

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

REMBRANDT PATENT INNOVATIONS  
LLC, and REMBRANDT SECURE  
COMPUTING, LP,

No. C 14-05094 WHA (lead)  
No. C 14-05093 WHA (consolidated)

Plaintiffs,

v.

APPLE INC.,

**ORDER RE SEALING MOTIONS**

Defendant.

Apple moves to file under seal certain exhibits submitted in support of its motion or summary judgment and its reply (Dkt. Nos. 174, 190). Rembrandt moves to file under seal its brief and certain exhibits submitted in support of its opposition to Apple’s motion (Dkt. No. 177). Apple’s declaration in support of Rembrandt’s sealing motion dedesignates Exhibits 8, 10, and 11 to the declaration of Jacob A. Schroeder, so Rembrandt’s motion is **DENIED** as to those materials. Apple contends that the remaining materials sought to be sealed contain confidential information including Apple’s source code, the supply chain and testing process for its hardware, and business and financial information, the dissemination of which, Apple contends, could be materially harmful to Apple.

Rembrandt’s brief cites the deposition testimony of Apple’s 30(b)(6) witness and the report of Apple’s expert all discussing the nature of the accused products recovery process, a key issue in the upcoming motion. Apple has offered no explanation of how the public release of those materials could be harmful at all particularly since similar materials appear unredacted


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 Apple’s own briefs. Accordingly, Rembrandt’s motion is **DENIED** as to the redacted materials on pages 13–15 of Rembrandt’s opposition brief.

The parties’ sealing motions are otherwise **GRANTED**. This is without prejudice to whether these materials could be sealed if presented at trial or at the upcoming oral argument on the parties’ respective motions.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 8, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE