

AUDIT ANALYTICS DUE DILIGENCE REPORT

MARVELL TECHNOLOGY GROUP LTD

Marvell Technology Group LTD

Recent Disclosure Control Issues
 Recent Non-Timely Filing
 Recent Director/Officer Resignation
 Material Legal Proceedings

Ticker	MRVL (Nasdaq National Mkt)
Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP since 1998
CIK Code	1058057
IRS Number	77-0481679
Accelerated Filer	Yes, as of 28 July 2007 (10-Q 2007-09-06)
Business Address	Canons Court 22 Victoria Street Hamilton, DO HM 12 (441) 296-6395
Mailing Address	Canons Court 22 Victoria Street Hamilton, DO HM 12
Employees	5,249
Company Website	www.marvell.com
Index	Member Nasdaq 100 Member Russell 1000
IPO Year	2000
Industry	SIC: 3674 <i>Semiconductors and Related Devices</i> NAICS: 334413 <i>Semiconductor and Related Device Manufacturing</i>
Fiscal Year End	January 31st
Market Cap	\$10,008,500,000
Revenue (yr)**	\$2,434,130,000
Revenue (mrq)	\$656,711,000
Earnings (mrq)	-\$56,456,000
Book Value	\$738,848,000
Assets	\$4,380,500,000
Shares Outstanding	590,473,000
Float	476,108,000
Short Interest	16,459,403 (2007/09/25)
Last Report	DEF 14A (2007-09-14)
Last Non-Timely Filing	NT 10-Q (2007-06-08)
Last Securities Registration	S-8 (2006-04-13)

Financial info as of 2007-07-28. ** Trailing twelve months.

Restatements

2006-07-05 8-K for the period from 2000-06-01 to 2006-06-30

Auditor Changes

None found.

Director / Officer Changes

2007-09-12 8-K

Appointed Pantas Sutardja PhD COO (Interim)

2007-07-17 8-K

Declined Re-election Douglas R King Director/ Chairman of Audit Committee

Appointed Michael Rashkin CFO (Interim)

2007-07-10 8-K

Resigned Michael Tate CFO (Interim)

2007-05-08 8-K

Resigned George Hervey VP of Finance/ CFO

Resigned Weili Dai Executive VP/ COO/ Corporate Secretary/ General Manager, Communications and Consumer Business Group/ Director

Appointed Weili Dai Director of Strategic Marketing and Business Development

Appointed Michael Tate Vice President/ Corporate Controller/ Treasurer/ CFO (Interim)

2006-04-04 8-K

Appointed Weili Dai COO

2006-03-28 8-K

Retired John Cioffi Director

2005-08-10 8-K

Appointed Arturo Krueger Director/ Chairman of Governance Committee

2005-04-13 8-K

Declined Re-election Ronald Verdoorn Director

Litigation

■ Material Legal Proceedings

Lead plaintiff in [Marvell Semiconductor et al v. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation](#)

Related Non-Party in [Microsoft Corp et al v. Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation](#)

Related Non-Party in [Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation v. Toshiba America Information Systems Inc et al](#)

Defendant in [In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd Securities Litigation](#)

Nominal Defendant in [In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd Derivative Litigation](#)

Non-Party Parent in [UniRAM Technology Inc v. Monolithic System Technology Inc et al](#)

Defendant in [In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd IPO Securities Litigation](#)

Auditor Fees

Year	Audit Fees	Non-Audit Fees	Total Fees
2007	\$3,883,000	\$601,000	\$4,484,000
2006	\$2,611,000	\$155,000	\$2,766,000
2005	\$2,808,000	\$163,000	\$2,971,000
2004	\$923,000	\$373,000	\$1,296,000
2003	\$636,000	\$383,000	\$1,019,000
2002	\$562,000	\$54,000	\$616,000
2001	\$457,000	\$555,000	\$1,012,000

Auditor Opinions

Year	Auditor	Auditor Location
2007	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	San Jose, California
2006	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	San Jose, California
2005	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	San Jose, California
2004	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	San Jose, California
2003	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	San Jose, California
2002	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	San Jose, California
2001	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	San Jose, California

Controls

Period	NT	ICFR (404) - Auditor	ICFR (404) Management	DC (302) Management	CIC (302) Management
20070728 10-Q				█	()
20070428 10-Q	█			█	
20070127 10-K	█	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP █	█	█	()
20061028 10-Q	█			█	()
20060729 10-Q	█			█	
20060429 10-Q				✓	
20060128 10-K		PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP ✓	✓	✓	
20051029 10-Q				✓	
20050730 10-Q				✓	
20050430 10-Q				✓	
20050129 10-K		PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP ✓	✓	✓	
20041030 10-Q				✓	()
20040731 10-Q				✓	
20040501 10-Q				✓	
20040131 10-K				✓	
20031001 10-Q				✓	
20030702 10-Q				✓	
20030503 10-Q				✓	
20030201 10-K				✓	
20021102 10-Q				✓	
20020703 10-Q					

NT = Non-Timely or Late Filing Notification Issued for the Period

ICFR - Auditor = Internal Controls over Financial Reporting (SOX 404) - Auditor's Assessment

ICFR - Management = Internal Controls over Financial Reporting (SOX 404) - Management's Assessment

DC - Management = Disclosure Controls (SOX 302) - Management's Assessment

CIC - Management = Changes in Internal Controls (SOX 302) - Management's Disclosure

Auditor Fees

2007	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	10-K 2007-07-02
	Audit Fees	\$3,883,000
	Financial Information Systems Design and Implementation Fees	\$0
	Audit Related Fees	\$555,000
	Benefit Plans Related Fees	\$0
	Tax Related Fees	\$44,000
	Other Fees	\$2,000
	Total Fees	\$4,484,000
2006	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	10-K 2007-07-02
	Audit Fees	\$2,611,000
	Financial Information Systems Design and Implementation Fees	\$0
	Audit Related Fees	\$88,000
	Benefit Plans Related Fees	\$0
	Tax Related Fees	\$55,000
	Other Fees	\$12,000
	Total Fees	\$2,766,000
2005	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	DEF 14A 2005-04-29
	Audit Fees	\$2,808,000
	Financial Information Systems Design and Implementation Fees	\$0
	Audit Related Fees	\$0
	Benefit Plans Related Fees	\$0
	Tax Related Fees	\$161,000
	Other Fees	\$2,000
	Total Fees	\$2,971,000
2004	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	PRE 14A 2004-04-06
	Audit Fees	\$923,000
	Financial Information Systems Design and Implementation Fees	\$0
	Audit Related Fees	\$181,000
	Benefit Plans Related Fees	\$0
	Tax Related Fees	\$182,000
	Other Fees	\$10,000
	Total Fees	\$1,296,000

Auditor Fees (continued)

2003	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	DEF 14A 2003-05-23
	Audit Fees	\$636,000
	Financial Information Systems Design and Implementation Fees	\$0
	Audit Related Fees	\$0
	Benefit Plans Related Fees	\$0
	Tax Related Fees	\$373,000
	Other Fees	\$10,000
	Total Fees	\$1,019,000
2002	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	
	Restated	DEF 14A 2003-05-23
	Audit Fees	\$562,000
	Financial Information Systems Design and Implementation Fees	\$0
	Audit Related Fees	\$0
	Benefit Plans Related Fees	\$0
	Tax Related Fees	\$39,000
	Other Fees	\$15,000
	Total Fees	\$616,000
	Initial Statement	DEF 14A 2002-05-17
	Audit Fees	\$431,000
	Financial Information Systems Design and Implementation Fees	\$0
	Audit Related Fees	\$0
	Benefit Plans Related Fees	\$0
	Tax Related Fees	\$0
	Other Fees	\$185,000
	Total Fees	\$616,000
2001	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP	DEF 14A 2001-05-21
	Audit Fees	\$457,000
	Financial Information Systems Design and Implementation Fees	\$0
	Audit Related Fees	\$0
	Benefit Plans Related Fees	\$0
	Tax Related Fees	\$0
	Other Fees	\$555,000
	Total Fees	\$1,012,000

Auditor Report - Financial Statements

2007 Opinion

Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Auditor Location	San Jose, California
Year Ended	27 January 2007
Signature	27 June 2007
Going Concern Issued	No
Non-Standard Opinion	Yes
Source	10-K

2006 Opinion

Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Auditor Location	San Jose, California
Year Ended	31 January 2006
Signature	13 April 2006
Going Concern Issued	No
Non-Standard Opinion	No
Source	10-K

2005 Opinion

Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Auditor Location	San Jose, California
Year Ended	31 January 2005
Signature	14 April 2005
Going Concern Issued	No
Non-Standard Opinion	No
Source	10-K

2004 Opinion

Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Auditor Location	San Jose, California
Year Ended	31 January 2004
Signature	16 March 2004
Going Concern Issued	No
Non-Standard Opinion	Yes
Source	10-K

Auditor Report - Financial Statements *(continued)*

2003 Opinion

Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Auditor Location	San Jose, California
Year Ended	31 January 2003
Signature	26 February 2003
Going Concern Issued	No
Non-Standard Opinion	Yes
Source	10-K

2002 Opinion

Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Auditor Location	San Jose, California
Year Ended	31 January 2002
Signature	27 February 2002
Going Concern Issued	No
Non-Standard Opinion	No
Source	10-K

2001 Opinion

Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Auditor Location	San Jose, California
Year Ended	31 January 2001
Signature	22 February 2001
Going Concern Issued	No
Non-Standard Opinion	No
Source	10-K

Internal Controls over Financial Reporting

2007

Auditor Opinion	
Management Report	
Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Year Ended	27 January 2007
Signature	27 June 2007
Auditor - internal controls are effective	No
Auditor - agrees with management's assessment	Yes
Management - internal controls are effective	No
Source	10-K

Auditor - Assessments

Not Effective - Accounting Rule (GAAP/FASB) Application Failures

Acc - Deferred, stock-based or executive comp issues

Not Effective - Internal Control Weakness

IC - Accounting documentation, policy and/or procedures

IC - Accounting personnel resources, competency/training

IC - Restatement or nonreliance of company filings

Management - Assessments

Not Effective - Accounting Rule (GAAP/FASB) Application Failures

Acc - Deferred, stock-based or executive comp issues

Not Effective - Internal Control Weakness

IC - Accounting documentation, policy and/or procedures

IC - Accounting personnel resources, competency/training

IC - Restatement or nonreliance of company filings

2006

Auditor Opinion	
Management Report	
Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Year Ended	31 January 2006
Signature	13 April 2006
Auditor - internal controls are effective	Yes
Auditor - agrees with management's assessment	Yes
Management - internal controls are effective	Yes
Source	10-K

Internal Controls over Financial Reporting *(continued)*

2005

Auditor Opinion	
Management Report	
Auditor	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Year Ended	31 January 2005
Signature	14 April 2005
Auditor - internal controls are effective	Yes
Auditor - agrees with management's assessment	Yes
Management - internal controls are effective	Yes
Source	10-K

Disclosure Controls

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	28 July 2007
Management - disclosure controls are effective	No
Material Weakness	Yes
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2007-09-06
Management - Assessments	

Management - Assessments

Accounting Rule (GAAP/FASB) Application Failures

Acc - Deferred, stock-based or executive comp issues

Other Deficiencies / Disclosures

DC - Fin close process/ policy/info accum & timeliness issues

DC - Period end close & non-routine adjustment issues

DC - Personnel inadequacies/ segregation of duty issues

DC - Restatement (recent past or pending) evident

DC - Sect 404 adverse report (recent past/pending) filed

DC - Senior management tone and/or self dealing issues

Disclosure Controls *(continued)*

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	28 April 2007
Management - disclosure controls are effective	No
Material Weakness	Yes
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2007-07-09

Management - Assessments

Accounting Rule (GAAP/FASB) Application Failures

Acc - Deferred, stock-based or executive comp issues

Other Deficiencies / Disclosures

DC - Fin close process/ policy/info accum & timeliness issues

DC - Period end close & non-routine adjustment issues

DC - Personnel inadequacies/segregation of duty issues

DC - Restatement (recent past or pending) evident

DC - Sect 404 adverse report (recent past/pending) filed

DC - Senior management tone and/or self dealing issues

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	27 January 2007
Management - disclosure controls are effective	No
Material Weakness	Yes
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-K
Source Filed	2007-07-02

Management - Assessments

Accounting Rule (GAAP/FASB) Application Failures

Acc - Deferred, stock-based or executive comp issues

Other Deficiencies / Disclosures

DC - Fin close process/ policy/info accum & timeliness issues

DC - Period end close & non-routine adjustment issues

DC - Personnel inadequacies/segregation of duty issues

DC - Restatement (recent past or pending) evident

DC - Sect 404 adverse report (recent past/pending) filed

DC - Senior management tone and/or self dealing issues

Disclosure Controls *(continued)*

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	28 October 2006
Management - disclosure controls are effective	No
Material Weakness	Yes
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2007-07-02

Management - Assessments

Accounting Rule (GAAP/FASB) Application Failures

Acc - Deferred, stock-based or executive comp issues

Other Deficiencies / Disclosures

DC - Fin close process/ policy/info accum & timeliness issues

DC - Period end close & non-routine adjustment issues

DC - Personnel inadequacies/segregation of duty issues

DC - Restatement (recent past or pending) evident

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	29 July 2006
Management - disclosure controls are effective	No
Material Weakness	Yes
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2007-07-02

Management - Assessments

Accounting Rule (GAAP/FASB) Application Failures

Acc - Deferred, stock-based or executive comp issues

Other Deficiencies / Disclosures

DC - Fin close process/ policy/info accum & timeliness issues

DC - Period end close & non-routine adjustment issues

DC - Personnel inadequacies/segregation of duty issues

DC - Restatement (recent past or pending) evident

Disclosure Controls *(continued)*

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	29 April 2006
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2006-06-08

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	28 January 2006
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-K
Source Filed	2006-04-13

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	29 October 2005
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2005-12-07

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	30 July 2005
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2005-09-08

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	30 April 2005
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2005-06-09

Disclosure Controls *(continued)*

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	29 January 2005
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-K
Source Filed	2005-04-14

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	30 October 2004
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2004-12-09

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	31 July 2004
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2004-09-09

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	1 May 2004
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2004-06-10

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	31 January 2004
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-K
Source Filed	2004-04-13

Disclosure Controls *(continued)*

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	1 October 2003
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2003-12-15

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	2 July 2003
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2003-09-15

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	3 May 2003
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2003-06-16

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	1 February 2003
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-K
Source Filed	2003-05-02

Disclosure Controls *(continued)*

Management Assessment	
Period Ended	2 November 2002
Management - disclosure controls are effective	Yes
Material Weakness	No
Other Deficiencies / Disclosures	No
Source	10-Q
Source Filed	2002-12-17

Benefit Plans

No benefit plan data found.

Non-Reliance / Restatement Disclosure

Source	2006-07-05 8-K
	2006-10-03 8-K
	2007-04-24 8-K
	2007-06-08 NT 10-Q
	2007-07-02 10-Q/A
	2007-07-02 10-Q
	2007-07-02 10-K
Period	2000-06-01 to 2006-06-30
Effect to the Financial Statements	Negative
Auditor Letter or Discussion	Yes
Board or Audit Committee Involvement	Yes
SEC (or Other Regulatory) Investigation	Yes

Management - Assessments

- Accounting Rule (GAAP/FASB) Application Failures*
- Deferred, stock-based and/or executive comp issues
- Deferred, stock-based options backdating only (subcategory)
- Financial Fraud, Irregularities and Misrepresentations*
- Deferred, stock-based and/or executive comp issues
- Deferred, stock-based options backdating only (subcategory)

Late Filings

Source	2007-06-08 NT 10-Q
Period	2007-04-28
2a	<input type="checkbox"/> (Filed due to unreasonable effort or expense)
2b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (To be filed by the 15th of the following month)
2c	<input type="checkbox"/> (Accountant's statement attached)
4.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Anticipate disclosing a significant change in results)

General Reason

Insufficient time to file report

Additional Reasons

Investigation underway, special committee (internal, external or SEC)

Restatement of financials pending

Z - Deferred or executive equity/options comp issues (123R)

Source	2007-03-29 NT 10-K
Period	2007-01-27
2a	<input type="checkbox"/> (Filed due to unreasonable effort or expense)
2b	<input type="checkbox"/> (To be filed by the 15th of the following month)
2c	<input type="checkbox"/> (Accountant's statement attached)
4.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Anticipate disclosing a significant change in results)

General Reason

Insufficient time to file report

Additional Reasons

Investigation underway, special committee (internal, external or SEC)

Z - Deferred or executive equity/options comp issues (123R)

Source	2006-12-06 NT 10-Q
Period	2006-10-28
2a	<input type="checkbox"/> (Filed due to unreasonable effort or expense)
2b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (To be filed by the 15th of the following month)
2c	<input type="checkbox"/> (Accountant's statement attached)
4.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Anticipate disclosing a significant change in results)

General Reason

Waiting on key information - Inability to obtain

Additional Reasons

Investigation underway, special committee (internal, external or SEC)

Z - Deferred or executive equity/options comp issues (123R)

Late Filings *(continued)*

Source	2006-09-07 NT 10-Q
Period	2006-07-29
2a	<input type="checkbox"/> (Filed due to unreasonable effort or expense)
2b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (To be filed by the 15th of the following month)
2c	<input type="checkbox"/> (Accountant's statement attached)
4.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Anticipate disclosing a significant change in results)

General Reason

Additional Reasons

NO REASON STATED

Source	2006-09-28 NT 10-Q/A
Period	2006-07-29
2a	<input type="checkbox"/> (Filed due to unreasonable effort or expense)
2b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (To be filed by the 15th of the following month)
2c	<input type="checkbox"/> (Accountant's statement attached)
4.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Anticipate disclosing a significant change in results)

General Reason

Insufficient time to file report

Additional Reasons

Investigation underway, special committee (internal, external or SEC)

Z - Deferred or executive equity/options comp issues (123R)

News

10/12/07 - 7:34 PM EDT

Marvell Technology Group, Ltd. Receives Wells Notice Concerning Previously Disclosed Investigation - PR Newswire

10/10/07 - 9:01 AM EDT

Marvell Qdeo Video Processing Powers LG BH200 HD DVD/Blu-ray Player - PR Newswire

10/09/07 - 9:58 AM EDT

Next Inning Technology Publishes State of Tech Reports: Updates Outlooks for Applied Micro Circuits, Broadcom, Marvell Technology Group, and PMC-Sierra - PR Newswire

09/18/07 - 12:00 PM EDT

Marvell Rolls Out DASH Technology, Ushering in New Era of Standards-Based Enterprise PC Manageability - PR Newswire

M&A Transactions

Description	Filings	Parties		Value (\$)	Commenced	Closed
Asset Purchase Agreement	8-K 2006-11-14	Acquirer Seller of Assets Survivor Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marvell Technology Group Ltd • Intel Corp • Marvell Technology Group Ltd • Communications and Application Processor Business 	600,000,000	2006-06-26	2006-11-08
Asset Purchase Agreement	8-K 2006-02-21 8-K 2006-05-04	Acquirer Seller of Assets Survivor Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marvell Technology Group Ltd • Avago Technologies • Marvell Technology Group Ltd • Printer Semiconductor Business 	240,000,000	2006-02-17	2006-05-01
Asset Purchase Agreement	10-Q 2007-09-06	Acquirer Seller of Assets Survivor Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marvell Technology Group Ltd • UTStarcom • Marvell Technology Group Ltd • Semiconductor Design Business Division 	40,800,000	2006-02-16	2006-02-16
Asset Purchase Agreement	8-K 2005-11-04	Acquirer Seller of Assets Survivor Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marvell Technology Group Ltd • QLogic Corp • Marvell Technology Group Ltd • Hard Disk and Tape Drive Controller Semiconductor Business 	180,000,000 (Estimate)	2005-08-29	2005-11-04

Company Governance - Overview

Executives	Age	Position	Since	Board Interlocks
Arturo Krueger	68	Director	2005	QuickLogic Corp
Douglas King	65	Director	2004	SJW Corp
Dr.Pantas Sutardja, Ph.D.	44	Founder/Chief Technology Officer/Director/COO/Vice President/Other Executive Officer	1995	
Dr.Paul R. Gray, Ph.D.	64	Director	2000	
Dr.Sehat Sutardja, Ph.D.	46	Founder/CEO/Chairman of the Board/President/Director	2003	
Kuo Wei (Herbert) Chang	45	Director	1996	Monolithic Power Systems Inc
Michael Rashkin	62	CFO/Vice President	2005	
Weili Dai	44	Other Corporate Officer	2005	

Recent Changes

			2007-09-12 8-K
Appointed Assuming additional Position(s)	Pantas Sutardja PhD	COO (Interim)	Effective: 2007-09-06
			2007-07-17 8-K
Declined Re-election Personal / Health Reasons	Douglas R King	Director/ Chairman of Audit Committee (Committees: Audit/ Executive Compensation/ Implementation)	Effective: Next Annual Meeting
Appointed Position Change within Company	Michael Rashkin (62)	CFO (Interim)	Effective: 2007-07-13
			2007-07-10 8-K
Resigned	Michael Tate	CFO (Interim)	Effective: 2007-07-13
			2007-05-08 8-K
Resigned	George Hervey	VP of Finance/ CFO	Effective: 2007-05-02
Resigned Position Change within Company	Weili Dai	Executive VP/ COO/ Corporate Secretary/ General Manager, Communications and Consumer Business Group/ Director	Effective: 2007-05-06
Appointed Position Change within Company	Weili Dai	Director of Strategic Marketing and Business Development	Effective: 2007-05-06
Appointed Position Change within Company	Michael Tate	Vice President/ Corporate Controller/ Treasurer/ CFO (Interim)	Effective: 2007-05-06
			2006-04-04 8-K
Appointed Assuming additional Position(s)	Weili Dai	COO	Effective: 2006-04-03
			2006-03-28 8-K
Retired Retired	John Cioffi	Director	Effective: 2006-04-01
			2005-08-10 8-K
Appointed	Arturo Krueger	Director/ Chairman of Governance Committee (Committees: Audit)	Effective: 2005-08-09
			2005-04-13 8-K
Declined Re-election Personal / Health Reasons	Ronald Verdoorn	Director (Committees: Audit/ Governance)	Effective: 2005-06-10

Company Governance - Committees

Audit								
Member Name (3)	Chair Retainer Fees	Member Retainer Fees	Chair Attendance Fees	Member Attendance Fees	Alternate Fees	Exceptional Fees	Meetings	Alternate Meetings
Douglas R. King (chair)	0	\$5,000	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	20	0
Arturo Krueger	0	\$5,000	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	20	0
Dr. Paul R. Gray, Ph.D.	0	\$5,000	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	20	0

Board								
Member Name (5)	Chair Retainer Fees	Member Retainer Fees	Chair Attendance Fees	Member Attendance Fees	Alternate Fees	Exceptional Fees	Meetings	Alternate Meetings
Sehat Sutardja (chair)	0	0	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	22	0
Arturo Krueger	0	0	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	22	0
Kuo Wei (Herbert) Chang	0	0	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	22	0
Pantas Sutardja	0	0	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	22	0
Paul R. Gray	0	0	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	22	0

Executive Compensation								
Member Name (2)	Chair Retainer Fees	Member Retainer Fees	Chair Attendance Fees	Member Attendance Fees	Alternate Fees	Exceptional Fees	Meetings	Alternate Meetings
Dr. Paul R. Gray, Ph.D. (chair)	0	\$5,000	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	23	0
Douglas R. King	0	\$5,000	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	23	0

Governance								
Member Name (2)	Chair Retainer Fees	Member Retainer Fees	Chair Attendance Fees	Member Attendance Fees	Alternate Fees	Exceptional Fees	Meetings	Alternate Meetings
Arturo Krueger (chair)	0	\$5,000	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	1	0
Kuo Wei (Herbert) Chang	0	\$5,000	0	\$1,000	\$250	0	1	0

Special								
Member Name (0)	Chair Retainer Fees	Member Retainer Fees	Chair Attendance Fees	Member Attendance Fees	Alternate Fees	Exceptional Fees	Meetings	Alternate Meetings

Company Governance - Compensation

George Hervey

Former Vice President, Divisional/Former CFO

Basic Compensation					
Year	Salary	Bonus	Other Annual Comp	LTIP Payout	All Other
2007	\$350,000	0	0	0	
2006	\$290,000	0	0	0	
2005	\$267,805	0	0	0	

Pantas Sutardja

Chief Technology Officer

Basic Compensation					
Year	Salary	Bonus	Other Annual Comp	LTIP Payout	All Other
2007	\$400,000	0	0	0	
2006	\$300,000	\$10,250	0	0	
2005	\$300,000	\$30,000	0	0	

Sehat Sutardja

CEO/President

Basic Compensation					
Year	Salary	Bonus	Other Annual Comp	LTIP Payout	All Other
2007	\$557,000	0	0	0	
2006	\$500,000	\$58,750	0	0	
2005	\$500,000	\$36,000	0	0	

Weili Dai

Former Executive VP/Former COO

Basic Compensation					
Year	Salary	Bonus	Other Annual Comp	LTIP Payout	All Other
2007	\$481,000	0	0	0	
2006	\$375,000	\$250	0	0	
2005	\$375,000	0	0	0	

Material Legal Proceedings

From the most recent 10-Q (2007-09-06)

Item 1. Legal Proceedings

IPO Securities Litigation. On July 31, 2001, a putative class action suit was filed against two investment banks that participated in the underwriting of our initial public offering, or IPO, on June 29, 2000. That lawsuit, which did not name Marvell or any of our officers or directors as defendants, was filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. Plaintiffs allege that the underwriters received “excessive” and undisclosed commissions and entered into unlawful “tie-in” agreements with certain of their clients in violation of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Thereafter, on September 5, 2001, a second putative class action was filed in the Southern District of New York relating to our IPO. In this second action, plaintiffs named three underwriters as defendants and also named as defendants Marvell and two of our officers, one of whom is also a director. Relying on many of the same allegations contained in the initial complaint in which we were not named as a defendant, plaintiffs allege that the defendants violated various provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. In both actions, plaintiffs seek, among other items, unspecified damages, pre-judgment interest and reimbursement of attorneys’ and experts’ fees. These two actions relating to our IPO have been consolidated with hundreds of other lawsuits filed by plaintiffs against approximately 40 underwriters and approximately 300 issuers across the United States. Defendants in the consolidated proceedings moved to dismiss the actions. In February 2003, the trial court granted the motions in part and denied them in part, thus allowing the case to proceed against the underwriters and us as to alleged violations of section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Claims against the individual officers have been voluntarily dismissed with prejudice by agreement with plaintiffs. On June 26, 2003, the plaintiffs announced that a settlement among plaintiffs, the issuer defendants and their directors and officers, and their insurers has been structured, a part of which provides that the insurers for all issuer defendants would guarantee up to \$1 billion to investors who are class members, depending upon plaintiffs’ success against non-settling parties. Our board of directors approved the proposed settlement, which if approved by the court would result in the plaintiffs’ dismissing the case against us and granting releases that extend to all of our officers and directors. Definitive settlement documentation were completed in early June 2004 and first presented to the court on June 14, 2004. On February 15, 2005, the court issued an opinion preliminarily approving the proposed settlement, contingent upon certain modifications being made to one aspect of the proposed settlement — the proposed “bar order.” The court ruled that it had no authority to deviate from the wording of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 and that any bar order that may issue should the proposed settlement be finally approved must be limited to the express wording of 15 U.S.C. section 78u-4(f)(7)(A). On May 2, 2005 the issuer defendants and plaintiffs jointly submitted an amendment to the settlement agreement conforming the language of the settlement agreement with the court’s February 15, 2005 ruling regarding the bar order. The court on August 31, 2005 issued an order preliminarily approving the settlement and setting a public hearing on its fairness for April 24, 2006 due to difficulties in mailing the required notice to class members. A final settlement approval hearing on the proposed issuer settlement was held on April 24, 2006. The court took the matter under submission. Meanwhile the consolidated case against the underwriters proceeded. On October 2004, the district court certified a class. On December 5, 2006, however, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed, holding that a class could not be certified. The Second Circuit’s holding, while directly affecting only the underwriters, raises some doubt as to whether the settlement class contemplated by the proposed issuer settlement would be approved in its present form. On January 5, 2007, plaintiffs petitioned the Second Circuit for rehearing of the Second Circuit’s decision. On April 6, 2007, the Second Circuit denied the petition. At a status conference on April 23, 2007, the district court suggested that the issuers’ settlement could not be approved in its present form, given the Second Circuit’s ruling. On June 25, 2007, a stipulation terminating the settlement was filed. On September 27, 2007, Plaintiffs will file their opening brief on the motion to certify the classes. On December 21, 2007, responsive briefs are due. On February 15, 2008, reply briefs are due.

Jasmine Networks Litigation. On September 12, 2001, Jasmine Networks, Inc. (“Jasmine”) filed a lawsuit in the Santa Clara County Superior Court alleging claims against three officers and us for improperly obtaining and using information and technologies during the course of the negotiations with our personnel regarding the potential acquisition of certain Jasmine assets by us. The lawsuit claims that our officers improperly obtained and used such information and technologies after we signed a non-disclosure agreement with Jasmine. We believe the claims asserted against our officers and us are without merit and we intend to defend all claims vigorously.

On June 21, 2005, we filed a cross complaint in the above disclosed action in the Santa Clara County Superior Court asserting claims against Jasmine and unnamed Jasmine officers and employees. The cross complaint was later amended to name two individual officers of Jasmine. On May 15, 2007, we filed a second amended cross complaint to add additional causes of action for declaratory relief against Jasmine. Among other actions, the cross complaint alleges that Jasmine and its personnel engaged in fraud in connection with their effort to sell to us technology that Jasmine and its personnel wrongfully obtained from a third party in violation of such third party’s rights. The cross complaint seeks declaratory judgment that our technology does not incorporate any of Jasmine’s alleged technology. The cross complaint seeks further declaratory judgment that Jasmine and its personnel misappropriated certain aspects of Jasmine’s alleged technology. We intend to prosecute the cross complaint against Jasmine and its personnel vigorously, including, but not limited to, filing certain dispositive motions regarding the ownership of the technology which is the subject of the cross complaint. On June 13, 2007, Jasmine filed a demurrer to the fifth, sixth, and seventh causes of action of our second amended cross-complaint. The demurrer was heard on July 19, 2007 and denied. On August 3, 2007, Jasmine filed its answer to the second amended complaint. We have reserved October 30, 2007 as a hearing date for a motion for summary adjudication on its fifth and sixth causes of action for declaratory relief, which will seek, among other things, a determination that Jasmine held no propriety interest in the “JSLIP” algorithm, which was one of the core technologies Jasmine asserts was misappropriated by Marvell.

CSIRO Litigation. In 2004, Australia’s Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (“CSIRO”) sent notice letters to a number of Wi-Fi System manufacturers regarding CSIRO’s patent, U.S. Patent No. 5,487,069 as it relates to IEEE 802.11a and 802.11g wireless standards. In May 2005, a group of system manufacturers, including customers of our 802.11a or 802.11g wireless LAN products, filed an action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California seeking a declaratory judgment against CSIRO that the plaintiff manufacturers’ products employing the IEEE 802.11a or 802.11g wireless standards do not infringe CSIRO’s patent, U.S. Patent No. 5,487,069. In September 2006, CSIRO filed an answer and counterclaims alleging that plaintiffs’ products that employ those wireless standards infringe the CSIRO patent and seeking damages, including enhanced damages and attorneys’ fees and costs, and an injunction against sales of infringing products.

