

1 Lester L. Levy (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
 Michele F. Raphael (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
 2 WOLF POPPER LLP
 845 Third Avenue
 3 New York NY 10022
 Telephone: 212.759.4600
 4 Facsimile: 212.486.2093
 e-mail: llevy@wolfpopper.com
 5 e-mail: mraphael@wolfpopper.com

6 William M. Audet (SBN 117456)
 Audet & Partners, LLP
 7 221 Main Street, Suite 1460
 San Francisco, CA 94105-1938
 8 Telephone: 415.568.2555
 Facsimile: 415.568.2556
 9 e-mail: waudet@audetlaw.com

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14	CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC d/b/a)	CASE NO: C05-03649 JW
15	INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, and HOWARD)	
16	STERN, on behalf of themselves and all)	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
17	others similarly situated,)	DEFENDANT GOOGLE INC.'S
18	Plaintiffs,)	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR
19	vs.)	LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER
20	GOOGLE, INC.,)	SEAL IN CONNECTION WITH
21	Defendant.)	GOOGLE INC.'S REPLY TO
22)	PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL
23)	OPPOSITION TO GOOGLE INC.'s
24)	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
25)	Civil L. R. 79-11
26)	Civil L. R. 79-5
27)	Courtroom: 8
28)	Judge: Hon. James W. Ware

28 **[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL IN CONNECTION WITH GOOGLE INC.'S SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY**

1 Defendant Google Inc. has made an Administrative Motion for Leave to File Documents
2 Under Seal. The Court has duly considered the submissions and arguments of counsel for both
3 parties and finds that there is no good cause to grant Google's request to file Google Inc.'s Reply
4 to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition to Google Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment under
5 seal. Nor has Defendant made the requisite showing with respect to Exhibits A - C of the
6 Supplemental Declaration of M. Christopher Jhang in Support of Google, Inc.'s Reply to
7 Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition to Google Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment. Google
8 has not shown that it possesses overriding confidentiality interests that overcome the right of
9 public access to the record nor to support sealing the record. Nor has Google shown that it is
10 likely to be prejudiced nor irreparably harmed. Google's requested sealing is not narrowly
11 tailored, it does not comport with the parties' confidentiality stipulation and there are less
12 restrictive means to achieve any confidentiality interests.

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Google's Administrative Motion for Leave to File
14 Documents Under Seal in Connection with Google Inc.'s Reply to Plaintiffs' Supplemental
15 Opposition to Google Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18
19 Dated: May __, 2007

20 _____
The Honorable James Ware
United States District Court Judge