

RAMBUS INC
Form 10-Q
April 30, 2012
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-Q

(Mark One)

QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the quarterly period ended March 31, 2012

OR

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from _____ to _____

Commission File Number: 000-22339

RAMBUS INC.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware
(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)

94-3112828
(I.R.S. Employer
Identification No.)

1050 Enterprise Way, Suite 700, Sunnyvale, CA 94089

(Address of principal executive offices) (zip code)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: **(408) 462-8000**

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of large accelerated filer, accelerated filer and smaller reporting company in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer

Accelerated filer

Non-accelerated filer
(Do not check if a smaller reporting company)

Smaller reporting company

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes No

The number of shares outstanding of the registrant's Common Stock, par value \$.001 per share, was 110,409,906 as of March 31, 2012.

Table of Contents

RAMBUS INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<u>Special Note Regarding Forward-Looking Statements</u>	3
PART I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION	
Item 1. Financial Statements:	
<u>Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets as of March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011</u>	5
<u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Operations for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011</u>	6
<u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income (Loss) for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011</u>	7
<u>Condensed Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011</u>	8
<u>Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements</u>	9
<u>Item 2. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	29
<u>Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk</u>	40
<u>Item 4. Controls and Procedures</u>	41
<u>PART II. OTHER INFORMATION</u>	41
<u>Item 1. Legal Proceedings</u>	41
<u>Item 1A. Risk Factors</u>	41
<u>Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds</u>	56
<u>Item 3. Defaults Upon Senior Securities</u>	56
<u>Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	56
<u>Item 5. Other Information</u>	56
<u>Item 6. Exhibits</u>	56
<u>Signature</u>	57
<u>Exhibit Index</u>	58

Table of Contents

NOTE REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q (Quarterly Report) contains forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements include, without limitation, predictions regarding the following aspects of our future:

- Success in the markets of our or our licensees' products;
- Sources of competition;
- Research and development costs and improvements in technology;
- Sources, amounts and concentration of revenue, including royalties;
- Success in renewing license agreements;
- Technology product development;
- Outcome and effect of current and potential future intellectual property litigation and other significant litigation;
- Acquisitions, mergers or strategic transactions and our related integration efforts;
- Pricing policies of our licensees;
- Deterioration of financial health of commercial counterparties and their ability to meet their obligations to us;

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

- Engineering, marketing and general and administration expenses;
- Contract revenue;
- Operating results;
- International licenses and operations;
- Effects of changes in the economy and credit market on our industry and business;
- Ability to identify, attract, motivate and retain qualified personnel;
- Growth in our business;
- Methods, estimates and judgments in accounting policies;
- Adoption of new accounting pronouncements;
- Effective tax rates;
- Realization of deferred tax assets/release of deferred tax valuation allowance;
- Trading price of our Common Stock;
- Internal control environment;
- Corporate governance;

- The level and terms of our outstanding debt;

Table of Contents

- Resolution of the governmental agency matters involving us;
- Litigation expenses;
- Protection of intellectual property;
- Terms of our licenses and amounts owed under licensing agreements;
- Indemnification and technical support obligations;
- Issuances of our securities, which could involve restrictive covenants or be dilutive to our existing stockholders; and
- Likelihood of paying dividends or repurchasing securities.

You can identify these and other forward-looking statements by the use of words such as may, future, shall, should, expects, plans, anticipate, believes, estimates, predicts, intends, potential, continue, projecting or the negative of such terms, or other comparable terminology. Forward-looking statements also include the assumptions underlying or relating to any of the foregoing statements.

Actual results could differ materially from those anticipated in these forward-looking statements as a result of various factors, including those set forth under Item 1A, Risk Factors. All forward-looking statements included in this document are based on our assessment of information available to us at this time. We assume no obligation to update any forward-looking statements.

Table of Contents

RAMBUS INC.

CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

(Unaudited)

	March 31, 2012		December 31, 2011
(In thousands, except shares and per share amounts)			
ASSETS			
Current assets:			
Cash and cash equivalents	\$	188,548	\$ 162,244
Marketable securities		43,970	127,212
Accounts receivable		728	1,026
Prepays and other current assets		7,010	8,096
Deferred taxes		2,798	2,798
Total current assets		243,054	301,376
Intangible assets, net		194,895	181,955
Goodwill		138,669	115,148
Property, plant and equipment, net		81,928	81,105
Deferred taxes, long term		7,531	7,531
Other assets		7,609	6,539
Total assets	\$	673,686	\$ 693,654
LIABILITIES & STOCKHOLDERS EQUITY			
Current liabilities:			
Accounts payable	\$	6,615	\$ 16,567
Accrued salaries and benefits		26,830	31,763
Accrued litigation expenses		10,808	10,502
Other accrued liabilities		15,173	6,479
Total current liabilities		59,426	65,311
Convertible notes, long-term		136,845	133,493
Long-term imputed financing obligation		44,285	43,793
Long-term income taxes payable		9,343	9,946
Other long-term liabilities		15,374	11,317
Total liabilities		265,273	263,860
Commitments and contingencies (Notes 7 and 13)			
Stockholders' equity:			
Convertible preferred stock, \$.001 par value:			
Authorized: 5,000,000 shares; Issued and outstanding: no shares at March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011			
Common Stock, \$.001 par value:			
Authorized: 500,000,000 shares; Issued and outstanding: 110,409,906 shares at March 31, 2012 and 110,267,145 shares at December 31, 2011			
		110	110
Additional paid in capital		1,056,131	1,049,716
Accumulated deficit		(647,533)	(619,643)
Accumulated other comprehensive loss		(295)	(389)
Total stockholders' equity		408,413	429,794
Total liabilities and stockholders' equity	\$	673,686	\$ 693,654

See Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements

Table of Contents

RAMBUS INC.

CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS

(Unaudited)

	Three Months Ended	
	March 31,	
	2012	2011
	(In thousands, except per share amounts)	
Revenue:		
Royalties	\$ 62,043	\$ 59,235
Contract revenue	820	3,292
Total revenue	62,863	62,527
Operating costs and expenses:		
Cost of revenue*	7,163	3,149
Research and development*	38,394	23,317
Marketing, general and administrative*	34,834	32,732
Costs of restatement and related legal activities	30	1,159
Gain from settlement		(6,200)
Total operating costs and expenses	80,421	54,157
Operating income (loss)	(17,558)	8,370
Interest income and other income (expense), net	98	164
Interest expense	(6,580)	(5,988)
Interest and other income (expense), net	(6,482)	(5,824)
Income (loss) before income taxes	(24,040)	2,546
Provision for income taxes	3,850	6,776
Net loss	\$ (27,890)	\$ (4,230)
Net loss per share:		
Basic	\$ (0.25)	\$ (0.04)
Diluted	\$ (0.25)	\$ (0.04)
Weighted average shares used in per share calculation:		
Basic	110,358	107,613
Diluted	110,358	107,613

* Includes stock-based compensation:

Cost of revenue	\$ 10	\$ 123
Research and development	\$ 2,720	\$ 2,512
Marketing, general and administrative	\$ 3,996	\$ 4,655

See Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements

Table of Contents

RAMBUS INC.

CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE INCOME (LOSS)

(Unaudited)

	Three Months Ended March 31,		
	2012	(In thousands)	2011
Net loss	\$	(27,890)	\$ (4,230)
Other comprehensive income (loss):			
Unrealized gain (loss) on marketable securities, net of tax		94	(1)
Total comprehensive loss	\$	(27,796)	\$ (4,231)

See Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements

Table of Contents

RAMBUS INC.

CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

(Unaudited)

	Three Months Ended March 31,	
	2012	2011
	(In thousands)	
Cash flows from operating activities:		
Net loss	\$ (27,890)	\$ (4,230)
Adjustments to reconcile net loss to net cash used in operating activities:		
Stock-based compensation	6,726	7,290
Depreciation	3,099	2,803
Amortization of intangible assets	7,616	1,979
Non-cash interest expense and amortization of convertible debt issuance costs	3,510	3,016
Deferred tax benefit		(46)
Change in assets and liabilities, net of effects of acquisition:		
Accounts receivable	298	2,211
Prepays and other assets	4,200	(343)
Accounts payable	(9,565)	4,091
Accrued salaries and benefits and other accrued liabilities	1,502	(24,502)
Accrued litigation expenses	306	684
Income taxes payable	(794)	2,502
Net cash used in operating activities	(10,992)	(4,545)
Cash flows from investing activities:		
Acquisition of businesses, net of cash acquired	(42,397)	
Purchases of property, plant and equipment	(3,043)	(6,478)
Acquisition of intangible assets	(250)	
Purchases of marketable securities		(94,160)
Maturities of marketable securities	82,926	62,820
Net cash provided by (used in) investing activities	37,236	(37,818)
Cash flows from financing activities:		
Proceeds received from issuance of common stock under employee stock plans	63	3,263
Principal payments against lease financing obligation	(3)	(417)
Proceeds from landlord for tenant improvements		6,739
Payments under installment payment arrangement		(250)
Net cash provided by financing activities	60	9,335
Net (decrease) increase in cash and cash equivalents	26,304	(33,028)
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period	162,244	215,262
Cash and cash equivalents at end of period	\$ 188,548	\$ 182,234
Non-cash investing activities and financing activities:		
Property, plant and equipment received and accrued in accounts payable and other accrued liabilities	\$ 3,893	\$ 2,362
Non-cash obligation for property, plant and equipment	\$ 495	\$
Intangible assets acquired under installment payment arrangement	\$ 1,050	\$
Remaining purchase consideration for acquisition of business	\$ 3,881	\$

See Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements

Table of Contents

RAMBUS INC.

NOTES TO UNAUDITED CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

1. Basis of Presentation

The accompanying unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements include the accounts of Rambus Inc. (Rambus or the Company) and its wholly-owned subsidiaries. All intercompany accounts and transactions have been eliminated in the accompanying unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements. Investments in entities with less than 20% ownership or in which the Company does not have the ability to significantly influence the operations of the investee are being accounted for using the cost method and are included in other assets.

In the opinion of management, the unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements include all adjustments (consisting only of normal recurring items) necessary to state fairly the financial position and results of operations for each interim period presented. Interim results are not necessarily indicative of results for a full year.

The unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the SEC) applicable to interim financial information. Certain information and Note disclosures included in the financial statements prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles have been omitted in these interim statements pursuant to such SEC rules and regulations. The information included in this Form 10-Q should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and notes thereto in Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2011.

Reclassifications

Certain prior year balances were reclassified to conform to the current year s presentation. None of these reclassifications had an impact on reported net income (loss) for any of the periods presented.

2. Recent Accounting Pronouncements

In December 2011, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued Accounting Standards Update (ASU) No. 2011-11, Disclosures about Offsetting Assets and Liabilities. ASU 2011-11 will require the Company to disclose information about offsetting and related arrangements to enable users of its financial statements to understand the effect of those arrangements on its financial position. The new guidance is effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2013, and interim periods within those annual periods. The disclosures are to be applied retrospectively for all comparative periods presented. The Company does not expect that this guidance will have an impact on its financial position, results of operations or cash flows as it is disclosure-only in nature.

In September 2011, the FASB amended its guidance to simplify how an entity tests goodwill for impairment. The amendment will allow an entity to first assess qualitative factors to determine whether it is necessary to perform the two-step quantitative goodwill impairment test. An entity no longer will be required to calculate the fair value of a reporting unit unless the entity determines, based on a qualitative assessment, that it is more likely than not that its fair value is less than its carrying amount. The amendment became effective for the Company's interim period ended March 31, 2012. The Company will apply this guidance in its fourth quarter of fiscal 2012 at the time it performs its annual goodwill test and does not expect that this guidance will materially impact the Company's financial position or results of operations.

In May 2011, the FASB amended its guidance to converge fair value measurement and disclosure guidance about fair value measurement under U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). IFRS is a comprehensive series of accounting standards published by the International Accounting Standards Board. The amendment changes the wording used to describe many of the requirements in U.S. GAAP for measuring fair value and for disclosing information about fair value measurements. For many of the requirements, the FASB does not intend for the amendment to result in a change in the application of the requirements in the current authoritative guidance. The amendment became effective prospectively for the Company's interim period ended March 31, 2012. The Company adopted this guidance and the adoption did not have a material impact on the Company's financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

Table of Contents

3. Settlement Agreement with Samsung

On January 19, 2010, the Company, Samsung and certain related entities of Samsung entered into a Settlement Agreement (the Settlement Agreement) to release all claims against each other with respect to all outstanding litigation between them and certain other potential claims. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the Company and Samsung entered into a Semiconductor Patent License Agreement on January 19, 2010 (the License Agreement), under which Samsung licenses from the Company non-exclusive rights to certain Rambus patents and has agreed to pay the Company cash amounts equal to approximately \$25.0 million per quarter, subject to certain adjustments and conditions related to their DRAM revenue. These payments commenced in the first quarter of 2010 and will conclude in the last quarter of 2014.

The settlement with Samsung is a multiple element arrangement for accounting purposes. For a multiple element arrangement, the Company is required to determine the fair value of the elements. The Company considered several factors in determining the accounting fair value of the elements of the settlement with Samsung which included a third party valuation using an income approach, the Black-Scholes-Merton option pricing model and a residual approach (collectively the Fair Value). The total gain from settlement related to the settlement with Samsung of \$133.0 million was recognized as of the end of the first quarter of 2011, of which \$6.2 million was recognized in the first quarter of 2011. The gain from settlement represents the Fair Value of the cash consideration allocated to the resolution of the antitrust litigation settlement and the residual value of other elements.

4. Acquisitions

Unity Semiconductor Corporation

On February 3, 2012, the Company completed its acquisition of a privately-held company, Unity Semiconductor Corporation (Unity), by acquiring all issued and outstanding shares of capital stock of Unity. Pursuant to the merger agreement on February 3, 2012, a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company merged with and into Unity, with Unity as the surviving corporation. Under the terms of the merger agreement, the purchase price is \$35.0 million subject to certain adjustments, of which the Company has paid approximately \$31.3 million in cash and will pay the balance in the second quarter of 2012. Of the purchase price, approximately \$5.5 million in cash was deposited into an escrow account until August 3, 2013, subject to any claims, to fund any indemnification obligations to the Company following the consummation of the merger. The Company acquired Unity s technology and a portfolio of non-volatile solid state memory patents. The solid state memory technology is intended to replace NAND in the growing non-volatile memory market. This memory technology has been designed to accelerate the commercialization of the Terabit generation of non-volatile memories. Devices using this technology are expected to achieve higher density, faster performance, lower manufacturing costs and greater data reliability than NAND Flash. Unity is part of the Semiconductor Business Group (SBG) reportable segment. The Company incurred approximately \$0.6 million in direct acquisition costs in connection with the acquisition which were expensed as incurred.

In addition to the purchase consideration, the Company agreed to pay an aggregate of \$5.0 million in retention bonuses to certain Unity employees over the next three years. The retention bonus payouts are subject to the condition of employment, and therefore, will be treated as compensation and expensed as incurred on a graded attribution basis.

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

The purchase price allocation for the business acquired is based on management's estimate of the fair value for purchase accounting purposes at the date of acquisition. The fair value of the assets acquired has been determined primarily by using valuation methods that discount the expected future cash flows to present value using estimates and assumptions determined by management, which is a level three fair value measurement. The Company performed a valuation of the net assets acquired as of the February 3, 2012 closing date. The purchase price from the business combination was allocated as follows:

	Total (in thousands)	
Cash	\$	182
Property and equipment		51
Other tangible assets		36
Identified intangible assets		19,280
Goodwill		15,451
Total	\$	35,000

The goodwill arising from the acquisition is primarily attributed to synergies related to the combination of new and complementary technologies of the Company and the assembled workforce of Unity. This goodwill is not expected to be deductible for tax purposes.

Table of Contents

The identified intangible assets assumed in the acquisition of Unity were recognized as existing technology based upon their fair values as of the acquisition date. The purchased intangible assets have an estimated average useful life of 10 years from the date of acquisition.

Other Acquisition Activities

In the first quarter of 2012, the Company entered into one additional business combination and a patent acquisition for \$12.8 million, which resulted in approximately \$8.1 million of goodwill, \$3.7 million of intangible assets (weighted average useful life of 6 years) and \$1.0 million of other assets and has an additional payment of \$1.0 million due in the second quarter of 2012. These acquisitions are part of the All Other reportable segment.

The condensed consolidated financial statements include the operating results of these businesses from the date of acquisition. The acquired assets did not generate any revenue during the reported periods. Pro forma results of operations for these business combinations have not been presented because their effects were not significant to the Company's financial results.

5. Equity Incentive Plans and Stock-Based Compensation***Stock Option Plans***

As of March 31, 2012, 359,315 shares of the 14,900,000 shares approved under the 2006 Equity Incentive Plan (the 2006 Plan) remain available for grant. The 2006 Plan is now the Company's only plan for providing stock-based incentive awards to eligible employees, executive officers, non-employee directors and consultants; however, the 1997 Stock Option Plan (the 1997 Plan) and the 1999 Non-statutory Stock Option Plan (the 1999 Plan) will continue to govern awards previously granted under those plans.

A summary of shares available for grant under the Company's plans is as follows:

	Shares Available for Grant
Shares available as of December 31, 2011	2,812,876
Stock options granted	(1,937,002)
Stock options forfeited	136,993
Stock options expired under former plans	(21,837)
Nonvested equity stock and stock units granted (1)	(635,057)
Nonvested equity stock and stock units forfeited (1)	3,342
Total available for grant as of March 31, 2012	359,315

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

(1) For purposes of determining the number of shares available for grant under the 2006 Plan against the maximum number of shares authorized, each restricted stock granted reduces the number of shares available for grant by 1.5 shares and each restricted stock forfeited increases shares available for grant by 1.5 shares.

General Stock Option Information

The following table summarizes stock option activity under the 1997 Plan, 1999 Plan and 2006 Plan for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and information regarding stock options outstanding, exercisable, and vested and expected to vest as of March 31, 2012.

	Options Outstanding Number of Shares	Weighted Average Exercise Price Per Share	Weighted Average Remaining Contractual Term (years)	Aggregate Intrinsic Value
	(Dollars in thousands, except per share amounts)			
Outstanding as of December 31, 2011	14,587,596	\$ 19.73		
Options granted	1,937,002	7.30		
Options exercised	(11,467)	4.67		
Options forfeited	(136,993)	17.86		
Outstanding as of March 31, 2012	16,376,138	18.28	5.77	\$ 497
Vested or expected to vest at March 31, 2012	15,699,805	18.46	5.63	497
Options exercisable at March 31, 2012	10,806,897	20.18	4.23	497

Table of Contents

The aggregate intrinsic value in the table above represents the total pre-tax intrinsic value for in-the-money options at March 31, 2012, based on the \$6.45 closing stock price of Rambus Common Stock on March 30, 2012 on the NASDAQ Global Select Market, which would have been received by the option holders had all option holders exercised their options as of that date. The total number of in-the-money options outstanding and exercisable as of March 31, 2012 was 250,967 and 250,967, respectively.

Employee Stock Purchase Plan

No purchases were made under the 2006 Employee Stock Purchase Plans (ESPP) during the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011 respectively. As of March 31, 2012, 313,964 shares under the ESPP remain available for issuance.

Stock-Based Compensation

For the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, the Company maintained stock plans covering a broad range of potential equity grants including stock options, nonvested equity stock and equity stock units and performance based instruments. In addition, the Company sponsors an ESPP, whereby eligible employees are entitled to purchase Common Stock semi-annually, by means of limited payroll deductions, at a 15% discount from the fair market value of the Common Stock as of specific dates.

Stock Options

During the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, Rambus granted 1,937,002 and 1,633,701 stock options, respectively, with an estimated total grant-date fair value of \$7.5 million and \$17.7 million, respectively. During the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, Rambus recorded stock-based compensation related to stock options of \$4.3 million and \$5.2 million, respectively.

As of March 31, 2012, there was \$38.1 million of total unrecognized compensation cost, net of expected forfeitures, related to unvested stock-based compensation arrangements granted under the stock option plans. That cost is expected to be recognized over a weighted-average period of 3.4 years. The total fair value of shares vested as of March 31, 2012 was \$148.8 million.

The total intrinsic value of options exercised was \$39 thousand and \$2.1 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively. Intrinsic value is the total value of exercised shares based on the price of the Company's common stock at the time of exercise less the cash received from the employees to exercise the options.

During the three months ended March 31, 2012, net proceeds from employee stock option exercises totaled approximately \$54 thousand.

Employee Stock Purchase Plan

For the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, the Company recorded compensation expense related to the ESPP of \$0.7 million and \$0.4 million, respectively. As of March 31, 2012 there was \$0.2 million of total unrecognized compensation cost related to share-based compensation arrangements granted under the ESPP. This cost is expected to be recognized over one month.

