

Order

IN THE MATTER OF

RAMBUS INCORPORATED**ORDER GRANTING JOINT PETITION TO MODIFY
SCHEDULE**

Counsel for Respondent and Counsel for the Complaint have filed a Joint Petition to Modify the Schedule in the Commission's May 13, 2005 Order. The parties state that as a consequence of scheduling constraints, the schedule in the Commission's Order appears to be impractical, and they therefore request a modified schedule.

The Commission has determined to grant the Joint Petition. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT the parties' Joint Petition to Modify the Schedule in the Commission's May 13, 2005 Order is hereby **GRANTED**; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT the following schedule shall replace the schedule set forth in the Commission's May 13, 2005 Order:

1. On or before June 17, 2005, Complaint Counsel and Rambus may each file such parts of the record of the evidentiary hearing in the Infineon litigation as each party may deem relevant to any issue in this matter; provided, however, that the filing of such materials shall be accompanied by a schedule of exhibits which includes both exhibit numbers for each exhibit and a brief description of each exhibit; and
2. On or before July 8, 2005, either party may file any objections to the exhibits filed by the other party, stating with particularity each exhibit to which each objection is made and the nature of and legal basis for the objection; and

Order

3. On or before July 19, 2005, Rambus and Complaint Counsel shall file their responses, if any, to the filings required or permitted by 2., above.

Order

IN THE MATTER OF

BASIC RESEARCH, L.L.C.**ORDER**

This matter comes before the Commission on the certification by Chief Administrative Law Judge Stephen J. McGuire (“ALJ”) of three procedural motions relating to Respondents’ allegation that Complaint Counsel’s disregard of the Commission’s rules regarding electronic filings resulted in the posting and disclosure of Respondents’ confidential documents on the Commission’s public Web site. The Commission treats this allegation as a serious matter, and recognizes the public interest in ensuring that all reasonable measures be taken to safeguard confidential information from improper disclosure. Accordingly, as explained below, the Commission, after reviewing Respondents’ arguments and Complaint Counsel’s responses, has determined to dispose of the certified motions by: (1) imposing certain procedural restrictions on Complaint Counsel for the remainder of this proceeding to help prevent any recurrence of the posting of information designated confidential by Respondents or by any other submitter, but otherwise denying Respondents’ motion for an order to show cause why Complaint Counsel should not be held in contempt, including Respondents’ request for dismissal and monetary relief; (2) granting in part and denying in part Respondents’ motion seeking access to certain internal agency electronic files by providing Respondents’ with aggregate FTC Web server data; and (3) denying Respondents’ motion for additional discovery.

I. Background**A. The Documents and Motions at Issue**

The documents at issue consist of five exhibits contained in Complaint Counsel's Motion for Partial Summary Decision, filed January 31, 2005, and one exhibit contained in Complaint