

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION



In the Matter of

RAMBUS INC.,

a corporation.

Docket No. 9302

ORDER DENYING COMPLAINANT'S MOTION

MOTION TO COMPEL AN ADDITIONAL DAY  
OF DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF RICHARD CRISP

representative of the Joint Electronics Device Engineering Council ("JEDEC") committee from

Mr. Crisp was previously deposed by Complaint Counsel on Friday, February 14, 2003,

not Mr. Crisp.

Further, Complaint Counsel has not presented compelling reasons for ordering an additional day of deposition testimony outside of the close of discovery. First, it does not appear that Rambus produced additional documents since Mr. Crisp's February 14 deposition. Thus, Complaint Counsel had all documents upon which its examination was based prior to Mr.

Crisp's deposition. Second, Complaint Counsel has access to over 60 hours of testimony provided by Mr. Crisp in depositions and at trial in private litigation. While these private matters did not pose the identical issues addressed in the instant action, they did raise numerous similar issues. At the least, Complaint Counsel could have used these materials to hone their deposition examination of Mr. Crisp prior to his February 14 deposition. If Complaint Counsel believed,

On the basis of these materials, that Mr. Crisp's testimony in this case was not truthful

