

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

E-FILED on 5/4/10

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES,  
AUSTRALIA PTY LIMITED and  
ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

INTERNATIONAL GAME TECHNOLOGY  
and IGT,

Defendants.

No. C-06-03717 RMW

ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS TO SEAL

[Re Docket Nos. 705, 743]


Defendants International Game Technology and IGT (collectively "IGT") move to file under seal: (1) portions of its notice of motion and motion for leave to file first supplemental answer and counterclaims, (2) portions of its first supplemental answer and counterclaims, and (3) Exhibits B and C to the Declaration of Kristin Cleveland in support thereof. Plaintiffs Aristocrat Technologies, Australia PTY Limited, and Aristocrat Technologies, Inc. (collectively "Aristocrat") move to file under seal portions of its opposition to IGT's motion for additional depositions after the discovery deadline and Exhibit G to the Declaration of Robert J. Blanch in support thereof.

A request to seal must establish that the document, or portions thereof, is privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law. Civ. L. R. 79-5(a). The request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing of only sealable material. *Id.* Having

1 reviewed the material that IGT and Aristocrat seek to file under seal, the court has concerns about  
2 the extent of material which the parties seek to file under seal. With the exception of the portions  
3 identified in paragraph 3 of the Declaration of Kristin L. Cleveland in support of IGT's motion to  
4 seal, it appears that there is no basis for filing the remainder of the material under seal. *See* Dkt. No.  
5 706 ¶ 3. The court therefore orders the parties to explain why the remaining material is sealable. If  
6 the parties do not submit an explanation establishing that the rest of the material is sealable within  
7 ten days, the motions to seal will be denied.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DATED: 5/4/10

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge

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

**Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:**

**Counsel for Plaintiffs:**

Anthony R. de Alcaeus	adealcuaz@mwe.com
Terrence Patrick McMahon	tmcMahon@mwe.com
Jeremy Todd Elman	jelman@mwe.com
Robert J. Blanch, Jr.	rblanch@mwe.com
Phillip C. Ducker	pducker@mwe.com

**Counsel for Defendants:**

Jeffrey Stewart Love	jeffrey.love@klarquist.com
Daniel Justin Weinberg	dweinberg@orrick.com
Gabriel M. Ramsey	gramsey@orrick.com
Garth Alan Winn	garth.winn@klarquist.com
Kristin L. Cleveland	kristin.cleveland@klarquist.com
Laura Kieran Kieckhefer	kkieckhefer@orrick.com
Michael J. Bettinger	mike.bettinger@klgates.com
Patrick Marshall Bible	patrick.bible@klarquist.com
Robert T. Cruzen	rob.cruzen@klarquist.com
Stephanie Sue Nelson	stephanie.nelson@klarquist.com
Eric Lance Wesenberg	ewesenberg@orrick.com

Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

**Dated:** 5/4/10

CCL  
**Chambers of Judge Whyte**