# **FILED**

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MAR 2 6 2008

#### NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA



4	HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC.; HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA, INC.; HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR U.K. LTD.; and HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR DEUTSCHLAND GmbH,
-	SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA, INC.:
5	HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR U.K. LTD.: and
- 1	HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR
6	DEUTSCHLAND GmbH,
- 1	• • • • •
7	Plaintiffs

CASE NO. C 00-20905 RMW

#### SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

Judge: Hon. Ronald M. Whyte

CASE NO. C 05-00334 RMW

VS.

RAMBUS INC.,

Defendant.

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

VS.

1

2

3

8

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

21

24

25

26

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC., HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR

15 MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC..

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, NANCY TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION U.S.A.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff,

20 RAMBUS INC.,

22

vs.

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., and MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR PRODUCTS, INC.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C 06-00244 RMW

27 28

Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

# We, the jury in the above-entitled actions, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict:

### FINDINGS ON ANTITRUST CLAIMS

## I. Alleged Violation of the Sherman Act: Monopolization

Questions 1-6 below relate to Manufacturers' claims for unlawful monopolization under the Sherman Act.

Do you find that it is more likely than not that any of the following technology markets exist? Please respond for each market.

Technology Markets	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market	X	
b. Burst length technology market	X	
c. Data acceleration technology market	X	
d. Clock synchronization technology market	V	
e. Precharge technology market	X	
f. Write latency technology market	X	

If you answered "Yes" to any part of 1, please answer question 2; if you answered "No" to all parts of question 1, please continue to Section III.

With respect to any of the markets for which you answered "Yes" to question 1, do you find it more likely than not that a geographic market comprising the United States of America exists (write N/A if you answered "No" to a market above)?

Technology Markets	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market	X	
b. Burst length technology market	X	
c. Data acceleration technology market	1	
d. Clock synchronization technology market	X	
e. Precharge technology market	X	
f. Write latency technology market	X	-

Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

3. For each market you have found to exist in your response to questions 1 and 2, do you find it more likely than not that Rambus has monopoly power in that market? (Enter N/A for any market for which you answered "No" to questions 1 or 2)

Technology Market	Monopo	ly Power?
	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market	X	
b. Burst length technology market	X	
c. Data acceleration technology market	X	
d. Clock synchronization technology market	X	
e. Precharge technology market	X	
f. Write latency technology market	7	

If you answered "Yes" to any part of 3, please answer question 4; if you answered "No" or "N/A" to all parts of question 3, please continue to **Section II.** 

4. For each market you have found to exist, do you find it more likely than not that Rambus acquired or maintained its monopoly power through anticompetitive conduct? (Enter N/A for any market for which you answered "No" to questions 1, 2, or 3)

Technology Market	Anticon	npetitive
	conduc	kanasiah Lipusasiah
	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market		X
b. Burst length technology market		V
c. Data acceleration technology market		X
d. Clock synchronization technology market		X
e. Precharge technology market		
f. Write latency technology market		1 4

	1
	If you answered "Yes" to any part of question 4, please answer question 5; if you answered "No" or "N/A" to all parts of question 4, please continue to Section II.
	5. Do you find that it is more likely than not that Rambus's anticompetitive conduct was a material cause of antitrust injury for any of the following parties:
<i>6</i>	Yes No
7	Hynix
9	Micron
10	Nanya
11	
12	If you answered "Yes" to question 5 for any party, please answer question 6: if you
13	
14	6a. Did Rambus proffer any legitimate business reason for the acts or omissions that resulted in its monopoly power?
15	in its monopoly power?
16	Yes No
17	If you answered "Yes" to question <b>6a</b> , please answer question <b>6b</b> ; if you answered "No" for <b>6a</b> , please continue to <b>Section II</b> .
18	ou, pieuse commue to section 11.
19	6b. Do you find that it is more likely than not that the anticompetitive effect of Rambus's
20	conduct that resulted in its monopoly power outweighed the procompetitive effect of that conduct?
21	Yes No
22	Please proceed to <b>Section II</b> .
23	TOT X79_X_45 6 (3 C)
24	II. Violation of the Sherman Act: Attempted Monopolization
25	Questions 7-11 below relate to Manufacturers' claims for attempted monopolization under
26	the Sherman Act.
27 28	7. For the market(s) that you found to exist in response to questions 1 and 2 in Section I above, do you find that it is more likely than not that Rambus had a specific intent to achieve
	-3- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

monopoly power in one or more of those markets? [If you answered "No" to any part of question 1 or 2, please mark "N/A" for that market.]

