

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION**

AIRCRAFT TECHNICAL PUBLISHERS,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

AVANTEXT, INC.,

 Defendant.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS

Case No. C 07-04154 SBA

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION PURSUANT
TO CIVIL L.R. 79-5(D) TO FILE
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL IN
CONNECTION WITH ATP’S REPLY AND
EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
REGARDING LACHES AFFIRMATIVE
DEFENSES**

Civil L.R. 79-5 (d)

On September 15, 2009, Plaintiff filed its Reply in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Regarding Laches Affirmative Defenses (the “Reply”). In support of the Reply, Plaintiffs filed Exhibits 2 and 3 which contained produced documents subject to the Protective Order entered in this Action. In connection with the Reply, Plaintiff filed an Administrative Motion to Seal pursuant to Civil L.R. 79-5(d) (the “Administrative Motion”).

The Administrative Motion seeks to reference in its papers certain documents designated as “Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only” and “Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only” pursuant to the Protective Order signed by Judge Edward M. Chen on September 23, 2008. Pursuant to Rule 79-5(d) Plaintiff filed redacted versions of the Reply and the protected


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

documents in Exhibits 2 and 3 in support of the Reply.

Based on the Plaintiff's Administrative Motion to Seal and the Declaration of Gregory J. Lavorgna in Support of the Administrative Motion, the Court hereby ORDERS that:

- 1. the unredacted versions of the Reply and Exhibits 2 and 3 shall be filed under seal;
- and
- 2. the redacted versions of the Reply and Exhibits 2 and 3 shall be filed in the public record.

Dated: 10/22/09



Hon. Sandra B. Armstrong
United States District Judge