Microsoft Corporation v. I	mmersion	Corporation
----------------------------	----------	-------------

	The Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez	
UNITED STATES I WESTERN DISTRICT		
MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington corporation, Plaintiff, v.) No. CV07 936RSM) IMMERSION CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO	
IMMERSION CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, Defendant.) SEAL ORIGINAL COMPLAINT))))	

Immersion Corporation has not yet responded to the Complaint in this action, but specially appears to respond briefly to Microsoft's Motion to Seal Original Complaint. The request to seal should be granted, but the body of Microsoft's motion regrettably misstates the pertinent background.

When Microsoft filed its original complaint in this case on June 18, 2007, it elected to include in its allegations confidential financial terms of an agreement between Immersion Corporation and Sony Computer Entertainment, Inc. and Sony Computer Entertainment America, Inc. Immersion had previously given this information to Microsoft only after Microsoft expressly agreed in writing to preserve it as confidential and not further disseminate it. When Immersion learned of the public filing of the Complaint containing the confidential information, Immersion promptly informed Microsoft by letter that its public disclosure of this

IMMERSION CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SEAL ORIGINAL COMPLAINT (CV07 936RSM) - 1

BYRNES & KELLER LLP 38th Floor 1000 Second Avenue Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 622-2000

Dockets.Justia.com

sensitive financial information violated the express terms of the confidentiality agreement that Microsoft signed on May 11, 2007–the agreement that enabled Microsoft to learn the information. After Immersion raised the confidentiality agreement, Microsoft then filed an Amended Complaint that deleted the information. Microsoft also filed a "Motion to Seal Original Complaint." But rather than point out to the Court that Microsoft's original Complaint unnecessarily contained confidential information that Microsoft itself expressly agreed would receive confidential treatment, Microsoft uses its own misconduct as an opportunity to improperly pre-argue the merits of the case. In doing so, Microsoft completely ignores its own violation of the parties' confidentiality agreement, the basis for Immersion's raising the confidentiality point.

Microsoft specifically agreed that Immersion's agreement with Sony, and the confidential information therein, would only be used "subject to an appropriate confidentiality agreement or court order that may be negotiated or otherwise entered." As a result, the information should not have been included in the original Complaint and should be sealed. Microsoft's Motion to Seal arises only because Microsoft disregarded this agreement. There is no issue regarding the public policy of settlement agreements. Indeed, whether Immersion's agreement with Sony constitutes a 'settlement of the Sony Lawsuit' under the terms of the Microsoft-Immersion contract at issue in this lawsuit is one of the core questions to be litigated in this case. Those questions will be addressed at the appropriate time and in the appropriate context. This, however, is neither the appropriate time nor context, and it was inappropriate for Microsoft to use its own failure to abide by the confidentiality agreement as an opportunity to try to "condition" the court to its position regarding the sharply contested core issue of whether Immersion's agreement with Sony was a "settlement" within the terms and meaning of the applicable agreements between Immersion and Microsoft. Microsoft also lodges an overreaching proposed order that it no doubt intends to point to later in the case, when the Court has not yet had any opportunity -- nor cause -- to have any involvement in the merits of the case.

IMMERSION CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SEAL ORIGINAL COMPLAINT (CV07 936RSM) - 2

BYRNES & KELLER LLP 38th Floor 1000 Second Avenue Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 622-2000

1

1	There is no question, though, that the original Complaint that unnecessarily and		
2	improperly contained competitively sensitive information regarding Immersion should be		
3	sealed. A revised proposed order is lodged herewith for the convenience of the Court.		
4	DATED this 28th day of June, 2007.		
5	BYRNES & KELLER	LLP	
6			
7	By <u>/s/ Bradley S. Kell</u>	er	
8	Bradley S. Keller, 1000 Second Aven Seattle, WA 9810	nue, Suite 3800	
9	Telephone: (206) 6 Facsimile: (206) 6	522-2000	
10	<u>bkeller@byrneske</u> Attorneys for Immersi	ller.com	
11	Anomeys jor minersi	on Corporation	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
	IMMERSION CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SEAL ORIGINAL COMPLAINT (CV07 936RSM) - 3	BYRNES & KELLER LLP 38th Floor 1000 Second Avenue Seattle, Washington 98104	

(206) 622-2000

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE			
2	The undersigned attorney certifies that on the 28th day of June, 2007, I electronically			
3	filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:			
4	Paul J. Kundtz (<u>pkundtz@riddellwilliams.com</u>) Blake Marks-Dias (<u>bmarksdias@riddellwilliams.com</u>)			
5	Wendy E. Lyon (<u>wlyon@riddellwilliams.com</u>			
6	Riddell Williams P.S. 1001 Fourth Avenue Plaza			
7	Suite 4500 Seattle, WA 98154-3600			
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
9				
10	<u>/s/Bradley S. Keller, WSBA #10665</u> Byrnes & Keller LLP			
11	1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor			
12	Seattle, WA 98104 Telephone: (206) 622-2000			
13	Facsimile: (206) 622-2522 bkeller@byrneskeller.com			
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
	IMMERSION CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S BYRNES & KELLER LLP MOTION TO SEAL ORIGINAL COMPLAINT (CV07 936RSM) - 4 38th Floor 1000 Second Avenue 1000 Second Avenue Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 622-2000			