

1 DAVID T. BIDERMAN, Bar No. 101577
2 TIMOTHY J. FRANKS, Bar No. 197645
3 M. CHRISTOPHER JHANG, Bar No. 211463
4 FARSCHAD FARZAN, Bar No. 215194

5 **PERKINS COIE LLP**
6 Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 2400
7 San Francisco, California 94111
8 Telephone: (415) 344-7000
9 Facsimile: (415) 344-7050
10 Email: DBiderman@perkinscoie.com
11 Email: TFranks@perkinscoie.com
12 Email: CJhang@perkinscoie.com
13 Email: FFarzan@perkinscoie.com

14 Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.

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 05-03649 JW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION UNDER LOCAL RULE 79-5(d)
FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL
PORTIONS OF DOCUMENTS DUE TO
CONFIDENTIAL DESIGNATIONS BY
DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.**

Date: January 6, 2009
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Place: Courtroom 5
Judge: Honorable Patricia V. Trumbull

1 Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion Under Local Rule 79-5(d) for Leave to File Under Seal
2 Portions of Documents Due to Confidential Designations by Defendant Google, Inc. (the
3 "Motion") was filed on November 26, 2008. Upon consideration of the Motion and the
4 Declaration of David T. Biderman filed in support thereof, the Court finds there is good cause to
5 grant the request to file the following document and information under seal:

6 **Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Google, Inc.'s Answer to Interrogatories No. 4**
7 **and 5 and to Produce Documents in Response to Request for Production No.**
8 **29, and**

9 **Exhibit 6 to the Declaration of Rachel S. Black in Support of Plaintiffs'**
10 **Motion to Compel Google, Inc.'s Answer to Interrogatories No. 4 and 5 and**
11 **to Produce Documents in Response to Request for Production No. 29.**

12 GOOD CAUSE having been shown, the Court finds that:

- 13 (1) The parties possess overriding confidentiality interests that overcome the right of
14 public access to the record in the above-mentioned documents;
- 15 (2) The parties' overriding confidentiality interests support sealing the record;
- 16 (3) A substantial probability exists that the parties' overriding confidentiality interests
17 will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed;
- 18 (4) The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored; and
- 19 (5) No less restrictive means exist to achieve this overriding interest.

20 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion is GRANTED.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 DATED: _____

The Honorable Patricia V. Trumbull
United States Magistrate Judge