

1 MICHAEL A. LADRA, State Bar No. 64037  
 Email: mladra@wsgr.com  
 2 JAMES C. YOON, State Bar No. 177155  
 Email: jyoona@wsgr.com  
 3 STEFANI E. SHANBERG, State Bar No. 206717  
 Email: sshanberg@wsgr.com  
 4 ROBIN L. BREWER, State Bar No. 253686  
 Email: rbrewer@wsgr.com  
 5 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
 Professional Corporation  
 6 650 Page Mill Road  
 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050  
 7 Telephone: (650) 493-9300  
 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100  
 8  
 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant  
 9 FORTINET, INC.

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

13 FORTINET, INC., a Delaware corporation,	)	CASE NO.: 09-CV-00036-RMW (PVT)
	)	
14 Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER GRANTING</b>
	)	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO</b>
15 v.	)	<b>FILE DOCUMENTS AND PORTIONS</b>
	)	<b>OF DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL</b>
16 PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC., and	)	<b>PERTAINING TO FORTINET, INC.'S</b>
17 PATRICK R. BROGAN,	)	<b>OPPOSITION TO PALO ALTO</b>
	)	<b>NETWORKS, INC.'S MOTION FOR</b>
18 Defendants.	)	<b>SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF</b>
	)	<b>NONINFRINGEMENT AND</b>
	)	<b>INVALIDITY REGARDING THE '974</b>
	)	<b>PATENT</b>
	)	
20 _____	)	
	)	
21 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS	)	
	)	
22 _____	)	

23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 Having considered Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant Fortinet, Inc.’s administrative  
2 motion to file under seal portions of Fortinet’s Opposition to Palo Alto Networks, Inc.’s (“PAN”)  
3 Motion for Summary Judgment of Noninfringement and Invalidity Regarding the ‘974 Patent  
4 (“Opposition”), portions of the Declaration of Dr. Matthew A. Bishop in Support of Fortinet’s  
5 Opposition (“Bishop Declaration”), and Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Stefani E. Shanberg in  
6 Support of Fortinet’s Opposition (“Confidential Exhibit”) pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and  
7 79-5(c) and June 30, 2010 good cause appearing:

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Fortinet’s administrative motion is GRANTED.

9 Accordingly, the Confidential Exhibit, portions of the Bishop Declaration identified in  
10 the Administrative Motion and the following portions of Fortinet’s Opposition filed under seal:

- 11 a) TOC i.16 (following “PAN’s products do not. . .” through the end of the line);
- 12 b) TOC i.17-23;
- 13 c) 1:10-15;
- 14 d) 4:11-12;
- 15 e) 4:15-6:9;
- 16 f) 6:14;
- 17 g) 6:16-20;
- 18 h) 6:22;
- 19 i) 6:24-26;
- 20 j) 7:1-6;
- 21 k) 7:7-9 (following “it is woefully incomplete. . .” through “. . .(2) Mr. Zuk’s  
22 Deposition”);
- 23 l) 7:13-8:8;
- 24 m) 8:13-14 (following “PAN firewalls are . . .” through end of line 14);
- 25 n) 8:19-25;
- 26 o) 9:3 (following “PAN’s products do not . . .” through end of the line);
- 27 p) 9:4-5 (following “PAN products . . .” through “. . .Motion at 1, 7”);
- 28 q) 9:6-10:16;

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

- r) 18:16-17 (following “products practice . . .” through “. . .Details regarding further discovery”); and
- s) 18:25-28 (following “241:15-16. . .” through end of footnote)

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: June 30, 2010

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable Ronald M. Whyte  
United States District Court Judge

Presented by:  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
/s/ Stefani E. Shanberg  
Stefani E. Shanberg

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant  
FORTINET, INC.