

1 DAVID T. BIDERMAN, Bar No. 101577  
 2 JUDITH B. GITTERMAN, Bar No. 115661  
 3 M. CHRISTOPHER JHANG, Bar No. 211463  
**PERKINS COIE LLP**  
 4 Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 2400  
 San Francisco, CA 94111-4131  
 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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

10

**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION**

11

12

CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC d/b/a  
INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, and HOWARD  
13 STERN, on behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

14

Plaintiffs,

15

v.

16

GOOGLE, INC.,

17

Defendant.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CASE NO. C O5-03649 JW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING  
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

**ORDER**

The Court finds, having considered Plaintiffs CLRB Hanson Industries, LLC, d/b/a Industrial Printing, and Howard Stern’s Second Motion To Seal Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 79-5(d) Portions Of Amended Documents Due To Confidentiality Designations By Defendant Google Inc. (“Plaintiffs’ Second Motion to Seal Amended Documents”) (Document Nos. 137-139), the Declaration of M. Christopher Jhang In Response To Plaintiffs’ Second Motion to Seal Amended Documents, and the papers submitted therewith and arguments raised therein, and good cause appearing:

1. That the redactions (i.e., sealing as confidential documents) requested in Plaintiffs’ Second Motion to Seal Amended Documents, in connection with Plaintiffs’ Amended Supplemental Memorandum In Support Of Plaintiffs’ Motion For Partial Summary Judgment (“Plaintiffs’ Amended Supplemental Memorandum”) and Amended Supplemental Declaration of Michele F. Raphael (“Amended Supplemental Raphael Declaration”), are consistent with Google’s confidentiality designations; and

2. That Google has demonstrated that Plaintiffs’ Amended Supplemental Memorandum and the Amended Supplemental Raphael Declaration are subject to seal in accordance with its confidential designations because of overriding confidentiality interests that overcome the right of public access to the record in these documents.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That Plaintiffs’ Second Motion to Seal Amended Documents is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable James Ware  
United States District Judge