

1
2
3
4

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

8 FLATWORLD INTERACTIVES, No. C -12-01956 JSW (EDL)
9 Plaintiff, **ORDER**

10 || v.

11 | APPLE INC.,

ORDER

12 ||

Defendant.

14 As part of the Court's April 22, 2013 ruling regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Compel, the
15 Court ordered Defendant to file a declaration setting forth the burden associated with the relevant
16 protective order and third party confidentiality issues that would arise from producing redacted
17 versions of damages expert reports, whether initial, supplemental, or rebuttal, exhibits thereto, and
18 trial testimony and exhibits thereto relating to damages, from the Motorola v. Apple litigation in the
19 Northern District of Illinois. Defendant filed that declaration on April 23, 2013, and Plaintiff filed a
20 response on April 26, 2013. The Court has reviewed the parties' filings and requires additional
21 information.

22 In Defendant's declaration, counsel states that the expert in the Motorola litigation, Bruce
23 Napper, submitted three expert reports, two of which relate to Defendant's claims of infringement.
24 Counsel states that Napper's initial report contained confidential information from Motorola, as well
25 as from 125 other third parties. According to counsel, the parties in Motorola agreed that a copy of
26 Napper's initial expert report with all of Motorola's confidential information redacted could be
27 shown to the clients in Motorola by virtue of an agreement between the parties. A redacted copy of
28 the initial expert report was created. Counsel attests to the burden of seeking to redact all of the
other third party confidential information. Peija Decl. ¶ 10.

1 However, as Plaintiff points out, the fact that confidential information from 125 third parties
2 was not redacted from the initial Napper report (when the Motorola confidential information was
3 redacted) before that report was shown to clients in that case tends to show that the third party
4 information may not be confidential and may not need to be redacted from the initial Napper report
5 before being produced to Plaintiff in this case. Defendant has not had an opportunity to respond to
6 this argument. Therefore, no later than May 10, 2013, Defendant shall file a declaration of no more
7 than two pages responding to this issue.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: May 6, 2013



ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Chief Magistrate Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28