There were no tax benefits realized as a result of employee stock option exercises, stock purchase plan purchases, and vesting of equity stock and stock units for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011 calculated in accordance with accounting for share-based payments.

Valuation Assumptions

The fair value of stock awards is estimated as of the grant date using the Black-Scholes-Merton (BSM) option-pricing model assuming a dividend yield of 0% and the additional weighted-average assumptions as listed in the following tables:

	Three Months Ended	
	2012	March 31, 2011
Stock Option Plans		
Expected stock price volatility	60%	52%
Risk free interest rate	0.7%	2.8%
Expected term (in years)	5.6	6.0
Weighted-average fair value of stock options granted	\$ 3.88	\$ 10.81

Table of Contents

No grants were made under the ESPP during the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011.

Nonvested Equity Stock and Stock Units

The Company grants nonvested equity stock units to officers, employees and directors. During the three months ended March 31, 2012, the Company granted nonvested equity stock units totaling 423,371 shares under the 2006 Plan. These awards have a service condition, generally a service period of four years, except in the case of grants to directors, for which the service period is one year. The nonvested equity stock units were valued at the date of grant giving them a fair value of approximately \$3.1 million. The Company occasionally grants nonvested equity stock units to its employees with vesting subject to the achievement of certain performance conditions. During the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, the achievement of certain performance conditions for certain performance equity stock units was considered probable, and as a result, the Company recognized stock-based compensation expense related to these performance stock units for both periods; the aggregate amounts were not significant.

For the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, the Company recorded stock-based compensation expense of approximately \$1.8 million and \$1.7 million, respectively, related to all outstanding nonvested equity stock grants. Unrecognized stock-based compensation related to all nonvested equity stock grants, net of estimated forfeitures, was approximately \$9.5 million at March 31, 2012. This is expected to be recognized over a weighted average of 2.5 years.

The following table reflects the activity related to nonvested equity stock and stock units for the three months ended March 31, 2012:

Nonvested Equity Stock and Stock Units	Shares	Weighted-Average Grant-Date Fair Value
Nonvested at December 31, 2011	763,510	\$ 18.02
Granted	423,371	7.28
Vested	(181,099)	18.75
Forfeited	(2,228)	7.31
Nonvested at March 31, 2012	1,003,554	13.38

6. Marketable Securities

Rambus invests its excess cash and cash equivalents primarily in U.S. government sponsored obligations, commercial paper, corporate notes and bonds, money market funds and municipal notes and bonds that mature within three years. As of March 31, 2012, all of the Company's cash equivalents and marketable securities had a remaining maturity of less than one year.

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

All cash equivalents and marketable securities are classified as available-for-sale. Total cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities are summarized as follows:

(Dollars in thousands)	Fair Value	Amortized Cost	March 31, 2012		Weighted Rate of Return
			Gross Unrealized Gains	Gross Unrealized Losses	
Money market funds	\$ 172,588	\$ 172,588	\$	\$	0.01%
Corporate notes, bonds and commercial paper	43,970	43,976	1	(7)	0.13%
Total cash equivalents and marketable securities	216,558	216,564	1	(7)	
Cash	15,960	15,960			
Total cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities	\$ 232,518	\$ 232,524	\$ 1	\$ (7)	

(Dollars in thousands)	Fair Value	Amortized Cost	As of December 31, 2011		Weighted Rate of Return
			Gross Unrealized Gains	Gross Unrealized Losses	
Money market funds	\$ 127,559	\$ 127,559	\$	\$	0.01%
Corporate notes, bonds and commercial paper	137,108	137,208		(100)	0.29%
Total cash equivalents and marketable securities	264,667	264,767		(100)	
Cash	24,789	24,789			
Total cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities	\$ 289,456	\$ 289,556	\$	\$ (100)	

Table of Contents

Available-for-sale securities are reported at fair value on the balance sheets and classified as follows:

	March 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
	(Dollars in thousands)	
Cash equivalents	\$ 172,588	\$ 137,455
Short term marketable securities	43,970	127,212
Total cash equivalents and marketable securities	216,558	264,667
Cash	15,960	24,789
Total cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities	\$ 232,518	\$ 289,456

The Company continues to invest in highly rated, highly liquid debt securities. As of March 31, 2012, these securities had a remaining maturity of less than one year. The Company holds all of its marketable securities as available-for-sale, marks them to market and regularly reviews its portfolio to ensure adherence to its investment policy and to monitor individual investments for risk analysis, proper valuation and unrealized losses that may be other than temporary. As of March 31, 2012, certain marketable debt securities with a fair value of \$39.6 million, which mature within one year, had insignificant unrealized losses. The unrealized loss, net, at March 31, 2012 was insignificant in relation to the Company's total available-for-sale portfolio. The unrealized loss, net, can be primarily attributed to a combination of market conditions as well as the demand for and duration of the corporate notes and bonds. The Company has no intent to sell, there is no requirement to sell and the Company believes that it can recover the amortized cost of these investments. The Company has found no evidence of impairment due to credit losses in its portfolio. Therefore, these unrealized losses were recorded in other comprehensive income (loss). However, the Company cannot provide any assurance that its portfolio of cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities will not be impacted by adverse conditions in the financial markets, which may require the Company in the future to record an impairment charge for credit losses which could adversely impact its financial results.

The estimated fair value of cash equivalents and marketable securities classified by date of contractual maturity and the length of time that the securities have been in a continuous unrealized loss, net, position at March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 are as follows:

	March 31, 2012	As of	December 31, 2011	March 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
			Unrealized Loss, net		
			(In thousands)		
Less than one year	\$ 216,558	\$	264,667	\$ (6)	\$ (100)

See Note 14, Fair Value of Financial Instruments, for discussion regarding the fair value of the Company's cash equivalents and marketable securities.

7. Commitments and Contingencies

As of March 31, 2012, the Company's material contractual obligations are (in thousands):

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

	Total	Remainder of 2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Thereafter
Contractual obligations (1)							
Imputed financing obligation (2)	\$ 59,071	\$ 4,711	\$ 6,827	\$ 6,997	\$ 7,168	\$ 7,348	\$ 26,020
Leases	9,529	2,800	1,562	1,472	1,345	992	1,358
Software licenses (3)	2,747	2,308	359	80			
Acquisition retention bonuses (4)	57,390	16,667	19,114	19,113	2,496		
Convertible notes	172,500			172,500			
Interest payments related to convertible notes	21,563	8,625	8,625	4,313			
Total	\$ 322,800	\$ 35,111	\$ 36,487	\$ 204,475	\$ 11,009	\$ 8,340	\$ 27,378

(1) The above table does not reflect possible payments in connection with uncertain tax benefits of approximately \$16.0 million including \$7.0 million recorded as a reduction of long-term deferred tax assets and \$9.0 million in long-term income taxes payable, as of March 31, 2012. As noted below in Note 9, Income Taxes, although it is possible that some of the unrecognized tax benefits could be settled within the next 12 months, the Company cannot reasonably estimate the outcome at this time.

Table of Contents

- (2) With respect to the imputed financing obligation, the main components of the difference between the amount reflected in the contractual obligations table and the amount reflected on the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets are the interest on the imputed financing obligation and the estimated common area expenses over the future periods. Additionally, the amount includes the amended Ohio lease and the amended Sunnyvale lease.
- (3) The Company has commitments with various software vendors for non-cancellable license agreements generally having terms longer than one year. The above table summarizes those contractual obligations as of March 31, 2012 which are also presented on the Company's Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet under current and other long-term liabilities.
- (4) In connection with recent acquisitions, the Company is obligated to pay retention bonuses to certain employees and contractors, subject to certain eligibility and acceleration provisions including the condition of employment. The Cryptography Research, Inc. (CRI) retention bonuses payable on June 3, 2013 and 2014 will be paid in cash or stock at the Company's election.

Rent expense was approximately \$0.8 million and \$0.6 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively.

Deferred rent of \$0.5 million as of March 31, 2012 was included primarily in other long-term liabilities. Deferred rent of \$0.5 million as of December 31, 2011 was included primarily in other long-term liabilities.

Indemnifications

The Company enters into standard license agreements in the ordinary course of business. Although the Company does not indemnify most of its customers, there are times when an indemnification is a necessary means of doing business. Indemnifications cover customers for losses suffered or incurred by them as a result of any patent, copyright, or other intellectual property infringement claim by any third party with respect to the Company's products. The maximum amount of indemnification the Company could be required to make under these agreements is generally limited to fees received by the Company.

Several securities fraud class actions, private lawsuits and shareholder derivative actions were filed in state and federal courts against certain of the Company's current and former officers and directors related to the stock option granting actions. As permitted under Delaware law, the Company has agreements whereby its officers and directors are indemnified for certain events or occurrences while the officer or director is, or was serving, at the Company's request in such capacity. The term of the indemnification period is for the officer's or director's term in such capacity. The maximum potential amount of future payments the Company could be required to make under these indemnification agreements is unlimited. The Company has a director and officer insurance policy that reduces the Company's exposure and enables the Company to recover a portion of future amounts to be paid. As a result of these indemnification agreements, the Company continues to make payments on behalf of current and former officers. As of March 31, 2012, the Company had made cumulative payments of approximately \$31.9 million on their behalf, including \$30.0 thousand in the quarter ended March 31, 2012. As of March 31, 2011, the Company had made cumulative payments of approximately \$16.9 million on their behalf, including \$1.2 million in the quarter ended March 31, 2011. These payments were recorded under costs of restatement and related legal activities in the condensed consolidated statements of operations.

8. Stockholders' Equity

Share Repurchase Program

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

During the three months ended March 31, 2012, the Company did not repurchase any shares of its Common Stock under its share repurchase program. As of March 31, 2012, the Company had repurchased a cumulative total of approximately 26.3 million shares of its Common Stock with an aggregate price of approximately \$428.9 million since the commencement of the program in 2001. As of March 31, 2012, there remained an outstanding authorization to repurchase approximately 5.2 million shares of the Company's outstanding Common Stock.

The Company records stock repurchases as a reduction to stockholders' equity. The Company records a portion of the purchase price of the repurchased shares as an increase to accumulated deficit when the price of the shares repurchased exceeds the average original proceeds per share received from the issuance of Common Stock.

Table of Contents

9. Income Taxes

During the quarter ended March 31, 2012, the Company calculated its interim tax provision to record taxes incurred by the U.S. entity on a discrete basis because the Company is projecting losses in which a tax benefit cannot be recognized in accordance with FASB Accounting Standards Codification 740, Income Taxes. The Company recorded a provision for income taxes of \$3.9 million and \$6.8 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively. The provision for income taxes of \$3.9 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 is primarily comprised of withholding taxes and other foreign taxes based upon income earned during the period with no tax benefit recorded for the loss jurisdictions.

During the three months ended March 31, 2012, the Company paid withholding taxes of \$4.4 million. As the Company continues to maintain a valuation allowance against its U.S. deferred tax assets, the Company's tax provision is based primarily on the withholding taxes, other foreign taxes and current state taxes.

As of March 31, 2012, the Company's condensed consolidated balance sheets included net deferred tax assets, before valuation allowance, of approximately \$149.3 million, which consists of net operating loss carryovers, tax credit carryovers, depreciation and amortization, employee stock-based compensation expenses and certain liabilities, partially reduced by deferred tax liabilities associated with the convertible debt instruments that may be settled in cash upon conversion, including partial cash settlements. As of March 31, 2012, a full valuation allowance has been recorded against the U.S. deferred tax assets. During the three months ended March 31, 2012, the Company did not significantly change its deferred tax assets. Management periodically evaluates the realizability of the Company's net deferred tax assets based on all available evidence, both positive and negative. The realization of net deferred tax assets is solely dependent on the Company's ability to generate sufficient future taxable income during periods prior to the expiration of tax statutes to fully utilize these assets. The Company intends to maintain the valuation allowance until sufficient positive evidence exists to support its reversal.

The Company maintains liabilities for uncertain tax positions within its long-term income taxes payable accounts. These liabilities involve judgment and estimation and are monitored by management based on the best information available including changes in tax regulations, the outcome of relevant court cases and other information.

As of March 31, 2012, the Company had approximately \$16.0 million of unrecognized tax benefits, including \$7.0 million recorded as a reduction of long-term deferred tax assets and \$9.0 million in long-term income taxes payable. If recognized, approximately \$2.2 million would be recorded as an income tax benefit. No benefit would be recorded for the remaining unrecognized tax benefits as the recognition would require a corresponding increase in the valuation allowance. As of December 31, 2011, the Company had \$16.6 million of unrecognized tax benefits, including \$7.0 million recorded as a reduction of long-term deferred tax assets and \$9.6 million in long-term income taxes payable.

Although it is possible that some of the unrecognized tax benefits could be settled within the next 12 months, the Company cannot reasonably estimate the outcome at this time.

The Company recognizes interest and penalties related to uncertain tax positions as a component of the income tax provision. At March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011, an insignificant amount of interest and penalties are included in long-term income taxes payable.

Rambus files U.S. federal income tax returns as well as income tax returns in various states and foreign jurisdictions. The Company is subject to examination by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for tax years ended 2009 through 2011. The Company is also subject to examination by the State of California for tax years ended 2008 through 2011. In addition, any research and development credit carry forward or net operating loss carry forward generated in prior years and utilized in these or future years may also be subject to examination by the IRS and the State of California. The Company is also subject to examination in various other foreign jurisdictions, including India, for various periods.

The Company's future effective tax rates could be adversely affected by earnings being higher than anticipated in countries where the Company has higher statutory rates or lower than anticipated in countries where it has lower statutory rates, by changes in valuation of its deferred tax assets and liabilities or by changes in tax laws or interpretations of those laws.

10. Earnings (Loss) Per Share

Basic earnings (loss) per share is calculated by dividing the net income (loss) by the weighted average number of common shares outstanding during the period. Diluted earnings (loss) per share is calculated by dividing the earnings (loss) by the weighted average

Table of Contents

number of common shares and potentially dilutive securities outstanding during the period. Potentially dilutive common shares consist of incremental common shares issuable upon exercise of stock options, employee stock purchases, restricted stock and restricted stock units and shares issuable upon the conversion of convertible notes. The dilutive effect of outstanding shares is reflected in diluted earnings per share by application of the treasury stock method. This method includes consideration of the amounts to be paid by the employees, the amount of excess tax benefits that would be recognized in equity if the instrument was exercised and the amount of unrecognized stock-based compensation related to future services. No potential dilutive common shares are included in the computation of any diluted per share amount when a net loss is reported. For the first eight months of 2011, the Company reported approximately 4.8 million shares issued to Samsung as contingently redeemable common stock (CRCS) due to the contractual put rights associated with those shares. As such, the Company used the two-class method for reporting earnings per share for 2011.

The following table sets forth the computation of basic and diluted loss per share:

	Three Months Ended March 31,			
	2012	(In thousands, except per share amounts)		2011
	CRCS*	Other CS**	CRCS*	Other CS**
Basic net loss per share:				
Numerator:				
Allocation of undistributed earnings	\$	\$ (27,890)	\$ (188)	\$ (4,042)
Denominator:				
Weighted-average common shares outstanding		110,358	4,788	102,825
Basic net loss per share	\$	\$ (0.25)	\$ (0.04)	\$ (0.04)
Diluted net loss per share:				
Numerator:				
Allocation of undistributed earnings for diluted computation	\$	\$ (27,890)	\$ (188)	\$ (4,042)
Denominator:				
Number of shares used in diluted computation		110,358	4,788	102,825
Diluted net loss per share	\$	\$ (0.25)	\$ (0.04)	\$ (0.04)

* CRCS Contingently Redeemable Common Stock

** Other CS Common Stock other than CRCS

For the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, options to purchase approximately 16.1 million and 7.8 million shares, respectively, were excluded from the calculation because they were anti-dilutive after considering proceeds from exercise, taxes and related unrecognized stock-based compensation expense. For the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, an additional 5.4 million and 3.0 million, respectively, potentially dilutive shares have been excluded from the weighted average dilutive shares because there was a net loss for the period.

11. Business Segments and Major Customers

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

For the three months ended March 31, 2012, only SBG was considered a reportable segment as it met the quantitative thresholds for disclosure as a reportable segment. The results of the remaining immaterial operating segments were combined and shown under All Other.

The Company evaluates the performance of its segments based on segment direct operating income (loss). Segment direct operating income (loss) does not include the allocation of any corporate support functions (including human resources, facilities, legal, finance, information technology, corporate development, general administration, corporate licensing and marketing expenses, advanced technology development, and cost of restatement) to the segments. Additionally, certain expenses are not allocated to the operating segments because they are managed at the corporate level and they are not considered in evaluating the segments' operating performance. Such unallocated corporate level expenses include stock-based compensation expenses, depreciation and amortization expenses, and certain bonus and acquisition expenses. The Reconciling Items category includes these unallocated corporate support function expenses as well as corporate level expenses. The presentation of the three months ended March 31, 2011 segment data has been updated accordingly to conform with the 2012 segment direct operating income (loss) definition.

Table of Contents

The table below presents reported segment revenues and reported segment direct operating income (loss).

	For the Three Months Ended March 31, 2012		
	SBG	All Other (In thousands)	Total
Revenues	\$ 57,088	\$ 5,775	\$ 62,863
Segment direct operating income (loss)	\$ 43,604	\$ (3,307)	\$ 40,297
Reconciling items			(57,855)
Total operating loss			\$ (17,558)
Interest and other expense, net			(6,482)
Loss before income taxes			\$ (24,040)

	For the Three Months Ended March 31, 2011		
	SBG	All Other (In thousands)	Total
Revenues	\$ 62,376	\$ 151	\$ 62,527
Gain from settlement	\$ 6,200		\$ 6,200
Segment direct operating income (loss)	\$ 56,442	\$ (3,594)	\$ 52,848
Reconciling items			(44,478)
Total operating income			\$ 8,370
Interest and other expense, net			(5,824)
Income before income taxes			\$ 2,546

The Company's chief operating decision authority resides with the senior executive management team, which does not review information regarding assets on an operating segment basis. Additionally, the Company does not record intersegment revenue or expense.

Customers A, C and E accounted for 37%, 13% and 10%, respectively, of revenue in the three months ended March 31, 2012. Customers A, B, C and D accounted for 31%, 14%, 11% and 11%, respectively, of revenue in the three months ended March 31, 2011.

Rambus licenses its technologies and patents to customers in multiple geographic regions. Revenue from customers in the following geographic regions was recognized as follows:

	Three Months Ended	
	2012	March 31, 2011
	(In thousands)	
South Korea	\$ 23,247	\$ 19,144
Japan	17,569	29,601
USA	16,189	13,499
Canada	1,979	128
Asia-Other	2,750	148
Europe	1,129	7

Total	\$	62,863	\$	62,527
-------	----	--------	----	--------

Table of Contents**12. Amortizable Intangible Assets and Goodwill***Amortizable Intangible Assets*

The components of the Company's intangible assets as of March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 were as follows:

	Useful Life	Gross Carrying Amount	As of March 31, 2012 Accumulated Amortization (In thousands)	Net Carrying Amount
Patents	3 to 10 years	\$ 29,943	\$ (13,965)	\$ 15,978
Customer contracts and contractual relationships	1 to 10 years	32,650	(9,357)	23,293
Existing technology	3 to 10 years	178,320	(22,913)	155,407
Non-compete agreements	3 years	300	(83)	217
Intellectual property	4 years	10,384	(10,384)	
Total intangible assets		\$ 251,597	\$ (56,702)	\$ 194,895

	Useful Life	Gross Carrying Amount	As of December 31, 2011 Accumulated Amortization (In thousands)	Net Carrying Amount
Patents	3 to 10 years	\$ 28,643	\$ (12,997)	\$ 15,646
Customer contracts and contractual relationships	1 to 10 years	33,550	(7,148)	26,402
Existing technology	3 to 7 years	159,350	(19,685)	139,665
Non-compete agreements	3 years	400	(158)	242
Intellectual property	4 years	10,384	(10,384)	
Total intangible assets		\$ 232,327	\$ (50,372)	\$ 181,955

Amortization expense for intangible assets for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011 was \$7.6 million and \$2.0 million, respectively.

During the first quarter of 2012, the Company acquired Unity. As part of the acquisition, the Company acquired existing technology with a fair value of \$19.3 million determined as of the acquisition date. Also during the first quarter of 2012, the Company acquired intangible assets which resulted in existing technology with a fair value of \$3.7 million, of which \$1.0 million will be due in the second quarter of 2012.

The estimated future amortization expense of intangible assets as of March 31, 2012 was as follows (amounts in thousands):

Years Ending December 31:

Amount

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

2012 (remaining 9 months)	\$	27,545
2013		34,835
2014		30,694
2015		30,044
2016		29,089
Thereafter		42,688
	\$	194,895

Goodwill

The following table presents goodwill balances and adjustments to those balances for each of the reportable segments for the three months ended March 31, 2012 (in thousands):

Reportable Segment:	December 31, 2011	Addition to Goodwill (1) (In thousands)	March 31, 2012
SBG	\$ 4,454	\$ 15,451	\$ 19,905
All Other	110,694	8,070	118,764
Total	\$ 115,148	\$ 23,521	\$ 138,669

(1) The addition to goodwill resulted from two business combinations in the first quarter of 2012. See Note 4, Acquisitions for further details.

