

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE**
8 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
9

10 **AGENCY SOLUTIONS.COM, LLC)** **CV F 11-1014 AWI GSA**
11 **d.b.a. HEALTHCONNECT SYSTEMS,)**
12 **Plaintiff,)** **ORDER MOVING HEARING**
13 **v.)** **DATE OF AUGUST 1, 2011,**
14 **THE TRIZETTO GROUP, INC.,)** **ORDER PERMITTING SUR-**
15 **Defendant.)** **REPLY**
16 **)** **AND RELATED ORDERS**
17

18 In this action for misappropriation of trade secrets, plaintiff Healthconnect Systems (“Plaintiff”)
19 has moved for preliminary injunction against defendant Trizetto Group, Inc. (“Defendant”). In
20 support of, and in opposition to, Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction, the parties have
21 submitted both legal briefs and supporting documents. Two concerns arise.

22 First, the volume of documents submitted is substantially larger than the court normally
23 encounters in regards to preliminary injunctions. The court will require additional time to review
24 the documents provided.

25 Second, the parties stipulated to an Order for Expedited Discovery, which was filed on
26 June 27, 2011. Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction and Defendants opposition appear to
27 have been filed prior to the conduct of any significant discovery. Plaintiff’s reply to Defendant’s
28 opposition, however, indicates the inclusion of a large number of documents that appears to have
 been at least in part the product of the expedited discovery process. The court finds that the

1 interests of a more complete consideration of the factual basis of Plaintiff's motion would be
2 served by providing Defendant an opportunity to submit a sur-reply to Plaintiff's reply brief.
3 Should Defendant wish to submit a sur-reply, Defendant shall limit the scope of such sur-reply to
4 address specifically those documents and products of expedited discovery that were used by
5 Plaintiff in its reply brief or that were made available during the same period of expedited
6 discovery.

7 A final concern of the court is that the court's docket is becoming cluttered with redacted
8 versions of documents, unredacted versions of which are later being filed under seal. The court,
9 having reviewed a number of the redacted documents finds they serve no useful purpose and tend
10 to make the recovery of the corresponding unredacted documents more difficult. The court will
11 require that only unredacted versions of documents be submitted to the court unless some
12 particular purpose is served by the submission of a redacted version.

13

14 THEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, it is hereby ORDERED that:

15 1. The hearing on Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction that was previously
16 scheduled for Monday, August 1, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. is hereby MOVED to Monday,
17 August 22, 2011, at 1:30 p.m. in courtroom 2.

18 2. Defendant may file and serve a sur-reply to Plaintiff's reply in support of the motion for
19 preliminary injunction not later than 4:30 p.m., Thursday, August 4, 2011. Any sur-reply
20 shall be limited in scope in accordance with the foregoing discussion.

21 3. Any party seeking to file a document with the court containing significant amounts of
22 material requiring confidential treatment shall e-mail the document or documents to
23 awiorders@caed.uscourts.gov together with a request to file under seal and a proposed
24 order to file under seal. Any documents e-mailed to the court with an accompanying
25 request to seal shall be deemed filed on the date and time the e-mail is received. Any
26 party seeking to file a redacted documents shall provide the court with an explanation of

1 why the filing of a redacted document is necessary.
2
3 IT IS SO ORDERED.
4

5 Dated: July 28, 2011


6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE