

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**  
**FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN JOSE DIVISION**

ADAPTIX, INC., )  
 ) Case No. 5:13-cv-01774-PSG  
 Plaintiff, )  
 ) **ORDER DENYING MOTION**  
 v. ) **FOR RECONSIDERATION**  
 )  
 ) **(Re: Docket No. 172)**  
 CELLCO PARTNERSHIP *d/b/a* )  
 VERIZON WIRELESS, *et al.*, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

ADAPTIX, INC., )  
 ) Case No. 5:13-cv-01776-PSG  
 Plaintiff, )  
 ) **ORDER DENYING MOTION**  
 v. ) **FOR RECONSIDERATION**  
 )  
 ) **(Re: Docket No. 202)**  
 APPLE INC., *et al.*, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

ADAPTIX, INC., )  
 ) Case No. 5:13-cv-01777-PSG  
 Plaintiff, )  
 ) **ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR**  
 v. ) **RECONSIDERATION**  
 )  
 ) **(Re: Docket No. 205)**  
 APPLE INC., *et al.* )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

ADAPTIX, INC., )  
 ) Case No. 5:13-cv-01778-PSG  
 Plaintiff, )  
 ) **ORDER DENYING MOTION**  
 v. ) **FOR RECONSIDERATION**  
 )  
 ) **(Re: Docket No. 200)**  
 AT&T, Inc., *et al.*, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

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

ADAPTIX, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP *d/b/a*  
VERIZON WIRELESS, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

)  
) Case No. 5:13-cv-01844-PSG  
)  
) **ORDER DENYING MOTION**  
) **FOR RECONSIDERATION**  
)  
) **(Re: Docket No. 191)**

ADAPTIX, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
APPLE INC., *et al.*  
Defendants.

)  
) Case No. 5:13-cv-02023-PSG  
)  
) **ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR**  
) **RECONSIDERATION**  
)  
) **(Re: Docket No. 186)**

Before the court is Plaintiff Adaptix, Inc’s motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of this court’s April 17, 2014 orders denying various administrative motions to file under seal.

All reconsideration motions big and small must pass muster under Civil L.R. 7-9(b). Adaptix seeks relief exclusively pursuant to subsection (1), which requires a moving party to establish that “a material difference in fact or law exists from that which was presented to the Court before entry of the interlocutory order for which reconsideration is sought.” The only difference Adaptix points to is its failure to comply with this district’s four-day deadline for submitting a declaration in support of any adversary’s sealing request. This plainly does not qualify; to conclude otherwise would be to effectively eliminate all deadlines in this court’s local rules.

Mindful of the impact of this plain reading of the local rule, the court has nevertheless reviewed the materials at issue. In seeking to seal whole pages of attorney correspondence and deposition transcripts that are anything but confidential, Adaptix’ request runs afoul of the requirement that any sealing request be narrowly tailored.<sup>1</sup>


<sup>1</sup> See Civil L.R. 79-5(b).

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

The motion is DENIED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 29, 2014

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL S. GREWAL  
United States Magistrate Judge