

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

IN RE )  
INTEL CORPORATION )  
MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST ) MDL No. 05-1717-JJF  
LITIGATION )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., a Delaware )  
corporation, and AMD INTERNATIONAL SALES )  
& SERVICE, LTD., a Delaware corporation, )

Plaintiffs, )

C.A. No. 05-441-JJF )

v. )

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, )  
and INTEL KABUSHIKI KAISHA, a Japanese )  
corporation, )

Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

PHIL PAUL, on behalf of himself )  
and all others similarly situated, )

Plaintiffs, )

C.A. No. 05-485-JJF )

v. )

CONSOLIDATED ACTION )

INTEL CORPORATION, )

Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**INTEL'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'  
JOINT PRELIMINARY CASE STATEMENT**

**PUBLIC VERSION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. AMD’S VIEW OF THE LEGAL STANDARDS FOR ANTICOMPETITIVE CONDUCT IS CONTRADICTED BY SUPREME COURT AUTHORITY.....	5
A. AMD’s Challenge to Intel’s Pricing Practices Is Governed by <i>Brooke Group</i> .....	6
B. AMD Cannot Circumvent <i>Brooke Group</i> by Relying on Intel’s Expressions of Desire to Prevail over AMD.....	10
C. AMD Proposes an Incorrect Standard for a Price-Cost Test .....	11
D. AMD Cannot Rely on the “Synergistic” Effect of Various Forms of Lawful Conduct to Support a Claim of Illegality .....	14
III. INTEL’S RESPONSE TO AMD’S FACTUAL CONTENTIONS.....	15
A. Overview.....	15
B. AMD’s False Claims Regarding Its “Superior” Product Offerings.....	17
C. AMD’s Claims of Anticompetitive Exclusion from OEMs Are Unfounded .....	19
1. Dell.....	19
2. HP .....	23
3. IBM.....	25
4. Lenovo .....	27
5. Gateway .....	30
6. Acer.....	31
7. Sony .....	32
8. Toshiba.....	33
D. AMD’s Claim of Exclusion from the Distributor Channel has No Basis.....	33

E.	AMD’s Demand for ■ Depositions Regarding Intel’s Alleged “Exclusionary Technical Conduct” Is Completely Unsupported and Excessive.....	34
F.	Intel’s Document Policies .....	37
IV.	INTEL’S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS’ REQUESTED RELIEF.....	39

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

### CASES

<i>2660 Woodley Road Joint Venture v. ITT Sheraton Corp.</i> , 369 F.3d 732 (3d Cir. 2004).....	10
<i>Advo, Inc. v. Phila. Newspapers, Inc.</i> , 51 F.3d 1191 (3d Cir. 1995).....	4, 12, 13, 14
<i>Alaska Airlines, Inc. v. United Airlines, Inc.</i> , 948 F.2d 536 (9th Cir. 1991) .....	37
<i>Am. Academic Suppliers v. Beckley-Cardy, Inc.</i> , 922 F.2d 1317 (7th Cir. 1991) .....	15
<i>Atl. Richfield Co. v. USA Petroleum Co.</i> , 495 U.S. 328 (1990).....	8, 44
<i>Barry Wright Corp. v. ITT Grinnell Corp.</i> , 724 F.2d 227 (1st Cir. 1983).....	12, 13, 43
<i>Brooke Group Ltd. v. Brown &amp; Williamson Tobacco Corp.</i> , 509 U.S. 209 (1993).....	4, 5, 8, 9, 15, 17
<i>Cascade Health Solutions v. PeaceHealth</i> , 515 F.3d 883 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	9, 13
<i>City of Groton v. Conn. Light &amp; Power Co.</i> , 662 F.2d 921 (2d Cir. 1981).....	16
<i>Concord Boat Corp. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 207 F.3d 1039 (8th Cir. 2000) .....	9
<i>Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Or. v. Weyerhaeuser Co.</i> , 411 F.3d 1030 (9th Cir. 2005) .....	9
<i>Consol. Metal Prods., Inc. v. Am. Petroleum Inst.</i> , 846 F.2d 284 (5th Cir. 1988) .....	39
<i>Directory Sales Mgmt. Corp. v. Ohio Bell Tel. Co.</i> , 833 F.2d 606 (6th Cir. 1987) .....	15
<i>Int'l Travel Arrangers v. NWA, Inc.</i> , 991 F.2d 1389 (8th Cir. 1998) .....	15

