

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FINJAN, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JUNIPER NETWORK, INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-05659-WHA (TSH)

**ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO SEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 559

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

On June 25, 2019, Finjan filed a motion to seal in connection with a discovery letter brief, seeking to seal certain information that had been designated as confidential by Juniper. ECF No. 559. On June 29, 2019, Juniper filed the Petersen Declaration in partial support of the motion to seal. ECF No. 567. The motion to seal is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**. With respect to the joint discovery letter, the Petersen Declaration does not state that the redaction on page 3 merits redaction, so that redaction is disallowed. The redaction on page 4 is appropriate. With respect to Exhibits C, D and 1, Juniper’s objections to interrogatory 5 do not reveal Juniper’s pricing information and are not confidential. However, everything that comes after “Subject to these specific objections and the general objections incorporated here, Junior responds as follows,” is properly redacted.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 2, 2019

  
THOMAS S. HIXSON  
United States Magistrate Judge