

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

EMBLAZE LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

) Case No. 5:11-cv-01079-PSG

) **ORDER RE: APPLE’S MOTION FOR**
) **LEAVE TO FILE A MOTION FOR**
) **RECONSIDERATION OF THE**
) **COURT’S PRIOR SEALING ORDER**

) **(Re: Docket No. 552)**

Before the court is a motion construed as a motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration¹ of the court’s prior order addressing a series of administrative motions to file certain documents under seal.² Apple does not squarely address the burden it faces under Civil L.R. 7-9, but rather files its motion “to further establish good cause and to clarify the reasons it seeks to seal narrowly tailored redacted portions” of certain documents.³ In light of the burden the parties faced preparing for and during trial, the court will move beyond the procedural shortcomings of this approach and focus on the merits of Apple’s request.⁴

¹ See Docket No. 552.

² See Docket No. 519.

³ Docket No. 552 at 1.

⁴ See Docket No. 552-1.

The court rules as follows:

- 1
- 2 **A. Docket No. 444-4 – Ex. A to the Gibson Declaration in Support of Apple’s Motions in**
3 **Limine**
- 4 • Pages 386, 421, 432 and 436 may not be filed under seal. Apple has not demonstrated with
5 sufficient particularity why sealing is warranted.
- 6 **B. Docket No. 447-9 – Ex. L to the Gibson Declaration in Support of Apple’s Opposition**
7 **to Emblaze’s Motion to Exclude Apple’s Damages Expert**
- 8 • The proposed redactions at pages 12-15 may be filed under seal.
- 9 **C. Docket No. 463-4 – Emblaze’s Opposition to Apple’s Motion to Exclude Opinion and**
10 **Testimony of Catharine Lawton**
- 11 • Pages 4, 5 and 6 may not be filed under seal. Apple has not demonstrated with sufficient
12 particularity why sealing is warranted.
- 13 **D. Docket No. 463-8 – Ex. C to the Ferrari Declaration in Opposition to Apple’s Motion**
14 **to Exclude Opinion and Testimony of Catharine Lawton**
- 15 • The proposed redactions at pages 46-48 and 227-28 and 231-232 may be filed under seal.
 - 16 • Page 262 may not be filed under seal. Apple has not demonstrated with sufficient
17 particularity why sealing is warranted.
- 18 **E. Docket No. 463-17 – Ex. N to the Ferrari Declaration in Opposition to Apple’s Motion**
19 **to Exclude Opinion and Testimony of Catharine Lawton**
- 20 • The proposed redactions at page 7 may be filed under seal.
 - 21 • Pages 8 and 12 may not be filed under seal. Apple has not demonstrated with sufficient
22 particularity why sealing is warranted.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: July 11, 2014

25 
26 PAUL S. GREWAL
27 United States Magistrate Judge