 2)).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 90	SOC Chip Families with and without MNP/NLD	Total Monthly shipments of MNP/NLD SOC chips by month from 1/99 to 7/12. Lawton Chart 23. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 134)), (P-Demo 13 (Slide 3)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 108	Marvell 3/2003 HDD Forecast v. Actual Trendfocus Data	Line chart comparing Marvell Consumer Market Forecast and HDD Market Forecast to Trendfocus Actual Data. Lawton Chart 21 (P-Demo 9 (Slide 152)), (P-Demo 16 (Slide 1)).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 152) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 112	Marvell RC & SOC Gross Margins, Operating Profits & Excess Profits	Bar Chart comparing Total Gross Margin, Gross Margin in excess of targets, Total RC-SOC Operating profits, and Total GM in MNP/NLD in	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would</li> </ul>

		excess of targets by year from 2000-2013. Lawton Chart 27. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 156), (P-Demo 16 (Slide 2))).		<p>cause current competitive harm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 113	Marvell’s Excess Profits	<p>Calculation of Excess Profits, Profit per Unit, and Total Excess Profits (P-Demo 9 (Slide 157.)</p> <p>The same as Slide 10 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.</p>	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 157) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 114	Total Reported Sales FY2003-FY2010 & FY2003-FY2004	Sales by Unit, Revenue, Cost, and Gross Margin of C7500, C7500M, C5575, C5575M from 2003-2010. Lawton Table 12. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 158.), (P-Demo 16 (Slide 4))).	See D-Demo 11(Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 1, 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 118	Sales price, sales price delta, gross margin delta, estimated operating	Marvell per unit premiums of C7500 v. C7500M, and C5575 and C5575M. (Non Accused and Accused Models). List of	See D-Demo 11(Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> </ul>



	profit delta for one of Marvell's chip lines differentiated by end-customer	Infringing Chips that Ms. Lawton looked at to determine a difference in estimated operating profit delta between models with and without the MNP. Lawton Table 13. Same as D Demo 11 Slide 14.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 120	E-mail Re: Budgetary Channel Pricing from Marvell	Internal Marvell emails regarding 7500M pricing. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 164)), (P-Demo 16, Slide 5).  The same as Slide 17 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See D-Demo 11(Slide CL-14) ¶¶ 2,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 124	Accused Infringing Chip – Sales Price Delta	7500M chips with actual sales and ASP. Lawton Schedule 47. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 168)); (P-Demo 16, Slide 3).	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 125	Top 44	Line Graph of Top 44	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> </ul>

	MNP/NLD Chips – Fiscal Quarter Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	MNP/NLD Chips – Fiscal Quarter DirectMargin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. Lawton Chart 28. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 169)), (P-Demo 16, Slide 6).	1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a judicial record shown during a public jury trial, the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• Substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 126	All Marvell Sales – Fiscal Quarter margin percentage and ASP by RC & SOC	Line Graph of all Marvell Sales – Fiscal Quarter Direct Margin Percentage and ASP by RC & SOC from 2003 to 2013. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 170)),  The same as Slide 23 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>
Page 127	RC & SoC Direct Margin per Unit (FY1999 Q4 – FY2013 Q2)	Line graph of RC & SoC direct Margin per Unit (FY1999 Q4 – FY2013 Q2). (P-Demo 9 (Slide 171));  The same as Slide 24 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a “compelling reason” that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs</li> </ul>

		requested to be sealed.		the public's interest in accessing them.
Page 128	Marvell's excess profit and operating profit	Marvell's excess profit and operating profit per chip amounts conclusions. (P-Demo 9 (Slide 172)),  The same as Slide 25 at Ex. 41 at Docket No. 771 which is not under seal or requested to be sealed.	See P-Demo 9 (Slide 4) ¶¶ 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DENIED.</li> <li>• As a currently available public record the objection to future sealing is waived</li> <li>• There is substantial public interest in the dissemination of this information</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence to show disclosure of this slide would cause current competitive harm</li> <li>• Court finds that Marvell has not proven a "compelling reason" that its interest in sealing these slides overcomes the presumption of access to judicial records and outweighs the public's interest in accessing them.</li> </ul>