Table of Contents

No goodwill was impaired as of March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011.

13. Litigation and Asserted Claims

Hynix Litigation

U.S District Court of the Northern District of California

On August 29, 2000, Hynix (formerly Hyundai) and various subsidiaries filed suit against Rambus in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. The complaint, as amended and narrowed through motion practice, asserts claims for fraud, violations of federal antitrust laws and deceptive practices in connection with Rambus' participation in a standards setting organization called JEDEC, and seeks a declaratory judgment that the Rambus patents-in-suit are unenforceable, invalid and not infringed by Hynix, compensatory and punitive damages, and attorneys' fees. Rambus denied Hynix's claims and filed counterclaims for patent infringement against Hynix.

The case was divided into three phases. In the first phase, Hynix tried its unclean hands defense beginning on October 17, 2005 and concluding on November 1, 2005. In its January 4, 2006 Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the court held that Hynix's unclean hands defense failed. Among other things, the court found that Rambus did not adopt its document retention policy in bad faith, did not engage in unlawful spoliation of evidence, and that while Rambus disposed of some relevant documents pursuant to its document retention policy, Hynix was not prejudiced by the destruction of Rambus documents.

The second phase of the Hynix-Rambus trial on patent infringement, validity and damages began on March 15, 2006, and was submitted to the jury on April 13, 2006. On April 24, 2006, the jury returned a verdict in favor of Rambus on all issues and awarded Rambus a total of approximately \$307 million in damages, excluding prejudgment interest. The damages award was later remitted to approximately \$134 million.

The third phase of the Hynix-Rambus case, involving Hynix's affirmative JEDEC-related antitrust and fraud allegations, was part of a coordinated trial involving Rambus, Hynix, Micron and Nanya. It began on January 29, 2008, and was submitted to the jury on March 25, 2008. On March 26, 2008, the jury returned a verdict in favor of Rambus and against Hynix, Micron, and Nanya on each of their claims submitted to the jury. On March 3, 2009, the court issued an order rejecting Hynix, Micron, and Nanya's equitable claims and defenses that had been tried during the coordinated trial.

On March 10, 2009, the court entered final judgment against Hynix in the amount of approximately \$397 million as follows: approximately \$134 million for infringement through December 31, 2005; approximately \$215 million for infringement from January 1, 2006 through January 31, 2009; and approximately \$48 million in pre-judgment interest (with post-judgment interest to accrue at the statutory rate). The court denied Rambus's request for an injunction against Hynix but awarded costs to Rambus in the amount of approximately \$0.76 million. Pursuant to the judgment, Hynix paid into an escrow account the awarded costs plus royalties on net sales for U.S. infringement after January 31, 2009 and before April 18, 2010 of 1% for SDR SDRAM and 4.25% for DDR DDR2, DDR3, GDDR, GDDR2 and GDDR3 SDRAM memory devices. Hynix posted a bond in the full amount of the judgment plus accrued post-judgment interest.

On April 6, 2009, Hynix filed its notice of appeal. On April 17, 2009, Rambus filed its notice of cross appeal. Oral argument was coordinated with the appeal in the Micron Delaware case (discussed below) and held on April 5, 2010. Oral argument was reheard by an expanded panel of five judges on October 6, 2010. On May 13, 2011, the Federal Circuit issued its opinion (1) concluding that the district court erred in applying too narrow a standard of reasonable foreseeability and vacating the district court's findings of fact and conclusions of law regarding spoliation; (2) affirming the district court's decisions on Hynix's JEDEC-related waiver and estoppel defenses; (3) affirming the district court's claim construction order; (4) affirming the district court's order denying Hynix's motion for judgment as a matter of law or for a new trial on the basis of written description; (5) affirming the district court's order denying Hynix's motion for a new trial on the basis of obviousness; and (6) affirming the district court's grant of Hynix's motion for summary judgment for the claims at issue in Rambus's cross-appeal. The Federal Circuit vacated the district court's final judgment and remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings consistent with the Federal Circuit's opinions in the *Micron* and *Hynix* cases. On July 29, 2011, the Federal Circuit denied the parties' petitions for rehearing. On February 21, 2012, the United States Supreme Court denied Hynix's petition seeking review of the Federal Circuit decision.

On remand, the parties filed briefs on issues related to unclean hands, costs awarded to Hynix by the Federal Circuit, the bond Hynix posted in the amount of the now-vacated judgment, and the escrowed funds. A hearing on these issues was held on December

Table of Contents

16, 2011. In an order dated January 11, 2012, the court released Hynix's obligation to maintain a supersedeas bond and denied Hynix's request to lift Hynix's obligations with respect to escrowed funds. On March 21, 2012, the court issued an order taxing Rambus approximately \$8.1 million for Hynix's bond premiums, filing fees, and transcript costs. On April 25, 2012, the court issued an order releasing the funds Hynix had paid into the aforementioned escrow account. No decision on unclean hands has issued to date.

Micron Litigation

U.S. District Court in Delaware: Case No. 00-792-SLR

On August 28, 2000, Micron filed suit against Rambus in the U.S. District Court for Delaware. The suit asserts violations of federal antitrust laws, deceptive trade practices, breach of contract, fraud and negligent misrepresentation in connection with Rambus' participation in JEDEC. Micron seeks a declaration of monopolization by Rambus, compensatory and punitive damages, attorneys' fees, a declaratory judgment that eight Rambus patents are invalid and not infringed, and the award to Micron of a royalty-free license to the Rambus patents. Rambus has filed an answer and counterclaims disputing Micron's claims and asserting infringement by Micron of 12 U.S. patents.

This case has been divided into three phases in the same general order as in the *Hynix* 00-20905 action: (1) unclean hands; (2) patent infringement; and (3) antitrust, equitable estoppel, and other JEDEC-related issues. A bench trial on Micron's unclean hands defense began on November 8, 2007 and concluded on November 15, 2007. The court ordered post-trial briefing on the issue of when Rambus became obligated to preserve documents because it anticipated litigation. A hearing on that issue was held on May 20, 2008. The court ordered further post-trial briefing on the remaining issues from the unclean hands trial, and a hearing on those issues was held on September 19, 2008.

On January 9, 2009, the court issued an opinion in which it determined that Rambus had engaged in spoliation of evidence by failing to suspend general implementation of a document retention policy after the point at which the court determined that Rambus should have known litigation was reasonably foreseeable. The court issued an accompanying order declaring the 12 patents in suit unenforceable against Micron (the Delaware Order). On February 9, 2009, the court stayed all other proceedings pending appeal of the Delaware Order. On February 10, 2009, judgment was entered against Rambus and in favor of Micron on Rambus' patent infringement claims and Micron's corresponding claims for declaratory relief. On March 11, 2009, Rambus filed its notice of appeal. Rambus filed its opening brief on July 2, 2009. On August 28, 2009, Micron filed its answering brief. On October 14, 2009, Rambus filed its reply brief. Oral argument was coordinated with the appeal in the *Hynix* case (discussed above) and held on April 5, 2010. Oral argument was reheard by an expanded panel of five judges on October 6, 2010. On May 13, 2011, the Federal Circuit issued its opinion affirming the district court's determination that Rambus spoliated documents, vacating the district court's dismissal sanction (including the district court's determination of bad faith and prejudice), and remanding the case to the district court for further consideration consistent with its opinion. On June 27, 2011, Rambus filed a petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc with respect to the issues of spoliation, bad faith, and prejudice. On July 29, 2011, the Federal Circuit denied Rambus's petition.

On remand, the parties filed simultaneous briefs on November 9 and December 21, 2011, on the unclean hands-related issues of bad faith, prejudice, and sanction. A hearing on these issues was held on January 26, 2012. No decision has issued to date.

U.S. District Court of the Northern District of California

On January 13, 2006, Rambus filed suit against Micron in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Rambus alleges that 14 Rambus patents are infringed by Micron's DDR2, DDR3, GDDR3, and other advanced memory products. Rambus seeks compensatory and punitive damages, attorneys' fees, and injunctive relief.

As explained above, the court ordered a coordinated trial (without Samsung) of certain common JEDEC-related claims and defenses asserted in *Hynix v Rambus*, Case No. C 00-20905 RMW, *Rambus Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. et al.*, Case No. 05-02298 RMW, *Rambus Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor Inc., et al.*, Case No. 05-00334, and *Rambus Inc. v. Micron Technology, Inc., et al.*, Case No. C 06-00244 RMW. The coordinated trial involving Rambus, Hynix, Micron and Nanya began on January 29, 2008, and was submitted to the jury on March 25, 2008. On March 26, 2008, the jury returned a verdict in favor of Rambus and against Hynix, Micron, and Nanya on each of their claims. On March 3, 2009, the court issued an order rejecting Hynix, Micron, and Nanya's equitable claims and defenses that had been tried during the coordinated trial.

Table of Contents

On July 10, 2008, the court issued its claim construction order relating to the Farmwald/Horowitz patents in suit and denied Hynix, Micron, Nanya, and Samsung's (collectively, the Manufacturers') motions for summary judgment of noninfringement and invalidity based on their proposed claim construction. The court issued claim construction orders relating to the Ware patents in suit on July 25 and August 27, 2008, and denied the Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment of noninfringement of certain claims. On September 4, 2008, at the court's direction, Rambus elected to proceed to trial on 12 patent claims, each from the Farmwald/Horowitz family. On September 16, 2008, Rambus granted a covenant not to assert any claim of patent infringement against the Manufacturers under the Ware patents in suit (U.S. Patent Nos. 6,493,789 and 6,496,897), and each party's claims relating to those patents were dismissed with prejudice. On November 21, 2008, the court entered an order clarifying certain aspects of its July 10, 2008, claim construction order. On November 24, 2008, the court granted Rambus' motion for summary judgment of direct infringement with respect to claim 16 of Rambus' U.S. Patent No. 6,266,285 by the Manufacturers' DDR2, DDR3, gDDR2, GDDR3, GDDR4 memory chip products (except for Nanya's DDR3 memory chip products). In the same order, the court denied the remainder of Rambus' motion for summary judgment of infringement.

On January 19, 2009, Micron filed a motion for summary judgment on the ground that the Delaware Order should be given preclusive effect. Rambus filed an opposition to Micron's motion on January 26, 2009, and a hearing was held on January 30, 2009. On February 3, 2009, the court entered a stay of this action pending resolution of Rambus' appeal of the Delaware Order.

European Patent Infringement Cases

In 2001, Rambus filed suit against Micron in Mannheim, Germany, for infringement of European patent, EP 1 022 642. That suit has not been active. Two proceedings in Italy remain active. One relates to Rambus's claim that Micron is infringing European patent, EP 1 004 956. The court in this proceeding has found the 956 patent valid but not infringed. The court also dismissed Micron's claims for unfair competition based on JEDEC as well as abuse of process. Any appeals are due by December 27, 2012. The second case in Italy involves Micron's purported claim resulting from a seizure of evidence in Italy in 2000 carried out by Rambus pursuant to a court order. The court in this proceeding dismissed Micron's claim. Micron has appealed this decision to the Italian Supreme Court.

DDR2, DDR3, gDDR2, GDDR3, GDDR4 Litigation (DDR2)

U.S. District Court in the Northern District of California

On January 25, 2005, Rambus filed a patent infringement suit in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California court against Hynix, Infineon, Nanya, and Inotera. Infineon and Inotera were subsequently dismissed from this litigation as was Samsung which had been added as a defendant. Rambus alleges that certain of its patents are infringed by certain of the defendants' SDRAM, DDR, DDR2, DDR3, gDDR2, GDDR3, GDDR4 and other advanced memory products. Hynix and Nanya have denied Rambus' claims and asserted counterclaims against Rambus for, among other things, violations of federal antitrust laws, unfair trade practices, equitable estoppel, and fraud in connection with Rambus' participation in JEDEC.

As explained above, the court ordered a coordinated trial (without Samsung) of certain common JEDEC-related claims and defenses asserted in *Hynix v Rambus*, Case No. C 00-20905 RMW, *Rambus Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. et al.*, Case No. 05-02298 RMW, *Rambus Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor Inc., et al.*, Case No. 05-00334, and *Rambus Inc. v. Micron Technology, Inc., et al.*, Case No. C 06-00244 RMW. The

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

coordinated trial involving Rambus, Hynix, Micron and Nanya began on January 29, 2008, and was submitted to the jury on March 25, 2008. On March 26, 2008, the jury returned a verdict in favor of Rambus and against Hynix, Micron, and Nanya on each of their claims.

On March 3, 2009, the court issued an order rejecting Hynix, Micron, and Nanya's equitable claims and defenses that had been tried during the coordinated trial.

In these cases (except for the *Hynix* 00-20905 action), a hearing on claim construction and the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment on infringement and validity was held on June 4 and 5, 2008. On July 10, 2008, the court issued its claim construction order relating to the Farmwald/Horowitz patents in suit and denied the Manufacturers' motions for summary judgment of noninfringement and invalidity based on their proposed claim construction. The court issued claim construction orders relating to the Ware patents in suit on July 25 and August 27, 2008, and denied the Manufacturers' motion for summary judgment of noninfringement of certain claims. On September 4, 2008, at the court's direction, Rambus elected to proceed to trial on 12 patent claims, each from the Farmwald/Horowitz family. On September 16, 2008, Rambus granted a covenant not to assert any claim of patent infringement against the Manufacturers under U.S. Patent Nos. 6,493,789 and 6,496,897, and each party's claims relating to those patents were

Table of Contents

dismissed with prejudice. On November 21, 2008, the court entered an order clarifying certain aspects of its July 10, 2008, claim construction order. On November 24, 2008, the court granted Rambus's motion for summary judgment of direct infringement with respect to claim 16 of Rambus's U.S. Patent No. 6,266,285 by the Manufacturers' DDR2, DDR3, gDDR2, GDDR3, GDDR4 memory chip products (except for Nanya's DDR3 memory chip products). In the same order, the court denied the remainder of Rambus's motion for summary judgment of infringement.

On January 19, 2009, Nanya and Hynix filed motions for summary judgment on the ground that the Delaware Order should be given preclusive effect. Rambus filed opposition briefs to these motions on January 26, 2009, and a hearing was held on January 30, 2009. On February 3, 2009, the court entered a stay of this action pending resolution of Rambus' appeal of the Delaware Order.

European Commission Competition Directorate-General

On or about April 22, 2003, Rambus was notified by the European Commission Competition Directorate-General (Directorate) (the European Commission) that it had received complaints from Infineon and Hynix. Rambus answered the ensuing requests for information prompted by those complaints on June 16, 2003. Rambus obtained a copy of Infineon's complaint to the European Commission in late July 2003, and on October 8, 2003, at the request of the European Commission, filed its response. On August 1, 2007, Rambus received a statement of objections from the European Commission. The statement of objections alleges that through Rambus' participation in the JEDEC standards setting organization and subsequent conduct, Rambus violated European Union competition law. Rambus filed a response to the statement of objections on October 31, 2007, and a hearing was held on December 4 and 5, 2007.

On December 9, 2009, the European Commission announced that it had reached a final settlement with Rambus to resolve the pending case. Under the terms of the settlement, the Commission made no finding of liability, and no fine will be assessed against Rambus. Rambus commits to offer licenses with maximum royalty rates for certain memory types and memory controllers on a forward-going basis (the Commitment). The Commitment is expressly made without any admission by Rambus of the allegations asserted against it. The Commitment also does not resolve any existing claims of infringement prior to the signing of any license with a prospective licensee, nor does it release or excuse any of the prospective licensees from damages or royalty obligations through the date of signing a license. Rambus offers licenses with maximum royalty rates for five-year worldwide licenses of 1.5% for DDR2, DDR3, GDDR3 and GDDR4 SDRAM memory types. Qualified licensees will enjoy a royalty holiday for SDR and DDR DRAM devices, subject to compliance with the terms of the license. In addition, Rambus offers licenses with maximum royalty rates for five-year worldwide licenses of 1.5% per unit for SDR memory controllers through April 2010, dropping to 1.0% thereafter, and royalty rates of 2.65% per unit for DDR, DDR2, DDR3, GDDR3 and GDDR4 memory controllers through April 2010, then dropping to 2.0%. The Commitment to license at the above rates remains valid for a period of five years from December 9, 2009. All royalty rates are applicable to future shipments only and do not affect liability, if any, for damages or royalties that accrued up to the time of the license grant.

On March 25, 2010, Hynix filed appeals with the General Court of the European Union purporting to challenge the settlement and the European Commission's rejection of Hynix's complaint. No decision has issued to date on Hynix's appeal.

Superior Court of California for the County of San Francisco

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

On May 5, 2004, Rambus filed a lawsuit against Micron, Hynix, Infineon and Siemens in San Francisco Superior Court (the San Francisco court) seeking damages for conspiring to fix prices (California Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720 *et seq.*), conspiring to monopolize under the Cartwright Act (California Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720 *et seq.*), intentional interference with prospective economic advantage, and unfair competition (California Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*). This lawsuit alleges that there were concerted efforts beginning in the 1990s to deter innovation in the DRAM market and to boycott Rambus and/or deter market acceptance of Rambus RDRAM product. Subsequently, Infineon and Siemens were dismissed from this action (as a result of a settlement with Infineon) and three Samsung-related entities were added as defendants and later dismissed (as a result of a settlement with Samsung).

A jury trial against Micron and Hynix began on June 20, 2011. On September 21, 2011, the jury began deliberations. On November 16, 2011, the jury returned a verdict in favor of Hynix and Micron and against Rambus by a tally of 9-3. Judgment was entered by the Court on February 15, 2012. Rambus filed a notice of appeal on April 3, 2012.

On February 15, 2012, Micron and Hynix filed memoranda of costs seeking to recover approximately \$1.6 million and \$3.0 million, respectively, in alleged costs from Rambus. On April 2, 2012, Rambus filed motions to tax approximately \$4.1 million of

Table of Contents

these costs. Hynix's and Micron's oppositions are due on May 2, 2012. Rambus's reply is due on May 17, 2012. A hearing is scheduled for June 8, 2012.

Stock Option Investigation Related Claims

On May 30, 2006, the Audit Committee commenced an internal investigation of the timing of past stock option grants and related accounting issues. Several class action, derivative, and private shareholder suits were subsequently filed, all of which (with one exception described below) have been dismissed or settled.

On March 1, 2007, a pro se lawsuit was filed in the Northern District of California by two alleged Rambus shareholders against Rambus, certain current and former executives and board members, and PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (*Kelley et al. v. Rambus, Inc. et al.* C-07-01238-JF (N.D. Cal.)). This action was consolidated with a substantially identical pro se lawsuit filed by another purported Rambus shareholder against the same parties. The consolidated complaint against Rambus alleges violations of federal and state securities laws, and state law claims for fraud and breach of fiduciary duty. On April 17, 2008, the court dismissed all claims with prejudice except for plaintiffs' claims under sections 14(a) and 18(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 as to which leave to amend was granted. On June 2, 2008, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint containing substantially the same allegations as the prior complaint although limited to claims under sections 14(a) and 18(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. On December 9, 2008, the court granted Rambus' motion and entered judgment in favor of Rambus. Plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal on December 15, 2008. On June 16, 2010, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a decision affirming the judgment in favor of Rambus.

On September 11, 2008, the same pro se plaintiffs filed a separate lawsuit in Santa Clara County Superior Court against Rambus, certain current and former executives and board members, and PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (*Kelley et al. v. Rambus, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 1-08-CV-122444). The complaint alleges violations of certain California state securities statutes as well as fraud and negligent misrepresentation based on substantially the same underlying factual allegations contained in the pro se lawsuit filed in federal court. On October 31, 2010, the plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint. On December 2, 2010, Rambus filed a demurrer to plaintiffs' second amended complaint on the ground that it is barred by the doctrine of claim preclusion, among other things. On May 12, 2011, the court sustained Rambus' demurrer without leave to amend. Judgment in favor of Rambus was entered on June 15, 2011. On August 10, 2011, plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal. Briefing is ongoing and no date has been set for oral argument.

NVIDIA Litigation

U.S. District Court in the Northern District of California

On July 10, 2008, Rambus filed suit against NVIDIA Corporation (NVIDIA) in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California alleging that NVIDIA's products with memory controllers for SDR, DDR, DDRx, GDDR, and GDDRy (where DDRx and GDDRy includes at least DDR2, DDR3 and GDDR3) technologies infringe 17 patents. On September 16, 2008, Rambus granted a covenant not to assert any claim of patent infringement against NVIDIA under two of the patents in suit U.S. Patent Nos. 6,493,789 and 6,496,897. On December 1, 2010, Rambus filed suit against NVIDIA in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California alleging that NVIDIA's products with certain peripheral interfaces, including PCI Express and DisplayPort peripheral interfaces, infringe six patents from the Dally family of patents which

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

are owned by Massachusetts Institute of Technology and exclusively licensed by Rambus. On February 7, 2012, Rambus and NVIDIA entered into a settlement agreement pursuant to which the parties agreed to release all claims against each other with respect to all outstanding litigation between them, including these district court cases. On February 14, 2012, all pending claims and counterclaims in this action were dismissed.

International Trade Commission 2008 Investigation

On November 6, 2008, Rambus filed a complaint with the U. S. International Trade Commission (the ITC) requesting the commencement of an investigation pertaining to NVIDIA products. The complaint seeks an exclusion order barring the importation, sale for importation, or sale after importation of products that infringe nine Rambus patents from the Ware and Barth families of patents. The accused products include NVIDIA products that incorporate DDR, DDR2, DDR3, LPDDR, GDDR, GDDR2, and GDDR3 memory controllers, including graphics processors, and media and communications processors. The complaint names NVIDIA as a proposed respondent, as well as companies whose products incorporate accused NVIDIA products and are imported into the United States. Additional respondents include: Asustek Computer Inc. and Asus Computer International, BFG Technologies, Biostar Microtech and Biostar Microtech International Corp., Diablotek Inc., EVGA Corp., G.B.T. Inc. and Giga-Byte Technology

Table of Contents

Co., Hewlett-Packard, MSI Computer Corp. and Micro-Star International Co., Palit Multimedia Inc. and Palit Microsystems Ltd., Pine Technology Holdings, and Sparkle Computer Co.

On December 4, 2008, the ITC instituted the investigation. On June 5, 2009, Rambus moved to withdraw from the investigation four of the asserted patents and certain claims of a fifth asserted patent in order to simplify the investigation, streamline the final hearing, and conserve Commission resources. A final hearing before the administrative law judge was held October 13-20, 2009, and the parties submitted two rounds of post-hearing briefs.

On January 22, 2010, the administrative law judge issued a final initial determination holding that the importation of the accused NVIDIA products violates section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337 because they infringe seventeen claims of three asserted Barth patents. The administrative law judge recommended that the ITC issue (1) a limited exclusion order prohibiting the unlicensed importation of accused products by any respondent; and (2) a cease and desist order prohibiting domestic respondents from engaging in certain activities in the United States with respect to the accused products. On February 12, 2010, the parties filed petitions asking the full Commission to review certain aspects of the final initial determination.

On March 25, 2010, the ITC determined to review certain obviousness findings regarding the Barth patents and certain obviousness and anticipation findings regarding the Ware patents. On May 26, 2010, the ITC requested further briefing on the impact of the license between Rambus and Samsung on the administrative law judge's findings and conclusions, particularly on the issue of patent exhaustion. On June 22, 2010, the ITC requested additional briefing to discuss the relevance and effect with respect to the issue of patent exhaustion of a decision issued on May 27, 2010, by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in a case captioned *Fujifilm Corp. v. Benun*.

On July 26, 2010, the ITC issued its final determination affirming the administrative law judge's initial determination with certain modifications to provide further analysis of issues related to obviousness. The ITC found that respondents failed to demonstrate that Rambus' patent rights are exhausted with respect to accused products that incorporate Samsung memory. The ITC issued (1) a limited exclusion order prohibiting the unlicensed importation by any respondent of memory controller products and products incorporating a memory controller that infringe one or more of the seventeen claims of three asserted Barth patents; and (2) a cease and desist order prohibiting respondents with commercially significant inventories of infringing products in the United States from importing, selling, marketing, advertising, distributing, offering for sale, transferring (except for exportation), and soliciting U.S. agents or distributors for, memory controller products and products incorporating a memory controller that infringe one or more of the seventeen claims of three asserted Barth patents, in violation of 19 U.S.C. § 1337. The ITC determined that the amount of the bond to permit importation during the sixty-day Presidential review period was 2.65 percent of the entered value of the subject imports. The ITC denied respondents' request for stay and terminated the investigation.

On February 7, 2012, Rambus and NVIDIA entered into a settlement agreement pursuant to which the parties agreed to release all claims against each other with respect to all outstanding litigation between them, including this ITC investigation. On February 10, 2012, the appeals filed by NVIDIA and Rambus were dismissed by the Federal Circuit. On February 13, 2012, Rambus filed a motion to dismiss the Federal Circuit appeal filed by the additional named respondents as moot due to the settlement with NVIDIA. The only party that indicated it would oppose this motion was Hewlett Packard. On February 17, 2012, the ITC filed a response stating that it agreed with Rambus to the extent that Hewlett Packard was seeking an advisory opinion and asked the Federal Circuit to remand the case if Hewlett Packard was disputing the coverage of the license. Hewlett Packard filed a responsive brief on February 27, 2012. Rambus filed its reply on March 5, 2012. On April 3, 2012, the Federal Circuit granted Rambus' motion to dismiss the appeal as moot and remanded the case to the ITC with instructions to vacate the exclusion orders at issue in the appeal.

International Trade Commission 2010 Investigation

On December 1, 2010, Rambus filed a complaint with the ITC requesting the commencement of an investigation and seeking an exclusion order barring the importation, sale for importation, or sale after importation of, among other things, NVIDIA products with certain peripheral interfaces, including PCI Express and DisplayPort peripheral interfaces, that Rambus alleges infringe three patents from the Dally family. The complaint names, among others, NVIDIA as a respondent, as well as companies whose products incorporate accused NVIDIA products and are imported into the United States, including Asustek Computer Inc. and Asus Computer International Inc., Biostar Microtech (U.S.A.) Corp., Biostar Microtech International Corp., Elitegroup Computer Systems, EVGA Corp., Galaxy Microsystems Ltd., G.B.T. Inc., Giga-Byte Technology Co. Ltd., Gracom Technologies LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, Jaton Corp., Jaton Technology TPE, Micro-Star International Co., MSI Computer Corp., Palit Microsystems Ltd., Pine Technology Holdings, Ltd., Sparkle Computer Co., Ltd., Zotac International (MCO) Ltd. and Zotac USA Inc. On December 29, 2010,

Table of Contents

the ITC instituted the investigation. A final hearing before the administrative law judge was held October 12-20, 2011. On February 22, 2012, Rambus's complaint against NVIDIA was dismissed pursuant to the parties' settlement agreement.

Broadcom, Freescale, LSI, MediaTek, and STMicroelectronics Litigation

International Trade Commission 2010 Investigation

On December 1, 2010, Rambus filed a complaint with the ITC requesting the commencement of an investigation and seeking an exclusion order barring the importation, sale for importation, or sale after importation of products that incorporate at least DDR, DDR2, DDR3, LPDDR, LPDDR2, mobile DDR, GDDR, GDDR2, and GDDR3 memory controllers from Broadcom, Freescale, LSI, MediaTek and STMicroelectronics that infringe patents from the Barth family of patents, and products having certain peripheral interfaces, including PCI Express interfaces, DisplayPort interfaces, and certain Serial ATA Attachment (SATA) and Serial Attached SCSI (SAS) interfaces, from Broadcom, Freescale, LSI and STMicroelectronics that infringe patents from the Dally family of patents. The complaint names, among others, Broadcom, Freescale, LSI, MediaTek and STMicroelectronics as respondents, as well as companies whose products incorporate those companies' accused products and are imported into the United States, including Asustek Computer Inc. and Asus Computer International Inc., Audio Partnership Plc, Cisco Systems, Garmin International, G.B.T. Inc., Giga-Byte Technology Co. Ltd., Gracom Technologies LLC, Hewlett-Packard Company, Hitachi GST, Motorola, Inc., Oppo Digital, Inc., and Seagate Technology. As described more fully above, the complaint also names NVIDIA and certain companies whose products incorporate accused NVIDIA products with certain peripheral interfaces, including PCI Express and DisplayPort peripheral interfaces, and seeks to bar their importation, sale for importation, or sale after importation. On December 29, 2010, the ITC instituted the investigation. On June 20, 2011, the administrative law judge granted a joint motion by Rambus and Freescale to terminate the investigation as to Freescale pursuant to the parties' settlement agreement. A final hearing before the administrative law judge was held October 12-20, 2011. On January 17, 2012, the administrative law judge granted a joint motion by Rambus and Broadcom to terminate the investigation as to Broadcom pursuant to the parties' settlement agreement. On March 16, 2012, Rambus and MediaTek filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation as to MediaTek pursuant to the parties' settlement agreement. On March 29, 2012, the Office of Unfair Import Investigations responded supporting the joint motion. To date, the Commission has not ruled on the motion.

On March 2, 2012, the administrative law judge issued an initial determination that there was no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337. As a threshold matter, the administrative law judge determined that: a licensing-based domestic industry existed for the asserted Dally and Barth patents; that the accused LSI, STMicro, MediaTek products literally infringe all asserted claims of each asserted Barth patent, and that LSI, STMicro, and MediaTek induce infringement and contribute to the infringement of the asserted Barth claims; that the accused LSI and STMicro patents products literally infringe all asserted claims of both asserted Dally patents that are still in suit, and that LSI and STMicro induce infringement and contribute to the infringement of the asserted Dally claims; the Barth patents and the Dally patents are not invalid for failure to satisfy the written description or definiteness requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, nor are they unenforceable due to prosecution laches or patent misuse; Rambus had standing to assert the Dally patents; Rambus was not equitably estopped from asserting the Dally patents and the Barth patents; the asserted Barth patents are not unenforceable due to inequitable conduct, and not invalid for failure to satisfy the utility requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 101; the asserted patents are invalid due to anticipation and obviousness; and the Barth patents are unenforceable due to unclean hands. On March 19, 2012, the parties filed petitions asking the full Commission to review certain aspects of the initial determination. The full Commission is expected to determine whether to review any issues raised in these petitions sometime around May 2, 2012.

U.S District Court in the Northern District of California

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

On December 1, 2010, Rambus filed complaints against Broadcom, Freescale, LSI, MediaTek and STMicroelectronics in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California alleging that 1) products that incorporate at least DDR, DDR2, DDR3, LPDDR, LPDDR2, mobile DDR, GDDR, GDDR2, and GDDR3 memory controllers from Broadcom, Freescale, LSI, MediaTek and STMicroelectronics infringe patents from the Barth family of patents; 2) those same products and products from those companies that incorporate SDR memory controllers infringe patents from the Farmwald-Horowitz family; and 3) products having certain peripheral interfaces, including PCI Express, DisplayPort, and certain SATA and SAS interfaces, from Broadcom, Freescale, LSI and STMicroelectronics infringe patents from the Dally family of patents. On June 7, 2011, Rambus' s complaint against Freescale was dismissed pursuant to the parties' settlement agreement. On January 24, January 26, and March 1, 2011, LSI, Broadcom, and STMicroelectronics filed their respective answers denying Rambus' s allegations and asserting counterclaims seeking declarations of non-infringement and invalidity, and unenforceability with respect to at least certain of the patents in suit. Rambus filed answers denying the allegations in LSI' s, Broadcom' s, and STMicroelectronics' s counterclaims on February 14, February 16, and March 22,

Table of Contents

2011, respectively. On March 7, 2011, MediaTek filed an answer denying Rambus's allegations. Broadcom, MediaTek, STMicroelectronics, and LSI filed motions to stay their respective actions. On June 13, 2011, the Court granted in part the motions to stay and denied them as to certain patents not overlapping with patents asserted in the ITC 2010 investigation. On December 29, 2011, Rambus's complaint against Broadcom was dismissed pursuant to the parties' settlement agreement. On March 20, 2011, Rambus's complaint against MediaTek was dismissed pursuant to the parties' settlement agreement. Discovery is ongoing and a claim construction hearing is currently scheduled for August 29, 2012.

Potential Future Litigation

In addition to the litigation described above, companies continue to adopt Rambus technologies into various products. Rambus has notified many of these companies of their use of Rambus technology and continues to evaluate how to proceed on these matters.

There can be no assurance that any ongoing or future litigation will be successful. Rambus spends substantial company resources defending its intellectual property in litigation, which may continue for the foreseeable future given the multiple pending litigations. The outcomes of these litigations, as well as any delay in their resolution, could affect Rambus's ability to license its intellectual property in the future.

The Company records a contingent liability when it is probable that a loss has been incurred and the amount is reasonably estimable in accordance with accounting for contingencies. A reasonably possible loss in excess of amounts accrued is not significant to the financial statements.

14. Fair Value of Financial Instruments

The Company tests the pricing inputs by obtaining prices from two different sources for the same security on a sample of its portfolio. The Company has not adjusted the pricing inputs it has obtained. The following table presents the financial instruments that are carried at fair value and summarizes the valuation of its cash equivalents and marketable securities by the above pricing levels as of March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011:

	Total	As of March 31, 2012		
		Quoted Market Prices in Active Markets (Level 1)	Significant Other Observable Inputs (Level 2)	Significant Unobservable Inputs (Level 3)
		(In thousands)		
Money market funds	\$ 172,588	\$ 172,588	\$	\$
Corporate notes, bonds and commercial paper	43,970		43,970	
Total available-for-sale securities	\$ 216,558	\$ 172,588	\$ 43,970	\$

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

	As of December 31, 2011				
		Quoted		Significant	
		Market		Other	Significant
		Prices in		Observable	Unobservable
		Active		Inputs	Inputs
		Markets		(Level 2)	(Level 3)
	Total	(Level 1)			
		(In thousands)			
Money market funds	\$ 127,559	\$ 127,559	\$		\$
Corporate notes, bonds and commercial paper	137,108			137,108	
Total available-for-sale securities	\$ 264,667	\$ 127,559	\$	137,108	\$

The Company monitors the investment for other-than-temporary impairment and records appropriate reductions in carrying value when necessary. The Company made an investment of \$2.0 million in a non-marketable equity security of a private company during the third quarter of 2009. The Company evaluated the fair value of the investment in the non-marketable security as of March 31, 2012 and determined that there were no events that caused a decrease in its fair value below the carrying cost.

Table of Contents

The following table presents the financial instruments that are measured and carried at cost on a nonrecurring basis as of March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011:

(in thousands)	As of March 31, 2012				
	Carrying Value	Quoted market prices in active markets (Level 1)	Significant other observable inputs (Level 2)	Significant unobservable inputs (Level 3)	Impairment charges for the three months ended March 31, 2012
Investment in non-marketable securities	\$ 2,000	\$	\$	\$ 2,000	\$

(in thousands)	As of December 31, 2011				
	Carrying Value	Quoted market prices in active markets (Level 1)	Significant other observable inputs (Level 2)	Significant unobservable inputs (Level 3)	Impairment charges for the year ended December 31, 2011
Investment in non-marketable securities	\$ 2,000	\$	\$	\$ 2,000	\$

For the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, there were no transfers of financial instruments between different categories of fair value.

The following table presents the financial instruments that are not carried at fair value but which require fair value disclosure as of March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011:

(in thousands)	As of March 31, 2012			As of December 31, 2011		
	Face Value	Carrying Value	Fair Value	Face Value	Carrying Value	Fair Value
5% Convertible Senior Notes due 2014	\$ 172,500	\$ 136,845	\$ 172,716	\$ 172,500	\$ 133,493	\$ 170,289

The fair value of the convertible notes at each balance sheet date is determined based on recent quoted market prices for these notes which is a level two measurement. As of March 31, 2012, the convertible notes are carried at face value of \$172.5 million less any unamortized debt discount. The carrying value of other financial instruments, including cash, accounts receivable, accounts payable and other payables, approximates fair value due to their short maturities.

The Company monitors its investments for other than temporary losses by considering current factors, including the economic environment, market conditions, operational performance and other specific factors relating to the business underlying the investment, reductions in carrying

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

values when necessary and the Company's ability and intent to hold the investment for a period of time which may be sufficient for anticipated recovery in the market. Any other than temporary loss is reported under Interest and other income (expense), net in the condensed consolidated statement of operations. For the three months ended March 31, 2012, the Company has not incurred any impairment loss on its investments.

15. Convertible Notes

The Company's convertible notes are shown in the following table:

(Dollars in thousands)	As of March 31, 2012		As of December 31, 2011	
5% Convertible Senior Notes due 2014 (the 2014 Notes)	\$	172,500	\$	172,500
Unamortized discount		(35,655)		(39,007)
Total convertible notes	\$	136,845	\$	133,493
Less current portion				
Total long-term convertible notes	\$	136,845	\$	133,493

Interest expense related to the notes for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011 was as follows:

	Three Months Ended March 31,			
	2012	(in thousands)		2011
2014 Notes coupon interest at a rate of 5%	\$	2,157	\$	2,156
2014 Notes amortization of discount at an additional effective interest rate of 11.7%		3,510		3,016
Total interest expense on convertible notes	\$	5,667	\$	5,172

Table of Contents

Item 2. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations

This report contains forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. These statements relate to our expectations for future events and time periods. All statements other than statements of historical fact are statements that could be deemed to be forward-looking statements, including any statements regarding trends in future revenue or results of operations, gross margin or operating margin, expenses, earnings or losses from operations, synergies or other financial items; any statements of the plans, strategies and objectives of management for future operations; any statements concerning developments, performance or industry ranking; any statements regarding future economic conditions or performance; any statements regarding pending investigations, claims or disputes; any statements of expectation or belief; and any statements of assumptions underlying any of the foregoing. Generally, the words anticipate, believes, plans, expects, future, intends, may, should, estimates, predicts, potential, continue, projecting and similar expressions identify forward-looking statements. Our forward-looking statements are based on current expectations, forecasts and assumptions and are subject to risks, uncertainties and changes in condition, significance, value and effect. As a result of the factors described herein, and in the documents incorporated herein by reference, including, in particular, those factors described under Risk Factors, we undertake no obligation to publicly disclose any revisions to these forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances occurring subsequent to filing this report with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Rambus, RDRAM™, XDRTM, FlexIOTM and FlexPhase™ are trademarks or registered trademarks of Rambus Inc. Other trademarks that may be mentioned in this quarterly report on Form 10-Q are the property of their respective owners.

Industry terminology, used widely throughout this report, has been abbreviated and, as such, these abbreviations are defined below for your convenience:

Double Data Rate	DDR
Dynamic Random Access Memory	DRAM
Gigabits per second	Gb/s
Graphics Double Data Rate	GDDR
Input/Output	I/O
Light Emitting Diodes	LED
Lighting and Display Technology	LDT
Liquid Crystal Display	LCD
Peripheral Component Interconnect	PCI
Rambus Dynamic Random Access Memory	RDRAM™
Single Data Rate	SDR
Synchronous Dynamic Random Access Memory	SDRAM
eXtreme Data Rate	XDRTM

From time to time we will refer to the abbreviated names of certain entities and, as such, have provided a chart to indicate the full names of those entities for your convenience.

Advanced Micro Devices Inc.	AMD
Broadcom Corporation	Broadcom
Cryptography Research, Inc.	CRI
Elpida Memory, Inc.	Elpida

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

Freescale Semiconductor Inc.
Fujitsu Limited
General Electric Company
Global Lighting Technologies, Inc.
Hewlett-Packard Company
Hynix Semiconductor, Inc.
Infineon Technologies AG
Inotera Memories, Inc.
Intel Corporation
International Business Machines Corporation
Joint Electronic Device Engineering Councils
Lighting and Display Technology
LSI Corporation
MediaTek Inc.

Freescale
Fujitsu
GE
GLT
Hewlett-Packard
Hynix
Infineon
Inotera
Intel
IBM
JEDEC
LDT
LSI
MediaTek

Table of Contents

Micron Technologies, Inc.	Micron
Mobile Technology Division	MTD
Nanya Technology Corporation	Nanya
New Business Group	NBG
NEC Electronics Corporation	NEC
NVIDIA Corporation	NVIDIA
Qimonda AG (formerly Infineon's DRAM operations)	Qimonda
Panasonic Corporation	Panasonic
Renesas Electronics	Renesas
Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.	Samsung
Semiconductor Business Group	SBG
Sony Computer Electronics	Sony
Spansion, Inc.	Spansion
ST Microelectronics N.V.	ST Microelectronics
Texas Instruments Inc.	Texas Instruments
Toshiba Corporation	Toshiba

Table of Contents

Business Overview

We are a premier intellectual property and technology licensing company focusing on the creation, design, development and licensing of patented innovations, technologies and architectures that are foundational to nearly all digital electronics products and systems. Our mission is to continuously enrich the end-user experience of electronic systems through groundbreaking innovations and technologies designed to improve the performance, power efficiency, time-to-market and cost-effectiveness of the products, components and systems offered by market-leading companies in semiconductors, computing, tablets, handheld devices, mobile applications, gaming and graphics, high definition televisions and displays, general lighting, cryptography and data security. Our inventors and engineering teams focus on creating innovations designed to address the most challenging demands of each target market and industry. We believe we have established an unparalleled licensing platform and business model that will continue to foster the development of new foundational technologies. By continuing to build upon this platform, our goal is to create additional licensing opportunities, and thereby perpetuate strong company operating performance and long-term stockholder value.