Material Legal Proceedings *(continued)*

In December 2006, the district court granted CSIRO's motion to transfer the case to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, where CSIRO had brought a similar lawsuit against another company. As a result of CSIRO's counterclaims for patent infringement, a customer of ours has sought indemnification from us. Also in December 2006, CSIRO filed suit in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas against several manufacturers and suppliers of wireless products, including customers of our 802.11a or 802.11g wireless LAN products. The complaint alleges that the manufacture, use and sale of wireless products compliant with the IEEE 802.11a or 802.11g wireless standards infringes on the CSIRO patent. As a result of CSIRO's claim for patent infringement, another customer of ours has sought indemnification from us. In response to these demands for indemnification, we have acknowledged the demands and incurred costs in response to them. On July 3, 2007, we moved to intervene in the two actions described above pending in the Eastern District of Texas, for the purposes of staying the actions as to products incorporating Marvell parts in favor of the separate action that we filed as described in the next paragraph. Alternatively we moved to disqualify the firm of Townsend, Townsend and Crew from continuing to represent CSIRO because of a conflict of interest. CSIRO opposed these motions on August 3, 2007.

On May 4, 2007, we filed an action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas seeking a declaratory judgment against CSIRO that the CSIRO patent is invalid and unenforceable and that we and our customers do not infringe the CSIRO patent. The complaint also seeks damages and a license for us and our customers on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms in the event our 802.11a/g wireless LAN products are found to infringe and the CSIRO patent is found to be valid and enforceable. On August 3, 2007, CSIRO moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of case or controversy and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or, in the alternative, to stay the case pending the resolution of the pending lawsuits described in the preceding paragraph. Marvell will oppose that motion.

Shareholder Derivative Litigation. Between July 7, 2006 and August 2, 2006, three purported shareholder derivative actions were filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Each of these lawsuits names us as a nominal defendant and a number of our current and former directors and officers as defendants. Each lawsuit seeks to recover damages purportedly sustained by us in connection with our option granting processes, and seeks certain corporate governance and internal control changes. Pursuant to orders of the court dated August 17 and October 17, 2006, the three actions were consolidated as a single action, entitled *In re Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Derivative Litigation*. The plaintiffs filed an amended and consolidated complaint on November 1, 2006. On January 16, 2007, we filed a motion to dismiss the consolidated complaint for lack of standing or, in the alternative, stay proceedings. Pursuant to stipulations among the parties and orders of the court, our motion is currently scheduled to be heard on November 2, 2007.

On February 12, 2007, a new purported derivative action was filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Like *In re Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Derivative Litigation*, this lawsuit names us as a nominal defendant and a number of our current and former directors and officers as defendants. It seeks to recover damages purportedly sustained by us in connection with our option granting processes, and seeks certain corporate governance and internal control changes. On May 1, 2007, the court entered an order consolidating this lawsuit with *In re Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Derivative Litigation*.

On May 29, 2007, the court entered an order staying discovery in this matter pending resolution of our motion to dismiss.

Securities Litigation. Between October 5, 2006 and November 13, 2006, four putative class actions were filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California against us and certain of our officers and directors. The complaints allege that we and certain of our officers and directors violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements and omissions relating to the grants of stock options. The complaints seek, on behalf of persons who purchased our common stock during the period from October 3, 2001 to October 3, 2006, unspecified damages, interest, and costs and expenses, including attorneys' fees and disbursements. Pursuant to an order of the court dated February 2, 2007, these four putative class actions were consolidated as a single action entitled *In re Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Securities Litigation*. The plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on August 16, 2007. Pursuant to stipulation and by order of the court, defendants have 45 days to respond to the complaint.

SEC and United States Attorney Inquiries. In July 2006, we received a letter of informal inquiry from the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") requesting certain documents relating to our stock option grants and practices. We also received a grand jury subpoena from the office of the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California requesting substantially similar documents. On April 20, 2007, we were informed that the SEC is now conducting a formal investigation in this matter. On June 8, 2007 and July 3, 2007, we received document subpoenas from the SEC. We have cooperated with the SEC and the United States Attorney regarding these matters and intend to continue to do so. We cannot predict the outcome of these investigations.

General. We are also party to other legal proceedings and claims arising in the normal course of business.

The legal proceedings and claims described above could result in substantial costs and could divert the attention and resources of our management. Although the legal responsibility and financial impact with respect to these proceedings and claims cannot currently be ascertained, we do not believe that these matters will result in our payment of monetary damages, net of any applicable insurance proceeds, that in the aggregate would be material in relation to our consolidated financial position or results of operations. However, litigation is subject to inherent uncertainties and unfavorable rulings could occur. An unfavorable ruling in litigation could require us to pay damages or one-time license fees or royalty payments, which could adversely impact gross margins in future periods, or could prevent us from manufacturing or selling some of our products or limit or restrict the type of work that employees involved in such litigation may perform for us. There can be no assurance that these matters will be resolved in a manner that is not adverse to our business, financial condition, results of operations or cash flows.

Litigation

Marvell Semiconductor et al v. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation

Docket	6:07-cv-00204-LED	Case began	2007-05-04
Court	Texas Eastern District Court	Case ended	
Judge	Leonard E Davis	Exposure began	
		Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	

Patent Law (NOS 830)

Court Archives

Complaint (2007-05-04)

On May 4, 2007, Marvell filed an action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas seeking a declaratory judgment against CSIRO that the CSIRO patent is invalid and unenforceable and that Marvell and its customers do not infringe the CSIRO patent. The complaint also seeks damages and a license for Marvell and its customers on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms in the event our 802.11a/g wireless LAN products are found to infringe and the CSIRO patent is found to be valid and enforceable. On August 3, 2007, CSIRO moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of case or controversy and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or, in the alternative, to stay the case pending the resolution of the pending lawsuits described in the preceding paragraph. Marvell will oppose that motion.

Party		Representation
Marvell Semiconductor	Plaintiff (Lead)	Provost & Umphrey Law Firm LLP White & Case LLP
Marvell Asia Pte Ltd	Plaintiff	
Marvell International Ltd	Plaintiff	
Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organization	Defendant (Lead)	Kerr & Wagstaffe LLP

Litigation (continued)

Microsoft Corp et al v. Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation

Docket	6:06-cv-00549-LED	Case began	2006-12-22
	Additional Docket (1)	Case ended	
Court	Texas Eastern District Court	Exposure began	
Judge	Leonard E Davis	Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	

Patent Law (NOS 830)
Counterclaim

Court Archives
Complaint (2006-12-22)

CSIRO Patent Litigation. Microsoft Corporation, Hewlett-Packard Company, et al. v. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation of Australia is an action filed by HP and two other plaintiffs on May 9, 2005 in the District Court for the Northern District of California seeking a declaratory judgment against Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation of Australia (“CSIRO”) that HP’s products employing the IEEE 802.11a and 8.02.11g wireless protocol standards do not infringe CSIRO’s US patent no. 5,487,069 relating to wireless transmission of data at frequencies in excess of 10GHz. On September 22, 2005, CSIRO filed an answer and counterclaims alleging that all HP products which employ those wireless protocol standards infringe the CSIRO patent and seeking damages, including enhanced damages and attorneys fees and costs, and an injunction against sales of infringing products. On December 12, 2006, CSIRO successfully moved to have the case transferred to the District Court of the Eastern District of Texas, a court that has granted CSIRO’s motions for summary judgment on the issues of validity and patent infringement in a patent infringement action brought by CSIRO against a third party vendor of wireless networking products based on the same patent.

Party		Representation
Microsoft Corp	Plaintiff (Lead)	Fish & Richardson PC
Apple Computer Inc	Plaintiff	
Hewlett-Packard Co	Plaintiff	Fulbright & Jaworski LLP Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP Wilson Sheehy Knowles Robertson & Cornelius PC
Netgear Inc	Plaintiff	
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	Defendant (Lead)	Brown McCarroll LLP Townsend & Townsend & Crew LLP
Marvell Technology Group Ltd	Related Non-Party	

Litigation (continued)

Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation v. Toshiba America Information Systems Inc et al

Docket	6:06-cv-00550-LED	Case began	2006-12-22
Court	Texas Eastern District Court	Case ended	
Judge	Leonard E Davis	Exposure began	
		Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	

Patent Law (NOS 830)
Counterclaim

Court Archives
Amended Complaint (2007-06-01)

In December 2006, CSIRO filed suit in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas against several manufacturers and suppliers of wireless products, including customers of Marvell's 802.11a or 802.11g wireless LAN products. The complaint alleges that the manufacture, use and sale of wireless products compliant with the IEEE 802.11a or 802.11g wireless standards infringes on the CSIRO patent. As a result of CSIRO's claim for patent infringement, another customer of Marvell's has sought indemnification. In response to these demands for indemnification, Marvell has acknowledged the demands and incurred costs in response to them. On July 3, 2007, Marvell has moved to intervene in this action and another action both pending in the Eastern District of Texas, for the purposes of staying the actions as to products incorporating Marvell parts in favor of the separate action that Marvell filed as described in the next paragraph. Alternatively Marvell moved to disqualify the firm of Townsend, Townsend and Crew from continuing to represent CSIRO because of a conflict of interest. CSIRO opposed these motions on August 3, 2007.

Party		Representation
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	Plaintiff (Lead)	Goodwin Procter LLP Brown McCarroll LLP Townsend & Townsend & Crew LLP
Toshiba America Information Systems Inc	Defendant (Lead)	Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP Smead Anderson & Dunn
3Com Corporation	Defendant	Morgan Miller Blair LC
Accton Technology Corporation USA	Defendant	Wilson Sheehy Knowles Robertson & Cornelius PC Morgan Miller Blair LC
ASUS Computer International	Defendant	Albritton Law Firm PC Stevens Law Firm Okamoto & Benedicto LLP
Belkin Corporation	Defendant	O'Melveny & Myers LLP Young Pickett & Lee
D-Link Systems Inc	Defendant	Wilson Sheehy Knowles Robertson & Cornelius PC Morgan Miller Blair LC Law Offices of SJ Christine Yang

Litigation *(continued)*

Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation v. Toshiba America Information Systems Inc et al *(continued)*

Party		Representation
Fujitsu Computer Systems Corporation	Defendant	Provost & Umphrey Law Firm LLP Morrison & Foerster LLP
SMC Networks Inc	Defendant	Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP
Toshiba America Information Systems Inc	Defendant	Ramey & Flock Nixon & Vanderhye PC Cooley Godward Kronish LLP
Marvell Technology Group Ltd	Related Non-Party	

Litigation (continued)

In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd Securities Litigation

Docket	5:06-cv-06286-RMW	Case began	2006-10-05
Court	California Northern District Court	Case ended	
Judge	Richard Seeborg	Exposure began	2001-10-03
		Exposure ended	2006-10-03
		Claim	
		Settlement	

Class Action, Securities Law (NOS 850), Stock Options Backdating

Court Archives

Complaint (2006-10-05)

Between October 5, 2006 and November 13, 2006, four putative class actions were filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California against Marvell (the "Company") and certain of its officers and directors. The complaints allege that the Company and certain of its officers and directors violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements and omissions relating to the grants of stock options. The complaints seek, on behalf of persons who purchased Marvell's common stock during the period from October 3, 2001 to October 3, 2006, unspecified damages, interest, and costs and expenses, including attorneys' fees and disbursements. Pursuant to an order of the court dated February 2, 2007, these four putative class actions were consolidated as a single action entitled In re Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Securities Litigation. By an order of the court dated February 28, 2007, the plaintiffs must file a consolidated complaint no later than 45 days after the Company file restated financial statements with the SEC.

Party		Representation
Monte Paschi Asset Management SGR	Plaintiff (Lead)	Schiffirin Barroway Topaz & Kessler LLP
Police & Fire Retirement System of the City of Detroit	Plaintiff (Lead)	Berman DeValerio Pease Tabacco Burt & Pucillo PC Kohn Swift & Graf PC Schiffirin Barroway Topaz & Kessler LLP
Puerto Rico Government Employees Retirement Systems	Plaintiff (Lead)	Schiffirin Barroway Topaz & Kessler LLP
Carter Brantner	Plaintiff	Schiffirin Barroway Topaz & Kessler LLP
City of Boca Raton Police & Firefighters Retirement System	Plaintiff	Leiff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein LLP
David Duong	Plaintiff	Braun Law Group PC
Harriet Goldstein	Plaintiff	Hulett Harper Stewart LLP
Marvell Institutional Investors Group	Plaintiff	Bramson Plutzik Mahler & Birhaeuser LLP
Proxima Investments Ltd	Plaintiff	Cotchett Pitre & Simon
Shawn M Perry	Plaintiff	Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP
The Strouse Group	Plaintiff	
Tarich Group	Plaintiff	Finkelstein Thompson & Loughran
Timothy Mahrt	Plaintiff	

Litigation *(continued)*

In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd Securities Litigation *(continued)*

Party		Representation
Sehat Sutardja	Defendant (Lead)	
George A Hervey	Defendant	
Marvell Technology Group Ltd	Defendant	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
Pantas Sutardja	Defendant	
Weili Dai	Defendant	

Litigation (continued)

In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd Derivative Litigation

Docket	5:06-cv-03894-RMW	Case began	2006-06-22
Court	California Northern District Court	Case ended	
Judge	Richard Seeborg	Exposure began	
		Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	

Derivative, Securities Law (NOS 850), Stockholders Suits (NOS 160)

Court Archives

Consolidated Verified Shareholder Derivative Complaint (2006-11-01)

Between July 7, 2006 and August 2, 2006, three purported shareholder derivative actions were filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Each of these lawsuits names Marvell Technology Group Ltd. (the "Company") as a nominal defendant and a number of its current and former directors and officers as defendants. Each lawsuit seeks to recover damages purportedly sustained by the Company in connection with its option granting processes, and seeks certain corporate governance and internal control changes. Pursuant to orders of the court dated August 17 and October 17, 2006, the three actions were consolidated as a single action, entitled In re Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Derivative Litigation. The plaintiffs filed an amended and consolidated complaint on November 1, 2006. On January 16, 2007, the Company filed a motion to dismiss the consolidated complaint for lack of standing or, in the alternative, stay proceedings. Pursuant to stipulations among the parties and orders of the court, the Company's motion is currently scheduled to be heard on November 2, 2007. On February 12, 2007, a new purported derivative action was filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Like In re Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Derivative Litigation, this lawsuit names the Company as a nominal defendant and a number of its current and former directors and officers as defendants. It seeks to recover damages purportedly sustained by the Company in connection with its option granting processes, and seeks certain corporate governance and internal control changes. On May 1, 2007, the court entered an order consolidating this lawsuit with In re Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Derivative Litigation. On May 29, 2007, the court entered an order staying discovery in this matter pending resolution of the Company's motion to dismiss.

Party		Representation
Alaska Hotel Hotel & Restaurant Employees Pension Trust Fund	Plaintiff (Lead)	Lerach Coughlin Stoia & Robbins LLP
Alfred E Ronconi	Plaintiff	Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein LLP Greenfield & Goodman LLC
Joseph Marinelli	Plaintiff	Federman & Sherwood Green Welling LLP
Yen Shei	Plaintiff	Scott & Scott LLC
Sehat Sutardja	Defendant (Lead)	
Alan Armstrong	Defendant Terminated: 2006-11-01	
Arturo Krueger	Defendant	
Avigdor Willenz	Defendant	
Diosdado P Banatao	Defendant	

Litigation *(continued)*

In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd Derivative Litigation *(continued)*

Party		Representation
Douglas King	Defendant	
George A Hervey	Defendant	Bergeson LLP
John M Cioffi	Defendant	
Kuo Wei Herbert Chang	Defendant	
Manuel Alba	Defendant	
Pantas Sutardja	Defendant	
Paul R Gray	Defendant	
Ronald Verdoorn	Defendant	
Weili Dai	Defendant	
Marvell Technology Group Ltd	Nominal Defendant	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

Litigation (continued)

Microsoft Corporation et al v. Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation

Docket	3:05-cv-01894-MJJ	Case began	2005-05-09
Court	California Northern District Court	Case ended	2006-12-11
Judge	Martin J Jenkins	Exposure began	
		Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	

Patent Law (NOS 830)
Counterclaim

Court Archives
Complaint (2005-05-09)

In 2004, Australia's Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation ("CSIRO") sent notice letters to a number of Wi-Fi System manufacturers regarding CSIRO's patent, U.S. Patent No. 5,487,069 as it relates to IEEE 802.11a and 802.11g wireless standards. In May 2005, a group of system manufacturers, including customers of our 802.11a or 802.11g wireless LAN products, filed an action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California seeking a declaratory judgment against CSIRO that the plaintiff manufacturers' products employing the IEEE 802.11a or 802.11g wireless standards do not infringe CSIRO's patent, U.S. Patent No. 5,487,069. In September 2006, CSIRO filed an answer and counterclaims alleging that plaintiffs' products that employ those wireless standards infringe the CSIRO patent and seeking damages, including enhanced damages and attorneys' fees and costs, and an injunction against sales of infringing products. In December 2006, the district court granted CSIRO's motion to transfer the case to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, where CSIRO had brought a similar lawsuit against another company. As a result of CSIRO's counterclaims for patent infringement, a customer of Marvell Technology Group, Ltd. ("Marvell") has sought indemnification from Marvell.

Party		Representation
Microsoft Corporation	Plaintiff	Fish & Richardson PC Kerr & Wagstaffe LLP
Netgear Inc	Plaintiff	Wilson & Sonsini
Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation	Defendant (Lead)	Townsend & Townsend & Crew LLP
Marvell Technology Group Ltd	Related Non-Party	

Litigation (continued)

Realtek Semiconductor Corporation v. Marvell Technology Group Ltd et al

Docket	3:04-cv-04265-MMC	Case began	2004-10-07
Court	California Northern District Court	Case ended	2005-08-12
Judge	Joseph C Spero	Exposure began	
		Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	\$550,000

Patent Law (NOS 830)
Counterclaim

Court Archives
Complaint (2004-10-07)

On October 7, 2004, Realtek Semiconductor Corp. filed a complaint in the California Northern District Court against Marvell Technology Group Ltd. for an alleged Patent Infringement violation. The action was assigned to Honorable Maxine M. Chesney and referred to Honorable Joseph C. Spero. Realtek is the owner to the U.S. Patent No. 6,433,608 entitled "Device and Method for Correcting the Baseline Wandering of Transmitting Signals," issued on August 13, 2002, to Chen-Chih Huang. Plaintiff Realtek alleged that Defendant Marvell has infringed the '608 patent by making, using, selling, offering for sale, importing and inducing others to use and sell gigabit Ethernet network controller chip products, including but not limited to Marvell's 88E8000, 88E8003, 88E8052, 88E1000, 88E1000S, and 88E1111 series products, and other products with similar functionality related to the '608 patent within the United States. On August 12, 2005, the Court dismissed this case with prejudice and on November 21, 2005, Marvell's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses, in the total amount of \$549,225 was granted. This ruling was without prejudice to Marvell's seeking additional costs pursuant to its pending bill of costs; this order terminated the case.

Party		Representation
Realtek Semiconductor Corporation	Plaintiff (Lead)	Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
Marvell Technology Group LTD	Defendant (Lead)	
Marvell Semiconductor Inc	Defendant	Fish & Richardson PC

Litigation (continued)

Lonestar Inventions LP v. Marvell Semiconductor Inc et al

Docket	1:04-cv-00209-SS	Case began	2004-04-14
Court	Texas Western District Court	Case ended	2004-07-21
Judge	Sam Sparks	Exposure began	
		Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	

Patent Law (NOS 830)
Counterclaim

Court Archives
Complaint (2004-04-14)

In April 2004 Lonestar Inventions, L.P. filed a complaint against Broadcom Corp., Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. and Analog Devices, Inc. in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas alleging that Broadcom and the other named defendants (i) infringed a single patent relating to circuit technology and (ii) induced infringement of such patent. The complaint sought a permanent injunction against Broadcom as well as the recovery of monetary damages, including treble damages for willful infringement, and attorneys' fees. In September 2004 Broadcom and Lonestar entered into a settlement agreement and dismissed with prejudice all claims and counterclaims between them. Other terms of the settlement were not disclosed.

Party		Representation
Lonestar Inventions LP	Plaintiff (Lead)	Gibbs & Bruns LLP Daffer McDaniel LLP Jacks Law Firm
Marvell Semiconductor Inc	Defendant (Lead)	Fish & Richardson PC
Analog Devices Inc	Defendant	Hale & Dorr LLP Brown McCarroll LLP
Broadcom Corporation	Defendant	Latham & Watkins LLP McGinnis Lochridge & Kilgore LLP

Litigation (continued)

UniRAM Technology Inc v. Monolithic System Technology Inc et al

Docket	3:04-cv-01268-VRW	Case began	2004-03-31
Court	California Northern District Court	Case ended	
Judge	Maria-Elena James	Exposure began	
		Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	\$2,400,000

Patent Law (NOS 830)
Counterclaim

Court Archives
Amended Complaint (2004-05-13)

On March 31, 2004, UniRAM Technology, Inc. filed a complaint against Monolithic System Technology, Inc. ("MoSys") in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, alleging trade secret misappropriation and patent infringement. UniRAM's complaint asserts that it provided trade secret information to Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. ("TSMC") in 1996-97 and speculated that MoSys improperly obtained unspecified trade secrets of UniRAM from TSMC in an unknown manner. Subsequent to March 31, 2004, UniRAM amended its complaint twice to add TSMC as a defendant and additional allegations to the suit, and to drop all infringement claims for one of the two patents identified in the initial complaint. On October 24, 2006, MoSys entered into a settlement agreement with UniRAM under which MoSys and UniRAM agreed to dismiss all outstanding claims and counterclaims with prejudice, and MoSys paid UniRAM \$2.4 million and received a complete release of all claims as well as a future fully paid license for itself and all of its licensees with respect to UniRAM's relevant intellectual property.

Party		Representation
UniRAM Technology Inc	Plaintiff (Lead)	Morrison & Foerster LLP Susman Godfrey LLP Heim Payne & Chorus LLP
Monolithic System Technology	Defendant (Lead)	Bingham McCutchen LLP Krieg Keller Sloan Reilley & Roman LLP McCutchen Doyle Brown & Enersen LLP Vista IP Law Group LLP
Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Ltd	Defendant	Weil Gotshal
TSMC North America	Defendant	Weil Gotshal & Manges LLP
Intel Corporation	Third Party	Perkins Coie
Marvell Semiconductor Israel Ltd	Third Party	Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw LLP
Marvell Technology Group Ltd	Non-Party Parent	

Litigation (continued)

Kenney v. Marvell Technology et al

Docket	1:01-cv-08332-SAS	Case began	2001-09-05
Court	New York Southern District Court	Case ended	2002-08-16
Judge	Shira A Scheindlin	Exposure began	
		Exposure ended	
		Claim	
		Settlement	

Class Action, Initial Public Offering, Securities Law (NOS 850)

On September 5, 2001, Martin Kenney filed a complaint in the New York Southern District Court (Foley Square) against Marvell Technology Group Inc. for an alleged Securities violation. The action was assigned to Judge Shira A. Scheindlin. This case is a member case of Docket No. 1:01-cv-07053-SAS, which has been designed the lead case. On August 16, 2002, the lawsuit ended.

Party		Representation
Martin Kenney	Plaintiff (Lead)	Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP
Marvell Technology Group Ltd	Defendant (Lead)	
Dr Sehat Sutardja	Defendant	
George Hervey	Defendant	
JP Morgan Chase	Defendant	
Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc	Defendant	Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw LLP
Robertson Stephens Inc	Defendant	O'Melveny & Myers LLP
The Goldman Sachs Group Inc	Defendant	

Litigation (continued)

In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd IPO Securities Litigation

Docket	1:01-cv-07053-SAS	Case began	2001-07-31
Court	New York Southern District Court	Case ended	
Judge	Shira A Scheindlin	Exposure began	2000-06-27
		Exposure ended	2000-12-06
		Claim	
		Settlement	\$1,000,000,000

Class Action, Initial Public Offering, Securities Law (NOS 850)

Court Archives

Amended Complaint (2002-04-19)

On July 31, 2001, a putative class action suit was filed against two investment banks that participated in the underwriting of Marvell Technology Group's (the "Company") initial public offering, or IPO, on June 29, 2000. That lawsuit, which did not name Marvell or any of our officers or directors as defendants, was filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. Plaintiffs allege that the underwriters received "excessive" and undisclosed commissions and entered into unlawful "tie-in" agreements with certain of their clients in violation of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Thereafter, on September 5, 2001, a second putative class action was filed in the Southern District of New York relating to our IPO. In this second action, plaintiffs named three underwriters as defendants and also named as defendants Marvell and two of our officers, one of whom is also a director. Relying on many of the same allegations contained in the initial complaint in which we were not named as a defendant, plaintiffs allege that the defendants violated various provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. In both actions, plaintiffs seek, among other items, unspecified damages, pre-judgment interest and reimbursement of attorneys' and experts' fees. These two actions relating to our IPO have been consolidated with hundreds of other lawsuits filed by plaintiffs against approximately 40 underwriters and approximately 300 issuers across the United States. Defendants in the consolidated proceedings moved to dismiss the actions. In February 2003, the trial court granted the motions in part and denied them in part, thus allowing the case to proceed against the underwriters and us as to alleged violations of section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Claims against the individual officers have been voluntarily dismissed with prejudice by agreement with plaintiffs. On June 26, 2003, the plaintiffs announced that a settlement among plaintiffs, the issuer defendants and their directors and officers, and their insurers has been structured, a part of which provides that the insurers for all issuer defendants would guarantee up to \$1 billion to investors who are class members, depending upon plaintiffs' success against non-settling parties. The Company's board of directors approved the proposed settlement, which if approved by the court would result in the plaintiffs' dismissing the case against us and granting releases that extend to all of our officers and directors. Definitive settlement documentation were completed in early June 2004 and first presented to the court on June 14, 2004. On February 15, 2005, the court issued an opinion preliminarily approving the proposed settlement, contingent upon certain modifications being made to one aspect of the proposed settlement — the proposed "bar order." The court ruled that it had no authority to deviate from the wording of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 and that any bar order that may issue should the proposed settlement be finally approved must be limited to the express wording of 15 U.S.C. section 78u-4(f)(7)(A). On May 2, 2005 the issuer defendants and plaintiffs jointly submitted an amendment to the settlement agreement conforming the language of the settlement agreement with the court's February 15, 2005 ruling regarding the bar order. The court on August 31, 2005 issued an order preliminarily approving the settlement and setting a public hearing on its fairness for April 24, 2006 due to difficulties in mailing the required notice to class members. A final settlement approval hearing on the proposed issuer settlement was held on April 24, 2006. The court took the matter under submission. Meanwhile the consolidated case against the underwriters proceeded. On October 2004, the district court certified a class. On December 5, 2006, however, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed, holding that a class could not be certified. The Second Circuit's holding, while directly affecting only the underwriters, raises some doubt as to whether the settlement class contemplated by the proposed issuer settlement would be approved in its present form. On January 5, 2007, plaintiffs petitioned the Second Circuit for rehearing of the Second Circuit's decision. On April 6, 2007, the Second Circuit denied the petition. At a status conference on April 23, 2007, the district court suggested that the issuers' settlement could not be approved in its present form, given the Second Circuit's ruling. On June 25, 2007, a stipulation terminating the settlement was filed. On September 27, 2007, Plaintiffs will file their opening brief on the motion to certify the classes. On December 21, 2007, responsive briefs are due. On February 15, 2008, reply briefs are due.

Litigation (continued)

In Re Marvell Technology Group Ltd IPO Securities Litigation (continued)

Party		Representation
Richard Hart	Plaintiff (Lead)	Seeger Weiss LLP Milberg Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins
Martin Kenney	Plaintiff (Consolidated) Terminated: 2002-04-19	Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP
Joseph P Genco	Plaintiff	Bernstein Liebhard & Lifshitz LLP Milberg Weiss Bershad & Schulman
Lehman Brothers Inc	Defendant (Lead)	Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw LLP Paul Weiss Rifkind Wharton & Garrison LLP
George Hervey	Defendant (Consolidated) Terminated: 2002-11-20	
JP Morgan Securities Inc	Defendant (Consolidated)	Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
Marvell Technology Group Ltd	Defendant (Consolidated)	
Robertson Stephens Inc	Defendant (Consolidated) Terminated: 2002-04-19	O'Melveny & Myers LLP
Sehat Sutardja	Defendant (Consolidated) Terminated: 2002-11-20	
Goldman Sachs & Co Inc	Defendant	Sullivan & Cromwell LLP

Securities Registrations

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2006-04-13)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling & Kempe Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2006-04-13)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2005-04-14)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling Hunter
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2005-04-14)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan Marvell Technology Group Ltd. 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2004-04-13)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling Hunter Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registrations *(continued)*

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan Marvell Technology Group Ltd. 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2004-04-13)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Options Assumed by Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Originally Granted Under the Asica, Inc. 2001 Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2003-12-12)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling Hunter Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Options Assumed by Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Originally Granted Under the Asica, Inc. 2001 Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2003-12-12)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2003-08-28)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling Hunter Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2003-08-28)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registrations *(continued)*

Securities Registration	
Re:	Options Assumed by Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Originally Granted Under the Radlan Computer Communications Ltd. Key Employee Share Incentive Plan (2002), the Radlan Computer Communications Ltd. Key Employee Share Incentive Plan (1998) and the Radlan Computer Communications Ltd. 2003 Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2003-06-30)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling & Kempe Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Options Assumed by Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Originally Granted Under the Radlan Computer Communications Ltd. Key Employee Share Incentive Plan (2002), the Radlan Computer Communications Ltd. Key Employee Share Incentive Plan (1998) and the Radlan Computer Communications Ltd. 2003 Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2003-06-30)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2003-05-02)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling & Kempe Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2003-05-02)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Options Issued by Marvell Technology Group Ltd. to Optionholders of SysKconnect GmbH
Source	S-8 (2002-06-25)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling & Kempe Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registrations *(continued)*

Securities Registration	
Re:	Options Issued by Marvell Technology Group Ltd. to Optionholders of SysKonnnect GmbH
Source	S-8 (2002-06-25)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan Marvell Technology Group Ltd. 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2002-05-01)
Registrant Firm	Appleby Spurling & Kempe Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan Marvell Technology Group Ltd. 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2002-05-01)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. 2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2001-02-28)
Registrant Firm	Conyers Dill & Pearman Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Marvell Technology Group Ltd. Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2001-02-21)
Registrant Firm	Conyers Dill & Pearman Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registrations *(continued)*

Securities Registration	
Re:	Galileo Technology LTD. 1998 Nonemployee Directors Stock Option Plan Galileo Technology LTD. 1997 GTI Stock Option Plan Galileo Technology LTD. 1997 Employees' Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2001-01-23)
Registrant Firm	Conyers Dill & Pearman Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Galileo Technology LTD. 1998 Nonemployee Directors Stock Option Plan Galileo Technology LTD. 1997 GTI Stock Option Plan Galileo Technology LTD. 1997 Employees' Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2001-01-23)
Registrant Firm	Pro Se (Copied)
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	2000 Employee Stock Purchase Plan
Source	S-8 (2000-06-26)
Registrant Firm	Conyers Dill & Pearman Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Securities Registration	
Re:	Amended and Restated 1995 Stock Option Plan
Source	S-8 (2000-06-26)
Registrant Firm	Conyers Dill & Pearman Legal Opinion
Legal Fees	NA
Accounting Fees	NA

Source: AuditAnalytics.com 18 October 2007

AuditAnalytics.com is a premium on-line market intelligence service available from the Ives Group Inc, a leading independent research provider focused on the accounting, insurance and investment communities. For information call (508) 476-7007, email info@auditanalytics.com or visit www.auditanalytics.com.