UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA NORFOLK DIVISION

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

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT I/P ENGINE'S MOTION TO SEAL I/P ENGINE, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ALONG WITH EXHIBITS 2-8, 11-19, 22-24, 27-32, 34-39, 45, 53-54, 56

In support of its Motion to Seal pursuant to Local Rule 5, Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc. ("I/P Engine") states the following:

- 1. I/P Engine moves the Court for leave to file under seal its Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment along with Exhibits 8, 11-19, 22-24, 27-32, 34-39, 45, 53-54, 56. The afore-mentioned contain information that is marked as confidential by Defendants under the Protective Order entered in this matter on January 23, 2012 (D.I. No. 85) ("Protective Order").
- 2. There are three requirements for sealing court findings: (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)). I/P Engine's

Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment along with Exhibits 8, 11-19, 22-24,

27-32, 34-39, 45, 53-54, 56 contains information that is marked by Defendants as confidential.

An in camera copy of the afore-mentioned is being provided to the Court. In light of

Defendant's representation that this is confidential material under the Protective Order, there

appears to be no alternative that appropriately serves Defendants' confidentiality concerns.

3. The information contained in the Memorandum and these Exhibits contains

Google's proprietary and confidential information.

4. For the sake of consistency with practices governing the case as a whole, I/P

Engine believes the Memorandum and these Exhibits should remain sealed and be treated in

accordance with the terms and conditions of the Protective Order.

5. Accordingly, and in satisfaction of the requirements of Local Rule 5, I/P Engine

respectfully asks the Court to enter the Proposed Agreed Order sealing its Opposition to

Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment along with Exhibits 8, 11-19, 22-24, 27-32, 34-39,

45, 53-54, 56.

Dated: September 26th 2012

By: /s/ Jeffrey K. Sherwood

Donald C. Schultz (Virginia Bar No. 30531)

W. Ryan Snow (Virginia Bar No. 47423)

CRENSHAW, WARE & MARTIN PLC

150 West Main Street

Norfolk, VA 23510

Telephone: (757) 623-3000

Facsimile: (757) 623-5735

Jeffrey K. Sherwood (Virginia Bar No. 19222)

Frank C. Cimino, Jr.

Kenneth W. Brothers

DeAnna Allen

Charles J. Monterio, Jr.

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

2

DSMDB-3099624

1825 Eye Street, NW Washington, DC 20006 Telephone: (202) 420-2200

Facsimile: (202) 420-2201

Counsel for Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 26th day of September, 2012, the foregoing

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT I/P ENGINE'S MOTION TO SEAL I/P ENGINE,

INC.'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

ALONG WITH EXHIBITS 2-8, 11-19, 22-24, 27-32, 34-39, 45, 53-54, 56, was served via the

Court's CM/ECF system and via Hand Delivery, on the following:

Stephen Edward Noona Kaufman & Canoles, P.C. 150 W Main St Suite 2100 Norfolk, VA 23510 senoona@kaufcan.com

David Bilsker
David Perlson
Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
davidbilsker@quinnemanuel.com
davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Robert L. Burns
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
Two Freedom Square
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190
robert.burns@finnegan.com

Cortney S. Alexander Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP 3500 SunTrust Plaza 303 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 94111 cortney.alexander@finnegan.com

/s/ Jeffrey K. Sherwood