

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

IYM TECHNOLOGIES LLC
Plaintiff,
v.
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.
Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-mc-80167-SK

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION
REGARDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE
AND RESERVING RULING ON MOTION
TO SEAL**

Regarding Docket Nos. 1, 4

Hearing Date: TBD

Hearing time: TBD

Judge: Sallie Kim

The Court HEREBY GRANTS the stipulation to amend the briefing schedule on the pending motion to compel. Synopsys, Inc. (“Synopsys”) shall file its response by no later than January 12, 2018. IYM Technologies LLC (“IYM”) shall file its reply, if any, by no later than January 19, 2018. The Court will schedule a hearing if necessary

IYM filed a motion to seal portions of its motion to compel and the supporting documents. IYM seeks to seal documents that have been designated as confidential by Synopsys, the defendant in the action before this Court, and by Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., the defendant in the action pending in Delaware. Because IYM is relying Sysopsis’s and AMD’s

1 designations, Sysopsis and AMD have an obligation pursuant to Northern District Local Civil
2 Rule 79-5(e) to file a declaration to establish that the information is sealable.

3 The Court notes that, as a public forum, the Court may only entertain requests to seal that
4 establish good cause and are narrowly tailored to seal only the particular information that is
5 genuinely privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise has a compelling need for
6 confidentiality. *See* Northern District Civil L.R. 79-5(b) & cmt. Parties seeking to file
7 documents, or portions thereof, under seal must file a declaration to establish that “the document
8 sought to be filed under seal, or portions thereof, are sealable. Reference to a stipulation or
9 protective order that allows a party to designate certain documents as confidential is not
10 sufficient to establish that a document, or portions thereof, are sealable.” Northern District Civil
11 L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A); *see also See Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-
12 81 (9th Cir. 2006) (“Those who seek to maintain the secrecy of documents ... must meet the high
13 threshold of showing that ‘compelling reasons’ support secrecy.”).

14 The Court will RESERVE RULING on IYM’s motion to seal pending receipt of
15 Sysopsis’s and AMD’s declarations. Sysopsis and AMD shall file the required declarations by
16 no later than January 9, 2018. If Sysopsis and AMD fail to file the required declarations by this
17 date, the Court will deny the motion to seal without any further notice. IYM shall serve a copy
18 of its motion to seal and this Order on AMD by no later than January 4, 2018 and file a proof of
19 service by no later than January 4, 2018.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21
22 Dated: January 2, 2018



23 SALLIE KIM
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25
26
27
28