

1 On February 14, 2013, the court granted the parties' request for an extension until February
2 20, 2013 to file the thousands of documents that the court found should not be sealed,³ and on
3 February 15, 2013, Apple filed a renewed motion to seal certain financial documents, presumably
4 with more details about how its request meets the good cause standard for the nondispositive
5 motions to which the documents were attached.⁴

6 The stipulation the court granted on February 14, 2013 included an agreement between the
7 parties that they would have to file only documents that were not the subject of either the renewed
8 motions to seal or motions to stay the February 1 order.⁵ Apple thus assumed that the stipulation
9 the court granted on February 14, 2013 exempted documents that were the subject of the renewed
10 motions to seal from the new February 20 deadline to comply with the court's February 1 order.⁶
11 Samsung, on the other hand, moved to stay the court's order regarding those documents pending
12 the court's resolution of its renewed motion to seal,⁷ and the court granted that request on February
13 19, 2013.⁸ Apple, concerned that it had misunderstood its obligations, likewise moved to stay the
14 February 1 order on much the same grounds as Samsung's earlier request.⁹

15
16
17 Regardless of whether Apple's or Samsung's motions to stay really were necessary given
18 the court's February 14 order, the court repeats here that it finds a stay pending resolution of the
19 renewed motions appropriate. As the court noted in its order granting Samsung's request for a
20 stay, part of its reasoning for denying the previous motions to seal stemmed from the parties'

21 _____
22 ³ See Docket No. 2227.

23 ⁴ See Docket No. 2228.

24 ⁵ See Docket No. 2227.

25 ⁶ See Docket No. 2233.

26 ⁷ See Docket No. 2230.

27 ⁸ See Docket No. 2232.

28 ⁹ See Docket No. 2233.

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

failure to provide sufficient showings of particularized harm if the documents were disclosed.¹⁰
Apple, like Samsung, represents that its renewed motion cures that deficiency, and so the court
finds that a stay pending the court's consideration of the renewed motion is warranted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 20, 2013


PAUL S. GREWAL
United States Magistrate Judge

¹⁰ See Docket No. 2232.