

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

IN RE HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE  
LITIGATION

No. CV 12-06003 CRB

**ORDER UNSEALING COMPLAINT  
IN PART AND REQUIRING  
FURTHER BRIEFING**

This document relates to: ALL ACTIONS

---


Plaintiff moved to seal certain portions of the Consolidated Shareholder Derivative Complaint, noting that Nominal Defendant Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP”) had designated the material confidential, but that Plaintiff did not believe HP could justify sealing all of the information. See dkt. 75. HP then moved to seal only some of what Plaintiff had redacted. See dkt. 77. The Court granted HP’s motion. See dkt. 82. The Court UNSEALS all redacted information in the Complaint except the portions identified in its Order of May 20, 2013, see dkt. 82, as no party has offered any reason why it should remain sealed.

Upon further review, the Court ORDERS HP to explain and provide relevant authority addressing, in a filing of no more than six pages delivered to the Court on or before 5:00 p.m. on May 23, 2013, how releasing the kind of information that remains sealed “would harm Autonomy’s competitive position . . . [in] that Autonomy’s competitors would be interested in and could make competitive use of HP’s internal assessments and internal financial metrics for the Autonomy business,” Pforzheimer Decl. (dkt. 77-2) ¶¶ 3-4, and why that interest (or another interest) amounts to a “compelling reason” overcoming the “strong

1 presumption in favor of access to court records.” Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins., 331  
2 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003).

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4  
5 Dated: May 20, 2013

6   
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 CHARLES R. BREYER  
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28