	Specific Intent to Monopolize?	
Markets	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market	X	
b. Burst length technology market	Х	
c. Data acceleration technology market	7	
d. Clock synchronization technology market	У	
e. Precharge technology market	Х	
f. Write latency technology market	<b>X</b>	

If you answered "Yes" to any part of question 7, please answer question 8; if you answered "No" or "N/A" to all parts, please continue to Section III.

8. For each market you have found to exist, do you find it more likely than not that Rambus engaged in anticompetitive conduct? [If you answered "No" to any part of question 1, 2, or 7, please mark "N/A" for that market.]

Technology Market	Anticompetitive	
	conduct	ner Dalinasia. Prioritis en como
	Yes	No
a. Latency technology market		×
b. Burst length technology market		X
c. Data acceleration technology market		+
d. Clock synchronization technology market		<b>&gt;</b>
e. Precharge technology market		<i>y</i>
f. Write latency technology market		1

If you answered "Yes" to any part of question 8, please answer question 9; if you answered "No" or "N/A" to all parts, please continue to Section III.

	Substantial	and real likelihood?
Markets	Yes	$N_0$
a. Latency technology market		
b. Burst length technology market		
c. Data acceleration technology market		
d. Clock synchronization technology marke	t	
e. Precharge technology market		
f. Write latency technology market		
Do you find that it is more likely than not		
0. Do you find that it is more likely than not naterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the fo	that Rambus's anti	tion III.
O. Do you find that it is more likely than not naterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the fo	that Rambus's anti	tion III.
O. Do you find that it is more likely than not naterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the form	that Rambus's anti	tion III.
Appendix App	that Rambus's anti- illowing parties?  No  In the second section III	competitive conducts
Do you find that it is more likely than not naterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the form Yes  Hynix  Micron  Nanya  If you answered "Yes" to question 10 for the form of the for	that Rambus's anti- illowing parties?  No  In the second section III	competitive conducts
O. Do you find that it is more likely than not naterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the form Yes.  Hynix  Micron  Nanya  If you answered "Yes" to question 10 for a answered "No" for all parties, please constant.  1a. Did Rambus proffer any legitimate business.	that Rambus's anti- illowing parties?  No  In the second section III	competitive conducts
And that it is more likely than not naterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of the formatterial cause of antitrust injury for any of any of antitrust injury for any of antitrust injury for any of any of any of any of any of any	that Rambus's anti- illowing parties?  No  nny party, please antimue to Section III ess reason for the access	competitive conduct of the competitive conduct o

1			
2	11b. Do you find that conduct that resulted in conduct?	it is more likely than not that the antic an anticompetitive effect outweighed to	ompetitive effect of Rambus's he procompetitive effect of that
4		27	
5	Yes _	No	
6		Please proceed to Section II	U.
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			er e
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		-6-	Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

1		FINDINGS ON FRAUD CLAIMS
2		
3	ш.	Fraud
4	A.	Intentional Misrepresentation: Please answer the following questions as to each
5	Manu	facturer:
6		Hynix
7 8		Did Rambus make important representations that it did not have any intellectual property ning to the work of JEDEC and intend or reasonably expect that the representations would ard by or repeated to others including Hynix?
9		Yes No
10		If you answered "Yes" to question 12, please answer question 13; if you answered "No"
11		please continue to Micron.
12	13.	Were Rambus's representations false?
13	13.	•
14		Yes No
15		If you answered "Yes" to question 13, please answer question 14; if you answered "No" please continue to Micron.
16 17	14. the rep	Did Rambus either know that the representations were false when it made them or make presentations recklessly and without regard for their truth?
18		Yes No
19		If you answered "Yes" to question 14, please answer question 15; if you answered "No"
20		please continue to Micron.
21	15.	Did Rambus intend for Hynix to rely on the representations?
22		Yes No
23	•	If you answered "Yes" to question 15, please answer question 16; if you answered "No"
24	-	please continue to Micron.
25	16.	Did Hynix reasonably rely on Rambus's representations?
26		Yes No
27		If you answered "Yes" to question 16, please answer question 17; if you answered "No"
28		please continue to Micron.
		-7- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

1		
2	17. Was Hynix harmed?	
3	Yes No	
4	If you answered "Yes" to question 17, please answer question 18; if you answered "No please continue to <b>Micron</b> .	) <b>"</b>
5 6	18. Were Rambus's representations a substantial factor in causing Hynix's harm?	
7	Yes No	
8		
	Trease commune to interon.	
9	Micron	
10	19. Did Rambus make important representations that it did not have any intellectual prope	erty
11	pertaining to the work of JEDEC and intend or reasonably expect that the representations would be heard by or repeated to others including Micron?	ıld
12		
13		
14	If you answered "Yes" to question 19, please answer question 20; if you answered "No please continue to Nanya.	)"
15		
16	20. Were Rambus's representations false?	
17	Yes No	
18	If you answered "Yes" to question <b>20</b> , please answer question <b>21</b> ; if you answered "No please continue to <b>Nanya</b> .	) <b>"</b>
19	21. Did Rambus either know that the representations were false when it made them or mal	ke
20	the representations recklessly and without regard for their truth?	
21	Yes No	
22	If you answered "Yes" to question 21, please answer question 22; if you answered "No	)"
23	please continue to Nanya.	
24	22. Did Rambus intend for Micron to rely on the representations?	
25	Yes No	
26	If you answered "Yes" to question 22, please answer question 23; if you answered "No	,"
27	please continue to Nanya.	
28	23. Did Micron reasonably rely on Rambus's representations?	
	_8_ Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-24	A DNAW
1	10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-1	I TATAT AA

1		Yes	N	lo		
2		_	"Yes" to questi		ise answer	question 24; if you answered "No"
4	24.	Was Micron har	•			
5		Yes	N	I o		
6		·				
7		please continue	_	on 24, piec	ise answer (	question 25; if you answered "No"
8	25.	Were Rambus's	representations	a substant	ial factor in	causing Micron's harm?
9		Voa	`N	To.		
10		Yes _	N		<del></del>	
11		Please continue	to Nanya.			
12		Nanya				
13 14	1.4		of JEDEC and in	ntend or rea	asonably ex	d not have any intellectual property pect that the representations would
15		Yes	N	Io X		
16		_			iea aneniar i	question 27; if you answered "No"
17		please continue			se unswer i	question 21, y you diswered 110
18	27.	Were Rambus's	representations	false?		
19		Yes	N	To		
20		If you answered please continue			se answer o	question 28; if you answered "No"
21	20	•			4_4:	- Calan araban it was do thoms on mades
22	28. the rep	resentations reck		-		e false when it made them or make th?
23		Yes	N	ĺο		
24					se answer i	question 29; if you answered "No"
25		please continue	-	_	se answer q	acsion 22, y you districted 110
26	29.	Did Rambus into	end for Nanya to	o rely on th	ie represent	ations?
27		Yes	N	ĺo.		
28		103				
				-	9-	Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMV
- 1	l					

1	If you answered "Yes" to question 29, please answer question 30; if you answered "No" please continue to Section III-B.		
2	30. Did Nanya reasonably rely on Rambus's representations?		
3			
4			
5 6	Please continue to <b>Section III-B</b> – there are no questions for you to answer regarding harm to Nanya.		
7	B. <u>Concealment</u> : Please answer the following questions as to each Manufacturer:		
8	Half-truths		
9			
10	of products compliant with synchronous DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC by disclosing some facts but failing to disclose other important facts, making the disclosure		
11	deceptive?		
12	Yes No		
13	If you answered "Yes" to question 31, please answer question 32; if you answered "No" please continue to <b>Omissions</b> .		
14	32. Did Hynix not know of the concealed or omitted fact?		
15	Yes No		
16	If you answered "Yes" to question 32, please answer question 33; if you answered "No"		
17	please continue to 37.		
18 19	33. Did Rambus intend to deceive Hynix by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Hynix?		
20	Yes No		
21	If you answered "Yes" to question 33, please answer question 34; if you answered "No"		
22	please continue to 37.		
23	34. Did Hynix reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?		
24	Yes No		
25	If you answered "Yes" to question 34, please answer question 35; if you answered "No" please continue to 37.		
26	35. Was Hynix harmed?		
27	Yes No		
28			
	-10- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW		

1	If you answered "Yes" to question 35, please answer question 36; if you answered "No" please continue to 37.
2	36. Were Rambus's half-truths a substantial factor in causing Hynix's harm?
3	Yes No
4	Please continue to 37.
5	37. Did Micron not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
7	Yes No
8	If you answered "Yes" to question 37, please answer question 38; if you answered "No" please continue to 42.
10 11	38. Did Rambus intend to deceive Micron by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Micron?
12	Yes No
13	If you answered "Yes" to question 38, please answer question 39; if you answered "No" please continue to 42.
14	39. Did Micron reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
15	Yes No
16 17	If you answered "Yes" to question 39, please answer question 40; if you answered "No" please continue to 42.
18	40. Was Micron harmed?
19	Yes No
20 21	If you answered "Yes" to question <b>40</b> , please answer question <b>41</b> ; if you answered "No" please continue to <b>42</b> .
22	41. Were Rambus's half-truths a substantial factor in causing Micron's harm?
23	Yes No
24	Please continue to 42.
25	42. Did Nanya not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
26	Yes No
27 28	If you answered "Yes" to question <b>42</b> , please answer question <b>43</b> ; if you answered "No" please continue to <b>Omissions</b> .
	-11- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

1 2	43. Did Rambus intend to deceive Nanya by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Nanya?		
3	Yes No		
4	If you answered "Yes" to question 43, please answer question 44; if you answered "No"		
5	please continue to <b>Omissions</b> .		
6	44. Did Nanya reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?		
7	Yes No		
8	Please continue to <b>Omissions</b> .		
9	Omissions		
10			
45. Did JEDEC members share a clearly defined expectation that members would discrete relevant knowledge they had about patent applications or the intent to file patent application technology being considered for adoption as a JEDEC standard?			
12	Yes NoX		
13	If you answered "Yes" to question 45, please answer question 46; if you answered "No"		
14	please continue to <b>Section III-C</b> .		
15 16	property coverage or potential coverage of products compliant with DRAM standards then being		
17	reasonably discovered?		
18	Yes No		
19	If you answered "Yes" to question 46, please answer question 47; if you answered "No" please continue to 52.		
20	47. Did Hynix not know of the concealed or omitted fact?		
21	Yes No		
22	If you answered "Yes" to question 47, please answer question 48; if you answered "No"		
23	please continue to 52.		
24	48. Did Rambus intend to deceive Hynix by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Hynix?		
25	Yes No		
26	If you answered "Yes" to question 48, please answer question 49; if you answered "No"		
27	please continue to 52.		
28			
	-12- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW		

	11		
1	49.	Did Hynix reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?	
2		Yes No	
3		If you answered "Yes" to question 49, please answer question 50; if you answered "No"	
4		please continue to 52.	
5	50.	Was Hynix harmed?	
6		Yes No	
7		If you answered "Yes" to question 50, please answer question 51; if you answered "No" please continue to 52.	
8	51.	Were Rambus's omissions a substantial factor in causing Hynix's harm?	
9		Yes No	
10		Please continue to 52.	
11	52.	Did Rambus actively conceal its intellectual property coverage or potential coverage of	
12	products compliant with DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC or prevent Hynix from discovering the fact?		
13	:	Yes No	
14 15		If you answered "Yes" to question 52, please answer question 53; if you answered "No" please continue to 58.	
16	53.	Did Hynix not know of the concealed or omitted fact?	
17		Yes No	
18		If you answered "Yes" to question 53, please answer question 54; if you answered "No"	
19		please continue to 58.	
20	54. reason	Did Rambus intend to deceive Hynix by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or nably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Hynix?	
21		Yes No	
22		If you answered "Yes" to question 54, please answer question 55; if you answered "No"	
23		please continue to 58.	
24	55.	Did Hynix reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?	
25		YesNo	
26		If you answered "Yes" to question 55, please answer question 56; if you answered "No"	
27		please continue to 58.	
28	56.	Was Hynix harmed?	
		-13- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW	

1		Voc.
2		Yes No
3		If you answered "Yes" to question 56, please answer question 57; if you answered "No" please continue to 58.
4	57.	Was Rambus's concealment a substantial factor in causing Hynix's harm?
5		Yes No
6		Please continue to 58.
7 8 9	consi	Did Rambus intentionally fail to disclose an important fact concerning its intellectual crty coverage or potential coverage of products compliant with DRAM standards then being dered by JEDEC that was known only to Rambus and which Micron could not have nably discovered?
10		Yes No
11		If you answered "Yes" to question 58, please answer question 59; if you answered "No" please continue to 64.
12	59.	Did Micron not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
13		Yes No
14		If you answered "Yes" to question 59, please answer question 60; if you answered "No"
15		please continue to 64.
16 17	60. reason	Did Rambus intend to deceive Micron by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or nably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Micron?
18		Yes No
19		If you answered "Yes" to question 60, please answer question 61; if you answered "No" please continue to 64.
20	61.	Did Micron reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
21		Yes No
22		If you answered "Yes" to question 61, please answer question 62; if you answered "No"
23	:	please continue to 64.
24	62.	Was Micron harmed?
25		Yes No
26		If you answered "Yes" to question 62, please answer question 63; if you answered "No" please continue to 64.
27	63	
28	63.	Were Rambus's omissions a substantial factor in causing Micron's harm?
		-14- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

1	<b>f</b> l
2	
3	
4	64. Did Rambus actively conceal its intellectual property coverage or potential coverage of products compliant with DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC or prevent Micron from discovering the fact?
5	Yes No
6	<del></del>
7	If you answered "Yes" to question 64, please answer question 65; if you answered "No" please continue to 70.
8	65. Did Micron not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
9	Yes No
10	If you answered "Yes" to question 65, please answer question 66; if you answered "No"
11	please continue to 70.
12	66. Did Rambus intend to deceive Micron by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or
13	reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Micron?
14	Yes No
15	If you answered "Yes" to question 66, please answer question 67; if you answered "No" please continue to 70.
16	67. Did Micron reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
17	Yes No
18	If you answered "Yes" to question 67, please answer question 68; if you answered "No" please continue to 70.
19	
20	68. Was Micron harmed?
21	Yes No
22	If you answered "Yes" to question 68, please answer question 69; if you answered "No"
23	please continue to 70.
24	69. Was Rambus's concealment a substantial factor in causing Micron's harm?
25	Yes No
26	Please continue to 70.
27	70. Did Rambus intentionally fail to disclose an important fact concerning its intellectual property coverage or potential coverage of products compliant with DRAM standards then being
28	considered by JEDEC that was known only to Rambus and which Nanya could not have reasonably discovered?
	-15- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

	Yes No
2	If you answered "Yes" to question 70, please answer question 71; if you answered "No"
3	please continue to 74.
4	71. Did Nanya not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
5	Yes No
6	If you answered "Ies" to question /1, please answer question 72; if you answered "No"
7	
8	reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Nanya?
9 10	Yes No
11	If you answered "Yes" to question 72, please answer question 73; if you answered "No" please continue to 74.
12	73. Did Nanya reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
13	Yes No
14	Please continue to 74.
15	74. Did Rambus actively conceal its intellectual property coverage or potential coverage of
16	products compliant with DRAM standards then being considered by JEDEC or prevent Nanya from discovering the fact?
17	Yes No
18 19	If you answered "Yes" to question 74, please answer question 75; if you answered "No" please continue to <b>Section III-C</b> .
20	75. Did Nanya not know of the concealed or omitted fact?
21	Yes No
22	If you answered "Yes" to question 75, please answer question 76; if you answered "No"
23	please continue to Section III-C.
24	76. Did Rambus intend to deceive Nanya by concealing or omitting the fact and intend or reasonably expect that the concealment would be relied on by Nanya?
25	Yes No
26	If you answered "Yes" to question 76, please answer question 77; if you answered "No"
27	please continue to Section III-C.
28	77. Did Nanya reasonably rely on Rambus's concealment?
	-16- Case Nos. 00-20905; 05-334; 06-244 RMW

	Case5:00-cv-20905-RMW Document3613 Filed03/26/08 Page18 of 18
	Yes No
2	Please continue to Section III-C.
3	B
4	C. Nominal Damages. If you answered "Yes" to any of 18, 36, 51, or 57 you must award Hynix nominal damages in the amount of \$1.00 in the field below. If you answered "Yes" to any of 25, 41, 63, or 69 you must award Migron nominal damages in the amount of \$1.00 in the field below.
5	of 25, 41, 63, or 69 you must award Micron nominal damages in the amount of \$1.00 in the field below.
6	
7	1
8	Micron: \$ <u>N/A</u>
9	·
10	D. <u>Punitive Damages</u> . If you awarded \$1.00 in any of the fields in Section III-C above, please also state whether you find by clear and convincing evidence that Rambus's conduct involved malice or fraud and was intended to harm Hynix or Micron:
11	J!
12	Plaintiff Yes No
13	Hynix
14	Micron
15	
16	Please have your foreperson sign and date your verdict form and return it to the Court.
17	3/-1/2
18	Date: 3/26/08
19	
20	Foreperson:
21	ANN HENNON
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	