

1 George C. Lombardi (*pro hac vice*)
glombardi@winston.com
2 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
35 West Wacker Drive
3 Chicago, IL 60601-9703
Telephone: (312) 558-5600
4 Facsimile: (312) 558-5700

Dustin J. Edwards (*pro hac vice*)
dedwards@winston.com
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
800 Capitol St., Suite 2400
Houston, TX 77002-2925
Telephone: (713) 651-2600
Facsimile: (713) 651-2700

5 E. Danielle T. Williams (*pro hac vice*)
dwilliams@winston.com
6 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
300 South Tryon Street, 16th Floor
7 Charlotte, NC 28202
Telephone: (704) 350-7700
8 Facsimile: (704) 350-7800

Diana Hughes Leiden (SBN: 267606)
dhleiden@winston.com
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
333 S. Grand Avenue, 38th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543
Telephone: (213) 615-1700
Facsimile: (213) 615-1750

9 Michael S. Elkin (*pro hac vice*)
melkin@winston.com
10 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
200 Park Avenue
11 New York, NY 10166
Telephone: (212) 294-6700
12 Facsimile: (212) 294-4700

13 *Attorneys for Defendants*
14 BANK OF AMERICA
CORPORATION
and BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
17 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

18 NantWorks, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company, and NANT
19 HOLDINGS IP, LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 vs.

22 BANK OF AMERICA
23 CORPORATION, a Delaware
corporation, and BANK OF AMERICA,
24 N.A., a national banking association,

25 Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-CV-7872-GW-PVC

**DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED
APPLICATION TO FILE
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL IN
CONNECTION WITH
DEFENDANTS' OF MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
OF NON- INFRINGEMENT FOR
THE ASSERTED CLAIM OF THE
ASSERTED PATENTS.**

Local Rule 79-5.2.2(b)

[Filed concurrently with Declaration of
Danielle Williams and Proposed Order]

1 TO THE COURT, PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to Local Rule 79-5.2.2.(b),
 3 Defendants Bank of America Corporation and Bank of America, N.A. (collectively,
 4 “Defendants” or “Bank of America”), hereby request that this Court enter an order
 5 permitting them to file under seal the materials described below that are filed in
 6 connection with Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-
 7 infringement of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents:

Document Description	Nature of Information to be Sealed
10 Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Danielle 11 Williams in Support of the Defendants’ 12 Motion for Partial Summary Judgment 13 of Non-infringement of the Asserted 14 Claims of the Asserted Patents	Designated by Plaintiffs in its entirety as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” and “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE,” and contains excerpts of documents designated by Bank of America and third-party Mitek as “Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes Only.” Plaintiffs and Mitek do not oppose sealing this exhibit in its entirety.
20 Exhibit 2 to the Declaration of Danielle 21 Williams in Support of Defendants’ 22 Motion for Partial Summary Judgment 23 of Non-infringement of the Asserted 24 Claims of the Asserted Patents	Designated by Defendants as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” under the parties’ stipulated protective orders (Dkt. Nos. 102, 210).
25 Exhibit 3 to the Declaration of Danielle 26 Williams in Support of Defendants’ 27 Motion for Partial Summary Judgment	Designated by Defendants as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY” under the parties’

Document Description	Nature of Information to be Sealed
of Non-infringement of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents	stipulated protective orders (Dkt. Nos. 102, 210).
Exhibit 4 to the Declaration of Danielle Williams in Support of Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-infringement of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents	Designated by Defendants' in its entirety as "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" and "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – SOURCE CODE," and contains excerpts of documents designated by Bank of America and third-party Mitek as "Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes Only." Plaintiffs and Mitek do not oppose sealing this exhibit in its entirety.
Exhibit 5 to the Declaration of Danielle Williams in Support of Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-infringement of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents	Designated by Defendants as "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" under the parties' stipulated protective orders (Dkt. Nos. 102, 210).
Exhibit 6 to the Declaration of Danielle Williams in Support of Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-infringement of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents	Designated by Defendants as "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" under the parties' stipulated protective orders (Dkt. Nos. 102, 210).
Exhibit 7 to the Declaration of Danielle Williams in Support of Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-infringement of the Asserted	Designated by third-party Mitek as "Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes Only." Plaintiffs and Mitek do not oppose sealing this exhibit in its entirety.

