

EXHIBIT 1

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
NORFOLK DIVISION**

<hr/>)	
I/P ENGINE, INC.,)	
	Plaintiff,)	
	v.)	Civ. Action No. 2:11-cv-512
)	
AOL, INC. et al.,)	
	Defendants.)	
<hr/>)	

[PROPOSED] AGREED ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.’s (“I/P Engine”) Motion to Seal its Memorandum in Support its Second Motion for Discovery Sanctions Regarding Untimely Discovery Responses along with Exhibits 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13 and 14 in support. After considering the Motion to Seal, Order and related filings, the Court is of the opinion that the Motion to Seal should be granted. It is therefore ORDERED as follows:

1. Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.'s Second Motion for Discovery Sanctions Regarding Untimely Discovery Responses along with Exhibits 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13 and 14 in support

2. There are three requirements for sealing court filings: (1) public notice with an opportunity to object; (2) consideration of less drastic alternatives; and (3) a statement of specific findings in support of a decision to seal and rejecting alternatives to sealing. *See, e.g., Flexible Benefits Council v. Feldman*, No. 1:08-CV-371, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93039 (E.D. Va. Nov. 13, 2008) (citing *Ashcroft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 282, 288 (4th Cir. 2000)). This Court finds

that the Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.'s Second Motion for Discovery Sanctions Regarding Untimely Discovery Responses along with Exhibits 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13 and 14 in support may contain data that is confidential under the Protective Order entered in this matter on January 23, 2012; that public notice has been given, that no objections have been filed; that the public's interest in access is outweighed by the interests in preserving such confidentiality; and that there are no alternatives that appropriately serve these interests.

3. For the sake of consistency with practices governing the case as a whole, the Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.'s Second Motion for Discovery Sanctions Regarding Untimely Discovery Responses along with Exhibits 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13 and 14 in support shall remain sealed and be treated in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Protective Order.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Seal is granted and I/P Engine is permitted to file under seal its Memorandum in Support its Second Motion for Discovery Sanctions Regarding Untimely Discovery Responses along with Exhibits 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13 and 14 in support. The Court shall retain sealed materials until forty-five (45) days after entry of a final order. If the case is not appealed, any sealed materials should then be returned to counsel for the filing party.

Dated: September ____, 2012

Entered: ____/____/____

United States District Court
Eastern District of Virginia