

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

PA ADVISORS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:07-CV-480 (DF)

ORDER

Currently before the Court is the Parties' Opposed Motion for Protective Order. Dkt. No. 175. The Court held a hearing on this matter on October 6, 2008. The parties agree, for the most part, on the content of the protective order, but disagree as to where source code inspection should take place and how much notice should be required beforehand. The Court will enter Plaintiff's Proposed Protective Order for the reasons set forth below.

The Court finds that judicial economy and efficiency favor having source code inspection in Dallas, Texas with a 24-hour notice requirement. This method of inspection was acceptable to the very same defendants in another matter that involves substantially the same technology and source code at issue in this case. *See Polaris IP, LLC v. Google, Inc., et. al.*, No. 2:07-CV-371 (Dkt. No. 134). Further, the same expert is being used in this case as in the *Polaris* matter; it makes sense for that expert to inspect the source code once, making a trip to California unnecessary. In sum, the Defendants fail to justify source code inspection procedures different from that in the *Polaris* matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 7th day of October, 2008.



DAVID FOLSOM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE