



Richard L. Horwitz
Partner
Attorney at Law
rhorwitz@potteranderson.com
302 984-6027 Direct Phone
302 658-1192 Fax

1313 North Market Street
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899-0951
302 984 6000

www.potteranderson.com

February 27, 2008

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING, E-MAIL AND BY HAND

The Honorable Vincent J. Poppiti
Blank Rome LLP
Chase Manhattan Centre, Suite 800
1201 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801-4226

Re: *Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., et al. v. Intel Corporation, et al., C.A. No. 05-441-JJF; In re Intel Corporation, C.A. No. 05-MD-1717-JJF; and Phil Paul, et al. v. Intel Corporation, C.A. 05-485-JJF*

Dear Judge Poppiti:

Intel herewith responds to AMD's letter to Your Honor of February 13, 2008, regarding the submission of the Weil Gotshal interview materials for *in camera* review. AMD contends that Intel's representation in its February 12, 2008 letter concerning the completeness of its production of such materials is insufficient, and specifically points to the phrasing of the representation regarding "derivative" materials. Intel's representation, however, is consistent with its understanding of the expected representation, specifically:

[T]his will confirm that Intel has provided for *in camera* review all interview notes and follow-up material, that could be located after a diligent search, reflecting factual information provided by Intel custodians to the Weil attorneys during the Weil interview process. As discussed during the January 3, 2008 and February 1, 2008 hearings, the materials provided for *in camera* review do not include materials that would be derivative of the underlying factual information learned by the Weil attorneys during the interviews.

AMD speculates in its February 13, 2008 letter that when drafting a "derivative" memorandum, "it is likely that the memorandum will include new facts that the attorney remembered when reviewing his or her contemporaneous shorthand notes." However, AMD's concerns are unfounded, and as such Intel believes it previously made the appropriate representation. However, in the interest of putting this issue to rest without further argument, Intel represents that, after a reasonable investigation, it has concluded that the "derivative" materials that were not submitted to the Special Master contain no factual information learned


The Honorable Vincent J. Poppiti
February 27, 2008
Page 2

during Weil's interviews with the Custodians not otherwise contained in the Weil interview notes and follow-up materials submitted for *in camera* review.

Finally, consistent with the above representation, Intel anticipates providing to the Special Master for *in camera* review a handful of additional materials that will result from some follow-up interviews conducted by the Weil attorneys.

If the Court has any questions of its own, we would be pleased for the opportunity to respond to them.

Respectfully,



Richard L. Horwitz (#2246)

RLH/mho

cc: The Honorable Vincent J. Poppiti (via electronic mail)
Charles Diamond, Counsel for AMD (via electronic mail)
Michael Hausfeld, Interim Class Counsel (via electronic mail)
Frederick L. Cottrell, III (via electronic mail)
James L. Holzman (via electronic mail)

#851438/29282