

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

INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT CORP.,

No. C 12-06575 JSW (LB)

Plaintiff,

**AMENDED¹ ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTIONS TO FILE PORTIONS OF
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL AND
DENYING AS MOOT DEFENDANT'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

v.

VIRAL TOLAT,

Defendant.

[Re: ECF No. 59, 60, 62]

On April 11, 2013, the parties filed redacted versions of two joint discovery letters briefs describing two discovery disputes. Joint Discovery Letter Brief No. 1, ECF No. 55; Joint Discovery Letter Brief No. 2, ECF No. 56. Plaintiff also filed redacted versions of two declarations in support of its positions in these two joint discovery letter briefs. Sandhu Declaration, ECF No. 57; Berryhill Declaration, ECF No. 58. Thereafter, Plaintiff filed two administrative motions requesting permission to file portions of the two joint discovery letter briefs and the Sandhu and Berryhill Declarations under seal. First Administrative Motion, ECF No. 59; Second Administrative Motion, ECF No. 60. On April 15, 2013, the undersigned's chambers received unredacted copies of the two joint discovery letter briefs and the Sandhu and Berryhill Declarations. These unredacted copies, however, did not highlight the portions of the letters and declarations that Plaintiff seeks to file

¹ The court issues this amended order to provide the correct case number in the caption and in the footer.

1 under seal. Upon being ordered to do so, Plaintiff thereafter submitted new, unredacted versions of
2 the two joint discovery letter briefs and the Sandhu and Berryhill Declarations with the portions that
3 Plaintiff seeks to file under seal highlighted in yellow. Then, on April 16, 2013, Defendant filed his
4 own administrative motion requesting that several of the same documents be filed under seal.
5 Defendant's Administrative Motion, ECF No. 62.

6 Good cause shown, the court **GRANTS** Plaintiff's administrative motions. Plaintiff's proposed
7 orders, however, included only the portions of the documents it designated as confidential and did
8 not, for some reason, include the portions of the documents Defendant designated as confidential.
9 Accordingly, the court specifies that the following shall be filed under seal:

- 10 1. The highlighted portions of the Joint Letter Brief No. 1 Regarding Discovery Disputes, filed
11 April 11, 2013, on pages 1, 2, 4, 5;
- 12 2. Paragraphs 2-5 and 8 to the Declaration of Harpal Sandhu, filed April 11, 2013;
- 13 3. Paragraphs 4-5 to the Declaration of Jon Berryhill, filed April 11, 2013;
- 14 4. The highlighted portions of Exhibit 1 to Joint Letter Brief No. 1 Regarding Discovery
15 Disputes, which are excerpts of Deposition Transcript of Viral Tolat, March 7, 2012, pages
16 429:17-435:13;
- 17 5. Exhibit 3 to Joint Letter Brief No. 1 Regarding Discovery Disputes, which are excerpts of
18 Deposition Transcript of Arthur Patterson, March 15, 2013;
- 19 6. The highlighted portions of Exhibit 5 to Joint Letter Brief No. 1 Regarding Discovery
20 Disputes, which is a March 11, 2012 Proposed Letter To Judge Beeler, on page 2;
- 21 7. The highlighted portions of Exhibit 6 Joint Letter Brief No. 1 Regarding Discovery Disputes,
22 which is a Draft of the Declaration of Harpal Sandhu on pages 2-4;
- 23 8. Exhibit 7 to Joint Letter Brief No. 1 Regarding Discovery Disputes, which are excerpts of
24 Integral Production Documents that are marked "confidential";
- 25 9. Exhibit 8 to Joint Letter Brief No. 1 Regarding Discovery Disputes, which are portions of a
26 March 20, 2013 Letter from Mr. Russo to Mr. Eckhaus;
- 27 10. Portions of Exhibit 4 to the Joint Letter Brief No. 2 Regarding Discovery Disputes, which is
28 a March 20, 2013 Letter from Mr. Russo to Mr. Eckhaus;

- 1 11. Exhibit 5 to Joint Letter Brief No. 2 Regarding Discovery Disputes which are excerpts of the
2 Deposition Transcript of Arthur Patterson, March 15, 2013;
3 12. Portions of Exhibit 6 Joint Letter Brief No. 1 Regarding Discovery Disputes, which is a Draft
4 of the Declaration of Harpal Sandhu, on pages 2-4; and
5 13. Exhibit 7 to Joint Letter Brief No. 2 Regarding Discovery Disputes, which are excerpts of
6 Integral Production Documents that are marked “confidential.”

7 In light of the court granting Plaintiff’s administrative motions, Defendant’s administrative
8 motion, which asks the undersigned to allow a subset of the above-listed documents to be filed under
9 seal, is **DENIED AS MOOT.**

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated: April 22, 2013



LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge