

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
5

6 **MEDIA TEK INC.,**

7 **Plaintiff,**

8 **vs.**

9 **FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,**

10 **Defendant.**  
11

Case No.: 11-cv-5341 YGR

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION OF THIRD PARTY  
INTEL CORPORATION TO INTERVENE**

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

12  
13 Third Party Intel Corporation, with the stipulated agreement of Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.  
14 and MediaTek, Inc., seeks to intervene in this action for the limited purpose of requesting the Court  
15 to maintain the confidentiality of portions of a “License and Cooperation Agreement” (“license”)  
16 between Intel and Motorola, Inc. that MediaTek filed under seal in accordance with Civil Local Rule  
17 79-5(e). MediaTek filed the document under seal because Freescale had designated it “Highly  
18 Confidential” under the governing stipulated protective order. Freescale filed a declaration in  
19 support of sealing certain portions of the license. Intel moves to intervene to supports Freescale’s  
20 request and to assert its own evidence and request for sealing additional portions of the license.

21 Intel seeks to intervene only for purposes of addressing the confidentiality of the license.  
22 Counsel for MediaTek and Freescale have stipulated to Intel’s request to intervene, and to the relief  
23 sought. Intel’s intervention will not, therefore, “unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the  
24 original parties’ rights. FRCP 24(b)(3); *see Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 11-CV-01846-  
25 LHK, 2013 WL 3958232, at \*2 & n.2 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2013) (granting, under permissive  
26 intervention standard, non-party’s motion to intervene for purposes of sealing its patent license  
27 agreement where non-party “does not seek to intervene for the purpose of litigating any claims on the  
28 merits, simply to ensure that a license agreement between [non-party] and [plaintiff] is maintained  
under seal. Neither [plaintiff] nor [defendant] oppose [non-party’s] motion. Therefore, there is no


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

basis for the Court to infer that intervention would ‘unduly delay or prejudice’ the adjudication of [the parties’] rights.”). Consequently, the motion is **GRANTED** for the limited purpose of considering the motion to seal filed by Intel at Docket No. 538.

This Order terminates Docket No. 537.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 5, 2014

  
YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE