1 George C. Lombardi (*pro hac vice*) Dustin J. Edwards (pro hac vice) glombardi@winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP dedwards@winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 2 800 Capitol St., Suite 2400 35 West Wacker Drive 3 Houston, TX 77002-2925 Chicago, IL 60601-9703 Telephone: (312) 558-5600 Facsimile: (312) 558-5700 Telephone: (713) 651-2600 Facsimile: (713) 651-2700 4 5 E. Danielle T. Williams (pro hac vice) Diana Hughes Leiden (SBN: 267606) dwilliams@winston.com WINSTON & STRAWN LLP dhleiden(a)winston.com 6 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 300 South Tryon Street, 16th Floor 333 S. Grand Avenue, 38th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543 Telephone: (213) 615-1700 Facsimile: (213) 615-1750 7 Charlotte, NC 28202 Telephone: (704) 350-7700 Facsimile: (704) 350-7800 8 9 Michael S. Elkin (pro hac vice) melkin@winston.com 10 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166 11 Telephone: (212) 294-6700 Facsimile: (212) 294-4700 12 13 Attorneys for Defendants BANK OF AMÉRICA 14 CORPORATION and BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 16 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 17 18 NantWorks, LLC, a Delaware limited Case No. 2:20-CV-7872-GW-PVC liability company, and NANT HOLDINGS IP, LLC, a Delaware 19 limited liability company, **DEFENDANTS' CORRECTED** 20 UNOPPOSED APPLICATION TO Plaintiffs, 21 FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL VS. 22 BANK OF AMERICA 23 CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, and BANK OF AMERICA, 24 N.A., a national banking association, 25 Defendants. 26 27



TO THE COURT, PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to Local Rule 79-5.2.2.(b), Defendants Bank of America Corporation and Bank of America, N.A. (collectively, "Defendants" or "Bank of America"), hereby request that this Court enter an order permitting them to file under seal the materials described below that are filed in connection with Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (the "112 Motion for Summary Judgment"):

Document Description	Nature of Information to be Sealed
Exhibit A to Exhibit 3 to the Declaration	Designated by Defendants as "HIGHLY
of Dustin J. Edwards in Support of the	CONFIDENTIAL- ATTORNEYS'
Motion for Partial Summary Judgment	EYES ONLY" under the parties'
of Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:	stipulated protective order (Dkt. No.
Expert Report of Nathanial Polish,	210), and contains or references
Ph.D., Regarding the Invalidity of	information designated by Bank of
Certain Claims of U.S. Patents Nos.	America and third-party Mitek as
7,881,529, 7,899,252, 8,478,036,	"Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes
9,324,004, and 9,031,278.	Only". Plaintiffs do not oppose sealing
	this exhibit in its entirety.
Exhibit 4 to the Declaration of Dustin J.	Designated by Plaintiffs as "CONTAINS
Edwards in Support of the Motion for	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE
Partial Summary Judgment of Invalidity	CODE – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY"
Under 35 U.S.C. § 112: Excerpts of	under the parties' stipulated protective
Expert Report of Dan Schonfeld, Ph.D.,	order (Dkt. No. 210), and contains or
Regarding the Infringement of the	references information designated by
Asserted Claims.	Bank of America and third-party Mitek
	as "Highly Confidential – Attorneys'
	Eyes Only." Plaintiffs and Mitek do not

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Document Description	Nature of Information to be Sealed
	oppose sealing this exhibit in its entirety.

I. Background

As set forth in the Declaration of Danielle Williams in Support of Plaintiffs' Application to File Under Seal submitted herewith, Defendants make this application because the foregoing documents are marked and designated as "Confidential" or "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."), ¶¶ 2–6. Defendants make this application because Exhibit numbers 3 and 4 contain information that is "Confidential," "Highly Confidential – Attorneys Eyes Only," and/or "Highly Confidential – Source Code" of Bank of America and/or its vendors. As required by Local Rule 79-5.2.2(b), counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendants conferred about Defendants' filing these materials to limit, if not entirely avoid, the necessity of this Application. Id., ¶ 2. Plaintiffs' counsel does not oppose filing the entirety of these materials under seal.

The Williams declaration sets forth the information Defendants seek to file under seal, the basis for the Application, and good cause to seal Bank of America confidential information. Id., ¶¶ 1–6. Due to the sensitive nature of the information in the foregoing materials, good cause exists to approve Bank of America's application to file these materials under seal pursuant to Local Rule 79-5.2.2(a), and, pursuant to Local Rule 79-5.2.2(b)(i).

II. Good Cause Exists to File Materials Under Seal

The decision to seal records is left to the discretion of the District Court. Hagestad v. Tragesser, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995) (citing Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 599 (1978)). Rule 26(c)(1)(G) of the Federal



Rules of Civil Procedure allows parties, upon a showing of "good cause," to file under seal documents containing "confidential . . . commercial information." *See also IMAX Corp. v. Cinematech, Inc.*, 152 F.3d 1161, 1168 n.9 (9th Cir. 1998) (noting that confidential and proprietary business information is "to be filed under seal."); *Sun Microsystems Inc. v. Network Appliance*, No. C-08-01641 EDL, 2009 WL 5125817, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2009) (granting sealing requests because the documents "contain confidential [business] information, much of which has been designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential under the parties' stipulated protective order, that could cause competitive harm if disclosed."); *In re Adobe Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation Master File*, 141 F.R.D. 155, 161-162 (N.D. Cal. 1992) ("Protective orders and filings under seal are the primary means by which the courts ensure full disclosure of relevant information, while still preserving the parties' (and third parties') legitimate expectation that confidential business information, proprietary technology and trade secrets will not be publicly disseminated.").

Bank of America respectfully requests that the Court grant its application to file under seal the foregoing materials on the grounds that Plaintiffs designated Exhibit 4 as Highly Confidential—Attorneys' Eyes Only and Highly Confidential – Source Code. Furthermore, the foregoing materials contain confidential information designated by Bank of America and/or Mitek. Specifically, the foregoing materials contain non-public, proprietary details about the design and functionality of Bank of America's mobile check deposit. Williams Decl., ¶ 6. Accordingly, Bank of America has an important interest in maintaining the confidentiality of this information, and any public interest in its disclosure is rebutted. *See, e.g., Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006) (differentiating dispositive motions by explaining that, for such motions, "the private interests of the litigants are not the only weights on the scale"). If such information were made public, competitors of Bank of America and its vendors would gain access to Bank of America's business practices regarding its product development and technical details regarding the design and functionality of its

Case, 2:20-cv-07872-GW-PVC Document 373 Filed 05/06/24 Page 5 of 5 Page ID #:41623

