

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

---

In the Matter of )  
 )  
 )  
INTEL CORPORATION, ) DOCKET NO. 9288  
 )  
 )  
a corporation. )  

---

ORDER REVISING AUGUST 24, 1998, OCTOBER 28, 1998  
AND DECEMBER 11, 1998 ORDERS AND  
RECONSIDERING DECEMBER 28, 1998 ORDER

On August 24, 1998, I ordered that Respondent Intel Corporation's Application to Maintain *In Camera* Treatment of the Declaration of William R. Vigdor ("Vigdor Declaration") be granted. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the ground for which *in camera* treatment is granted is that public disclosure would likely result in a clearly defined, serious injury to Intel. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Secretary shall maintain the *in camera* treatment of the Vigdor Declaration for a period of five years.

On October 28, 1998, I ordered that Respondent Intel Corporation's Application for *In Camera* Treatment of Motion to Compel Intel to Produce Documents or a Privilege Log ("Motion to Compel") and Declaration of John O'Hara Horsley ("Horsley Declaration") be granted. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the ground for which *in camera* treatment is granted is that public disclosure would likely result in a clearly defined, serious injury to Intel. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Secretary shall maintain the *in camera* treatment of the Motion to Compel and the Horsley Declaration for a period of five years.

On December 11, 1998, I ordered that Respondent Intel Corporation's Application For *In Camera* Treatment of Respondent Intel Corporation's Response to Compaq Computer Corporation's Motion to Quash Intel's Subpoena For the Deposition of Thomas Siekman be granted on the ground that public disclosure would likely result in a clearly defined, serious injury to Intel. IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the Secretary shall maintain the *in camera* treatment of the Application, the Response, and Exhibit A to the Response for a period of five years.

On December 28, 1998, I ordered that Respondent Intel Corporation's Application to Strike Confidentiality Designation (dated December 14, 1998) be denied. Upon reconsideration, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this application be GRANTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED

that, pursuant to Paragraph 7(d) of the Protective Order, the confidentiality designation of Complaint Counsel's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Respondent's Fourth Set of Interrogatories is STRICKEN and that document is to be considered non-confidential; and that, pursuant to Paragraph 7(d) of the Protective Order, the confidentiality designation of Responses 1-15 of Complaint Counsel's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Respondent's First Set of Requests for Admission is STRICKEN and those portions of that document are to be considered non-confidential.

James P. Timony  
Administrative Law Judge

Dated: January 22, 1999