Heidi L. Keefe (SBN 178960) Michael G. Rhodes (SBN 116127) 1 Mark R. Weinstein (SBN 193043) COOLEY LLP 2 Lowell D. Mead (SBN 223989) 101 California Street, 5th Floor COOLEY LLP San Francisco, California 94111-5800 3 3175 Hanover Street Telephone: (415) 693-2000 Palo Alto, California 94304 Facsimile: (415) 693-2222 Telephone: (650) 843-5000 4 Facsimile: (650) 849-7400 5 Phillip E. Morton (*pro hac vice*) Emily E. Terrell (SBN 234353) 6 Stephen C. Crenshaw (pro hac vice) 7 COOLEY LLP 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW 8 Suite 700 Washington, DC 20004 9 Telephone: (202) 842-7800 Facsimile: (202) 842-7899 10 **Attorneys for Defendant** 11 FACEBOOK, INC. 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 13 OAKLAND DIVISION 14 15 WINDY CITY INNOVATIONS, LLC Case No. 4:16-cv-01730-YGR 16 Plaintiff, **FACEBOOK, INC.'S** ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO 17 v. FILE UNDER SEAL (RE: 18 FACEBOOK'S REPLY IN SUPPORT FACEBOOK, INC., OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY 19 Defendant. JUDGMENT) 20 The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers 21 22 23 24 25 26 27



28

#### NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook") hereby moves this Court for an Order allowing Facebook to file under seal confidential, unredacted versions of the following documents:

- 1. Facebook's Reply In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment ("Reply Brief");
- 2. Exhibit 24 to Declaration of Phillip E. Morton in Support of Facebook's Reply In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment.

Facebook respectfully submits that compelling reasons exist for the filing of these documents under seal. The motion is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and the Declaration of Phillip E. Morton in Support of Administrative Motion to File Under Seal.

# **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

## I. <u>LEGAL STANDARD</u>

"[T]he courts of this country recognize a general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents." *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978). The right, however, "is not absolute and can be overridden given sufficiently compelling reasons for doing so." *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1135. "A narrow range of documents is not subject to the right of public access at all because the records have traditionally been kept secret for important policy reasons." *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal citations omitted). A party intending to seal document in connection with a dispositive motion "must show that 'compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings . . . outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure." *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n*, 565 F.3d 1106, 1115-16 (9th Cir. 2009) (citing *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178-79).

## II. <u>ARGUMENT</u>

The following documents contain materials designated by Windy City as "CONFIDENTIAL" or "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" pursuant to the controlling Protective Order (D.I. 67) in this case: (1) Facebook's Reply In Support of Motion for Summary



Judgment; and (2) Exhibit 24 to the Declaration of Phillip E Morton In Support of Facebook's Reply In Support of Motion for Summary Judgment.<sup>1</sup>

Under Civil Local Rule 79-5(e), a party may seek to "file under seal a document designated as confidential [and Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes Only] by the opposing party or a non-party pursuant to a protective order, or a document containing information so designated by an opposing party or a nonparty." Civil L.R. 79-5(e). Facebook does not take a position on whether or not the material designated as confidential by Windy City should properly be withheld, but has filed this motion to comply with the Protective Order and the Civil Local Rules. The relief requested in this motion is necessary and is narrowly tailored to protect confidential information.

## III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), Facebook attaches to this motion: (1) a declaration from Phillip E. Morton in support thereof; (2) a proposed order that is narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material and lists in table format each document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed; (3) redacted versions of the documents sought to be sealed; and (4) unredacted versions of the documents. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(e), Facebook will serve Phillip E. Morton's declaration supporting this motion on Windy City and will file proof of such service. Accordingly, Facebook respectfully requests that the Court grant its administrative motion to seal the aforementioned information from the public record.

Facebook does not contend that any portion of its Reply Brief contains Facebook technical trade secrets or confidential business information requiring sealing. However, Facebook notes that certain of the exhibits *cited* in the Reply Brief are exhibits to Windy City's Opposition to Facebook's Motion for Summary Judgment which Facebook seeks to seal in their entirety, as set forth in Windy City's Administrative Motion to File Opposition to Facebook's Motion for Summary Judgment Under Seal (D.I. 184), Declaration of P. Morton in Support of Windy City's Administrative Motion to Seal (D.I. 189), and Declaration of S. O'Reilly in Support of Windy City's Administrative Motion to Seal (D.I. 190-1). For example, in its Reply Brief, Facebook refers to testimony of Facebook engineer Hany Barakat regarding testing (*see* Facebook Reply at n.10) and cites to Exhibit T (excerpts from Mr. Barakat's deposition transcript). While the discussion of this testimony in the Reply Brief is at a high level and Facebook does not seek to seal it, as set forth in Mr. Morton and Mr. O'Reilly's declarations (at D.I. 189 and 190-1, respectively), it is Facebook's position that the underlying Exhibit T does contain confidential Facebook technical trade secret and sensitive business information, and should be sealed in its entirety. The same is also true for Exhibits U, V, W, X and Y.

