25


26


27

28

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 IN RE HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY No. 3:12-cv-06003-CRB 11 SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE LITIGATION ORDER DENYING PENDING 12 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTIONS TO FILE UNDER SEAL 13 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: 14 **ALL ACTIONS** 15 16 This litigation now having been resolved, the Court must determine which documents, 17 or portions thereof, should remain permanently shielded from public view. The Court has 18 19 received numerous motions to seal certain portions of documents which number in the 20 thousands of pages, most of which are heavily or entirely redacted. Specifically, the Court 21 now has before it the following pending motions: Hewlett Packard's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 337); Hewlett Packard's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal 22 23 (dkt. 367); Objector A.J. Copeland's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 378); 24 Objector Harriet Steinberg's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 380); Objectors

A.J. Copeland's and Harriet Steinberg's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 390); Hewlett Packard's Objection re Unsealing in Part of Consolidated Shareholder Derivative Complaint; Hewlett Packard's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 398); Directors' Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 401); and Objector Harriet Steinberg's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 404).





1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	For the foregoing reasons, the pending administrative motions to seal are D	ENIED.
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
10		
11	Dated: July 28, 2015 CHARLES R. BREYER	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT J	UDGE
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

No motion for reconsideration will be entertained unless HP identifies within three days "a limited amount of <u>exceptionally sensitive information</u> that truly deserves protection" under the "compelling reasons" standard of <u>Kamakana v. City and Cty. of Honolulu</u>, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178–79 (9th Cir. 2006), outlined by page and line number and including "specific factual findings" for each. <u>See O'Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc.</u>, No. c-13-3826-EMC, 2015 WL 355496, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 27, 2015). In light of the "public interest in understanding the judicial process" as it relates to the settlement of these claims, the Court will not countenance arguments that public filing would put HP at a competitive or legal disadvantage. <u>See Kamakana</u>, 447 F.3d at 1178–79.