

1 FABIO MARINO (STATE BAR NO. 183825)
 fmarino@orrick.com
 2 DENISE MINGRONE (STATE BAR NO. 135224)
 dmingrone@orrick.com
 3 SIDDHARTHA VENKATESAN (STATE BAR NO. 245008)
 svenkatesan@orrick.com
 4 CHRISTINA VON DER AHE (STATE BAR NO. 255467)
 cvonderahe@orrick.com
 5 NITIN GAMBHIR (STATE BAR NO. 259906)
 ngambhir@orrick.com
 6 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
 1000 Marsh Road
 7 Menlo Park, California 94025
 Telephone: 650-614-7400
 8 Facsimile: 650-614-7401

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants
 10 BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS, INC. AND
 FOUNDRY NETWORKS, LLC

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

14 BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS
 SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware corporation, and
 15 FOUNDRY NETWORKS, LLC, a Delaware
 limited liability company,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 A10 NETWORKS, INC., a California
 corporation; LEE CHEN, an individual;
 19 RAJKUMAR JALAN; an individual; RON
 SZETO, an individual; DAVID CHEUNG, an
 20 individual; LIANG HAN, an individual; and
 STEVEN HWANG, an individual,

21 Defendants.

22 A10 NETWORKS, INC., a California
 corporation,

23 Counterclaim-Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS
 SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware corporation, and
 26 FOUNDRY NETWORKS, LLC, a Delaware
 limited liability company,

27 Counterclaim-Defendants.
 28

Case No. 10-cv-03428 LHK

**ORDER GRANTING, in part,
 BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS
 SYSTEMS, INC.'S AND FOUNDRY
 NETWORKS, LLC'S
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR
 LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL
 SUBMISSION OF ATTORNEYS' FEES
 AND COSTS PURSUANT TO COURT
 ORDER**

Date: August 30, 2011
 Time: 11:00 am
 Dept: Courtroom 4, 5th Floor
 Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

1 The Court, having considered Brocade Communications, Inc. and Foundry Networks
2 LLC's ("Plaintiffs") administrative motion for leave to file under seal their Submission of
3 Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to Court Order and having found good cause to do so, it is
4 HEREBY ORDERED that said leave is GRANTED in part. However, Local Rule 79-5(a)
5 requires that the request to seal must be "narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable
6 material." While the Court finds that the itemized Orrick billing records are properly sealable
7 because they contain confidential information, the Submission of Fees, as well as the attorney
8 biographies do not contain confidential information.

9 If Plaintiffs believe the submission of fees and attorney biographies contain confidential
10 information, they shall submit a declaration explaining why this information is sealable within 5
11 days of the date of this Order. Otherwise, Plaintiffs' request is granted. To the extent that
12 Plaintiffs' sealing motion is granted, Plaintiffs shall comply with G.O. 62 regarding electronic
13 filing of the sealed information.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15
16 Dated: September 6, 2011

17 
18 Honorable Lucy H. Koh
19 United States District Court Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28