

1 DAVID T. BIDERMAN, Bar No. 101577  
 JUDITH B. GITTERMAN, Bar No. 115661  
 2 M. CHRISTOPHER JHANG, Bar No. 211463  
**PERKINS COIE LLP**  
 3 Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 2400  
 San Francisco, CA 94111-4131  
 4 Telephone: (415) 344-7000  
 Facsimile: (415) 344-7050  
 5 Email: [DBiderman@perkinscoie.com](mailto:DBiderman@perkinscoie.com)  
 Email: [JGitterman@perkinscoie.com](mailto:JGitterman@perkinscoie.com)  
 6 Email: [CJhang@perkinscoie.com](mailto:CJhang@perkinscoie.com)

7 Attorneys for Defendant Google Inc.

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, SAN JOSE DIVISION**

CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC d/b/a  
 INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, and HOWARD  
 STERN, on behalf of themselves and all others  
 similarly situated,  
  
 Plaintiffs,  
  
 v.  
 GOOGLE, INC.,  
  
 Defendant.

CASE NO. C O5-03649 JW

**DECLARATION OF M.  
 CHRISTOPHER JHANG IN  
 RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND  
 MOTION TO SEAL PURSUANT TO  
 CIV. L.R. 79-5(d) PORTIONS OF  
 AMENDED DOCUMENTS  
 (DOCUMENT NOS. 137-139)**

Date: June 11, 2007  
 Time: 9:00 a.m.  
 Dept.: Courtroom 8  
 Judge: Honorable James Ware

1 I, M. Christopher Jhang, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in all of the courts of the State of  
3 California and this Court, and am an attorney with the law firm of Perkins Coie LLP, counsel for  
4 defendant Google Inc. (“Google”) in this action. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), I submit  
5 this declaration in response to Plaintiffs’ Second Motion To Seal Pursuant To Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)  
6 Portions Of Amended Documents Due To Confidential Designations By Defendant Google Inc.  
7 (“Plaintiffs’ Second Motion to Seal Amended Documents”), filed with this Court on May 21,  
8 2007 (Document Nos. 137-139). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below except  
9 as to those matters stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be  
10 true. If called upon to testify, I could and would testify competently as to the matters set forth  
11 herein.

12 **BASIS FOR SEALING OF GOOGLE’S CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

13 2. On or about March 2, 2007, Google and plaintiffs CLRB Hanson Industries, LLC,  
14 d/b/a Industrial Printing, and Howard Stern (“Plaintiffs”) executed and filed with the Court their  
15 [Proposed] Stipulated Protective Order Regarding Confidential Information. On May 15, 2007,  
16 the Court executed the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order (with amendments). A true and  
17 correct copy of the Court-executed Stipulated Protective Order is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

18 3. The Stipulated Protective Order provides two tiers of confidential designations.  
19 The first tier covers information designated “Confidential,” which the Stipulated Protective  
20 Order generally describes as “those things that may be disclosed to the parties or their counsel  
21 for the purposes of the litigation, but which must be protected against disclosure to third parties.”  
22 Stipulated Protective Order, ¶ 4. The second tier covers information designated “Confidential –  
23 Trade Secret/Attorneys’ Eyes Only,” which the protective order generally describes as “those  
24 information or materials which are of a proprietary, business or technical nature that might  
25 reasonably be of value to a competitor or potential customer of the party or nonparty holding the  
26 proprietary rights thereto or might reasonably pose a commercial disadvantage to the producing  
27 party and must be protected from disclosure.” *Id.*

1           4.       On April 26, 2007, I sent Plaintiffs' counsel, Lester Levy and Michele Raphael, a  
2 letter providing Google's tailored confidentiality designations for the deposition transcripts of  
3 Google employees Heather Wilburn, Shivakumar Venkataraman, and Michael Schulman. A true  
4 and correct copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

5           5.       Google considers portions of Ms. Wilburn's deposition transcript to be  
6 "Confidential" because they discuss, describe, or refer to Google's internal training materials or  
7 internal guidelines used by Google's customer service representatives to respond to client  
8 inquiries. None of these materials are available to the public. Except for these "Confidential"  
9 portions, Ms. Wilburn's transcript has been designated by Google as non-confidential.

10          6.       Google considers Mr. Venkataraman's deposition transcript to be "Confidential"  
11 in its entirety because Mr. Venkataraman is a Google software engineer who primarily discussed  
12 in his deposition Google's internal processes and information not available to the public. Mr.  
13 Venkataraman discussed Google's proprietary technology related to its AdWords program, the  
14 development of new technology, and the content of confidential documents Google produced to  
15 Plaintiffs. No portions of his transcript have been designated "Confidential – Trade  
16 Secret/Attorneys' Eyes Only."

17          7.       Google considers most of Mr. Schulman's deposition transcript to be  
18 "Confidential." Mr. Schulman is a Google software engineer who primarily discussed in his  
19 deposition Google's internal processes and information not available to the public. For example,  
20 Mr. Schulman discussed Google's proprietary technology related to its AdWords program,  
21 including the computer programming of the system for serving ads, and the content of  
22 confidential documents Google produced to Plaintiffs. Google also considers a small portion of  
23 Mr. Schulman's transcript to be "Confidential – Trade Secret/Attorneys' Eyes Only" because  
24 this portion pertains to Google's highly sensitive algorithms used for the AdWords program.

25                   **PLAINTIFFS' SECOND MOTION TO SEAL AMENDED DOCUMENTS**

26          8.       On May 7, 2007, Plaintiffs filed an administrative motion to seal portions of  
27 Plaintiffs' Supplemental Memorandum In Support Of Plaintiffs' Motion For Partial Summary  
28

