

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

GSI TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
CYPRESS SEMICONDUCTOR
CORPORATION,
Defendant.

Case No. [5:11-cv-03613 EJD](#)
**ORDER RE: ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTIONS TO FILE UNDER SEAL**
Re: Dkt. Nos. 101, 151, 190, 192

Presently before the court are four administrative motions for leave to file certain matters under seal. See Docket Item Nos. 101, 151, 190, 192. On those motions, the court rules as follows:

1. Defendant’s Motion to File Under Seal Documents Designated as Confidential by Other Parties (Docket Item No. 101) is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. The motion is denied as to Page 4, Footnote 3 of Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment and as to Exhibits 81 and 82 of the Rubin Declaration in support of the Motion for Summary Judgment. The motion is also denied as to any designations from IDT, Renesas and Micron because the court is unable to locate an appropriate declaration from these parties pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5. The motion is granted in all other aspects.
2. Plaintiff’s Motion to File Under Seal Documents Designated as Confidential by Other Parties (Docket Item No. 151) is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. The

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 is denied as to any designations from Defendant, IDT and Micron because the court is unable to locate an appropriate declaration from these parties pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5. The motion is granted in all other aspects.

- 3. Plaintiff's Motion to File Under Seal its Responses to Evidentiary Objections (Docket Item No. 190) is GRANTED.
- 4. Defendant's Motion to File Under Seal portions of its opposition to Plaintiff's Request for Leave to File Responses to Evidentiary Objections (Docket Item No. 192) is DENIED because the court is unable to locate an appropriate declaration to support the designations pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5.

Because the court may have overlooked something in these extensive sealing requests, any party affected by this order may move for reconsideration on or before **October 24, 2014**, but in doing so must explain how it timely complied with all of the requirements of Civil Local Rule 79-5 for any particular designation. Failure to do so will result in the denial of any reconsideration request.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 17, 2014



EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge