United States District Court

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

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

ADAM BACKHAUT, et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.14-cv-02285-LHK

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND **DENYING IN PART MOTIONS TO SEAL**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 85, 93, 95, 101, 106

Before the Court are administrative motions to seal brought by Plaintiffs Adam Backhaut and Kenneth Morris ("Plaintiffs"), ECF Nos. 93, 101, and Defendant Apple, Inc. ("Defendant" or "Apple"), ECF Nos. 85, 95, 106. The parties seek to seal briefing and exhibits filed by the parties in connection with Plaintiffs' motion for class certification, ECF No. 50, and in connection with Defendant's motion for summary judgment, ECF No. 86. The Court previously denied the parties' motions to seal documents related to the motion for class certification as overbroad and for failure to satisfy the "good cause" standard. See ECF No. 90. The Court cautioned the parties that they must make a showing of "good cause" and that future sealing motions must be narrowly tailored. Id.

"Historically, courts have recognized a 'general right to inspect and copy public records

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

and documents, including judicial records and documents." Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc., 435) U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)). Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, "a strong presumption in favor of access is the starting point." Id. (internal quotation marks omitted).

Parties seeking to seal judicial records relating to dispositive motions bear the burden of overcoming the presumption with "compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings" that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure. Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1178–79. Compelling reasons justifying the sealing of court records generally exist "when such 'court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes,' such as the use of records to gratify private spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release trade secret." Id. at 1179 (quoting Nixon, 435 U.S. at 598). However, "[t]he mere fact that the production of records may lead to a litigant's embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not, without more, compel the court to seal its records." *Id.* Dispositive motions include "motions for summary judgment." Id.

Records attached to nondispositive motions are not subject to the strong presumption of access. See Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179. Because the documents attached to nondispositive motions "are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action," parties moving to seal must meet the lower "good cause" standard of Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Id.* at 1179–80 (internal quotation marks omitted). The "good cause" standard requires a "particularized showing" that "specific prejudice or harm will result" if the information is disclosed. Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210–11 (9th Cir. 2002) (internal quotation marks omitted); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). "Broad allegations of harm, unsubstantiated by specific examples of articulated reasoning" will not suffice. Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co., 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992).

In general, motions for class certification are considered nondispositive. See In re High-Tech Emp. Antitrust Litig., No. 11-CV-02509-LHK, 2013 WL 5486230, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2013) ("As Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification is a non-dispositive motion, the Court finds

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

that the parties need only demonstrate 'good cause' in order to support their requests to seal."). The Court therefore applies the "good cause" standard to the parties' requests.

Pursuant to Rule 26(c), a trial court has broad discretion to permit sealing of court documents for, inter alia, the protection of "a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1)(G). The Ninth Circuit has adopted the definition of "trade secrets" set forth in the Restatement of Torts, holding that "[a] trade secret may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it." Clark v. Bunker, 453 F.2d 1006, 1009 (9th Cir. 1972) (quoting Restatement (First) of Torts § 757 cmt. b). "Generally [a trade secret] relates to the production of goods. . . . It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business. . . . " Id. (ellipses in original). In addition, the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized that sealing may be justified to prevent judicial documents from being used "as sources of business information that might harm a litigant's competitive standing." Nixon, 435 U.S. at 598.

In addition, parties moving to seal documents must comply with the procedures established by Civil Local Rule 79-5. Pursuant to that rule, a sealing order is appropriate only upon a request that establishes the document is "sealable," or "privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law." Civ. L. R. 79-5(b). "The request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material, and must conform with Civil L.R. 79-5(d)." Id. Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), moreover, requires the submitting party to attach a "proposed order that is narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material" and that "lists in table format each document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed," as well as an "unredacted version of the document" that "indicate[s], by highlighting or other clear method, the portions of the document that have been omitted from the redacted version." Id. R. 79-5(d)(1). "Within 4 days of the filing of the Administrative Motion to File Under Seal, the Designating Party must file a declaration as required by subsection 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that all of the designated material is sealable." *Id.* R. 79-5(e)(1).

United States District Court Northern District of California

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Below, the Court applies the "good cause" standard to the parties' requests to seal documents in connection with Plaintiffs' motion for class certification and the "compelling reasons" standard to the parties' requests to seal documents in connection with Defendant's motion for summary judgment. With these standards in mind, the Court rules on the instant motions as follows:

United States District Court	forthern District of California
States 1	Distric
United	Northern

1	Motion to Seal	Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
2	85	Compelling		GRANTED as to the following proposed
3		Reasons	Summary Judgment	redactions: • Page ii, line 10
4				• Page ii, lines 13-14, subheading "d" –
				program name and last three words
5				only • Page ii, line 15
6				• Page 2
7				• Page 3
8				Page 6, line 1Page 7, lines 13-14, subheading "d" –
9				program name and last three words
				only • Page 7, lines 15-25
10				• Page 7, line 26, subheading "2" – last
11				two words only
12				Page 7, lines 27-28Page 8, lines 1-17
13				• Page 9, lines 2-3
				• Page 9, line 7 – customer name only
14				• Page 9, line 13 – customer name only
15				Page 9, line 15Page 9, line 19
16				• Page 9, line 23 – customer name only
17				• Page 9, line 25
				Page 10, lines 1-2Page 10, line 5
18				• Page 10, line 16 – customer name only
19				• Page 10, line 18
20				Page 10, line 20Page 10, lines 24-25
21				• Page 10, line 28
				• Page 11, line 10 – customer name only
22				 Page 11, lines 12-13 Page 11, line 16 – program name only
23				• Page 11, line 17
24				• Page 11, line 20
25				 Page 13, line 8 – program name only Page 16, lines 10-11
				Page 16, lines 10-11Page 16, lines 20-21
26				• Page 16, lines 25-26
27				• Page 17, lines 1-2

28

Motion to Seal	Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
85	Compelling	Declaration of Tiffany	DENIED with prejudice as to the following
	Reasons	Cheung in Support of	proposed redactions:
		Apple's Motion for Summary Judgment,	• Page 51, lines 4-13
		Exhibit 3	Page 51, lines 24-25Page 52, line 1
			• Page 75, lines 4-13
			• Page 101, lines 17-25
			• Page 102, lines 1-3
			The Court will not seal publicly available
			information, including information available on Apple's webpage and information that has
			been made public in <i>Moore v. Apple</i> .
			r
			Otherwise, GRANTED as to the proposed
	Commolling	Dealeration of Tifferen	redactions.
83	Compelling Reasons	Declaration of Tiffany Cheung in Support of	GRANTED as to the proposed redactions
	Reasons	Apple's Motion for	
		Summary Judgment,	
· -	G 111	Exhibit 4	
85	Compelling Reasons	Declaration of Tiffany Cheung in Support of	GRANTED as to the following proposed redactions:
	Reasons	Apple's Motion for	• Page 45, lines 12-25
		Summary Judgment,	• Page 95, lines 1-4
		Exhibit 5	• Page 98, line 16 – last two words only
			• Page 98, line 17 – first two words only
			• Page 98, line 19 – last word only
			Page 98, line 20Page 98, line 22 – first two words only
			 Page 38, line 22 – list two words only Page 133, line 12 – last word only
			• Page 133, line 14 – last two words only
			• Page 133, line 15 – first word only
			• Page 133, line 16 – program name only
			• Page 133, line 18 – third word only
			 Page 133, line 22 – first word only Page 133, line 25 – program name only
			rage 155, time 25 – program name only
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice. The
			Court will not seal publicly available
			information, including information that has
			been made public in <i>Moore v. Apple</i> .

1	Motion	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
	to Seal			
2	85	Compelling	Declaration of Tiffany	GRANTED as to the following proposed
3		Reasons	Cheung in Support of Apple's Motion for	redactions: • Page 28, lines 1-4
4			Summary Judgment,	• Page 28, lines 6-9
4			Exhibit 6	• Page 28, line 14
5				• Page 28, lines 17-25
6				• Page 33, lines 1-2
				Page 33, lines 5-7Page 33, lines 9-18
7				• Page 33, lines 22-24
8				• Page 59, line 1
9				• Page 59, lines 23-25
				• Page 60, lines 22-25
10				 Page 71, lines 1-8 Page 71, line 10 – last seven words
11				only
12				• Page 71, lines 13-15
				• Page 71, lines 20-25
13				Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
14	85	Compelling	Declaration of Tiffany	GRANTED as to the following redactions:
15		Reasons	Cheung in Support of	• Page 10, line 21 – Plaintiff Backhaut's
			Apple's Motion for Summary Judgment,	phone number only
16			Exhibit 7	 Page 11, line 18 – Plaintiff Backhaut's Apple ID only
17				Tapper and stary
18	0.5	G 11'	D 1 1 0 m; cc	Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
	85	Compelling Reasons	Declaration of Tiffany Cheung in Support of	GRANTED as to the following proposed redactions:
19		Reasons	Apple's Motion for	Paragraph 8 – serial number only
20			Summary Judgment,	• Paragraph 19 – serial numbers only
21			Exhibit 9	Paragraph 27 – MSISDN number only
				Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
22	85	Compelling	Declaration of Tiffany	DENIED with prejudice.
23		Reasons	Cheung in Support of	
24			Apple's Motion for Summary Judgment,	
			Exhibit 10	
25				

1	Motion to Seal	Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
2	85	Compelling	Declaration of Tiffany	GRANTED as to the proposed redactions
3		Reasons	Cheung in Support of Apple's Motion for	
4			Summary Judgment,	
5	85	Compelling	Exhibits 14-22 Declaration of Tiffany	GRANTED as to the following proposed
		Reasons	Cheung in Support of	redactions:
6			Apple's Motion for Summary Judgment,	Pages 3-5Page 6, paragraph 8, fifth bullet
7 8			Exhibit 23	Page 6, paragraph 8, last sentence – program name only
				• Page 9
9				Pages 11-13Page 14, paragraph 20
10				• Page 14, paragraph 21 – heading and
11				last three lines only • Page 14-15, paragraph 22 – program
12				name and phone number only
13				Page 14, footnote 6Pages 16-43
14				
15				Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice. The Court will not seal publicly available
16				information, including information that has been made public in <i>Moore v. Apple</i> .
17	85	Compelling	Declaration of Justin M.	GRANTED as to the following proposed redactions:
18		Reasons	Wood in Support of Apple's Motion for	• Paragraph 6
19			Summary Judgment	Paragraph 7 Paragraph 0
20				Paragraph 9Paragraph 14
				• Paragraph 15
21				Paragraph 16Paragraph 17
22				
23				Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice. The Court will not seal publicly available
24				information, including information that has been made public in <i>Moore v. Apple</i> .
25	85	Compelling	Declaration of Jeffrey J.	GRANTED as to the proposed redactions.
26		Reasons	Kohlman in Support of Apple's Motion for	
27			Summary Judgment	

Motion to Seal	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the following redactions
	Cause	Class Certification	proposed in Exhibit 16 to the Amended
			Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 94:
			• Page 2, lines 18-22
			 Page 2, line 25 – second and third words only
			• Page 3, lines 8-10 – last three lines of
			the block quote only
			• Page 3, lines 18-20
			• Page 3, lines 27-28, footnote 2 – last sentence of the proposed redaction only
			• Page 4, line 1
			• Page 4, lines 4-6
			• Page 4, lines 8-9
			• Page 4, lines 15-20
			• Page 5, lines 24-28
			• Page 6, lines 9-14
			• Page 6, lines 19-22
			• Page 6, lines 23-27
			• Page 7, lines 1-6
			• Page 7, lines 8-15
			• Page 7, lines 17-18
			• Page 7, lines 27-28, footnote 3
			• Page 8, lines 9-17
			• Page 8, line 24
			• Page 9, lines 1-4
			• Page 9, lines 7-8
			• Page 9, lines 10-22
			• Page 10, lines 14-24
			• Page 11, lines 1-10
			• Page 11, lines 13-14
			• Page 12, lines 3-4
			• Page 12, lines 8-9
			• Page 15, lines 12-13
			• Page 15, lines 15-17
			-
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.

Motion to Seal	Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the following proposed
	Cause	Class Certification, Exhibit B	redactions: • Page 44, lines 12-15
		Exmort B	• Page 158, lines 10-13
02	C 1	D1 : (:CC 2 N/ (: C	Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
93	Good Cause	Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification,	GRANTED as to the following proposed redactions:
	Cause	Exhibit C	• Page 12, lines 16-17
			• Page 44, line 1
			• Page 44, line 4 – last two words only
			• Page 44, line 5 – first word only
			 Page 44, lines 13-14 Page 44, line 20 – last two words only
			 Page 44, lines 21-23
			• Page 115, lines 2-13
			• Page 115, line 14 – last three words
			only
			• Page 115, line 15 – last five words only
			Page 115, lines 16-23Page 115, line 25
			1 age 113, line 23
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the following proposed
	Cause	Class Certification, Exhibit D	redactions: • Page 30, lines 2-6
		Exmort B	• Page 30, lines 20-22
			• Page 48, lines 2-25
			• Page 49
			• Page 50, lines 12-25
			 Page 51, lines 1-22 Page 53, line 19 – first five words only
			 Page 53, line 19 – list live words only Page 53, line 24 – second sentence only
			• Page 53, line 25
			• Page 80, lines 8-19
1			• Page 81, lines 7-25
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
	•		• •

Motion to Seal	Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the following proposed
	Cause	Class Certification,	redactions:
		Exhibit E	• Page 35, line 25
			• Page 38, lines 7-10
			• Page 40
			• Page 54, lines 1-15
			• Page 115, lines 2-13
			• Page 115, line 14 – last three words
			only
			 Page 115, line 15 – last five words onl
			• Page 115, lines 16-23
			• Page 115, line 25
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 1 to the Amended Declaration of Scot
		Exhibit F	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 2 to the Amended Declaration of Scot
		Exhibit G	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 3 to the Amended Declaration of Scot
		Exhibit M	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	DENIED with prejudice. The Court will not
	Cause	Class Certification,	seal publicly available documents.
		Exhibit N	
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 4 to the Amended Declaration of Scot
		Exhibit O	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 5 to the Amended Declaration of Scot
		Exhibit P	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
,,	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 6 to the Amended Declaration of Scott
		Exhibit Q	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
, ,	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 7 to the Amended Declaration of Scott
		Exhibit R	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
75	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 8 to the Amended Declaration of Scot
	Cause	Exhibit S	
		EAIIIUR 5	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.

Motion to Seal	Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 9 to the Amended Declaration of Scott
		Exhibit T	B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 10 to the Amended Declaration of
		Exhibit U	Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 11 to the Amended Declaration of
		Exhibit X	Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 12 to the Amended Declaration of
		Exhibit Y	Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 13 to the Amended Declaration of
		Exhibit Z	Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 14 to the Amended Declaration of
		Exhibit AA	Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the following proposed
	Cause	Class Certification,	redactions:
		Exhibit BB	• Page 78, line 8
			• Page 78, line 10 – first three words
			only
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Motion for	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Cause	Class Certification,	Exhibit 15 to the Amended Declaration of
		Exhibit DD	Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 94.
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Reply in	GRANTED as to the following redactions
	Cause	Support of Motion for	proposed in Exhibit 1 to the Amended
		Class Certification,	Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 96:
		Exhibit A	• Page 40, lines 7-8
			• Page 40, lines 10-11
			• Page 40, line 12 – first five words only
			• Page 40, lines 23-25
			• Page 51, lines 15-25
			• Page 72, line 19 – first five words only
			• Page 73, line 16 – fifth through ninth
			words only
			• Page 73, lines 19-20
			• Page 73, lines 24-25
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.

Motion	Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
to Seal			
93	Good	Plaintiffs' Reply in	DENIED with prejudice. Apple has not shown
	Cause	Support of Motion for Class Certification,	good cause for sealing the proposed document.
93	Good	Exhibit B Plaintiffs' Reply in	GRANTED as to the following proposed
	Cause	Support of Motion for	redactions:
		Class Certification	• Page 1, line 25, footnote 1
			• Page 3, lines 9-10
			 Page 3, line 25 – sixth and seventh words only
			• Page 4, lines 27-28, footnote 5
			• Page 7, lines 26-27, footnote 11
			• Page 15, lines 7-9 – last three lines of
			block quote onlyPage 15, lines 21-22
			1 ugo 13, mies 21 22
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
95	Good	Apple's Opposition to	GRANTED as to the following proposed
	Cause	Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification	redactions: • Page 4, lines 8-12
		Class Certification	 Page 4, lines 8-12 Page 14, line 9 – last eight words only
			• Page 14, lines 10-15
			• Page 14, lines 17-18
			• Page 14, lines 25-28, footnote 7
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
95	Good	Declaration of Tiffany	GRANTED as to the following proposed
	Cause	Cheung in Support of	redactions:
		Apple's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for	• Page 13, paragraph 18, fifth list entry
		Class Certification,	• Page 13, paragraph 18 – last line only
i I I		Exhibit 1	Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.

1	Motion	Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
2	to Seal 95	Good	Declaration of Tiffany	GRANTED as to the following redactions:
		Cause	Cheung in Support of	• Page 95, lines 1-4
3			Apple's Opposition to	• Page 98, line 16 – last two words only
4			Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification,	• Page 98, line 17 – first two words only
5			Exhibit 4	Page 98, line 19 – last word onlyPage 98, line 20
6				• Page 98, line 22 – first two words only
				• Page 102, line 17 – program name only
7				Page 113, lines 2-25Page 133, line 12 – last word only
8				• Page 133, line 14 – last two words only
9				• Page 133, line 15 – first word only
10				 Page 133, line 16 – program name only Page 133, line 18 – third word only
				• Page 133, line 22 – first word only
11				• Page 133, line 25 – program name only
12				Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice. The
13				Court will not seal publicly available
14				information, including information that has been made public in <i>Moore v. Apple</i> .
	95	Good	Declaration of Tiffany	GRANTED as to the following redactions:
15		Cause	Cheung in Support of	• Page 43, lines 1-11
16			Apple's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for	 Page 43, line 15 – last six words only Page 43, lines 16-18
17			Class Certification,	1 age 43, lines 10-10
18			Exhibit 5	Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice. The
				Court will not seal publicly available information, including information that has
19				been made public in <i>Moore v. Apple</i> .
20	95	Good Cause	Declaration of Tiffany Cheung in Support of	GRANTED.
21		Cause	Apple's Opposition to	
22			Plaintiffs' Motion for	
23			Class Certification, Exhibit 6	
	95	Good	Declaration of Tiffany	GRANTED.
24		Cause	Cheung in Support of Apple's Opposition to	
25			Plaintiffs' Motion for	
26			Class Certification,	
27			Exhibit 7	
<i>- 1</i>				

1 Mo 1	tion Standard	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
to S		71.1.100.1.0	
2 101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for	GRANTED as to the following redactions: • Page 38, lines 7-10
3	Reasons	Summary Judgment,	Page 38, lines /-10Page 40
4		Exhibit B	• Page 54, lines 1-15
			• Page 115, lines 2-13
5			• Page 115, line 14 – last three words only
6			 Page 115, line 15 – last five words only
,			• Page 115, lines 16-23
			• Page 115, line 25
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice. The
			Court will not seal publicly available
			information, including information that has been made public in <i>Moore v. Apple</i> .
101	Compelling	Plaintiffs' Opposition to	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Reasons	Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment,	Exhibit 1 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
		Exhibit C	B. Mullay, Let No. 103.
101	Compelling	Plaintiffs' Opposition to	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Reasons	Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment,	Exhibit 2 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
		Exhibit D	B. Mariay, Ect. No. 103.
101	Compelling	Plaintiffs' Opposition to	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Reasons	Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment,	Exhibit 3 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
		Exhibit E	
101	Compelling	Plaintiffs' Opposition to	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Reasons	Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment,	Exhibit 4 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
		Exhibit F	
101	Compelling	Plaintiffs' Opposition to	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Reasons	Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment,	Exhibit 5 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
		Exhibit G	•
101	1 0	Plaintiffs' Opposition to	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in Exhibit 6 to the Amended Declaration of Scott
	Reasons	Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment,	B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
		Exhibit H	
101	Compelling	Plaintiffs' Opposition to	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in
	Reasons	Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment,	Exhibit 7 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
		Exhibit I	, = == =

Motion to Seal	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit J	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in Exhibit 8 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit K	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in Exhibit 9 to the Amended Declaration of Scot B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit M	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in Exhibit 10 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit N	GRANTED as to the redactions proposed in Exhibit 11 to the Amended Declaration of Scott B. Murray, ECF No. 103.
101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit O	 GRANTED as to the following redactions: Page 78, line 8 Page 78, line 10 – first three words only
101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit P	Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice. GRANTED as to the following redactions: • Page 44, lines 12-15 • Page 158, lines 10-13 Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit Q	GRANTED as to the following redactions: Page 12, lines 16-17 Page 44, line 1 Page 44, line 4 – last two words only Page 44, line 5 – first word only Page 44, lines 13-14 Page 44, lines 20 – last two words only Page 44, lines 21-23
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.

Motion to Seal	<u>Standard</u>	<u>Document</u>	Ruling
101	Compelling Reasons	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit R	GRANTED as to the following proposed redactions: • Page 30, lines 2-6 • Page 30, lines 20-22 • Page 53, line 19 – first five words only • Page 53, line 24 – second sentence only • Page 53, line 25 • Page 80, lines 8-19 • Page 81, lines 7-25
			Otherwise, DENIED with prejudice.
106	Compelling Reasons	Apple's Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment	DENIED with prejudice as to the following proposed redactions: • Page 7, lines 27-28, to page 8, line 24 – footnote 3
			Otherwise, GRANTED as to the proposed redactions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 2, 2015

LUCY HE KOH

LUCY H. KOH United States District Judge