Document Description	Nature of Information to be Sealed
Claims of the Asserted Patents	
Exhibit 8 to the Declaration of Danielle Williams in Support of Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-infringement of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents	Designated by Defendants in its entirety as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY.” Plaintiffs do not oppose sealing this exhibit in its entirety.
Exhibit 9 to the Declaration of Danielle Williams in Support of Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-infringement of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents	Designated by Defendants in its entirety as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY.” Plaintiffs do not oppose sealing this exhibit in its entirety.
Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-infringement of the Asserted Claims of the Asserted Patents	Designated by Defendants in its entirety as “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY.” Plaintiffs do not oppose sealing this exhibit in its entirety.

I. Background

As set forth in the Declaration of Danielle Williams in Support of Defendants’ Application to File Under Seal submitted herewith, Defendants make this application because the foregoing documents are marked and designated as “Highly Confidential – Attorneys Eyes Only” and/or “Highly Confidential – Source Code” as follows pursuant to the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order (Dkt. No. 210). *See* Declaration of Danielle Williams (the “Williams Decl.”), ¶¶ 2–10. Defendants make this application because (i) materials nos. 2–7, 9–10 contain information that is “Highly Confidential – Attorneys Eyes Only” and/or “Highly Confidential – Source Code” of Bank of America; (ii) materials nos. 2–4 and 8 contain information that is “Highly Confidential –

1 Attorneys Eyes Only” and/or “Highly Confidential – Source Code” of Mitek Systems,
2 Inc. (“Mitek”). *Id.*, ¶¶ 2–10. As required by Local Rule 79-5.2.2(b), counsel for
3 Plaintiffs and Defendants conferred about Defendants’ filing these materials to limit, if
4 not entirely avoid, the necessity of this Application. *Id.*, ¶ 11. Plaintiffs’ counsel does
5 not oppose filing the entirety of these materials under seal. Counsel for Defendants also
6 conferred with counsel for Mitek in a similar manner, and Mitek’s counsel requested
7 that the entirety of these documents be filed under seal. *Id.*, ¶ 12.

8 The Williams declaration sets forth the information Defendants seek to file under
9 seal, the basis for the Application, and good cause to seal Bank of America confidential
10 information. *Id.*, ¶¶ 1–13. Due to the sensitive nature of the information in the
11 foregoing materials, good cause exists to approve Bank of America’s application to file
12 these materials under seal pursuant to Local Rule 79-5.2.2(a), and, pursuant to Local
13 Rule 79-5.2.2(b)(i), Mitek shall separately demonstrate such good cause.

14 II. Good Cause Exists to File Materials Under Seal

15 The decision to seal records is left to the discretion of the District Court.
16 *Hagestad v. Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995) (citing *Nixon v. Warner*
17 *Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 599 (1978)). Rule 26(c)(1)(G) of the Federal
18 Rules of Civil Procedure allows parties, upon a showing of “good cause,” to file under
19 seal documents containing “confidential . . . commercial information.” *See also IMAX*
20 *Corp. v. Cinematech, Inc.*, 152 F.3d 1161, 1168 n.9 (9th Cir. 1998) (noting that
21 confidential and proprietary business information is “to be filed under seal.”); *Sun*
22 *Microsystems Inc. v. Network Appliance*, No. C-08-01641 EDL, 2009 WL 5125817, at
23 *9 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2009) (granting sealing requests because the documents “contain
24 confidential [business] information, much of which has been designated as Confidential
25 or Highly Confidential under the parties’ stipulated protective order, that could cause
26 competitive harm if disclosed.”); *In re Adobe Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation Master*
27 *File*, 141 F.R.D. 155, 161-162 (N.D. Cal. 1992) (“Protective orders and filings under
28 seal are the primary means by which the courts ensure full disclosure of relevant

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.