

**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 Opposition to Defendants’ Motion in Limine #4 to Preclude Plaintiff from Offering Evidence or Arguments Relating to Defendants’ Conduct During Discovery or to Google’s Unproduced Licenses along with Exhibits 1 and 2. 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. Plaintiff I/P Engine, Inc.’s Opposition to Defendants’ Motion in Limine #4 to Preclude Plaintiff from Offering Evidence or Arguments Relating to Defendants’ Conduct During Discovery or to Google’s Unproduced Licenses along with Exhibits 1 and 2
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 Opposition to Defendants' Motion in Limine #4 to Preclude Plaintiff from Offering Evidence or Arguments Relating to Defendants' Conduct During Discovery or to Google's Unproduced Licenses along with Exhibits 1 and 2 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 Opposition and Exhibits 1 and 2 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 Opposition to Defendants' Motion in Limine #4 to Preclude Plaintiff from Offering Evidence or Arguments Relating to Defendants' Conduct During Discovery or to Google's Unproduced Licenses along with Exhibits 1 and 2. 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