

EXHIBIT 4

of the indirect purchaser Plaintiffs (“Plaintiffs”) in that litigation and to address issues associated with the Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification in that litigation.

3. Specifically, I was asked to address whether Plaintiffs had established that common proof could be used to demonstrate that members of the proposed class of indirect purchasers of computers or graphics cards suffered impact from the alleged conspiracy in the GPU Litigation and that damages from such claims to individuals in the proposed class could be proven in a common or formulaic manner.

4. My analysis focused on the methodology and claims of Plaintiffs’ experts in the GPU Litigation, Dr. Anna Meyendorff and Dr. Janet S. Netz. I reviewed their methodology in great detail, including their economic models, empirical estimates of pass-on and their regression methods.

5. Based upon my understanding of the economic analyses performed by Plaintiffs’ experts, I concluded that Plaintiffs had failed to offer a methodology showing that common, class wide proof could be used to establish the fact of injury or impact or to measure damages.

6. The expert reports and materials submitted by Plaintiffs in the GPU Litigation formed the bases for my analysis and my conclusions reached in the GPU Litigation.

7. While I met with ATI employees during my analysis, any information provided by ATI employees was simply background information, such as how ATI conducts its business and the correct interpretation of ATI data and documents. The basis for my conclusion regarding the insufficiency of the Plaintiffs’ methodology, however, was purely my own analysis of that methodology as contained in the Plaintiffs’ expert submissions and not anything that anyone at ATI furnished.

8. Based on my interviews of company personnel, I have no reason to believe that any ATI employee has knowledge about the factors that one must take into account to trace an increase in the price of a GPU to the price that an ultimate consumer pays for a computer containing the GPU.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed October 10, 2008, at Washington, D.C.



MICHELLE M. BURTIS