

Exhibit 1

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Norfolk Division**

I/P ENGINE, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 2:11-cv-512

AOL INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

[PROPOSED] ORDER TO MAINTAIN PORTIONS OF DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL

On this day came Defendants Google, Inc. ("Google") and IAC Search & Media, Inc. ("IAC Search"), by counsel, upon the Notice of Filing of Certain Unredacted and Further Redacted Materials in Response to Order to Show Cause ("Response to Show Cause"), and, upon consideration of the arguments set forth in the Notice, and for good cause shown, it is

ORDERED that the unredacted versions of Exhibits K and L to the Declaration of Emily C. O'Brien (Dkt. No. 106) in Support of Defendants' Brief in Support of its Motion to Compel Plaintiff to Supplement its Infringement Contentions ("Brief in Support of Motion to Compel") and the unredacted version of the Brief in Support of the Motion to Compel attached to the Defendants' Response to Show Cause shall be filed; and it is further

ORDERED that portions of the following documents be maintained under seal in connection with the pending motions they support:

ECF No. 106-13 – Exhibit M to the Declaration of Emily O'Brien in Support of Defendant Google Inc.'s and IAC Search & Media, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Plaintiff to Supplement its Infringement Contentions

ECF No. 106-14 – Exhibit N to the Declaration of Emily O'Brien in Support of Defendant Google Inc.'s and IAC Search & Media, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Plaintiff to Supplement its Infringement Contentions

The further redacted versions of Exhibit M and Exhibit N attached to Google's and IAC Search's Response to Show Cause shall be filed. The defendants have redacted these materials to seal only a narrow portion of information that should be protected. The Court finds that appropriate notice has been given and that these further redacted versions of Exhibits M and N contain sensitive information that: (1) has not been made public; (2) has economic value; and (3) if disclosed, could cause competitive harm. The Court further finds that there are no less drastic alternatives to sealing these further redacted materials in accordance with *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 282 (4th Cir. 2000).

Dated: May ____, 2012

Entered: ____/____/____

United States District Court
Eastern District of Virginia