

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYNOPSYS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
ATOPTECH, INC,
Defendant.

Case No. [13-cv-02965-MMC](#) (DMR)

**ORDER TAKING MOTION FOR
SANCTIONS UNDER SUBMISSION
WITHOUT ORAL ARGUMENT;
ORDER FOR SUPPLEMENTAL
DECLARATIONS ON MOTIONS TO
SEAL**

TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

The court has received Synopsys’s motion for sanctions [Docket No. 273] and finds that the matter is appropriate for resolution without oral argument pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b). Accordingly, the May 14, 2015 hearing on the motion is hereby **VACATED**. The court will issue a written order on the motion.

Atoptech has filed a motion to seal certain exhibits and declarations related to its opposition to the motion for sanctions. [Docket No. 283.] Specifically, Atoptech moves to seal Exhibit A to the Declaration of Henry Chang, which is a copy of a chart that shows all the commands that are available an executable file. Atoptech notes that it “does not claim this chart is confidential, but understands that Synopsys may.” [Docket No. 283-1 at ¶ 3.] Synopsys has not filed a responsive declaration as required by Civil Local Rules 79-5(e)(1) and 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that Exhibit A to the Declaration of Henry Chang is sealable. By **May 14, 2015**, Synopsys shall file either a responsive declaration or a statement of non-opposition to Atoptech’s motion to seal.

Synopsys moves to seal portions of its reply to its motion for sanctions that refer to the Declaration of Andrew Kahng. [Docket No. 287.] Synopsys also moves to seal the portions of

1 the Second Supplemental Declaration of Martin Walker that refer to information previously
2 marked “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL—ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” by ATopTech. Synopsys
3 does not contend that either of these documents contains materials that Synopsys has designated as
4 confidential, but rather notes that it has filed its motion to seal to give ATopTech “notice of its
5 burden to establish that the material designated confidential solely by ATopTech is properly
6 sealable.” [Docket No. 287 at 1]. ATopTech has not filed a responsive declaration as required by
7 Civil Local Rules 79-5(e)(1) and 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that the relevant portions of the
8 Second Supplemental Declaration of Martin Walker or the Declaration of Andrew Kahng are
9 sealable. By **May 14, 2015**, ATopTech shall file either a responsive declaration or a statement of
10 non-opposition to Synopsys’s motion to seal.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 11, 2015



DONNA M. RYU
United States Magistrate Judge