While we have historically focused our efforts in the development of technologies for electronics memory and chip interfaces, we have been expanding our portfolio of inventions and solutions to address additional markets in lighting, displays, chip and system security, digital media, as well as new areas within the semiconductor industry, such as imaging and non-volatile memory. We intend to continue our growth into new technology fields, consistent with our mission to create great value through our innovations and to make those technologies available through our licensing business model. Key to our efforts, both in our current businesses and in any new area of diversification, will be hiring and retaining world-class inventors, scientists and engineers to lead the development of inventions and technology solutions for these fields of focus, and the management and business support personnel necessary to execute our plans and strategies.

We have two business groups: SBG which focuses on the design, development and licensing of technology that is semiconductor based, and NBG which focuses on the design, development and licensing of technologies for lighting, displays, chip and system security, anti-counterfeiting, digital media and other markets. As of March 31, 2012, only SBG was considered a reportable segment because it was the only business group that met the quantitative thresholds for disclosure as a reportable segment. As such, segment information is not separately discussed below. For additional information concerning segment reporting, see Note 11, Business Segments and Major Customers, of Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements of this Form 10-Q.

The key elements of our strategy are as follows:

Innovate: Develop and patent our innovative technology to provide fundamental competitive advantage when incorporated into semiconductors and digital electronics products and systems.

Drive Adoption: Communicate the advantages of our patented innovations and technologies to the industry and encourage its adoption through demonstrations and incorporation in the products of select customers.

Monetize: License our patented inventions and technology solutions to customers for use in their semiconductor and system products.

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

As of March 31, 2012, our semiconductor, lighting, display, security and other technologies are covered by 1,597 U.S. and foreign patents. Additionally, we have 1,202 patent applications pending. Some of the patents and pending patent applications are derived from a common parent patent application or are foreign counterpart patent applications. We have a program to file applications for and obtain patents in the United States and in selected foreign countries where we believe filing for such protection is appropriate and would further our overall business strategy and objectives. In some instances, obtaining appropriate levels of protection may involve prosecuting continuation and counterpart patent applications based on a common parent application. We believe that our patented innovations provide our customers means to achieve improved performance, lower risk, greater cost-effectiveness and other benefits in their products and services.

Our patented inventions and technology solutions are offered to our customers through either a patent license or a solutions license. Our revenues are primarily derived from patent licenses, through which we provide our customers a license to use some specified portion of our broad portfolio of patented inventions. The patent license provides our customers with a defined right to use our patented innovations in the customer's own digital electronics products, systems or services, as applicable. The patent licenses may also define the specific field of use where our customers may use or employ our inventions in their products. Patent license agreements are structured with fixed, variable or a hybrid of fixed and variable royalty payments over certain defined periods.

Table of Contents

We also offer our customers solutions licenses to support the implementation and adoption of our technology in their products or services. Our solutions license offerings include a range of solutions developed by Rambus, which include leadership solutions (which are Rambus-proprietary solutions widely licensed to our customers) and industry-standard solutions that we provide to our customers under license for incorporation into our customers' digital electronics products and systems. We offer a range of services as part of our solutions licenses which can include know-how and technology transfer, product design and development, system integration, supply chain consulting and other services. These solutions license agreements may have both a fixed price (non-recurring) component and ongoing royalties. Further, under solutions licenses, our customers typically receive licenses to our patents necessary to implement these solutions in their products with specific rights and restrictions to the applicable patents elaborated in their individual contracts with us.

Royalties represent a substantial majority of our total revenue. We derive the majority of our royalty revenue by licensing our broad portfolio of patents for chip interfaces to our customers. These licenses may cover part or all of our patent portfolio across our breadth of technologies. Leading semiconductor and system companies such as AMD, Broadcom, Elpida, Freescale, Fujitsu, GE, Intel, Panasonic, Renesas, Samsung and Toshiba have licensed our patents for use in their own products.

We also derive additional revenue by licensing a range of technology solutions including our leadership and industry-standard solutions to customers for use in their digital electronics products and systems. Our customers include leading companies such as Elpida, GE, IBM, Panasonic, Samsung, Sony and Toshiba. Due to the often complex nature of implementing our technologies, we provide engineering services under certain of these licenses to help our customers successfully integrate our technology solutions into their semiconductor and system products. Licensees may also receive, in addition to their solutions license agreements, patent licenses as necessary to implement the technology in their products with specific rights and restrictions to the applicable patents elaborated in their individual contracts.

The remainder of our revenue is contract services revenue which includes license fees and engineering services fees. The timing and amounts invoiced to customers can vary significantly depending on specific contract terms and can therefore have a significant impact on deferred revenue or account receivables in any given period.

We intend to continue making significant expenditures associated with engineering, marketing, general and administration including litigation expenses, and expect that these costs and expenses will continue to be a significant percentage of revenue in future periods. Whether such expenses increase or decrease as a percentage of revenue will be substantially dependent upon the rate at which our revenue or expenses change.

Executive Summary

During the first quarter of 2012, we signed patent license agreements with NVIDIA and MediaTek. As a result of the patent license agreements with both NVIDIA and MediaTek, we settled all outstanding claims with them, including resolution of past use of our patented innovations. Additionally, during the quarter, we acquired Unity Semiconductor Corporation (Unity), an innovative memory technology company, for \$35.0 million in cash, of which \$31.3 million has been paid as of March 31, 2012. We expect that this acquisition will expand the breadth of our breakthrough memory technologies and will open up new markets for licensing. See Note 4, Acquisitions, of Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements of this Form 10-Q for further discussion.

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

Research and development continues to play a key role in our efforts to maintain product innovations. Our engineering expenses for the three months ended March 31, 2012 increased \$19.1 million as compared to the same period in 2011 primarily due to increased headcount related costs of \$3.4 million from additional employees to support our development efforts, increased amortization expense related to intangible assets acquired during 2011 of \$5.0 million and the accrual of retention bonuses related to acquisitions from the past twelve months of \$6.9 million. Marketing, general and administrative expenses in aggregate increased \$2.1 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 as compared to the same period in 2011 primarily due to higher consulting costs of \$1.8 million, accrual of the retention bonuses related to acquisitions from the past twelve months of \$1.6 million and increased headcount related costs of \$1.2 million from the increase in employees to support our business, offset by the decrease in litigation expenses related to ongoing major cases of \$5.1 million.

Trends

There are a number of trends that may or will have a material impact on us in the future, including but not limited to, the evolution of memory technology, adoption of LEDs in general lighting, and global economic conditions with the resulting impact on sales of consumer electronic systems.

Table of Contents

We have a high degree of revenue concentration, with our top five licensees for each reporting period representing approximately 74% of our revenue for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011. As a result of our license agreement with Samsung in 2010, Samsung is expected to account for a significant portion of our ongoing licensing revenue. For the three months ended March 31, 2012, revenue from NVIDIA, Renesas and Samsung each accounted for 10% or more of our total revenue. For the three months ended March 31, 2011, revenue from Elpida, NVIDIA, Samsung and Toshiba accounted for 10% or more of our total revenue. We expect to continue to experience significant revenue concentration for the foreseeable future.

The particular licensees which account for revenue concentration have varied from period to period as a result of the addition of new contracts, expiration of existing contracts, renewals of existing contracts, industry consolidation and the volumes and prices at which the licensees have recently sold licensed semiconductors to system companies. These variations are expected to continue in the foreseeable future.

The semiconductor industry is intensely competitive and highly cyclical, limiting our visibility with respect to future sales. To the extent that macroeconomic fluctuations negatively affect our principal licensees, the demand for our technology may be significantly and adversely impacted and we may experience substantial period-to-period fluctuations in our operating results. In February 2012, Elpida, one of our top 10% licensees by revenue for the past two years, commenced bankruptcy proceedings in Japan as a result of debt loads, competition and declining prices for memory chips, among other reasons.

The royalties we receive from our semiconductor business are partly a function of the adoption of our technologies by system companies. Many system companies purchase semiconductors containing our technologies from our licensees and do not have a direct contractual relationship with us. Our licensees generally do not provide us with details as to the identity or volume of licensed semiconductors purchased by particular system companies. As a result, we face difficulty in analyzing the extent to which our future revenue will be dependent upon particular system companies. System companies face intense competitive pressure in their markets, which are characterized by extreme volatility, frequent new product introductions and rapidly shifting consumer preferences.

The display industry is intensely competitive and highly cyclical. Since LED backlighting solutions are increasingly pervasive in LCDs for computers, smartphones, tablets, game systems, high definition televisions and any user interface incorporating an active display, the trend towards higher resolution displays across these products requires more LEDs per system. The increased usage of LEDs is thereby creating a need for increased power efficiency since the LED backlight is the primary source of power consumption in many consumer electronics products, including smartphones. Our LDT group has numerous patents in edge lit LED lightguide technology, and we plan to license our technology to key companies that use LED edge lit display products.

The highly fragmented general lighting industry is undergoing a fundamental shift from incandescent technology to cold cathode fluorescent lights and LED driven technology by the need to reduce energy consumption and to comply with government mandates. LED lighting typically saves energy costs as compared to existing installed lighting. Our LDT group's patents in LED edge lit lightguide technology also can be applied in the design of next generation LED lighting products. Our goal is to be a major player in the general lighting industry with our technology, and we have established a technology center in Brecksville, Ohio.

Our revenue from companies headquartered outside of the United States accounted for approximately 74% and 78% of our total revenue for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, respectively. We expect that revenue derived from international licensees will continue to represent a significant portion of our total revenue in the future. To date, all of the revenue from international licensees have been denominated in U.S. dollars. However, to the extent that such licensees' sales to their customers are not denominated in U.S. dollars, any royalties that we receive as a result of such sales could be subject to fluctuations in currency exchange rates. In addition, if the effective price of licensed

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

semiconductors sold by our foreign licensees were to increase as a result of fluctuations in the exchange rate of the relevant currencies, demand for licensed semiconductors could fall, which in turn would reduce our royalties. We do not use financial instruments to hedge foreign exchange rate risk.

For additional information concerning international revenue, see Note 11, Business Segments and Major Customers, of Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements of this Form 10-Q.

Engineering costs in the aggregate and as a percentage of revenue increased for the three months ended March 31, 2012 as compared to the same period in the prior year. In the near term, we expect engineering costs to be higher than in 2011 as we intend to continue to make investments in the infrastructure and technologies required to maintain our product innovations in semiconductor, lighting, security and other technologies.

Table of Contents

Marketing, general and administrative expenses in the aggregate and as a percentage of revenue increased for the three months ended March 31, 2012 as compared to the same period in the prior year. Historically, we have been involved in litigation stemming from the unlicensed use of our inventions. Our litigation expenses have been high and difficult to predict and future litigation expenses could be significant, volatile and difficult to predict. If we are successful in the litigation and/or related licensing, our revenue could be substantially higher in the future; if we are unsuccessful, our revenue may not grow or may decrease. Furthermore, our success in litigation matters pending before courts and regulatory bodies that relate to our intellectual property rights have impacted and will likely continue to impact our ability and the terms upon which we are able to negotiate new or renegotiate existing licenses for our technology. We expect to continue to pursue litigation against those companies that have infringed our patented technologies, which in turn will cause litigation expenses to remain significant until such litigation is resolved.

Our continued pursuit of litigation and investment in research and development projects, combined with any lower revenue from our licensees in the future, will negatively affect our cash from operations.

Results of Operations

The following table sets forth, for the periods indicated, the percentage of total revenue represented by certain items reflected in our unaudited condensed consolidated statements of operations:

	Three Months Ended	
	March 31,	
	2012	2011
Revenue:		
Royalties	98.7%	94.7%
Contract revenue	1.3%	5.3%
Total revenue	100.0%	100.0%
Operating costs and expenses:		
Cost of revenue*	11.4%	5.0%
Research and development*	61.1%	37.3%
Marketing, general and administrative*	55.4%	52.3%
Costs of restatement and related legal activities	0.0%	1.9%
Gain from settlement	%	(9.9)%
Total operating costs and expenses	127.9%	86.6%
Operating income (loss)	(27.9)%	13.4%
Interest income and other income (expense), net	0.2%	0.3%
Interest expense	(10.5)%	(9.6)%
Interest and other income (expense), net	(10.3)%	(9.3)%
Income (loss) before income taxes	(38.2)%	4.1%
Provision for income taxes	6.1%	10.8%
Net loss	(44.3)%	(6.7)%

* Includes stock-based compensation:

Cost of revenue	0.0%	0.2%
Research and development	4.3%	4.0%
Marketing, general and administrative	6.4%	7.4%

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

	2012	Three Months Ended March 31, (Dollars in millions)		2011	Change in Percentage
Total Revenue					
Royalties	\$	62.1	\$	59.2	4.7%
Contract revenue		0.8		3.3	(75.1)%
Total revenue	\$	62.9	\$	62.5	0.5%

Table of Contents

Royalty Revenue

Patent Licenses

Our patent royalties increased approximately \$6.7 million to \$57.7 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 from \$51.0 million for the same period in 2011. The increase was primarily due to complete allocation of Samsung's quarterly license payment to revenue since the second quarter of 2011 and revenue recognized from various new patent license agreements signed in the past year as well as patent license agreements acquired from the CRI acquisition, offset by lower royalties reported by certain licensees and expiration of a patent license agreement in the second quarter of 2011.

We are in negotiations with prospective licensees as well as existing licensees regarding renewals. We expect patent royalties will continue to vary from period to period based on our success in renewing existing license agreements and adding new licensees, as well as the level of variation in our licensees' reported shipment volumes, sales price and mix, offset in part by the proportion of licensee payments that are fixed or hybrid in nature.

Solutions Licenses

Royalties from solutions licenses decreased approximately \$3.8 million to \$4.4 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 from \$8.2 million for the same period in 2011. The decrease was primarily due to lower royalties from XDR™ DRAM associated with decreased shipments of the Sony PLAYSTATION®3 product.

In the future, we expect solutions royalties will continue to vary from period to period based on our licensees' shipment volumes, sales prices, and product mix.

Contract Revenue

Contract revenue decreased \$2.5 million to \$0.8 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 from \$3.3 million for the same period in 2011. The decrease was primarily due to the absence of new technology development contracts in the first quarter of 2012.

We believe that contract revenue recognized will continue to fluctuate over time based on our ongoing contractual requirements, the amount of work performed, the timing of completing engineering deliverables, and by changes to work required, as well as new technology development contracts booked in the future.

Engineering costs:

	Three Months Ended		Change in Percentage
	2012	March 31, 2011	
	(Dollars in millions)		
Engineering costs			
Cost of revenue	\$ 0.2	\$ 1.1	(81.2)%
Amortization of intangible assets	7.0	2.0	255.2%
Stock-based compensation	0.0	0.1	(91.9)%
Total cost of revenue	7.2	3.2	127.5%
Research and development	35.7	20.8	71.5%
Stock-based compensation	2.7	2.5	8.3%
Total research and development	38.4	23.3	64.7%
Total engineering costs	\$ 45.6	\$ 26.5	72.1%

Total engineering costs increased during the three months ended March 31, 2012 as compared to the same period in 2011 primarily due to increased headcount related costs of \$3.4 million from additional employees to support our development efforts, increased amortization expense related to intangible assets acquired during the past twelve months of \$5.0 million, the accrual of the retention bonuses related to acquisitions from the past twelve months of \$6.9 million, higher consulting costs of \$1.7 million and higher prototyping costs of \$0.6 million.

In the near term, we intend to continue to make investments in the infrastructure and technologies required to maintain our product innovation in semiconductor, lighting, security and other technologies.

Table of Contents**Marketing, general and administrative costs:**

	Three Months Ended		Change in		
	March 31,				
Marketing, general and administrative costs					
Marketing, general and administrative costs	\$	26.7	\$	18.8	41.6%
Litigation expense		4.1		9.2	(55.3)%
Stock-based compensation		4.0		4.7	(14.2)%
Total marketing, general and administrative costs	\$	34.8	\$	32.7	6.4%

Total marketing, general and administrative costs increased during the three months ended March 31, 2012 as compared to the same period in 2011, which included a decrease in litigation expenses related to ongoing major cases of \$5.1 million. Non-litigation related marketing, general and administrative costs increased in the first quarter of 2012 primarily due to the accrual of the retention bonuses related to acquisitions from the past twelve months of \$1.6 million and increased headcount related costs of \$1.2 million from the increase in employees to support our business as well as higher consulting costs of \$1.8 million.

In the future, marketing, general and administrative costs will vary from period to period based on the trade shows, advertising, legal, acquisition and other marketing and administrative activities undertaken, and the change in sales, marketing and administrative headcount in any given period. Litigation expenses are expected to vary from period to period due to the variability of litigation activities.

Costs of restatement and related legal activities:

Cost of restatement and related legal activities	\$	0.0	\$	1.2	(97.4)%
--	----	-----	----	-----	---------

Costs of restatement and related legal activities consist primarily of settlement payments, investigation, audit, legal and other professional fees related to the 2006-2007 stock option investigation and the filing of the restated financial statements and related litigation.

Costs of restatement and related legal activities were \$30 thousand for the three months ended March 31, 2012 primarily due to a relative lack of litigation expense associated with the derivative lawsuit related to the 2006-2007 stock option investigation. Until all the litigation and related issues are resolved, we anticipate that there could be additional amounts relating to these matters in the future.

Gain from settlement:

Gain from settlement	\$	\$	6.2	(100.0)%

The settlement with Samsung is a multiple element arrangement for accounting purposes. For a multiple element arrangement, we are required to determine the fair value of the elements. We considered several factors in determining the accounting fair value of the elements of the settlement with Samsung which included a third party valuation using an income approach, the Black-Scholes-Merton option pricing model and a residual approach (collectively the Fair Value). The total gain from settlement related to the settlement with Samsung of \$133.0 million was recognized as of the end of the first quarter of 2011. The gain from settlement represents the Fair Value of the cash consideration allocated to the resolution of the antitrust litigation settlement and the residual value of other elements.

Table of Contents***Interest and other income (expense), net:***

Interest income and other income (expense), net	\$	0.1	\$	0.2	(40.2)%
Interest and other income (expense), net	\$	(6.5)	\$	(5.8)	11.3%

Interest income and other income (expense), net, consists primarily of interest income generated from investments in high quality fixed income securities.

Interest expense consists of interest expense associated with our imputed facility lease obligations on the Sunnyvale and Ohio facilities and non-cash interest expense related to the amortization of the debt discount on the 5% convertible senior notes due 2014 (the 2014 Notes) as well as the coupon interest related to the 2014 Notes. We expect our non-cash interest expense to increase steadily as the 2014 Notes reach maturity.

Provision for income taxes:

	Three Months Ended			Change in Percentage	
	2012	March 31, (Dollars in millions)	2011		
Provision for income taxes	\$	3.9	\$	6.8	(43.2)%
Effective tax rate		(16.0)%		266.1%	

Our effective tax rate for the three months ended March 31, 2012 was different from the U.S. statutory tax due to foreign withholding taxes, a full valuation allowance on our U.S. net deferred tax assets and foreign losses with no current tax benefit recorded, partially offset by foreign tax credits. During the quarter ended March 31, 2012, we calculated our interim tax provision to record taxes incurred by the U.S. entity on a discrete basis because we are projecting losses in which a tax benefit cannot be recognized.

During the three months ended March 31, 2012, we paid withholding taxes of \$4.4 million. We recorded a provision for income taxes of \$3.9 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012, which is primarily comprised of withholding taxes and other foreign taxes. As we continue to maintain a valuation allowance against our U.S. deferred tax assets, our tax provision is based primarily on the withholding taxes, other foreign taxes and current state taxes.

Our effective tax rate for the three months ended March 31, 2011 was different from the U.S. statutory tax rate due to foreign withholding taxes, a full valuation allowance on our U.S. net deferred tax assets and foreign losses with no current tax benefit recorded, partially offset by foreign tax credits.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

	March 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
	(In millions)	
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 188.5	\$ 162.2
Marketable securities	44.0	127.2
Total cash, cash equivalents, and marketable securities	\$ 232.5	\$ 289.4

	Three Months Ended March 31,	
	2012	2011
	(In millions)	
Net cash used in operating activities	\$ (11.0)	\$ (4.5)
Net cash provided by (used in) investing activities	\$ 37.2	\$ (37.8)
Net cash provided by financing activities	\$ 0.1	\$ 9.3

Table of Contents

Liquidity

We currently anticipate that existing cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities balances and cash flows from operations will be adequate to meet our cash needs for at least the next 12 months. Additionally, substantially all of our cash and cash equivalents are in the United States. Our cash needs for three months ended March 31, 2012 were funded primarily from maturities of marketable securities.

We do not anticipate any liquidity constraints as a result of either the current credit environment or investment fair value fluctuations. Additionally, we have the intent and ability to hold our debt investments that have unrealized losses in accumulated other comprehensive loss for a sufficient period of time to allow for recovery of the principal amounts invested. Additionally, we have no significant exposure to European sovereign debt. We continually monitor the credit risk in our portfolio and mitigate our credit risk exposures in accordance with our policies. As described elsewhere in this Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations and this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, we are involved in ongoing litigation related to our intellectual property and our past stock option investigation. Any adverse settlements or judgments in any of this litigation could have a material adverse impact on our results of operations, cash balances and cash flows in the period in which such events occur.

Operating Activities

Cash used in operating activities of \$11.0 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 was primarily attributable to the net loss adjusted for certain non-cash items including stock-based compensation expense, non-cash interest expense, depreciation and amortization expense. Additionally, cash used in operating activities included a decrease in accounts payable due to the timing of vendor payments offset by a decrease in prepaid expenses and other assets.

Cash used in operating activities of \$4.5 million for the three months ended March 31, 2011 was primarily attributable to the net loss adjusted for certain non-cash items including stock-based compensation expense, non-cash interest expense, depreciation and amortization expense. Additionally, cash used in operating activities included a decrease in accrued salaries and benefits related to the payout of the 2010 Corporate Incentive Plan offset by an increase in accounts payable due to the timing of vendor payments.

Investing Activities

Cash provided by investing activities of approximately \$37.2 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 primarily consisted of proceeds from the maturities of available-for-sale marketable securities of \$82.9 million, offset by cash paid for the acquisition of Unity and other business of \$42.4 million, net of cash acquired. In addition, we paid \$3.0 million to acquire property, plant and equipment, primarily computer equipment and software, and \$0.3 million for intangible assets.

Cash used in investing activities of approximately \$37.8 million for the three months ended March 31, 2011 primarily consisted of purchases of available-for-sale marketable securities of \$94.2 million, partially offset by proceeds from the maturities of available-for-sale marketable securities of \$62.8 million. In addition, we paid \$6.5 million to acquire property, plant and equipment, primarily computer software.

Financing Activities

Cash provided by financing activities was \$0.1 million for the three months ended March 31, 2012 primarily due to proceeds of \$0.1 million from issuance of common stock under equity incentive plans.

Cash provided by financing activities was \$9.3 million for the three months ended March 31, 2011 due to proceeds of \$6.7 million received from the landlord for the tenant improvements related to the lease in Sunnyvale and \$3.3 million from issuance of common stock under equity incentive plans. We also made payments of \$0.4 million related to the principal payments against the lease financing obligation and \$0.3 million under an installment payment plan to acquire intangible assets.

Table of Contents**Contractual Obligations**

As of March 31, 2012, our material contractual obligations are (in thousands):

	Total	Remainder of 2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Thereafter
Contractual obligations (1)							
Imputed financing obligation (2)	\$ 59,071	\$ 4,711	\$ 6,827	\$ 6,997	\$ 7,168	\$ 7,348	\$ 26,020
Leases	9,529	2,800	1,562	1,472	1,345	992	1,358
Software licenses (3)	2,747	2,308	359	80			
Acquisition retention bonuses (4)	57,390	16,667	19,114	19,113	2,496		
Convertible notes	172,500			172,500			
Interest payments related to convertible notes	21,563	8,625	8,625	4,313			
Total	\$ 322,800	\$ 35,111	\$ 36,487	\$ 204,475	\$ 11,009	\$ 8,340	\$ 27,378

- (1) The above table does not reflect possible payments in connection with uncertain tax benefits of approximately \$16.0 million including \$7.0 million recorded as a reduction of long-term deferred tax assets and \$9.0 million in long-term income taxes payable, as of March 31, 2012. As noted in Note 9, *Income Taxes* of Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements, although it is possible that some of the unrecognized tax benefits could be settled within the next 12 months, we cannot reasonably estimate the outcome at this time.
- (2) With respect to the imputed financing obligation, the main components of the difference between the amount reflected in the contractual obligations table and the amount reflected on the Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets are the interest on the imputed financing obligation and the estimated common area expenses over the future periods. Additionally, the amount includes the amended Ohio lease and the amended Sunnyvale lease.
- (3) We have commitments with various software vendors for non-cancellable license agreements generally having terms longer than one year. The above table summarizes those contractual obligations as of March 31, 2012 which are also presented on our Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheet under current and other long-term liabilities.
- (4) In connection with recent acquisitions, we are obligated to pay retention bonuses to certain employees and contractors, subject to certain eligibility and acceleration provisions including the condition of employment. The CRI retention bonuses payable on June 3, 2013 and 2014 will be paid in cash or stock at our election.

Share Repurchase Program

During the three months ended March 31, 2012, we did not repurchase any shares of our Common Stock. As of March 31, 2012, we had repurchased a cumulative total of approximately 26.3 million shares of our Common Stock with an aggregate price of approximately \$428.9 million since the commencement of the program in 2001. As of March 31, 2012, there remained an outstanding authorization to repurchase approximately 5.2 million shares of our outstanding Common Stock.

We record stock repurchases as a reduction to stockholders' equity. We record a portion of the purchase price of the repurchased shares as an increase to accumulated deficit when the price of the shares repurchased exceeds the average original proceeds per share received from the

issuance of Common Stock.

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates

The discussion and analysis of our financial condition and results of operations are based upon our condensed consolidated financial statements, which have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States. The preparation of these financial statements requires us to make estimates and judgments that affect the reported amounts of assets, liabilities, revenue and expenses, and related disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities. On an ongoing basis, we evaluate our estimates, including those related to revenue recognition, expense accrual, investments, income taxes, litigation and other contingencies. We base our estimates on historical experience and on various other assumptions that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances, the results of which form the basis for making judgments about the carrying values of assets and liabilities that are not readily apparent from other sources. Actual results may differ from these estimates under different assumptions or conditions. Our critical accounting estimates include those regarding (1) revenue recognition, (2) litigation, (3) goodwill and intangible assets, (4) income taxes, (5) stock-based compensation, (6) marketable securities and (7) convertible notes. For a discussion of our critical accounting estimates, see Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations - Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2011.

Table of Contents**Recent Accounting Pronouncements**

See Note 2 Recent Accounting Pronouncements of Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements of this Form 10-Q for discussion of recent accounting pronouncements including the respective expected dates of adoption.

Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk

We are exposed to financial market risks, primarily arising from the effect of interest rate fluctuations on our investment portfolio. Interest rate fluctuation may arise from changes in the market's view of the quality of the security issuer, the overall economic outlook, and the time to maturity of our portfolio. We mitigate this risk by investing only in high quality, highly liquid instruments. Securities with original maturities of one year or less must be rated by two of the three industry standard rating agencies as follows: A1 by Standard & Poor's, P1 by Moody's and/or F-1 by Fitch. Securities with original maturities of greater than one year must be rated by two of the following industry standard rating agencies as follows: AA- by Standard & Poor's, Aa3 by Moody's and/or AA- by Fitch. By corporate investment policy, we limit the amount of exposure to \$15.0 million or 10% of the portfolio, whichever is lower, for any single non-U.S. Government issuer. A single U.S. Agency can represent up to 25% of the portfolio. No more than 20% of the total portfolio may be invested in the securities of an industry sector, with money market fund investments evaluated separately. Our policy requires that at least 10% of the portfolio be in securities with a maturity of 90 days or less. We may make investments in U.S. Treasuries, U.S. Agencies, corporate bonds and municipal bonds and notes with maturities up to 36 months. However, the bias of our investment portfolio is shorter maturities. All investments must be U.S. dollar denominated. Additionally, we have no significant exposure to European sovereign debt.

We invest our cash equivalents and marketable securities in a variety of U.S. dollar financial instruments such as U.S. Treasuries, U.S. Government Agencies, commercial paper and corporate notes. Our policy specifically prohibits trading securities for the sole purposes of realizing trading profits. However, we may liquidate a portion of our portfolio if we experience unforeseen liquidity requirements. In such a case, if the environment has been one of rising interest rates, we may experience a realized loss, similarly, if the environment has been one of declining interest rates, we may experience a realized gain. As of March 31, 2012, we had an investment portfolio of fixed income marketable securities of \$216.6 million including cash equivalents. If market interest rates were to increase immediately and uniformly by 1.0% from the levels as of March 31, 2012, the fair value of the portfolio would decline by approximately \$48 thousand. Actual results may differ materially from this sensitivity analysis.

The table below summarizes the amortized cost, fair value, unrealized gains (losses) and related weighted average interest rates for our cash equivalents and marketable securities portfolio as of March 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011:

(Dollars in thousands)	Fair Value	As of March 31, 2012		Gross Unrealized Losses	Weighted Rate of Return
		Amortized Cost	Gross Unrealized Gains		
Money market funds	\$ 172,588	\$ 172,588	\$	\$	0.01%
Corporate notes, bonds and commercial paper	43,970	43,976	1	(7)	0.13%
Total cash equivalents and marketable securities	216,558	216,564	1	(7)	
Cash	15,960	15,960			
Total cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities	\$ 232,518	\$ 232,524	\$ 1	\$ (7)	

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

(Dollars in thousands)	As of December 31, 2011					Weighted Rate of Return
	Fair Value	Amortized Cost	Gross Unrealized Gains	Gross Unrealized Losses		
Money market funds	\$ 127,559	\$ 127,559	\$	\$		0.01%
Corporate notes, bonds and commercial paper	137,108	137,208		(100)		0.29%
Total cash equivalents and marketable securities	264,667	264,767		(100)		
Cash	24,789	24,789				
Total cash, cash equivalents and marketable securities	\$ 289,456	\$ 289,556	\$	\$ (100)		

The fair value of our convertible notes is subject to interest rate risk, market risk and other factors due to the convertible feature. The fair value of the convertible notes will generally increase as interest rates fall and decrease as interest rates rise. In addition, the

Table of Contents

fair value of the convertible notes will generally increase as our common stock price increases and will generally decrease as our common stock price declines in value. The interest and market value changes affect the fair value of our convertible notes but do not impact our financial position, cash flows or results of operations due to the fixed nature of the debt obligation. Additionally, we do not carry the convertible notes at fair value. We present the fair value of the convertible notes for required disclosure purposes. The following table summarizes certain information related to our 2014 Notes as of March 31, 2012:

(in thousands)	Fair Value	Fair Value Given a 10% Increase in Market Prices	Fair Value Given a 10% Decrease in Market Prices
5% Convertible Senior Notes due 2014	\$ 172,716	\$ 189,988	\$ 155,444

We invoice our customers in U.S. dollars. Although the fluctuation of currency exchange rates may impact our customers, and thus indirectly impact us, we do not attempt to hedge this indirect and speculative risk. Our overseas operations consist primarily of one design center in India and small business development offices in Germany, Japan, Korea and Taiwan. We monitor our foreign currency exposure; however, as of March 31, 2012, we believe our foreign currency exposure is not material enough to warrant foreign currency hedging.

Item 4. Controls and Procedures**Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures**

We maintain disclosure controls and procedures designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed in the reports we file or submit pursuant to the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 as amended (Exchange Act) is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the rules and forms of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and that such information is accumulated and communicated to our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.

Management, with the participation of the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of the design and operation of our disclosure controls and procedures as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) of the Exchange Act as of the end of the period covered by this report. Based on this evaluation, our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have concluded that, as of March 31, 2012, our disclosure controls and procedures were effective.

Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

There were no changes in internal control over financial reporting during the quarter ended March 31, 2012 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

PART II OTHER INFORMATION

Item 1. Legal Proceedings

The information required by this item regarding legal proceedings is incorporated by reference to the information set forth in Note 13 Litigation and Asserted Claims of Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements of this Form 10-Q.

Item 1A. Risk Factors

Because of the following factors, as well as other variables affecting our operating results, past financial performance may not be a reliable indicator of future performance, and historical trends should not be used to anticipate results or trends in future periods. See also Special Note Regarding Forward-Looking Statements elsewhere in this report.

Risks Associated With Our Business, Industry and Market Conditions

If market leaders do not adopt our innovations, our results of operations could decline.

An important part of our strategy is to penetrate our target market segments by working with leaders in those market segments. This strategy is designed to encourage other participants in those segments to follow such leaders in adopting our innovations. If a

Table of Contents

high profile industry participant adopts our innovations but fails to achieve success with its products or adopts and achieves success with a competing technology, our reputation and sales could be adversely affected. In addition, some industry participants have adopted, and others may in the future adopt, a strategy of disparaging our solutions adopted by their competitors or a strategy of otherwise undermining the market adoption of our solutions.

We target market-leading companies to adopt our technologies, particularly those that develop and market high volume business and consumer products in semiconductors, computing, tablets, handheld devices, mobile applications, gaming and graphics, high definition televisions and displays, general lighting, cryptography and data security. We have diversified our technologies through the establishment of our NBG operations and will continue to seek out other target markets in and related to computing, gaming and graphics, consumer electronics, mobile, general lighting, and security applications. We are subject to many risks beyond our control that influence whether or not a potential licensee or partner company will adopt our technologies, including, among others:

- competition faced by a company in its particular industry;
- the timely introduction and market acceptance of a company's products;
- the engineering, sales and marketing and management capabilities of a company;
- technical challenges unrelated to our innovations faced by a company in developing its products;
- the financial and other resources of a company; and
- the degree to which our licensees promote our innovations to their customers.

There can be no assurance that consumer products that currently use our technology will continue to do so, nor can there be any assurance that the consumer products that incorporate our technology will be successful in their markets in order to generate expected royalties. If market leaders do not successfully adopt our technologies for any of these reasons, our strategy may not be successful and, as a result, our results of operations could decline.

We have traditionally operated in the semiconductor industry that is highly cyclical and in which the number of our potential customers may be in decline as a result of industry consolidation, and we face intense competition in all of our target markets that may cause our results of operations to suffer.

The semiconductor industry is intensely competitive and has been impacted by price erosion, rapid technological change, short product life cycles and cyclical market patterns. Significant economic downturns characterized by diminished demand, erosion of average selling prices, production overcapacity and production capacity constraints can affect the highly cyclical semiconductor industry. The economic downturn of the past several years and the threats of further regional or worldwide downturn are evident today. As a result, we may achieve a reduced number of licenses, tightening of customers' operating budgets, difficulty or inability of our customers to pay our licensing fees, extensions of the approval process for new licenses and consolidation among our customers, all of which may adversely affect the demand for our technology and may cause us to experience substantial period-to-period fluctuations in our operating results.

Many of our customers operate in industries that experience significant declines as a result of the recent economic downturns. In particular, DRAM manufacturers, which make up many of our existing and potential licensees, have suffered material losses and other adverse effects to their businesses. For example, in February 2012, Elpida, one of our top 10% licensees by revenue, commenced bankruptcy proceedings in Japan as a result of debt loads, competition and declining prices for memory chips, among other reasons. Pressures on the DRAM businesses may result in industry consolidation as companies seek to reduce costs and improve profitability through business combinations. Consolidation among our existing DRAM and other customers may result in loss of revenues under existing license agreements. Consolidation among companies in the DRAM and other industries within which we license our technology may reduce the number of future licensees for our products and services. In either case, consolidation in the DRAM and other industries in which we operate may negatively impact our short-term and long-term business prospects, licensing revenues and results of operations.

We face competition from semiconductor and intellectual property companies who provide their own DDR memory chip interface technology and solutions. In addition, most DRAM manufacturers, including our XDRTM licensees, produce versions of DRAM such

Table of Contents

as SDR, DDRx, GDDRx SDRAM and LPDDRx which compete with XDRTM chips. We believe that our principal competition for memory chip interfaces may come from our licensees and prospective licensees, some of which are evaluating and developing products based on technologies that they contend or may contend will not require a license from us. In addition, our competitors are also taking a system approach similar to ours in seeking to solve the application needs of system companies. Many of these companies are larger and may have better access to financial, technical and other resources than we possess. Wider applications of other developing memory technologies, including FLASH memory, may also pose competition to our licensed memory solutions.

JEDEC has standardized what it calls extensions of DDR, known as DDR2 and DDR3. Other efforts are underway to create other products including those sometimes referred to as GDDR4 and GDDR5, as well as new ways to integrate products such as system-in-package DRAM. To the extent that these alternatives might provide comparable system performance at lower or similar cost than XDRTM memory chips, or are perceived to require the payment of no or lower royalties, or to the extent other factors influence the industry, our licensees and prospective licensees may adopt and promote alternative technologies. Even to the extent we determine that such alternative technologies infringe our patents, there can be no assurance that we would be able to negotiate agreements that would result in royalties being paid to us without litigation, which could be costly and the results of which would be uncertain.

We also face competitive threats to our NBG operations. The display industry is intensely competitive and is impacted by rapid technological change, shifting government mandates, cyclical market patterns and increasing foreign and domestic competition. In particular, our LDT group faces competition from system and subsystem providers of backlighting and general lighting solutions, some of which have substantial resources and operations. The security technology industry also faces robust competition. Our CRI group acquired in 2011 faces competition from large semiconductor manufacturers and other companies that offer various security solutions, including hardware with on-chip security features, software based offerings and other products and services. Potential competitors may either develop their own competing offerings or acquire assets, companies or businesses that provide products or services that compete with our security technologies.

If for any of these reasons we cannot effectively compete in these primary markets, our results of operations could suffer.

If we do not succeed in developing our new businesses, our results of operations may be adversely affected.

The future success of NBG, which includes our LDT, CRI and MTD groups, depends on our ability to develop new or emerging licensing opportunities, diversify our business into lighting and displays, data security, mobile communications and additional semiconductor technologies. Our diversification efforts may include business models that are not within the scope of intellectual property or technology licensing, such as product and service offerings, for which we have limited operating experience. These potential areas of expansion may require significant investment without any certainty on our ability to generate significant revenues.

For our LDT group, we will be required to improve the visual capabilities, form factor, power efficiency and cost-effectiveness of backlighting of LCD displays in products for computing, gaming and graphics, consumer electronics, mobile and general lighting applications. We will need to keep pace with rapid changes in advanced lighting and optoelectronics technology, changing consumer requirements, new product introductions and evolving industry standards, any of which could render our existing technology obsolete if we fail to respond in a timely manner. The extent to which companies in the general lighting industry adopt solid state lighting and license our lighting technologies, and the timing of such adoption and licensing, if it occurs at all, is subject to many factors beyond our control and is not predictable by us. We are subject to many risks beyond our control that influence whether or not a potential licensee or partner company will adopt and license our lighting technologies.

For CRI, we will be required to continue to develop and provide robust data security technologies that are effective for licensees. Licensing of data security technologies also presents challenges in the face of intense competition. CRI will be required to continue to license differential power analysis countermeasures and other security technologies, and develop new security technologies in order to grow market acceptance and revenue.

Our MTD is another emerging business within NBG. To date, our MTD group has not generated any revenue, but our intent is to grow MTD in order to provide innovative software and technological solutions to satisfy the anticipated requirements of developers, chip suppliers and manufacturers in the market for mobile electronic products. If the development of our MTD business does not occur, our ability to achieve success in this market may be limited, and this may in turn adversely affect our potential for long term revenue growth.

The development, application and licensing of new technologies in lighting display, security and mobile technology is a complex process subject to a number of uncertainties, including the integration of our new businesses into the rest of our company. Our

Table of Contents

competitors have significant marketing, workforce, financial and other resources and longer operating history which could make acceptance of our NBG technologies more difficult. If others develop innovative technologies that are superior to ours or if we fail to accurately anticipate technology and market trends, respond on a timely basis with our own new enhancements and technology and achieve broad market acceptance of these enhancements and technology, our competitive position may be harmed and our operating results may be adversely affected.

In order to grow, we may have to invest more resources in research and development than anticipated, which could increase our operating expenses and negatively impact our operating results.

If new competitors, technological advances by existing competitors, our entry into new markets and/or development of new technologies or other competitive factors require us to invest significantly greater resources than anticipated in our research and development efforts, our operating expenses would increase. For the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, research and development expenses were \$38.4 million and \$23.3 million, respectively, including stock-based compensation of approximately \$2.7 million and \$2.5 million, respectively. For the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, research and development expenses were \$115.7 million and \$92.7 million, respectively, including stock-based compensation of approximately \$10.5 million and \$10.2 million, respectively. For the year ended December 31, 2011, research and development expenses also included \$15.7 million for retention bonuses for employees hired as a result of acquisitions, which will also be incurred in greater amounts in 2012. If we are required to invest significantly greater resources than anticipated in research and development efforts without an increase in revenue, our operating results could decline. Research and development expenses are likely to fluctuate from time to time to the extent we make periodic incremental investments in research and development, including as a result of acquisitions and our investment in new technologies. In order to grow, including entering new markets and/or developing new technologies, we anticipate that we will continue to devote substantial resources to research and development. We expect these expenses to increase in absolute dollars in the foreseeable future as our technology development efforts continue.

Our revenue is concentrated in a few customers, and if we lose any of these customers, our revenue may decrease substantially.

We have a high degree of revenue concentration. Our top five licensees for each reporting period represented approximately 74% of our revenues for the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011. For the three months ended March 31, 2012, revenues from NVIDIA, Renesas and Samsung each accounted for 10% or more of our total revenue. For the three months ended March 31, 2011, revenue from Elpida, NVIDIA, Samsung and Toshiba accounted for 10% or more of our total revenue. Our top five licensees for each reporting period represented approximately 66% and 85% of our revenues for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively. For the year ended December 31, 2011, revenues from Elpida, NVIDIA and Samsung, each accounted for 10% or more of our revenue. For the year ended December 31, 2010, revenue from Elpida and Samsung, each accounted for 10% or more of our total revenue. We expect to continue to experience significant revenue concentration for the foreseeable future.

In addition, some of our commercial agreements require us to provide certain customers with the lowest royalty rate that we provide to other customers for similar technologies, volumes and schedules. These clauses may limit our ability to effectively price differently among our customers, to respond quickly to market forces, or otherwise to compete on the basis of price. The particular licensees which account for revenue concentration have varied from period to period as a result of the addition of new contracts, expiration of existing contracts, renewal of existing contracts, industry consolidation, including the combination in 2010 of NEC and Renesas, and the volumes and prices at which the licensees have recently sold licensed semiconductors to system companies. These variations are expected to continue in the foreseeable future.

We continue to be in negotiations with licensees and prospective licensees to reach patent license agreements for DRAM devices and DRAM controllers. We expect that patent license royalties will continue to vary from period to period based on our success in renewing existing license

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

agreements and adding new licensees, as well as the level of variation in our licensees' reported shipment volumes, sales price and mix, offset in part by the proportion of licensee payments that are fixed. A number of our material license agreements are scheduled to expire in 2015. However, we cannot provide any assurance that we will reach agreement on renewal terms or that the royalty rates we will be entitled to receive under the new agreements will be as favorable to us as our current agreements. If we are unsuccessful in renewing any of these patent license agreements, our results of operations may decline significantly.

Table of Contents

If our counterparties are unable to fulfill their financial and other obligations to us, our business and results of operations may be affected adversely.

Any downturn in economic conditions or other business factors could threaten the financial health of our counterparties, including companies with whom we have entered into licensing arrangements, settlement agreements or that have been subject to litigation judgments that provide for payments to us, and their ability to fulfill their financial and other obligations to us. Such financial pressures on our counterparties may eventually lead to bankruptcy proceedings or other attempts to avoid financial obligations that are due to us under licenses, settlement agreements or litigation judgments. Because bankruptcy courts have the power to modify or cancel contracts of the petitioner which remain subject to future performance and alter or discharge payment obligations related to pre-petition debts, we may receive less than all of the payments that we would otherwise be entitled to receive from any such counterparty as a result of a bankruptcy proceedings. For example, in February 2012, Elpida, one of our top 10% licensees by revenue, commenced bankruptcy proceedings in Japan as a result of debt loads, competition and declining prices for memory chips, among other reasons. In addition, in 2009, two of our counterparties, Qimonda and Spansion, were subject to insolvency proceedings in their applicable jurisdictions as a result of a downturn in business which led to lower than anticipated or no payment to us. If we are unable to collect royalties or any other payments owed to us or if counterparties such as Elpida are unable to exit bankruptcy proceedings or otherwise suffer a loss of business as a result of such proceedings, or if other of our counterparties enter into bankruptcy or otherwise seek to renegotiate their financial obligations to us as a result of the deterioration of their financial health, our business and results of operations may be affected adversely.

If we cannot respond to rapid technological change in our target markets by developing new innovations in a timely and cost-effective manner, our operating results will suffer.

We derive most of our revenue from our chip interface technologies that we have patented. We expect that this dependence on our fundamental technology will continue for the foreseeable future. The semiconductor industry is characterized by rapid technological change, with new generations of semiconductors being introduced periodically and with ongoing improvements. The introduction or market acceptance of competing chip interfaces that render our chip interfaces less desirable or obsolete would have a rapid and material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition. The announcement of new chip interfaces by us could cause licensees or system companies to delay or defer entering into arrangements for the use of our current chip interfaces, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our success depends on our ability to introduce and patent enhancements and new generations of our chip interface technologies that keep pace with other changes in the semiconductor industry and which achieve rapid market acceptance. We must devote significant engineering resources to addressing the need for higher speed chip interfaces associated with increases in the speed of microprocessors and other controllers. The technical innovations that are required for us to be successful are inherently complex and require long development cycles, and there can be no assurance that our development efforts will ultimately be successful. In addition, these innovations must be:

- completed before changes in the semiconductor industry render them obsolete;
- available when system companies require these innovations; and

- sufficiently compelling to cause semiconductor manufacturers to enter into licensing arrangements with us to implement these new technologies.

In all of our target markets, significant technological innovations generally require a substantial investment before their commercial viability can be determined. There can be no assurance that we have accurately estimated the amount of resources required to complete our innovation efforts, or that we will have, or be able to expend, sufficient resources required for the development of our innovations. In addition, there is market risk associated with these products for which we develop technological innovations, and there can be no assurance that unit volumes, and their associated royalties, will occur. If our technology fails to capture or maintain a portion of the high volume target consumer market, our business results could suffer.

Security breaches or vulnerabilities in our data security technologies could harm our reputation, result in financial losses and divert resources.

Because the techniques used by hackers to access or sabotage secure chip and other technologies change frequently and generally are not recognized until launched against a target, we may be unable to anticipate these techniques and may not address them in our CRI data security technologies. Furthermore, our data security technologies may also fail to detect or prevent security breaches due to a number of reasons such as the evolving nature of such threats and the continual emergence of new threats. An actual or perceived security breach of our licensees or their end-customers, regardless of whether the breach is attributable to the failure of our data

Table of Contents

security technologies, could adversely affect the market's perception of our security technologies. We may not be able to correct any security flaws or vulnerabilities promptly, or at all. Any breaches, defects, errors or vulnerabilities in our data security technologies could result in:

- expenditure of significant financial and research and development resources in efforts to analyze, correct, eliminate or work-around breaches, errors or defects or to address and eliminate vulnerabilities;
- financial liability to licensees for breach of certain contract provisions;
- loss of existing or potential licensees;
- delayed or lost revenue;
- delay or failure to attain market acceptance;
- negative publicity, which will harm our reputation; and
- litigation, regulatory inquiries or investigations that may be costly and harm our reputation.

We have in the past and may in the future make acquisitions or enter into mergers, strategic transactions or other arrangements that may or may not produce the expected operating and financial results.

As part of our strategic initiatives, we currently are evaluating, and expect to continue to engage in, investments in or acquisitions of companies, products, patents or technologies, and the entry into strategic transactions or other arrangements. We completed a number of acquisitions in 2009 to date, including the acquisition of CRI in 2011, our largest transaction to date. These acquisitions, investments, transactions or arrangements are likely to range in size, some of which may be significant. After completing our acquisitions, we may experience difficulty integrating personnel and operations, which could negatively affect our operating results. In addition:

- the key personnel of the acquired entity or business may decide not to work for us or may not perform according to our expectations;

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

- we may experience additional legal, financial and accounting challenges and complexities in areas such as licensing, tax planning, cash management and financial reporting;
- we may experience challenges with existing or prospective licensees as a result of potential conflict between pre-existing and historical relationships and any newly acquired engagements and agreements;
- our ongoing business, including our operations, technology development and deliveries to our customers, may be disrupted, and employee retention and productivity could also suffer;
- we may not be able to recognize the financial benefits we anticipated and/or we may suffer losses, both with respect to our ongoing business and the acquired entity or business;
- our increasing international presence resulting from acquisitions may lead to additional risks associated with operating outside the United States, including with respect to legal, employment and other areas of focus, and may increase our exposure to international currency, tax and political risks; and
- our lack of experience with new products or technologies in new markets may cause us to fail to achieve expected financial and strategic benefits of the acquisition.

In connection with our strategic initiatives related to future acquisitions or mergers, strategic transactions or other arrangements, we may incur substantial expenses regardless of whether any transactions occur. Further, the risks described above may be exacerbated as a result of managing multiple acquisitions simultaneously.

Table of Contents

In addition, we may be required to assume the liabilities of the companies or related to the businesses we acquire. The assumption of such liabilities may include those related to intellectual property infringement or indemnification of customers of acquired businesses for similar claims, which could materially and adversely affect our business.

We may have to incur debt or issue equity securities to pay for any future acquisition, which debt or equity securities could involve restrictive covenants or be dilutive to our existing stockholders.

Some of our revenue is subject to the pricing policies of our licensees over whom we have no control.

We have no control over our licensees' pricing of their products and there can be no assurance that licensee products using or containing our chip interfaces will be competitively priced or will sell in significant volumes. One important requirement for our memory chip interfaces is for any premium charged by our licensees in the price of memory and controller chips over alternatives to be reasonable in comparison to the perceived benefits of the chip interfaces. If the benefits of our technology do not match the price premium charged by our licensees, the resulting decline in sales of products incorporating our technology could harm our operating results.

Our licensing cycle is lengthy and costly, and our marketing and licensing efforts may be unsuccessful.

The process of persuading customers to adopt and license our chip interface, lighting and display, data security, mobile and other semiconductor technologies can be lengthy. Even if successful, there can be no assurance that our technologies will be used in a product that is ultimately brought to market, achieves commercial acceptance or results in significant royalties to us. We generally incur significant marketing and sales expenses prior to entering into our license agreements, generating a license fee and establishing a royalty stream from each licensee. The length of time it takes to establish a new licensing relationship can take many months or even years. In addition, our ongoing intellectual property litigation and regulatory actions have and will likely continue to have an impact on our ability to enter into new licenses and renewals of licenses. We may incur costs in any particular period before any associated revenue stream begins, if at all. If our marketing and sales efforts are very lengthy or unsuccessful, then we may face a material adverse effect on our business and results of operations as a result of failure or delay to obtain royalties.

Future revenue is difficult to predict for several reasons, and our failure to predict revenue accurately may result in our stock price declining.

Our lengthy and costly license negotiation cycle and our ongoing intellectual property litigation make our future revenue difficult to predict because we may not be successful in entering into licenses with our customers on our estimated timelines and we are reliant on the litigation timelines for any results or settlements.

While some of our license agreements provide for fixed, quarterly royalty payments, many of our license agreements provide for volume-based royalties, and may also be subject to caps on royalties in a given period. The sales volume and prices of our licensees' products in any given period can be difficult to predict. As a result, our actual results may differ substantially from analyst estimates or our forecasts in any given

quarter.

In addition, a portion of our revenue comes from development and support services provided to our licensees. Depending upon the nature of the services, a portion of the related revenue may be recognized ratably over the support period, or may be recognized according to contract accounting. Contract revenue accounting may result in deferral of the service fees to the completion of the contract, or may be recognized over the period in which services are performed on a percentage-of-completion basis. There can be no assurance that the product development schedule for these projects will not be changed or delayed.

All of these factors make it difficult to predict future revenue and may result in our missing previously announced earnings guidance or analysts estimates which would likely cause our stock price to decline.

A substantial portion of our revenue is derived from sources outside of the United States and this revenue and our business generally are subject to risks related to international operations that are often beyond our control.

For the three months ended March 31, 2012 and 2011, revenue received from our international customers constituted approximately 74% and 78% of our total revenue, respectively. For the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, revenue received from our international customers constituted approximately 67% and 93%, respectively, of our total revenue. As a result of our

Table of Contents

continued focus on international markets, we expect that future revenue derived from international sources will continue to represent a significant portion of our total revenue.

To date, all of the revenue from international licensees has been denominated in U.S. dollars. However, to the extent that such licensees' sales to systems companies are not denominated in U.S. dollars, any royalties which are based as a percentage of the customer's sales that we receive as a result of such sales could be subject to fluctuations in currency exchange rates. In addition, if the effective price of licensed semiconductors sold by our foreign licensees were to increase as a result of fluctuations in the exchange rate of the relevant currencies, demand for licensed semiconductors could fall, which in turn would reduce our royalties. We do not use financial instruments to hedge foreign exchange rate risk.

We currently have international design operations in India and business development operations in Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Germany. Our international operations and revenue are subject to a variety of risks which are beyond our control, including:

- export controls, tariffs, import and licensing restrictions and other trade barriers;

- profits, if any, earned abroad being subject to local tax laws and not being repatriated to the United States or, if repatriation is possible, limited in amount;

- treatment of revenue from international sources and changes to tax codes, including being subject to foreign tax laws and being liable for paying withholding, income or other taxes in foreign jurisdictions, such as withholding taxes in Korea;

- foreign government laws and regulations and changes in these laws and regulations;

- lack of protection of our intellectual property and other contract rights by jurisdictions in which we may do business to the same extent as the laws of the United States;

- hiring, maintaining and managing a workforce remotely and under various legal systems;

- natural disasters, acts of war, terrorism, widespread illness or securities breaches;

- social, political and economic instability;

- geo-political issues; including changes in diplomatic and trade relationships; and
- cultural differences in the conduct of business both with licensees and in conducting business in our international facilities and international sales offices.

We and our licensees are subject to many of the risks described above with respect to companies which are located in different countries, particularly electronics manufacturers located in Asia. There can be no assurance that one or more of the risks associated with our international operations will not result in a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations.

Weak global economic conditions may adversely affect demand for the products and services of our licensees.

Our operations and performance depend significantly on worldwide economic conditions, and the U.S. and world economies have experienced a prolonged period of weak economic conditions, and the threats of further regional or worldwide downturn are evident today. Uncertainty about global economic conditions poses a risk as consumers and businesses may postpone spending in response to tighter credit, negative financial news and declines in income or asset values, which could have a material negative effect on the demand for the products of our licensees in the foreseeable future. Other factors that could influence demand include continuing increases in fuel and energy costs, competitive pressures, including pricing pressures, from companies that have competing products, changes in the credit market, conditions in the residential real estate and mortgage markets, consumer confidence, and other macroeconomic factors affecting consumer spending behavior. If our licensees experience reduced demand for their products as a result of economic conditions or otherwise, our business and results of operations could be harmed.

Table of Contents

If we are unable to attract and retain qualified personnel, our business and operations could suffer.

Our success is dependent upon our ability to identify, attract, compensate, motivate and retain qualified personnel, especially engineers, who can enhance our existing technologies and introduce new technologies. Competition for qualified personnel, particularly those with significant industry experience, is intense, in particular in the San Francisco Bay Area where we are headquartered and in the area of Bangalore, India where we have a design center. We are also dependent upon our senior management personnel. The loss of the services of any of our senior management personnel, or key sales personnel in critical markets, or critical members of staff, or of a significant number of our engineers could be disruptive to our development efforts or business relationships and could cause our business and operations to suffer.

During the first quarter of 2012, our chief executive officer, Harold Hughes, announced his plans to retire, and the Company's commencement of a search to identify a successor. While the board of directors is actively conducting a comprehensive search, the prospective change in the office of the chief executive officer, and any protracted delay in identifying a successor, may cause disruption to our business and adversely affect our operating results.

We are subject to various government restrictions and regulation, including on the sale of products and services that use encryption technology and those related to privacy and other consumer protection matters.

Regulatory initiatives throughout the world can also create new and unforeseen regulatory obligations on us and the technology we develop, particularly for NBG. The impact of these potential obligations varies based on the jurisdiction, but any such changes could impact whether we enter, maintain or expand our presence in a particular market or with particular potential licensees.

Various countries have adopted controls, license requirements and restrictions on the export, import and use of products or services that contain encryption technology. In addition, from time to time, governmental agencies have proposed additional requirements for encryption technology, such as requiring the escrow and governmental recovery of private encryption keys. Restrictions on the sale or distribution of products or services containing encryption technology may impact the ability of CRI to license its data security technologies to the manufacturers and providers of such products and services in certain markets or may require CRI or its licensees to make changes to the licensed data security technology that is embedded in such products to comply with such restrictions. Government restrictions, or changes to the products or services of CRI licensees to comply with such restrictions, could delay or prevent the acceptance and use of such licensees' products and services. In addition, the United States and other countries have imposed export controls that prohibit the export of encryption technology to certain countries, entities and individuals. Our failure to comply with export and use regulations concerning encryption technology of CRI could subject us to sanctions and penalties, including fines, and suspension or revocation of export or import privileges.

We are subject to a variety of laws and regulations in the United States and abroad that involve, for example, user privacy, data protection, content and consumer protection. A number of proposals are pending before federal, state, and foreign legislative and regulatory bodies that could significantly affect our business. For example, a revision to the 1995 European Union Data Protection Directive is currently being considered by European legislative bodies that may include more stringent operational requirements for data processors and significant penalties for non-compliance. Similarly, there have been a number of recent legislative proposals in the United States, at both the federal and state level, that would impose new obligations in areas such as privacy and liability for copyright infringement by third parties. These existing and proposed laws and regulations can be costly to comply with and can delay or impede the development of new products, result in negative publicity, increase our operating costs and subject us to claims or other remedies.

Our operations are subject to risks of natural disasters, acts of war, terrorism, widespread illness or security breach at our domestic and international locations, any one of which could result in a business stoppage and negatively affect our operating results.

Our business operations depend on our ability to maintain and protect our facilities, computer systems and personnel, which are primarily located in the San Francisco Bay Area. The San Francisco Bay Area is in close proximity to known earthquake fault zones. Our facilities and transportation for our employees are susceptible to damage from earthquakes and other natural disasters such as fires, floods and similar events. Should a catastrophe disable our facilities, we do not have readily available alternative facilities from which we could conduct our business, which stoppage could have a negative effect on our operating results. We also rely on our network infrastructure and technology systems for operational support and business activities, which are subject to damage from malicious code and other related vulnerabilities common to networks and computer systems, including acts of vandalism and potential security breach by third parties. Acts of terrorism, widespread illness, war and any event that causes failures or interruption in our network infrastructure and technology systems could have a negative effect at our international and domestic facilities and could harm our business, financial condition, and operating results.

Table of Contents

Unanticipated changes in our tax rates or in the tax laws and regulations could expose us to additional income tax liabilities which could affect our operating results and financial condition.

We are subject to income taxes in both the United States and various foreign jurisdictions. Significant judgment is required in determining our worldwide provision (or benefit) for income taxes and, in the ordinary course of business, there are many transactions and calculations where the ultimate tax determination is uncertain. Our effective tax rate could be adversely affected by changes in the mix of earnings in countries with differing statutory tax rates, changes in the valuation of deferred tax assets and liabilities, changes in tax laws and regulations as well as other factors. Our tax determinations are regularly subject to audit by tax authorities and developments in those audits could adversely affect our income tax provision. Although we believe that our tax estimates are reasonable, the final determination of tax audits or tax disputes may be different from what is reflected in our historical income tax provisions which could affect our operating results.

Our results of operations could vary as a result of the methods, estimates and judgments we use in applying our accounting policies.

The methods, estimates and judgments we use in applying our accounting policies have a significant impact on our results of operations, including the reported amounts of assets, liabilities, revenue and expenses, and related disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities, as described elsewhere in this report. On an ongoing basis, we evaluate our estimates, including those related to revenue recognition, expense accrual, investments, income taxes, litigation, goodwill and intangibles, and other contingencies. Such methods, estimates and judgments are, by their nature, subject to substantial risks, uncertainties and assumptions, and factors may arise over time that lead us to change our methods, estimates and judgments. In addition, actual results may differ from these estimates under different assumptions or conditions.

Changes in those methods, estimates and judgments could significantly affect our results of operations. In particular, the measurement of share-based compensation expense requires us to use valuation methodologies and a number of assumptions, estimates and conclusions regarding matters such as expected forfeitures, expected volatility of our share price, and the exercise behavior of our employees. Changes in these factors may affect both our reported results (including cost of contract revenue, research and development expenses, marketing, general and administrative expenses and our effective tax rate) and any forward-looking projections we make that incorporate projections of share-based compensation expense. Furthermore, there are no means, under applicable accounting principles, to compare and adjust our reported expense if and when we learn about additional information that may affect the estimates that we previously made, with the exception of changes in expected forfeitures of share-based awards.

Factors may arise that lead us to change our estimates and assumptions with respect to future share-based compensation arrangements, resulting in variability in our share-based compensation expense over time.

Risks Related to Capitalization Matters and Corporate Governance

The price of our common stock may fluctuate significantly, which may make it difficult for holders to resell their shares when desired or at attractive prices.

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

Our common stock is listed on The NASDAQ Global Select Market under the symbol RMBS. The trading price of our common stock has been subject to wide fluctuations which we expect to continue in the future in response to, among other things, the following:

- new litigation or developments in current litigation, including an unfavorable outcome to us from court proceedings relating to our ongoing litigation and reaction to any settlements that we enter into with former litigants, such as the November 2011 verdict against us in our San Francisco antitrust proceeding, and the unpredictability of litigation results or settlements and the timing and amount of any litigation expenses;
- any progress, or lack of progress, real or perceived, in the development of products that incorporate our innovations and technology companies' acceptance of our products, including the results of our efforts to expand into new target markets;
- our signing or not signing new licensees and the loss of strategic relationships with any licensee;

Table of Contents

- the success of high volume consumer applications;

- the dependence of our royalties upon fluctuating sales volumes and prices of products that include our technology, including the seasonal shipment patterns of systems incorporating our products and semiconductor or system companies discontinuing major products incorporating our products;

- announcements of our technological innovations or new products by us, our licensees or our competitors;

- changes in our customers' development schedules and levels of expenditure on research and development;

- our licensees terminating or failing to make payments under their current contracts or seeking to modify such contracts, whether voluntarily or as a result of financial difficulties;

- changes in our strategies, including changes in our licensing focus and/or acquisitions of companies with business models or target markets different from our own;

- changes in the economy and credit market and their effects upon demand for our technology and the products of our licensees;

- positive or negative reports by securities analysts as to our expected financial results and business developments;

- developments with respect to patents or proprietary rights and other events or factors;

- trading activity related to our share repurchase plans; and

- issuance of additional securities by us, including in acquisitions.

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

In addition, the stock market in general, and prices for companies in our industry in particular, have experienced extreme volatility that often has been unrelated to the operating performance of such companies. These broad market and industry fluctuations may adversely affect the price of our common stock, regardless of our operating performance.

Because our outstanding senior convertible notes are convertible into shares of our common stock, volatility or depressed prices of our common stock could have a similar effect on the trading price of our notes. In addition, the existence of the notes may encourage short selling in our common stock by market participants because the conversion of the notes could depress the price of our common stock.

Sales of substantial amounts of shares of our common stock in the public market, or the perception that those sales may occur, could cause the market price of our common stock to decline. In addition, lack of positive performance in our stock price may adversely affect our ability to retain key employees.

We have been party to, and may in the future be subject to, lawsuits relating to securities law matters which may result in unfavorable outcomes and significant judgments, settlements and legal expenses which could cause our business, financial condition and results of operations to suffer.

In connection with our stock option investigation, we and certain of our current and former officers and directors, as well as our current auditors, were subject to several stockholder derivative actions, securities fraud class actions and/or individual lawsuits filed in federal court against us and certain of our current and former officers and directors. The complaints generally allege that the defendants violated the federal and state securities laws and state law claims for fraud and breach of fiduciary duty. While we have settled most of these actions, certain individual lawsuits continue to be adjudicated. For more information about the historic litigation described above, see Note 13, *Litigation and Asserted Claims*, of Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements contained in this Form 10-Q. The amount of time to resolve these current and any future lawsuits is uncertain, and these matters could require significant management and financial resources which could otherwise be devoted to the operation of our business. Although we have expensed or accrued for certain liabilities that we believe will result from certain of these actions, the actual costs and expenses to defend and satisfy all of these lawsuits and any potential future litigation may exceed our current estimated accruals, possibly significantly. Unfavorable outcomes and significant judgments, settlements and legal expenses in litigation related to our past

Table of Contents

and any future securities law claims could have material adverse impacts on our business, financial condition, results of operations, cash flows and the trading price of our common stock.

We are leveraged financially, which could adversely affect our ability to adjust our business to respond to competitive pressures and to obtain sufficient funds to satisfy our future research and development needs, to protect and enforce our intellectual property and other needs.

We have indebtedness. In 2009, we issued \$172.5 million aggregate principal amount of our 2014 Notes. The degree to which we are leveraged could have important consequences, including, but not limited to, the following:

- our ability to obtain additional financing in the future for working capital, capital expenditures, acquisitions, litigation, general corporate or other purposes may be limited;
- a substantial portion of our cash flows from operations in the future will be dedicated to the payment of the principal of our indebtedness as we are required to pay the principal amount of our 2014 Notes in cash upon conversion if specified conditions are met or when due;
- if upon any conversion of our 2014 Notes we are required to satisfy our conversion obligation with shares of our common stock or we are required to pay a make-whole premium with shares of our common stock, our existing stockholders' interest in us would be diluted; and
- we may be more vulnerable to economic downturns, less able to withstand competitive pressures and less flexible in responding to changing business and economic conditions.

A failure to comply with the covenants and other provisions of our debt instruments could result in events of default under such instruments, which could permit acceleration of all of our notes. Any required repayment of our notes as a result of a fundamental change or other acceleration would lower our current cash on hand such that we would not have those funds available for use in our business.

If we are at any time unable to generate sufficient cash flows from operations to service our indebtedness when payment is due, we may be required to attempt to renegotiate the terms of the instruments relating to the indebtedness, seek to refinance all or a portion of the indebtedness or obtain additional financing. There can be no assurance that we will be able to successfully renegotiate such terms, that any such refinancing would be possible or that any additional financing could be obtained on terms that are favorable or acceptable to us.

If securities or industry analysts change their recommendations regarding our stock adversely, our stock price and trading volume could decline.

The trading market for our common stock is influenced by the research and reports that industry or securities analysts publish about us, our business or our market on the Internet or in the press. If one or more of the analysts who cover us change their recommendation regarding our stock adversely or otherwise publishes a negative analysis, our stock price would likely decline. If one or more of these analysts ceases coverage of our company or fails to regularly publish reports on us, we could lose visibility in the financial markets, which in turn could cause our stock price or trading volume to decline.

Compliance with changing regulation of corporate governance and public disclosure may result in additional expenses.

Changing laws, regulations and standards relating to corporate governance and public disclosure, including the historic Sarbanes-Oxley Act and recent Dodd-Frank Act, and new Securities and Exchange Commission regulations and NASDAQ rules, have historically created uncertainty for companies such as ours. Any new or changed laws, regulations and standards are subject to varying interpretations in many cases due to their lack of specificity, and as a result, their application in practice may evolve over time as new guidance is provided by regulatory and governing bodies, which could result in continuing uncertainty regarding compliance matters and higher costs necessitated by ongoing revisions to disclosure and governance practices. Any new investment of resources to comply with evolving laws, regulations and standards, may result in increased general and administrative expenses and a diversion of management time and attention from revenue generating activities to compliance activities. If our efforts to comply with new or changed laws, regulations and standards differ from the activities intended by regulatory or governing bodies due to ambiguities related to practice, our reputation may be harmed and our business and operations would suffer.

Table of Contents

Our restated certificate of incorporation and bylaws, Delaware law and our outstanding convertible notes contain provisions that could discourage transactions resulting in a change in control, which may negatively affect the market price of our common stock.

Our restated certificate of incorporation, our bylaws and Delaware law contain provisions that might enable our management to discourage, delay or prevent a change in control. In addition, these provisions could limit the price that investors would be willing to pay in the future for shares of our common stock. Pursuant to such provisions:

- our board of directors is authorized, without prior stockholder approval, to create and issue preferred stock, commonly referred to as blank check preferred stock, with rights senior to those of common stock, which means that a new stockholder rights plan could be implemented by our board to replace our old plan that expired in 2010;
- our board of directors is staggered into two classes, only one of which is elected at each annual meeting;
- stockholder action by written consent is prohibited;
- nominations for election to our board of directors and the submission of matters to be acted upon by stockholders at a meeting are subject to advance notice requirements;
- certain provisions in our bylaws and certificate of incorporation such as notice to stockholders, the ability to call a stockholder meeting, advance notice requirements and action of stockholders by written consent may only be amended with the approval of stockholders holding 66 2/3% of our outstanding voting stock;
- our stockholders have no authority to call special meetings of stockholders; and
- our board of directors is expressly authorized to make, alter or repeal our bylaws.

We are also subject to Section 203 of the Delaware General Corporation Law, which provides, subject to enumerated exceptions, that if a person acquires 15% or more of our outstanding voting stock, the person is an interested stockholder and may not engage in any business combination with us for a period of three years from the time the person acquired 15% or more of our outstanding voting stock.

Certain provisions of our outstanding convertible notes could make it more difficult or more expensive for a third party to acquire us. Upon the occurrence of certain transactions constituting a fundamental change, holders of the notes will have the right, at their option, to require us to repurchase, at a cash repurchase price equal to 100% of the principal amount plus accrued and unpaid interest on the notes, all or a portion of their notes. We may also be required to issue additional shares of our common stock upon conversion of such notes in the event of certain fundamental changes.

Litigation, Regulation and Business Risks Related to our Intellectual Property

We face current and potential adverse determinations in litigation stemming from our efforts to protect and enforce our patents and intellectual property and make other claims, which could broadly impact our intellectual property rights, distract our management and cause substantial expenses and declines in our revenue and stock price.

We seek to diligently protect our intellectual property rights. In connection with the extension of our licensing program to SDR SDRAM-compatible and DDR SDRAM-compatible products, we became involved in litigation related to such efforts against different parties in multiple jurisdictions. In each of these cases, we have claimed infringement of certain of our patents, while the manufacturers of such products have generally sought damages and a determination that the patents in suit are invalid, unenforceable and not infringed. Among other things, the opposing parties have alleged that certain of our patents are unenforceable because we engaged in document spoliation, litigation misconduct and/or acted improperly during our 1991 to 1995 participation in the JEDEC standard setting organization (including allegations of antitrust violations and unfair competition). We have also become involved in litigation related to infringement of our patents related to products having certain peripheral interfaces. In addition, we did not prevail at jury trial in our antitrust suit against certain memory manufacturers in November 2011, which caused the market price of our stock to drop significantly, and we face appeals and further proceedings related to such actions. See Note 13, Litigation and Asserted Claims, of Notes to Unaudited Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements of this Form 10-Q.

Table of Contents

There can be no assurance that any or all of the opposing parties will not succeed, either at the trial or appellate level, with such claims or counterclaims against us or that they will not in some other way establish broad defenses against our patents, achieve conflicting results or otherwise avoid, delay paying royalties for the use of our patented technology, or obtain orders to require us to pay or reimburse their costs or attorneys' fees in material amounts or post bonds to cover such amounts. Moreover, there is a risk that if one party prevails against us, other parties could use the adverse result to defeat or limit our claims against them; conversely, there can be no assurance that if we prevail against one party, we will succeed against other parties on similar claims, defenses, or counterclaims. In addition, there is the risk that the pending litigations and other circumstances may cause us to accept less than what we now believe to be fair consideration in settlement.

Any of these matters or any future intellectual property litigation, whether or not determined in our favor or settled by us, is costly, may cause delays (including delays in negotiating licenses with other actual or potential licensees), will tend to discourage future design partners, will tend to impair adoption of our existing technologies and divert the efforts and attention of our management and technical personnel from other business operations. In addition, we may be unsuccessful in our litigation if we have difficulty obtaining the cooperation of former employees and agents who were involved in our business during the relevant periods related to our litigation and are now needed to assist in cases or testify on our behalf. Furthermore, any adverse determination or other resolution in litigation could result in our losing certain rights beyond the rights at issue in a particular case, including, among other things: our being effectively barred from suing others for violating certain or all of our intellectual property rights; our patents being held invalid or unenforceable or not infringed; our being subjected to significant liabilities; our being required to seek licenses from third parties; our being prevented from licensing our patented technology; or our being required to renegotiate with current licensees on a temporary or permanent basis.

Even if we are successful in our litigation, or any settlement of such litigation, there is no guarantee that the applicable opposing parties will be able to pay any damages awards timely or at all as a result of financial difficulties or otherwise. Delay or any or all of these adverse results could cause substantial expenses or declines in our revenue and stock price.

From time to time, we are subject to proceedings by government agencies, such as our Federal Trade Commission and European Commission proceedings over the past several years. These proceedings may result in adverse determinations against us or in other outcomes that could limit our ability to enforce or license our intellectual property, and could cause our revenue to decline substantially.

An adverse resolution by or with a governmental agency could result in severe limitations on our ability to protect and license our intellectual property, and would cause our revenue to decline substantially.

Third parties have and may attempt to use adverse findings by a government agency to limit our ability to enforce or license our patents in private litigations, to challenge or otherwise act against us with respect to such government agency proceedings, such as the attempts by Hynix to appeal our settlement with the European Commission and to assert claims for monetary damages against us, and other attempts by other adverse parties to challenge our settlement. Although we have successfully defeated certain attempts to do so, there can be no assurance that other third parties will not be successful in the future or that additional claims or actions arising out of adverse findings by a government agency will not be asserted against us.

Further, third parties have sought and may seek review and reconsideration of the patentability of inventions claimed in certain of our patents by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) and/or the European Patent Office (the EPO). Currently, we are subject to numerous re-examination proceedings, including proceedings initiated by Hynix and Micron as a defensive action in connection with our litigation against those companies. A number of these re-examination proceedings are being reviewed by the PTO's Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI). The BPAI has issued decisions in a few cases, finding the challenged claims of Rambus's patents to be invalid. Decisions of the BPAI

Edgar Filing: RAMBUS INC - Form 10-Q

are subject to further PTO proceedings and appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. A final adverse decision by the PTO or EPO could invalidate some or all of these patent claims and could also result in additional adverse consequences affecting other related U.S. or European patents, including in our intellectual property litigation. If a sufficient number of such patents are impaired, our ability to enforce or license our intellectual property would be significantly weakened and this could cause our revenue to decline substantially.

The pendency of any governmental agency acting as described above may impair our ability to enforce or license our patents or collect royalties from existing or potential licensees, as our litigation opponents may attempt to use such proceedings to delay or otherwise impair any pending cases and our existing or potential licensees may await the final outcome of any proceedings before agreeing to new licenses or pay royalties.

Table of Contents

Litigation or other third-party claims of intellectual property infringement could require us to expend substantial resources and could prevent us from developing or licensing our technology on a cost-effective basis.

Our research and development programs are in highly competitive fields in which numerous third parties have issued patents and patent applications with claims closely related to the subject matter of our programs. We have also been named in the past, and may in the future be named, as a defendant in lawsuits claiming that our technology infringes upon the intellectual property rights of third parties. As we develop additional products and technology, we may face claims of infringement of various patents and other intellectual property rights by third parties. In the event of a third-party claim or a successful infringement action against us, we may be required to pay substantial damages, to stop developing and licensing our infringing technology, to develop non-infringing technology, and to obtain licenses, which could result in our paying substantial royalties or our granting of cross licenses to our technologies. Threatened or ongoing third-party claims of infringement actions may prevent us from pursuing additional development and licensing arrangements for some period. For example, we may discontinue negotiations with certain customers for additional licensing of our patents due to the uncertainty caused by our ongoing litigation on the terms of such licenses or of the terms of such licenses on our litigation. We may not be able to obtain licenses from other parties at a reasonable cost, or at all, which could cause us to expend substantial resources, or result in delays in, or the cancellation of, new product.

If we are unable to successfully protect our inventions through the issuance and enforcement of patents, our operating results could be adversely affected.

We have an active program to protect our proprietary inventions through the filing of patents. There can be no assurance, however, that:

- any current or future U.S. or foreign patent applications will be approved and not be challenged by third parties;
- our issued patents will protect our intellectual property and not be challenged by third parties;
- the validity of our patents will be upheld;
- our patents will not be declared unenforceable;
- the patents of others will not have an adverse effect on our ability to do business;
- Congress or the U.S. courts or foreign countries will not change the nature or scope of rights afforded patents or patent owners or alter in an adverse way the process for seeking or enforcing patents;

- changes in law will not be implemented, or changes in interpretation of such laws will occur, that will affect our ability to protect and enforce our patents and other intellectual property, including as a result of the passage of the America Invents Act of 2011 (which codifies several significant changes to the U.S. patent laws and will remain subject to certain rule-making and interpretation, including changing from a first to invent to a first inventor to file system, limiting where a patentee may file a patent suit, requiring the apportionment of patent damages, replacing interference proceedings with derivation actions, and creating a post-grant opposition process to challenge patents after they have issued);
- new legal theories and strategies utilized by our competitors will not be successful;
- others will not independently develop similar or competing chip interfaces or design around any patents that may be issued to us; or
- factors such as difficulty in obtaining cooperation from inventors, pre-existing challenges or litigation, or license or other contract issues will not present additional challenges in securing protection with respect to patents and other intellectual property that we acquire.

If any of the above were to occur, our operating results could be adversely affected.

Table of Contents

In addition, our patents will continue to expire according to their terms, with expiration dates ranging from 2012 to 2030. Our failure to continuously develop or acquire successful innovations and obtain patents on those innovations could significantly harm our business, financial condition, results of operations, or cash flows.

Our inability to protect and own the intellectual property we create would cause our business to suffer.

We rely primarily on a combination of license, development and nondisclosure agreements, trademark, trade secret and copyright law and contractual provisions to protect our non-patentable intellectual property rights. If we fail to protect these intellectual property rights, our licensees and others may seek to use our technology without the payment of license fees and royalties, which could weaken our competitive position, reduce our operating results and increase the likelihood of costly litigation. The growth of our business depends in large part on the use of our intellectual property in the products of third party manufacturers, and our ability to enforce intellectual property rights against them to obtain appropriate compensation. In addition, effective trade secret protection may be unavailable or limited in certain foreign countries. Although we intend to protect our rights vigorously, if we fail to do so, our business will suffer.

We rely upon the accuracy of our licensees' recordkeeping, and any inaccuracies or payment disputes for amounts owed to us under our licensing agreements may harm our results of operations.

Many of our license agreements require our licensees to document the manufacture and sale of products that incorporate our technology and report this data to us on a quarterly basis. While licenses with such terms give us the right to audit books and records of our licensees to verify this information, audits rarely are undertaken because they can be expensive, time consuming, and potentially detrimental to our ongoing business relationship with our licensees. Therefore, we typically rely on the accuracy of the reports from licensees without independently verifying the information in them. Our failure to audit our licensees' books and records may result in our receiving more or less royalty revenue than we are entitled to under the terms of our license agreements. If we conduct royalty audits in the future, such audits may trigger disagreements over contract terms with our licensees and such disagreements could hamper customer relations, divert the efforts and attention of our management from normal operations and impact our business operations and financial condition.

Any dispute regarding our intellectual property may require us to indemnify certain licensees, the cost of which could severely hamper our business operations and financial condition.

In any potential dispute involving our patents or other intellectual property, our licensees could also become the target of litigation. While we generally do not indemnify our licensees, some of our license agreements provide limited indemnities, and some require us to provide technical support and information to a licensee that is involved in litigation involving use of our technology. In addition, we may agree to indemnify others in the future. Any of these indemnification and support obligations could result in substantial expenses. In addition to the time and expense required for us to indemnify or supply such support to our licensees, a licensee's development, marketing and sales of licensed semiconductors, lighting and display, mobile communications and data security technologies could be severely disrupted or shut down as a result of litigation, which in turn could severely hamper our business operations and financial condition as a result of lower or no royalty payments.

Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds

Not Applicable

Item 3. Defaults Upon Senior Securities

Not Applicable

Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures

Not Applicable

Item 5. Other Information

Not Applicable

Item 6. Exhibits

Refer to the Exhibit Index of this quarterly report on Form 10-Q.

Table of Contents

SIGNATURE

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized.

RAMBUS INC.

Date: April 30, 2012

By:

/s/ Satish Rishi
Satish Rishi
Senior Vice President, Finance and
Chief Financial Officer

Table of Contents

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

Exhibit Number	Description of Document
3.1 (1)	Amended and Restated Certificate of Incorporation of Registrant filed May 29, 1997.
3.2 (2)	Certificate of Amendment of Amended and Restated Certificate of Incorporation of Registrant filed June 14, 2000.
3.3 (3)	Amended and Restated Bylaws of Registrant dated February 23, 2012.
31.1	Certification of Principal Executive Officer, pursuant to Rule 13a-14(a) and Rule 15d-14(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, as adopted pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
31.2	Certification of Principal Financial Officer, pursuant to Rule 13a-14(a) and Rule 15d-14(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, as adopted pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
32.1	Certification of Principal Executive Officer, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
32.2	Certification of Principal Financial Officer, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
101.INS±	XBRL Instance Document
101.SCH±	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema Document
101.CAL±	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Calculation Linkbase Document
101.LAB±	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Label Linkbase Document
101.PRE±	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Presentation Linkbase Document
101.DEF±	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Definition Linkbase Document

± XBRL (Extensible Business Reporting Language) information is furnished and not filed or a part of a registration statement or prospectus for purposes of Sections 11 or 12 of the Securities Act of 1933, is deemed not filed for purposes of Section 18 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and otherwise is not subject to liability under these sections.

(1) Incorporated by reference to the Form 10-K filed on December 15, 1997.

(2) Incorporated by reference to the Form 10-Q filed on May 4, 2001.

(3) Incorporated by reference to the Form 8-K filed on February 28, 2012.

