

1 Juanita R. Brooks (SBN 75934 / brooks@fr.com)  
 Jason W. Wolff (SBN 215819 / wolff@fr.com)  
 2 Madelyn S. McCormick (SBN 320063 / mmccormick@fr.com)  
 3 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
 12390 El Camino Real  
 4 San Diego, CA 92130  
 Tel: (858) 678-5070 | Fax: (858) 678-5099

5  
 6 Betty H. Chen (SBN 290588 / bchen@fr.com)  
 Joshua Kain Day (SBN 322372 / day@fr.com)  
 7 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
 500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
 8 Redwood City, California 94063  
 Tel: (650) 839-5070 | Fax: (650) 839-5071

9  
 10 Proshanto Mukherji (pro hac vice / mukherji@fr.com)  
 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
 11 One Marina Park Drive  
 Boston, MA 02110  
 12 Tel: (617) 542-5070 / Fax: (617) 542-8906

13 Attorneys for Defendant  
 14 MICROSOFT CORPORATION

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 (SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION)

17 LOOKSMART GROUP, INC.,  
 18 Plaintiffs,  
 19 v.  
 20 MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
 21 Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-04709-JST

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
 LOOKSMART’S ADMINISTRATIVE  
 MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL  
 PORTIONS OF LOOKSMART’S REPLY  
 IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR  
 SANCTIONS STRIKING MICROSOFT’S  
 BELATEDLY DISCLOSED NON-  
 INFRINGEMENT DEFENSES AND  
 EXHIBITS THERETO**

22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

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

**PROPOSED ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff LookSmart Group, Inc.’s (“LookSmart” or “Plaintiff”) Administrative Motion to Seal Portions of LookSmart’s Reply in Support of its Motion for Sanctions Striking Microsoft’s Belatedly Disclosed Non-Infringement Defenses and Exhibits Thereto.

Microsoft has articulated “compelling reasons” to seal the documents submitted in connection with LookSmart’s reply brief, rebutting the presumption of access to judicial records for each of those documents. See *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016). The proposed redactions are narrowly tailored. The Court’s ruling on the sealing requests are set forth in the table below:


<u>Document</u>	<u>Portion(s) to be Sealed</u>	<u>Evidence Offered in Support of Sealing</u>	<u>Order</u>
LookSmart’s Reply ISO its Motion for Sanctions Striking Microsoft’s Belatedly Disclosed Non-Infringement Defenses	Highlighted portions at: Page 1, lines 23-25 Page 2, lines 17-18, 26-27 Page 3, lines 1-6, 8-17, 19-20, 24-27 Page 4, lines 4-8, 11, 14-17, 19, 21, 23-24, 27 Page 5, lines 1-3, 5-7, 12, 17, 26-27 Page 6, lines 5-6, 10-11 Page 7, lines 4, 27 Page 8, lines 25, 27 Page 9, lines 1, 9-14, 16-20, 24, 28 Page 10, lines 9, 13-18 Page 11, lines 2, 18-21	McCormick Decl. ¶ 3	Granted

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

	Page 12, lines 10, 14, 17, 19, 21-22, 27-28		
	Page 13, lines 11-12, 16-19, 22		
	Page 14, lines 11, 13-14, 16-22, 24-27		
Exhibit 25	Entire document	McCormick Decl. ¶ 4	Granted
Exhibit 26	Entire document	McCormick Decl. ¶¶ 4 and 5	Granted

**IT IS SO ORDERED**

Date: July 16, 2019

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. J. S. Tigar  
United States District Court Judge