

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SPEEDTRACK INC., )  
)  
Plaintiff(s), )  
)  
v. )  
)  
WAL-MART.COM USA, LLC, et )  
al., )  
)  
Defendant(s). )  
)  
----- )  
ENDECA TECHNOLOGIES INC., )  
)  
Intervenor, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
SPEEDTRACK INC., et al. )  
)  
Defendant in )  
Intervention. )  
----- )

No. C 06-7336 PJH (BZ)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF  
SPEEDTRACK'S & DEFENDANT  
WAL-MART.COM'S MOTION FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO  
FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff Speedtrack's Motion  
for Administrative Relief To File Documents Under Seal is  
**DENIED**. Plaintiff moved to seal documents and deposition  
transcripts designated confidential by Wal-Mart.com and  
Endeca. Neither Wal-Mart.com nor Endeca filed a declaration  
establishing that the designated information is sealable, as


1 required by Local Rule 79-5(d).

2 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that defendant Wal-Mart.com's  
3 Motion for Administrative Relief To File Documents Under Seal  
4 is **DENIED**. Wal-Mart.com failed to identify which party  
5 designated the documents as confidential pursuant to the  
6 Protective Order; therefore, the Court is unable to determine  
7 whether Wal-Mart.com failed to comply with Local Rule 79-5(c),  
8 or whether Speedtrack or Endeca failed to comply with 79-5(d).  
9 The parties are admonished to adhere to the requirements set  
10 forth in Local Rule 79-5 or risk the imposition of sanctions.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Speedtrack and Wal-Mart.com  
12 comply with 79-5(e).

13 The parties are admonished to carefully comply with Local  
14 Rule 79-5 henceforth. Careless applications which waste the  
15 court's time in reviewing meritless applications will be  
16 sanctioned.

17 Dated: September 24, 2008

18  
19   
20 Bernard Zimmerman  
United States Magistrate Judge

21 G:\BZALL\REFS\SPEEDTRACK V. WAL-MART\ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO SEAL.wpd  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28