

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

WHATSAPP INC., et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

NSO GROUP TECHNOLOGIES
LIMITED, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-07123-PJH

**ORDER RE MOTIONS TO SEAL;
SETTING HEARING ON MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER AND MOTION
TO DISMISS**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 164, 176, 179, 181, 184,
185, 188, 191, 193, 195, 197, 198, 200,
202, 205, 209, 212, 214

The parties in the above-captioned case have filed a number of motions to seal various briefs, declarations, and exhibits. See Dkt. 164, 176, 179, 181, 184, 185, 188, 191, 193, 195, 197, 198, 200, 202, 205, 209, 212, 214. The underlying basis for each motion is the same, and is related to the parties’ attempt to comply with orders issued by an Israeli court. Based on the representations made in the supporting declarations, the court concludes that the parties’ claimed basis for sealing does meet the “good cause” standard applicable at this stage of the litigation, and thus, the motions to seal are GRANTED. At a later stage of the litigation, the court will re-evaluate whether continued sealing is warranted under the “compelling reasons” standard. See Ctr. For Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-97 (9th Cir. 2016).

Defendants have also filed a motion for protective order, as well as a motion to dismiss. The motion to dismiss was set for hearing on October 26, 2023, but due to the court’s unavailability on that day, the court hereby advances the hearing to **October 19, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.** The hearing will be held in person, and the court will hear arguments

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

on both the motion to dismiss and the motion for protective order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 14, 2023

 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton
PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge