

1 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
 JOSHUA A. JESSEN, SBN 222831
 2 JJessen@gibsondunn.com
 JEANA BISNAR MAUTE, SBN 290573
 3 JBisnarMaute@gibsondunn.com
 PRIYANKA RAJAGOPALAN, SBN 278504
 4 PRajagopalan@gibsondunn.com
 ASHLEY M. ROGERS, SBN 286252
 5 ARogers@gibsondunn.com
 1881 Page Mill Road
 6 Palo Alto, California 94304
 Telephone: (650) 849-5300
 7 Facsimile: (650) 849-5333

8 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
 CHRISTOPHER CHORBA, SBN 216692
 9 CChorba@gibsondunn.com
 333 South Grand Avenue
 10 Los Angeles, California 90071
 Telephone: (213) 229-7000
 11 Facsimile: (213) 229-7520

12 Attorneys for Defendant
 FACEBOOK, INC.

13
 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 16 OAKLAND DIVISION

17 MATTHEW CAMPBELL and MICHAEL
 HURLEY,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 FACEBOOK, INC.,

21 Defendant.

Case No. C 13-05996 PJH

**DECLARATION OF NIKKI STITT
 SOKOL IN SUPPORT OF THE JOINT
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL
 DOCUMENTS ACCOMPANYING CLASS
 CERTIFICATION BRIEFS AND
 EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS**

1 I, Nikki Stitt Sokol, declare as follows:

2 1. I am Associate General Counsel for Litigation for Defendant Facebook, Inc.
3 (“Facebook”). Pursuant to the Court’s instructions at the hearing on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class
4 Certification held on March 16, 2016, the Minute Order dated March 16, 2016 (Dkt. 174), Civil Local
5 Rules 7-11 and 79-5(b)-(d), and the Amended Stipulated Protective Order dated July 1, 2015
6 (Dkt. 93), I submit this Declaration in support of the information Facebook seeks to seal in the
7 parties’ Joint Administrative Motion to File Documents Accompanying Class Certification Briefs and
8 Evidentiary Objections Under Seal. The requested relief is narrowly tailored, and there are
9 compelling reasons to protect the confidentiality of certain Facebook information contained in
10 documents accompanying Facebook’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification. *See*
11 *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006); *see also In re*
12 *Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, No. 13-02430-LHK, 2013 WL 5366963, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013);
13 *Transperfect Glob., Inc. v. Motionpoint Corp.*, No. 10-2590 CW, 2013 WL 209678, at *1 (N.D. Cal.
14 Jan. 17, 2013). Except as otherwise noted, I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this
15 Declaration and, if called and sworn as a witness, could and would testify competently to them.

16 2. The Motion to Seal sets forth the documents Facebook is seeking to be sealed,
17 including the following:

18 (a) designated portions of Exhibits 2 and 5 to the Declaration of Melissa Gardner in support of
19 Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification (“Gardner Cert. Declaration”);

20 (b) designated portions of Exhibits C, D, EE, and JJ to the Declaration of Christopher Chorba
21 In Support of Defendant Facebook, Inc.’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification
22 (“Chorba Declaration”);

23 (c) designated portions of the Declaration of Alex Himel In Support of Facebook’s Opposition
24 to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification (“Himel Declaration”);

25 (d) designated portions of Exhibits MM and OO to the Himel Declaration;

26 (e) designated portions of the Declaration of Michael Adkins In Support of Facebook’s
27 Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification (“Adkins Declaration”);
28

1 (f) designated portions of the Expert Report of Dr. Benjamin Goldberg, submitted in
2 connection with Facebook’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification (“Goldberg
3 Report”);

4 (g) designated portions of the Declaration of Dan Fechete In Support of Facebook’s
5 Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification (“Fechete Declaration”);

6 (h) designated portions of Exhibit PP to the Fechete Declaration;

7 (i) Exhibits QQ, RR, SS, TT, UU, VV, WW, XX, YY, ZZ, and AAA to the Fechete
8 Declaration;

9 (j) designated portions of Exhibits 1 and 12 to the Declaration of David Slade in Support of
10 Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification (“Slade Declaration”); and

11 (k) designated portions of the Declaration of Alex Himel In Support of Facebook’s Objection
12 to and Request to Strike New Evidence and Misstatements of Fact in Plaintiffs’ Reply in Support Of
13 Their Motion For Class Certification (“Himel Declaration II”).

14 Because there are compelling reasons to permit filing this confidential information under seal,
15 the Court should grant the joint administrative motion. For the Court’s convenience, I discuss the
16 confidential information to be sealed in three categories below.

17 **Information Concerning Facebook’s Confidential Security and Anti-Abuse Systems**

18 3. There are compelling reasons to seal portions of Exhibit 2 to the Gardner Cert.
19 Declaration (Exhibit 31 to the Motion to Seal); Exhibit JJ to the Chorba Declaration (Exhibit 33 to
20 the Motion to Seal); Exhibit MM to the Himel Declaration (Exhibit 35 to the Motion to Seal); the
21 Adkins Declaration (Exhibit 37 to the Motion to Seal); and the Goldberg Report (Exhibit 39 to the
22 Motion to Seal). Specifically, the portions identified below contain non-public, confidential, and
23 proprietary Facebook business information that is protectable as a trade secret, as it concerns the
24 processes and functionality of Facebook’s confidential security and anti-abuse products and systems.
25 Facebook’s main priority is ensuring that the people who use Facebook are protected and that their
26 accounts are secure. The information that Facebook seeks to seal could be used by individuals or
27 companies that might seek to compromise the security of Facebook’s messages and other technology,
28

1 causing harm to Facebook and the people who use Facebook’s services. Facebook and its user base
 2 present an attractive target for hackers and other criminals. *See, e.g.*, Ellis Hamburger, “Inside
 3 Facebook Security: Defending Users from Spammers, Hackers, and ‘Likejackers,’” *The Verge* (May
 4 25, 2012), *available at* [http://www.theverge.com/2012/5/25/2996321/inside-facebook-likejackers-](http://www.theverge.com/2012/5/25/2996321/inside-facebook-likejackers-spammers-hackers)
 5 [spammers-hackers](http://www.theverge.com/2012/5/25/2996321/inside-facebook-likejackers-spammers-hackers). Indeed, as Facebook has previously explained in public-facing materials,
 6 Facebook does not (and cannot) share all of the specific details of how its security, spam, and abuse
 7 prevention systems operate, because this information could help provide a roadmap to hackers and
 8 others who seek to harm Facebook and people who use the service. Specifically, this information
 9 could help wrongdoers build and implement “workarounds” designed to thwart safety mechanisms.
 10 The public does not have a meaningful interest in obtaining information that could compromise the
 11 security of user accounts. Further, the public disclosure of this information would cause
 12 particularized harm to Facebook by allowing its competitors to access the specifics of Facebook’s
 13 business, which they could use to gain an unfair advantage against Facebook.

Document	Sealable Portions
Exhibit 2 to the Gardner Declaration ¹ (Ex. 31 to Mot. to Seal)	31:11-12; 31:14-22; 31:24-32:1; 32:3-6; and 32:26-28
Exhibit JJ to the Chorba Declaration ² (Ex. 33 to Mot. to Seal)	45:17-18; 45:24; 54:4; 54:13; 75:5; 75:5-76:10; 76:18; 76:19-77:6; 77:11; 77:12; 77:13; 77:13-14; 77:16; 77:17; 77:19; 77:24-25; 118:23-119:2; Errata p. 1 (lines 1-3; and Errata p. 2 (at 48:20-23; and 76:24)
Exhibit MM to the Himel Declaration (Ex. 35 to Mot. to Seal)	15:14; 15:14-17; 15:17; 15:17-18; 15:18-20; and 15:21-22

1 Facebook also redacted source code in this document (*see* pp. 6:15-18, 6:21-22; 7:9-16; 10:15-17; 10:19-20; 10:22-23; 10:25-26; 11:1-2, 11:4-6; 11:7; 12:5-6; 13:19; 14:13-14; 14:25-26; 15:4-5; 15:10-11; 15:23; 15:25; 15:27; 16:1; 16:3; 16:8; 16:13; 23:10-26; 24:1-14; 26:23-24; 27:18-24; 28:24-26; and 29:4-9), and Plaintiffs also redacted the name and Facebook ID of one of the Named Plaintiffs (*see* 28:9-10, 11, 28:12, and 28:13). Pursuant to the Court’s previous order, these redactions do not require the Court’s further approval. (Dkt. 174.)

2 Facebook also redacted source code in this document (*see* pp. 75:1; 75:3-4; 76:11; and 77:21). Pursuant to the Court’s previous order, these redactions do not require the Court’s further approval. (Dkt. 174.)

Document	Sealable Portions
Adkins Declaration ³ (Ex. 37 to Mot. to Seal)	1:7; 1:11; 1:14-17; 1:20; 1:21; 1:23; 1:24; 1:27; 2:3; 2:3-5; 2:6; 2:11; 2:14; 2:15; 2:16; 2:17-22; 2:23-27; 3:1; 3:2-3; 3:7-8; 3:9; 3:10; 3:11-12; 3:12-13; 3:14-15; 3:16; 3:18-19; 3:20-22; 3:24-27; 4:1-2; 4:3-6; 4:6-7; 4:7; 4:8-9; 4:10-11; 4:13-14; 4:17-18; 4:19; 4:21; 4:22-24; 4:24-27; 5:1-3; 5:3-5; 5:13-14; 5:18; 5:19-22; 5:22-23; 5:25-27; 6:1; 6:9-12; 6:13-16; 6:17; 6:18-19; 6:21-27; 7:1; 7:2; 7:3; 7:4; 7:5-6; 7:7-8; 7:9-11; 7:14-16; 7:17-19; 7:24-26; 8:8-10; 8:11-15; and 8:17-21
Goldberg Report ⁴ (Ex. 39 to Mot. to Seal)	¶ 102

Information Concerning Facebook’s Documentation of Changes to Source Code

4. There are compelling reasons to seal Exhibits QQ, RR, SS, TT, UU, VV, WW, XX, YY, ZZ, and AAA to the Fehete Declaration (Exhibits 31-51 to the Motion to Seal) in their entirety, and designated portions of Exhibit OO to the Himel Declaration (Exhibit 52 to the Mot. to Seal), as identified in the chart below. Specifically, the documents contain “Diffs” (or “differentials”) that constitute non-public, confidential, and proprietary Facebook source code and Facebook internal documentation of changes to source code. This information effectively demonstrates Facebook’s source code functionality that is protectable as a trade secret. Facebook treats this information in these documents as a valuable trade secret, given that it has invested millions of dollars in conjunction with the development of this code, including by providing it with the highest level of protection and security within Facebook. Most importantly, such information relates to code utilizing information about user activity on Facebook and could be used by individuals or companies that might seek to compromise the security of that information and technology, causing harm to Facebook and the people who use Facebook’s services. The public does not have a meaningful interest in obtaining such information. The public disclosure of this information would cause particularized

³ Facebook also redacted source code in this document (*see* pp. 3:9; 4:16; 4:21; 4:22). Pursuant to the Court’s previous order, these redactions do not require the Court’s approval. (Dkt. 174.)

⁴ Facebook also redacted source code in this document (*see* ¶¶ 33, 34, 35, 36, 40 41, 45, 46, 50, and 56). Pursuant to the Court’s previous order, these redactions do not require the Court’s approval. (Dkt. 174.)

1 harm to Facebook by allowing its competitors to access Facebook’s source code, which they could
2 use to gain an unfair advantage against Facebook.

Document	Sealable Portions
Exhibit OO to the Himel Declaration (Ex. 52 to Mot. to Seal)	Exhibits A through G

6 **Information Concerning Names of Internal Tables in Facebook’s Databases**

7 5. There are compelling reasons to seal portions of Exhibit 5 to the Gardner Cert.
8 Declaration (Exhibit 54 to the Motion to Seal); Exhibits C, D, and EE to the Chorba Declaration
9 (Exhibits 56, 58, and 60 to the Motion to Seal); the Himel Declaration (Exhibit 62 to the Motion to
10 Seal); the Goldberg Report (Exhibit 39 to the Motion to Seal); the Fechete Declaration (Exhibit 64 to
11 the Motion to Seal); Exhibit PP to the Fechete Declaration (Exhibit 66 to the Motion to Seal);
12 Exhibits 1 and 12 to the Slade Declaration (Exhibits 69 and 70 to the Motion to Seal); and the Himel
13 Declaration II (Exhibit 72 to the Motion to Seal), as identified in the chart below. Specifically, these
14 materials reflect names of internal tables in Facebook’s databases, which contain (or may have
15 contained) sensitive data and constitute non-public, confidential, and proprietary Facebook business
16 information that is protectable as a trade secret. This information constitutes a trade secret because it
17 could be used by individuals or companies that might seek to compromise the security of Facebook’s
18 messages and other technology, causing significant harm to Facebook and the people who use
19 Facebook’s services. The internal table names—and the databases in which they exist—are
20 referenced within Facebook’s proprietary source code and indicate both the schema for Facebook’s
21 internal databases (i.e., how they are structured) and—more importantly—where particular data or
22 types of data are (or were) stored. As indicated in paragraph 3 above, Facebook and its user base
23 present an attractive target for criminals and others with malicious intentions. Accordingly, revealing
24 the table names could provide a roadmap that would assist an unauthorized individual who illicitly
25 obtained access to Facebook’s internal systems in determining where sensitive data—including user
26 information—is (or was) stored, how it is (or was) stored, and how to access it. Limiting access to
27 user data and respecting the privacy and sensitivity of such data are extremely important and of
28

1 paramount importance within Facebook, as well as to the public. Accordingly, the public does not
 2 have a meaningful interest in obtaining such information. Moreover, the public disclosure of this
 3 information also would cause particularized harm to Facebook by allowing its competitors to access
 4 the details of Facebook’s internal tools, which they could use to gain an unfair advantage against
 5 Facebook.

Document	Sealable Portions
Exhibit 5 to the Gardner Declaration ⁵ (Ex. 54 to Mot. to Seal)	232:14
Exhibit C to the Chorba Declaration (Ex. 56 to Mot. to Seal)	pp. 4, 8
Exhibit D to the Chorba Declaration (Ex. 58 to Mot. to Seal)	pp. 4, 7
Exhibit EE to the Chorba Declaration ⁶ (Ex. 60 to Mot. to Seal)	293:6; 292:23; 293:6; 293:7, 293:17; 294:6; 295:16; 295:22; 296:4; 342:19; 342:21; 343:9; and 343:14
Himel Declaration ⁷ (Ex. 62 to Mot. to Seal)	ii.13; ii.14; ii.14; 1:9; 13:22; 13:25; 13:27; 14:3; 14:5; 14:5; 14:10; 14:17; 14:18; 14:19; 14:22; 14:26; 15:2; 15:2; 15:9; and 19:24
Goldberg Report ⁸ (Ex. 39 to Mot. to Seal)	Table of Contents at 24, 30; ¶ 9; Heading “B” at p. 24; ¶ 43; ¶ 44; Subheading 2 at p. 30; ¶ 56; Bullet 1 on p. 36; ¶ 80; and ¶ 101;
Fechete Declaration ⁹ (Ex. 64 to Mot. to Seal)	5:4; 5:5; 5:7; 5:9; 5:10; 5:12; 6:22; 6:23; 6:24; 7:1; 7:4; 7:4; 9:1; 9:8; 9:12; 9:13; 10:5; 10:5; 11:8; 11: 15; and 11:15

19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

⁵ Facebook also redacted names of non-parties (specifically, Facebook employees) (*see* pp. 226:5; 230:22), and the Facebook ID of a non-party (specifically, a Facebook employee) (*see* p. 270:3) in this document. Pursuant to the Court’s previous order, these redactions do not require the Court’s further approval. (Dkt. 174.)

⁶ Facebook also redacted source code (*see* pp. 294:4; 305:20; 307:22; 308:5) and the names of non-parties (specifically, Facebook employees) (*see* pp. 152:5; 152:9; 153:1; 153:3; 175:8; 175:16; 176:11; 176:12; 176:13; 176:18; 177:5; 177:13; 227:19; 227:21; 285:17; 288:14; 292:21; and 293:1) in this document. Pursuant to the Court’s previous order, these redactions do not require the Court’s further approval. (Dkt. 174.)

⁷ Facebook also redacted source code (*see* pp. 14:5) in this document. Pursuant to the Court’s previous order, this redaction does not require the Court’s further approval. (Dkt. 174.)

⁸ As indicated in Footnote 4, Facebook also redacted source code in this document.

⁹ Facebook also redacted source code (*see* pp. 4 n.2 and 4 n.3) in this document. Pursuant to the Court’s previous order, these redactions do not require the Court’s further approval. (Dkt. 174.)

Document	Sealable Portions
Exhibit PP to the Fechete Declaration (Ex. 66 to Mot. to Seal)	p. 1 at ***
Exhibit 1 to the Slade Declaration ¹⁰ (Ex. 68 to Mot. to Seal)	i.9; 9:25; 10:20; 11:8; 11:9; 11:12; 11:18; 11:18; 11:19; 12:13; 12:20; 12:22; 12:25; 13:3; and 13:6
Exhibit 12 to the Slade Declaration (Ex. 70 to Mot. to Seal)	139:1; 139:5; 139:8; 139:11; 140:1; 140:2; 140:4; 140:16; 140:18; 141:8; 142:1; 142:19; 143:1; 144:9; and 143:13
Himel Declaration II (Ex. 72 to Mot. to Seal)	2:9; 2:11; 2:19; 2:20; 2:23; 2:24; and 2:24

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I executed this Declaration in Menlo Park, California on March 28, 2016.

/s/ *Nikki Stitt Sokol*
Nikki Stitt Sokol

¹⁰ The document also contains redactions by both Facebook and Plaintiffs that do not require the Court's further approval (*see* Dkt. 174), because Facebook's redactions are of source code (*see* pp. 8:2; 11:19; 12:1-3; 12:5; 12:6; 12:8-11; and 12:22), and Plaintiffs' redaction is of the Facebook ID of one of the Named Plaintiffs (*see* pp. 2:13).

1 **ATTORNEY ATTESTATION**

2 I, Christopher Chorba, attest that concurrence in the filing of this Declaration of Nikki Stitt
3 Sokol has been obtained from the signatory. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the
4 United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 28th day of March
5 2016, in Los Angeles, California.

6
7 Dated: March 28, 2016

/s/ Christopher Chorba
Christopher Chorba