

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
 Email: JGitterman@perkinscoie.com
 6 Email: 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' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION PURSUANT TO CIV. L.R. 79-
5(d) TO FILE UNDER SEAL
PORTIONS OF PLAINTIFFS'
SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY
MEMORANDUM (DOCUMENT NOS.
163-165)**

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

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

ORDER

The Court finds, having considered Plaintiffs CLRB Hanson Industries, LLC, d/b/a Industrial Printing, and Howard Stern’s Administrative Motion Pursuant To Civ. L.R. 79-5(d) To File Under Seal Portions Of Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Reply Memorandum Due To Confidentiality Designations By Defendant Google Inc. (“Plaintiffs’ Motion to Seal Document”) (Document Nos. 163-165), the Declaration of M. Christopher Jhang In Response To Plaintiffs’ Motion to Seal Document, 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’ Motion to Seal Document, in connection with Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Reply Memorandum In Support Of Plaintiffs’ Motion For Partial Summary Judgment (“Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Reply Memorandum”), include information and testimony that Google has designated confidential; and

2. That Google has demonstrated that Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Reply Memorandum is subject to seal 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’ Motion to Seal Document is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

The Honorable James Ware
United States District Judge