

**PUBLIC**

3. As indicated on the privilege log, Samsung claims a “joint defense” privilege for 112 documents (P3 to P114). These documents were apparently prepared over a seven month period from August 14, 2000 to March 5, 2001. Of the 112 claims of joint defense privilege, 110 of the claims are directed to documents containing “Confidential communications re: alternative technology.” The remaining 2 privilege claims cover documents containing “agreement[s] on alternative technology.” (P14, P15).

4. Each privilege log entry lists the author and recipients of the respective document. Although various entries identify individuals as holding a Ph.D., e.g., P36, not a single listed individual among the entire set of 112 entries is identified as an attorney.

5. On December 5, 2002, I spoke with Samsung’s counsel, David Healey, about the privilege log. I stated that we did not understand Samsung’s assertions of privilege regarding the “joint defense” documents, particularly since it did not appear that any attorneys had authored or received any of the documents.

6. Samsung’s counsel informed me that the documents in question were prepared in connection with the work of ADT, a multi-party industry group. Counsel also said that Samsung was unlikely to litigate the “joint defense” privilege issue, and that he would inform the other ADT participants of Rambus’s intent to file a motion challenging the privilege claims. Samsung’s counsel sent me a letter on December 5, 2002 confirming his intention to notify other parties of Rambus’s plans. *See* exhibit C.

7. According to a January 17, 2000 press release, ADT consists of a venture by Hyundai MicroElectronics (later Hynix), Infineon Technologies, Micron Technology, Inc., NEC Corporation (later Elpida), Samsung and Intel to “cooperatively develop a high-performance advanced DRAM technology targeted for potential applications in 2003 and beyond. *See* NEC January 17, 2000 press release at <http://www.nec.co.jp/press/en/0001/1701.html>, visited on December 8, 2002. A true copy of this press release is attached to this declaration as exhibit D.

8. In connection with this motion, and at my direction, an associate at Munger, Tolles & Olson conducted a search both on the Internet and in a document database in an effort to identify the individuals listed in the 112 entries for which Samsung claims a joint defense privilege. No attorneys were identified as a result of this search.

9. The search did reveal that most of the individuals listed are, or were in the relevant time period, employed by Samsung, Infineon, Intel, NEC, Elpida, IBM, Micron or Hynix. In addition, at least 10 of the named individuals appear on one or both of the parties' witness lists in this case.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December \_\_\_\_, 2002 at Los Angeles, California.

---

Steven M. Perry

**PROOF OF SERVICE BY FACSIMILE/FEDERAL EXPRESS**

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 355 South Grand Avenue, 35th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071.

On December 9, 2002, I served the foregoing document described as: **DECLARATION OF STEVEN M. PERRY IN SUPPORT OF RAMBUS INC.'S MOTION TO COMPEL SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. TO PRODUCE CERTAIN DOCUMENTS WITHHELD ON PRIVILEGE GROUNDS** on the designated parties in this action by having a true copy thereof transmitted by facsimile machine to the number listed below. I caused the facsimile machine to print a record of the transmission, a copy of which is attached to this declaration.

On December 9, 2002, I also served a copy of the aforementioned document on the designated parties in this action by Federal Express overnight courier service. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for delivery to an employee of Federal Express. Under that practice it would be delivered to an employee of Federal Express on that same day at Los Angeles, California with charges to be billed to Munger, Tolles & Olson's account for delivery to the office of the addressee on December 10, 2002 in the ordinary course of business.

**By Facsimile and FedEx**

M. Sean Royall, Esq.  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Room H-372  
Washington, D.C. 20580  
**Facsimile: 202-326-2884**

**By FedEx**

Hon. James P. Timony  
Administrative Law Judge  
Federal Trade Commission  
Room H-112  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20580

**By Facsimile and FedEx**

Geoffrey Oliver, Esq.  
Malcolm L. Catt, Esq.  
Federal Trade Commission  
601 New Jersey Avenue  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
**Facsimile: 202-326-3496**

**By Facsimile and FedEx**

David J. Healey, Esq.  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
700 Louisiana, Suite 1600  
Houston, Texas 77002-2784  
**Facsimile: (713) 224-9511**

Executed on December 9, 2002, at Los Angeles, California.

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

---

Eunice Ikemoto

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

\_\_\_\_\_  
In the Matter of )  
 )  
 ) Docket No. 9302  
RAMBUS INC., )  
 )  
 a corporation, )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

**CERTIFICATION**

I, Steven M. Perry, hereby certify that the electronic copy of Declaration of Steven M. Perry In Support Of Rambus Inc.'s Motion To Compel Samsung Electronics America, Inc. To Produce Certain Documents Withheld on Privilege Grounds accompanying this certification is a true and correct copy of the paper original and that a paper copy with an original signature is being filed with the Secretary of the Commission on December 10, 2002 by other means.

Dated: December 9, 2002

/s/  
Steven M. Perry