

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GEOFFREY PECOBER and JEFFREY LAWRENCE, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, No C 08-2820 VRW ORDER

Plaintiffs,

v

ELECTRONIC ARTS INC, a Delaware Corporation,

Defendant.

On April 1, 2010, plaintiffs filed a redacted motion to exclude the opinions of defendants' expert, Jill Hamburger. Doc #130. In conjunction with their submission, plaintiffs provided the court with an unredacted copy under seal. At the court's request on August 4, 2010, plaintiffs furnished the court with a "duplicate" copy of the April 1 document submitted under seal. Upon inspection, however, the August 4 document appears to be different from its April 1 sibling. Contrast, for example, April 1 document at 1 ln 2-8 with August 4 document at 1 ln 2-7.

\\

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

In light of this apparent discrepancy, plaintiffs are ORDERED to submit to the court, on or before August 6, 2010 at 3:00 PM, a memorandum explaining the reason(s) for the apparent differences between the August 4 and April 1 under seal documents. Plaintiffs submission shall be accompanied by a red-line version of the April 1 document indicating all differences between it and its August 4 counterpart.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



---

VAUGHN R WALKER  
United States District Chief Judge