## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	0. CV 04-9484-AHM (SHX)			Date	November 2, 2009	
Title	Perfect 10	, Inc., v. Goggle Inc.	<u>, et al.,</u>			
Present: The		Stephen J. Hillman				
Honorable						
Sandra Butler						
Deputy Clerk		Co	ourt Reporter / Recorde	er	Tape No.	
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:			Attorneys Present for Defendants:			
N/A				N/A		
Proceeding	<b>gs:</b> (1	N CHAMBERS)				
Google's Request for Clarification Re October 6, 2009 Order:						

The Court adopted Perfect 10's proposed Order, specifically the language that "Perfect 10 is not required to produce any information about any settlements with third parties, other than the date, payor, and amount of any such settlement payments, and may redact settlement information it is not required to produce."

The Court adopted the above language with the understanding, perhaps incorrect, that Google, at least by the time of the hearing on the Motion, was not truly seeking the full confidential settlement agreements in other Perfect 10 cases, bur rather was satisfied with the limited information which the court ordered.

At the present time, the court will confirm the language and intent of the Order quoted above. Actual settlement agreements between Perfect 10 and third parties need not be produced.

If Google wishes to formally move to discover confidential settlement agreements, it is at least now informed of this Court's analysis of this issue, as set forth in the July 21, 2003 Minute Order in the Net Management Services litigation.

cc: Judge Matz
Counsel of Record\*
\*the term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party.

CV-90 (06/04) CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL Page 1 of 2

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 04-9484-AHM (SHx)	Date	November 2, 2009				
Title	Perfect 10, Inc., v. Goggle Inc., et al.,						
	Initials of Preparer						