

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

NAD KARIM,

Plaintiff,

No. C 12-5240 PJH

v.

**ORDER RE PROTECTIVE ORDER  
AND MOTION FOR CLASS  
CERTIFICATION**

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Before the court are the parties' letter brief regarding the joint application for entry of protective order, and plaintiff's motion to change time regarding the filing of his motion for class certification. Having read the parties' papers and carefully considered the arguments and the relevant legal authority, and good cause appearing, the court hereby rules as follows.

As to the protective order, the court agrees with plaintiff that the model protective order for standard litigation is appropriate in this case, as opposed to the model protective order for "litigation involving patents, highly sensitive information, and/or trade secrets." While defendants argue that this case involves "HP's proprietary information," it appears that the bulk of defendants' portion of the letter brief relates to the privacy concerns of its customers. The court does find that those privacy concerns must be protected through a protective order, but does not find that those concerns warrant the adoption of defendants' requested protective order. Instead, the court directs the parties to meet and confer, and to submit a stipulated protective order based on the model protective order for standard litigation, but modified to include the customer-privacy protections described in Khalilpour v. Cellco Partnership, 2010 WL 1267749 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2010). The parties shall submit a stipulated protective order by **July 19, 2013**.

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1           In light of the recent discovery dispute, the court does find it appropriate to continue  
2 the date for the filing of plaintiff's motion for class certification. However, plaintiff's  
3 proposed order is conditioned on the resolution of a motion to compel that has not yet been  
4 filed, so the court DENIES plaintiff's motion. Instead, the court extends the time for the  
5 filing of the class certification motion by 30 days, to **August 16, 2013**.

6  
7           **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: July 12, 2013



9  
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
12 United States District Judge