

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
 Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)
 2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com
 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
 3 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
 4 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

5 Kevin P.B. Johnson (Bar No. 177129)
 kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com
 6 Victoria F. Maroulis (Bar No. 202603)
 victoriamaroulis@quinnemanuel.com
 7 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
 Redwood Shores, California 94065-2139
 8 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100
 9

10 Michael T. Zeller (Bar No. 196417)
 michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com
 11 865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90017
 12 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100
 13

14 Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,
 LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
 15 INC. and SAMSUNG
 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC
 16

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION
 19

20 APPLE INC., a California corporation,

21 Plaintiff,

22 vs.

23 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a
 Korean business entity; SAMSUNG
 24 ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New
 York corporation; SAMSUNG
 25 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,
 LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,
 26

27 Defendant.
 28

CASE NO. 11-cv-01846-LHK

**SAMSUNG’S ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A
 REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTIONS TO
 SEAL; AND REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
 MOTIONS TO SEAL**

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

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY

In accordance with Northern District of California Civil Local Rule 7-11, Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC (collectively, "Samsung") respectfully move the Court for leave to file this Reply in Support of its Renewed Administrative Motion to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. No. 1490) and Motion to Seal Trial Exhibits (Dkt. No. 1488).

Third party Reuters America LLC filed a lengthy response opposing all pending motions to seal filed by Samsung, Apple, and various third parties, and 4 supporting declarations. (Dkt. No. 1556-1567.) Reuters' Opposition and Declarations in support thereof raise numerous new issues that were not contained in any prior briefs filed by Reuters.

In light of the extremely sensitive nature of the documents at issue and the harmful implications of disclosure to Samsung, Samsung respectfully requests that the Court grant this motion so that Samsung may have a fair opportunity to respond to Reuters' contentions.

DATED: August 3, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

By /s/ Victoria F. Maroulis
Charles K. Verhoeven
Kevin P.B. Johnson
Victoria F. Maroulis
Michael T. Zeller
Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,
LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC. and SAMSUNG
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC

1 Notwithstanding the potentially innocent public uses for the highly-sensitive information
2 Samsung seeks to seal, no amount of public interest can overcome the compelling reason to seal
3 that exists when a party's confidential information could be used improperly by competitors.
4 Reuters does not contest the case law presented on this issue. *See, e.g., Bean v. John Wiley &*
5 *Sons, Inc.*, No. CV 11–08028–PCT–FJM, 2012 WL 1078662, at *6-7 (D. Ariz. Mar. 30, 2012)
6 (production information and “precise revenue information results” and “exact sales and production
7 numbers” which could be used by competitors to calibrate their pricing and distribution methods
8 to undercut defendant also provide compelling reasons for sealing) and *Bauer Bros. LLC v. Nike,*
9 *Inc.*, No. 09cv500–WQH–BGS, 2012 WL 1899838, at *3-4 (S.D. Cal. May 24, 2012) (revenues
10 per product, revenue reductions, merchandise costs, royalty costs, promotional costs, personnel
11 costs, and costs of goods sold are sealable when a company’s business competitors could use the
12 information to replicate the company’s business practices).

13 Rather than addressing this on-point authority, Reuters makes three unsuccessful
14 arguments. First, Reuters cites to *Fraley v. Facebook*, Case no. 11-cv-01726-RS, Document 217
15 at 2:19-25 (N.D. Cal. Aug 1, 2012) (Order Denying Motion for Class Certification, Without
16 Prejudice; Denying Request to Expand List of Potential Cy Pres Recipients, Requiring Further
17 Meet and Confer Negotiations re: Sealing Motions) for the dicta that “it is far from apparent”
18 whether “relevant financial data” and information about how a Facebook feature worked “may
19 warrant sealing” on a motion for preliminary approval of a settlement. (Opp. at 3.) Judge
20 Seeborg did not evaluate whether any financial information qualified for sealing; he merely
21 suggested what this Court and the parties know – that not every type of financial information is
22 sealable. Samsung does not seek to seal every type of financial information at issue in this
23 litigation. The requests here, as explained fully in Samsung’s motions and supporting
24 declarations, are far narrower.

25 Next, Reuter accuses Samsung's supporting declarations of being “conclusory and lacking
26 in helpful specifics.” (Opp. at 4.) However, Reuters does not identify which declaration is
27 purportedly deficient or what information it claims is missing, nor can it. Samsung's declarations
28

1 describe in detail the documents Samsung seeks to seal and the competitive harm that would result
2 if the information were made public.

3 Finally, Reuters argues that “all of the cases on which the parties rely” are distinguishable
4 because no third party intervened requesting public access. (Opp. at 12.) Reuters' rationale
5 appears to be either that courts apply a different standard when third parties intervene, or that no
6 case law regarding sealing can be relied upon unless a third party has intervened. Either way,
7 Reuters is wrong. Tellingly, Reuters does not cite a single authority for the proposition that the
8 test for sealing highly-sensitive information somehow changes when a third party intervenes. As
9 this Court has recognized multiple times, the test is whether compelling reasons exist that
10 outweigh the public’s interest in disclosure, not whether a third party intervenes to compel
11 disclosure. See, e.g. Dkt. No. 1256 at 2; Dkt. No. 1269 at 2; see also *Kamakana v. City and*
12 *County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006); *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435
13 U.S. 589, 598 - 608 (1978) (holding that Warner Communications, a third party to the original
14 litigation, did not have a right to access the tapes at issue.)

15 When the Court considers the overwhelming amount of knowledge the public has already
16 received and will receive during the trial regarding Samsung's products, patents and business
17 practices, contrasted with Samsung's narrow sealing requests, whatever public interest there could
18 possibly be in Samsung sales figures, manufacturing costs, operating expenses, operating profit,
19 gross margins, and granular product-by-product costs and profits information, if any, is far
20 outweighed by the compelling business need for confidentiality.

21 **II. REUTERS AGREES WITH SAMSUNG’S PROPOSED TREATMENT OF**
22 **SOURCE CODE AND BUSINESS PLAN TRIAL EXHIBITS**

23 Samsung seeks to seal only the actual source code that is introduced into evidence in Trial
24 Exhibit 31, and not testimony or documents discussing the source code. (Dkt. No. 1488, at 5, 6.)
25 Reuters does not oppose this reasonable and narrowly tailored request. (Opp. at 17:26-28.)

26 In addition, Reuters does not oppose Samsung’s request to exclude from evidence and the
27 public record portions of certain documents that are not shown to the jury.

28

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

Conclusion

Samsung’s renewed motion to seal pre-trial exhibits pursuant to the Court’s July 17 order (Dkt. No. 1256) requests the sealing of only portions of 15 documents. Samsung’s motion to seal trial exhibits requests the sealing of 4 documents in their entirety and portions of only 5 documents. Of the thousands of documents filed with the court, and the millions of pages of documents produced by the parties, this very narrowly tailored request demonstrates Samsung’s commitment to making this an “open trial” pursuant to this Court’s prior statements.

Therefore, Samsung respectfully requests that the Court grant its motions to seal.

DATED: August 5, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

By /s/ Victoria F. Maroulis

Charles K. Verhoeven
Kevin P.B. Johnson
Victoria F. Maroulis
Michael T. Zeller
Attorneys for SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,
LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC. and SAMSUNG
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC