

1 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
 BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342
 2 DAVID L. ANDERSON #149604
 JACOB R. SORENSEN #209134
 3 MARC H. AXELBAUM #209855
 BRIAN J. WONG #226940
 4 DANIEL J. RICHERT #232208
 50 Fremont Street
 5 Post Office Box 7880
 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
 6 Telephone: (415) 983-1000
 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200
 7 Email: bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com

8 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
 DAVID W. CARPENTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 9 BRADFORD A. BERENSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 DAVID L. LAWSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 10 EDWARD R. McNICHOLAS (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 1501 K Street, N.W.
 11 Washington, D.C. 20005
 Telephone: (202) 736-8010
 12 Facsimile: (202) 736-8711

13 Attorneys for Defendants
 AT&T CORP. and AT&T INC.

14

15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

16

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18

19 TASH HEPTING, GREGORY HICKS,
 CAROLYN JEWEL and ERIK KNUTZEN
 20 on Behalf of Themselves and All Others
 Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

22

vs.

23

24 AT&T CORP., AT&T INC. and DOES 1-20,
 inclusive,

Defendants.

25

26

27

28

No. C-06-0672-VRW

**DEFENDANT AT&T CORP.'S
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
 REMOVE INCORRECTLY FILED
 DOCUMENT**

Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor
 Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker

[Civ. L.R. 7-11]

1 Defendant **AT&T CORP.** (“AT&T”) brings this motion pursuant to Local Rule 7-
2 11 to remove the Reply Memorandum of Defendant AT&T Corp. in Response to Court’s
3 May 17, 2006 Minute Order (Dkt. 141; “Redacted Reply”) from the Court’s docket.

4 **I. ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF SOUGHT.**

5 AT&T respectfully requests that the Court remove the incorrectly filed Redacted
6 Reply (Dkt. 141) from its files and enter the proposed order filed herewith.

7 **II. REASONS FOR SEEKING ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF.**

8 On May 24, 2006, counsel for AT&T e-filed a version of the Redacted Reply. Only
9 today, however, did counsel learn that e-filed version of the Redacted Reply could be
10 manipulated to reveal the redacted text. Ericson Declaration, filed herewith, ¶¶ 2-5.

11 On the morning on May 26, 2006, counsel for AT&T received an e-mail from
12 CNET News.com that said: “CNET News.com has learned that portions of the redacted
13 material filed with the court are readable using certain computer programs.” *Id.* ¶ 3. Later,
14 CNET News.com said that the Redacted Reply was the pleading in which it could view
15 redacted material. This was the first time that AT&T learned that redacted text in the
16 Redacted Reply could be viewed if manipulated. *Id.* ¶ 4. Upon learning this fact, counsel
17 for AT&T immediately contacted the Court and had the Redacted Reply locked to prevent
18 public access. AT&T has e-filed a replacement version of the Redacted Reply with the
19 Court; it is Dkt. 150. *Id.* ¶ 5.

20 Dated: May 26, 2006.

21 //

22 //

23 //

24

25

26

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
BRUCE A. ERICSON
DAVID L. ANDERSON
JACOB R. SORENSEN
MARC H. AXELBAUM
BRIAN J. WONG
DANIEL J. RICHERT
50 Fremont Street
Post Office Box 7880
San Francisco, CA 94120-7880

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
DAVID W. CARPENTER
BRADFORD A. BERENSON
DAVID L. LAWSON
EDWARD R. McNICHOLAS
1501 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

By /s/ Bruce A. Ericson
Bruce A. Ericson
Attorneys for Defendants
AT&T CORP. and AT&T INC.