

1 BINGHAM McCUTCHEM LLP
 DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257)
 2 GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468)
 HOLLY A. HOUSE (SBN 136045)
 3 ZACHARY J. ALINDER (SBN 209009)
 BREE HANN (SBN 215695)
 4 Three Embarcadero Center
 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
 5 Telephone: (415) 393-2000
 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286
 6 donn.pickett@bingham.com
 geoff.howard@bingham.com
 7 holly.house@bingham.com
 zachary.alinder@bingham.com
 8 bree.hann@bingham.com

9 DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)
 JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227)
 10 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7
 Redwood City, CA 94070
 11 Telephone: (650) 506-4846
 Facsimile: (650) 506-7114
 12 dorian.daley@oracle.com
 jennifer.gloss@oracle.com
 13

14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International Corporation,
 15 Oracle EMEA Limited, and Siebel Systems, Inc.

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 18 OAKLAND DIVISION

19 ORACLE USA, INC., *et al.*,
 20 Plaintiffs,
 21 v.
 22 SAP AG, *et al.*,
 23 Defendants.

CASE NO. 07-CV-01658 PJH (EDL)

**PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION TO PERMIT PLAINTIFFS
 TO FILE UNDER SEAL
 INFORMATION SUPPORTING
 ORACLE'S OPPOSITION TO
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
 COMPEL**

24
 25
 26
 27
 28 Case No. 07-CV-01658 PJH (EDL)

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Pursuant to Local Rules 7-11(a) and 79-5(c), Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle
3 International Corporation, Oracle EMEA Limited, and Siebel Systems, Inc. (“Plaintiffs” or
4 “Oracle”) and Defendants SAP AG, SAP America, Inc., and TomorrowNow, Inc. (“Defendants,”
5 and together with Plaintiffs, the “Parties”) request that the Court order the Clerk of the Court to
6 file under seal: (1) Portions of the Declaration of Zachary J. Alinder in Support of Oracle’s
7 Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Compel at ¶ 13 (“Alinder Declaration”) and Exhibits F, G,
8 H, K, L, P, DD, and EE thereto; (2) Portions of the Declaration of Jason Rice in Support of
9 Oracle’s Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Compel at ¶ 3, lines 12-17 and ¶ 6, lines 9-18
10 (“Rice Declaration”); and (3) Portions of the Declaration of Buffy Ransom in Support of
11 Oracle’s Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Compel at ¶ 9, lines 19-25 and Exs. A and B
12 thereto (“Ransom Declaration”).

13 Unredacted versions of these documents were lodged with the Court on January 5,
14 2009. Sealing of the documents identified above is requested because each of these documents
15 contains information designated by Defendants or Plaintiffs as “Confidential” or “Highly
16 Confidential – Attorneys Eyes’ Only” under the Stipulated Protective Order entered into in this
17 case, or otherwise contains information for which there is good cause to seal.

18 **II. ARGUMENT**

19 **A. Information Included at Defendants’ Request**

20 Oracle moves to seal part of the information specified above at Defendants’
21 request. Specifically, Oracle moves to seal Paragraph 13 of the Alinder Declaration and Exhibit
22 H to the Alinder Declaration at Defendants’ request. This request to seal Defendants’
23 information is supported by the Declaration of Bree Hann in support of Plaintiffs’ Administrative
24 Motion to Permit Plaintiffs to File Under Seal Information Supporting Oracle’s Opposition to
25 Defendants’ Motion to Compel (“Hann Declaration”) and is accompanied by a proposed order
26 and stipulation. Per Civil Local Rule 79-5(b), Defendants will separately file a declaration
27 establishing that this information is sealable.

1 **B. Good Cause Exists to Seal Oracle’s Confidential Information**

2 Oracle moves to seal the rest of the information specified above, including
3 Exhibits F, G, K, L, P, DD, and EE to the Alinder Declaration; portions of the Rice Declaration
4 at ¶ 3 at ¶ 6; and portions of the Ransom Declaration at ¶ 9 and Exhibits A and B, because good
5 cause exists to seal the confidential Oracle information contained within these documents. This
6 request is supported by the Hann Declaration, which establishes that each of these documents
7 contains nonpublic, commercially sensitive, private and confidential information, the disclosure
8 of which would create a risk of significant competitive injury and particularized harm and
9 prejudice to Oracle.

10 **1. Legal Standard**

11 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) provides broad discretion for a trial court to
12 permit sealing of court documents. As opposed to sealing information at trial or in case-
13 dispositive motions, which requires the most “compelling” of reasons, a showing of good cause
14 will suffice for sealing records attached to non-dispositive motions. *Navarro v. Eskanos &*
15 *Adler*, Case No. C-06 02231 WHA(EDL), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24864 at *7 (March 22, 2007)
16 (citing in part, *Kamakana v. Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006)).

17 To make such a showing of good cause, the party seeking protection from
18 disclosure must demonstrate that it has taken steps to keep the information confidential, and that
19 public disclosure of such information would create a risk of significant competitive injury and
20 particularized harm or prejudice. *See Navarro*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24864 at *5, *8; *see also*
21 *Phillips v. General Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2006); *In re Adobe Sys., Inc.*
22 *Sec. Litig.*, 141 F.R.D. 155, 158 (N.D. Cal. 1992).

23 **2. The Hann Declaration Establishes Good Cause Exists to**
24 **Seal Oracle’s Confidential Material**

25 The Hann Declaration establishes that Oracle has considered and treated the
26 information contained in the subject documents as confidential, commercially sensitive, and
27 proprietary, and that public disclosure of such information would create a risk of significant
28 competitive injury and particularized harm and prejudice to Oracle. *See Hann Declaration at*

1 ¶¶ 5-7.

2 Further, Oracle has continued to protect these documents and/or the underlying
3 information contained in these documents from improper public disclosure since the initiation of
4 this litigation through a Stipulated Protective Order (Docket No. 32) to prevent its private
5 confidential information from being improperly disclosed. *See id.*

6 The Hann Declaration also establishes that the request for sealing has been
7 narrowly tailored. *See id.* Accordingly, good cause exists to grant an order sealing these
8 documents.

9

10 DATED: January 5, 2010

BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

11

12

By: _____ /s/ Bree Hann

13

Bree Hann
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

14

Oracle USA, Inc.,
Oracle International Corporation, Oracle EMEA
Limited, and Siebel Systems, Inc.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28