

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
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
MENLO PARK

VOLTERRA SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRIMARION, INC., a Delaware Corporation, INFINEON TECHNOLOGIES AG, a German Corporation, and INFINEON TECHNOLOGIES NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation

Defendants.

CASE NO. C 08-05129 JCS

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL PORTIONS OF ITS OPPOSITION TO VOLTERRA'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND SUPPORTING DECLARATIONS AND DOCUMENTS (LOCAL RULE 79-5 (c))

Date: September 25, 2009
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Dept: Courtroom A, 15th Floor
Before: Honorable Joseph C. Spero
Complaint Filed: November 12, 2008
Trial Date: None

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants' Administrative Motion for Leave to File Under Seal Portions of Its Opposition to Volterra's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Motion for Summary Judgment, and Supporting Declarations and Documents. Having considered Defendants' motion, as well as the pleadings and materials lodged in this matter, the Court finds good cause and GRANTS the motion to seal portions of these documents.


1 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the following documents or portions thereof should be
2 sealed:

- 3 • Portions of: (1) Defendant’s Opposition and Memorandum in Support of
4 Opposition to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment; (2) Defendant’s
5 Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Motion for Preliminary
6 Injunction; and (3) Expert Report of R. Jacob Baker on the Issues of Invalidity of
7 U.S. Patent Nos. 6,278,264 and 6,462,522 (Exhibit 56 to the Declaration of David
8 H. Dolkas in Support of Defendant’s Opposition to Motion for Preliminary
9 Injunction); and (4) List of Things Considered and Relied Upon by Dr. Jacob
10 Baker (Exhibit 27 to the Declaration of Vanessa Lefort in Support of Defendant’s
11 Opposition to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment);
- 12 • The complete Declaration of Laura Carpenter in Support of Defendant’s
13 Opposition to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment;
- 14 • The complete Declaration of Kenneth Ostrom in Support of Defendant’s
15 Opposition to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment;
- 16 • The complete Declaration of Kenneth Ostrom in Support of Defendant’s
17 Opposition to Motion for Preliminary Injunction;
- 18 • The complete Declaration of John Zielinski in Support of Defendant’s Opposition
19 to Motion for Preliminary Injunction;
- 20 • Exhibits 1-22, 25-55, 65, 90-92, 95-98, 100-118, and 121-122 to the Declaration of
21 David H. Dolkas in Support of Defendant’s Opposition to Motion for Preliminary
22 Injunction (Exhibit 95 is the Expert Report of James E. Malackowski)
- 23 • Exhibits 1, 11-19, 36-38, and 40 to the Declaration of Vanessa Lefort in Support
24 of Defendant’s Opposition to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Exhibit 1 is
25 the Expert Report of R. Jacob Baker on the Issues of Claim Construction,
26 Indefiniteness, and Noninfringement as to U.S. Patent Nos. 6,278,264 and
27 6,462,522)

28 ///

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 8/12/09



MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOSEPH C. SPERO
United States Magistrate Judge

MPK 156434-2.072750.0023

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
MENLO PARK

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