

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

EPIC GAMES, INC.,
Plaintiff,
vs.
APPLE INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR

**TRIAL ORDER NO. 2 RE: (1) FACEBOOK
INC. ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CLARIFY; AND (2) ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTIONS TO SEAL DEPOSITION
DESIGNATIONS**

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM

Dkt. Nos. 491, 505, 598, 601

TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

The Court issues this Order with respect to several items on the docket:

1. Facebook Inc. Sealing Request Clarification

As the Court stated on the record, and as identified by counsel for Facebook Inc. (*see* Dkt. Nos. 598, 601), the Court had committed a typographical error with respect to Facebook’s sealing request in Trial Order No. 1. (Dkt. No. 594.) Regarding PX-2413 (Exhibit 2) at page EGFB-001160, the Court **AMENDS** the ruling on Facebook’s sealing request to read as follows: “The redaction at the bottom of the page in the email sent on March 2, 2020 at 6:25PM shall be

undated. The remainder of the proposed redactions on this page shall be sealed.”

2. Administrative Motions to Seal Deposition Designations

The Court is in receipt of defendant Apple Inc.'s Administrative Motion to Partially Seal Deposition Designations and plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.'s Motion to Seal Portions of Its Four-Hour Deposition Designations. (Dkt. Nos. 491, 505.) Trial records enjoy a "strong presumption in favor of access" that can only be overcome by "compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure." *Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006). "In general, 'compelling reasons' sufficient to outweigh the public's interest in disclosure and justify sealing court records exist when such 'court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes,' such as the use of records to gratify private spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release trade secrets." *Id.* at 1179 (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)).

Having carefully considered the parties' motions and supporting declarations, the Court rules on the motions as follows:

Deposition Designation	Party Having Confidential Information	Ruling
Epic Games' Motion to Seal (Dkt. No. 491)		
Cue 109:4 - 110:17	Apple	GRANTED. This concerns Apple's internal projections of the rate of return on App Store search. The information relates to current confidential financial data that could result in competitive harm if disclosed. (Dkt. No. 505-1 ¶¶ 6-8.)
Cue 190:4 – 192:16	Apple	DENIED. This concerns value of IAP vs. non-IAP customers to one third party. The information is relevant to the tying claim, and Apple has not articulated concrete harm from its release. (Dkt. No. 505-1 ¶¶ 6-8.)
Ong 9:10 - 9:12	Match	DENIED ¹
Ong 9:15 - 9:18	Match	DENIED
Ong 9:22 - 10:12	Match	DENIED

¹ Although Match initially designated certain material as confidential, much of the information has been made public and Match does not seek to seal the information denied here without comment. (See Dkt. No. 529.)

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

Ong 12:09 - 13:25	Match	DENIED
Ong 17:03 - 17:15	Match	DENIED
Ong 17:22 - 18:25	Match	DENIED
Ong 20:15 - 20:22	Match	DENIED
Ong 21:23 - 21:25	Match	DENIED
Ong 22:10 - 23:05	Match	DENIED
Ong 23:09 - 23:17	Match	DENIED
Ong 24:17 - 25:05	Match	DENIED
Ong 25:14 - 26:05	Match	DENIED
Ong 28:09 - 28:22	Match	GRANTED as to lines 28:11 and 28:15 only. This concerns concrete percentages of Match revenue that came from web and app versions of Tinder, respectively. Although relevant, the information could cause Match competitive harm, such as by helping competitors allocate marketing, and may be referred to in summary form at trial. (See Dkt. No. 529 ¶ 6.)
Ong 28:24 - 30:25	Match	DENIED
Ong 31:22 - 31:24	Match	DENIED
Ong 32:01 - 32:07	Match	DENIED
Ong 32:10 - 32:22	Match	DENIED
Ong 33:08 - 33:16	Match	DENIED
Ong 33:18 - 34:07	Match	DENIED
Ong 34:14 - 37:07	Match	DENIED
Ong 37:25 - 38:11	Match	DENIED
Ong 38:13 - 39:02	Match	DENIED
Ong 39:16 - 39:24	Match	DENIED
Ong 41:12 - 42:09	Match	DENIED
Ong 43:04 - 44:19	Match	DENIED
Ong 45:01 - 46:10	Match	DENIED
Ong 46:13 - 46:15	Match	GRANTED as to lines 45:15-16 and 46:1-2 only, which disclose the proportion of users and revenue attributable to Match's own payment system compared to the Google Play payment system. Although highly relevant, disclosure of the information may harm Match competitively, for example, if revealed to other app platforms, and may be referred to in summary form at trial. (Dkt. No. 529 ¶ 7.)
Ong 46:17 - 47:07	Match	DENIED
Ong 47:15 - 48:01	Match	DENIED
Ong 48:04 - 48:10	Match	DENIED
Ong 48:14 - 48:19	Match	DENIED
Ong 48:21 - 51:06	Match	GRANTED as to lines 49:1-2 and 49:11-17 only, which concern Match's internal process for providing the refund. The information is not directly relevant to any claim or defense and could cause Match harm by encouraging abuse of its policy. (Dkt. No. 529 ¶ 8.) The information also discloses Match's data gathering efforts, which is not relevant to the

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

		designated excerpt concerns publicly known information, including developers' inability to provide refunds on Apple IAP. (See Dkt. No. 407 ¶ 293(c).)
Ong 56:03 - 56:04	Match	DENIED
Ong 56:06 - 57:01	Match	GRANTED as to the numbers disclosed on lines 56:6-10, 16-20 only, which concern a specific percentage of users driven to Match products by the Apple App Store versus user searches. Although relevant, the information could cause Match competitive harm, such as by helping rivals determine bids for keywords, and may be referred to in summary form. (Dkt. No. 529 ¶ 9.)
Ong 57:20 - 57:22	Match	DENIED
Ong 58:08 - 58:10	Match	DENIED
Ong 58:20 - 59:16	Match	GRANTED as to the numbers disclosed on lines 58:25-59:2, 59:6, and 59:13 only, which concern a specific percentage of users driven to Match products by the Apple App Store versus user searches. Although relevant, the information could cause Match competitive harm, such as by helping rivals determine bids for keywords, and may be referred to in summary form. (Dkt. No. 529 ¶ 10.)
Ong 59:18 - 60:18	Match	DENIED
Ong 60:20 - 60:23	Match	DENIED
Ong 60:25 - 61:04	Match	DENIED
Ong 61:06 - 61:18	Match	DENIED
Ong 62:03 - 62:05	Match	DENIED
Ong 62:07 - 62:16	Match	DENIED
Ong 62:18 - 63:03	Match	DENIED
Ong 63:05 - 64:16	Match	DENIED
Ong 65:01 - 65:17	Match	DENIED
Ong 65:19 - 65:25	Match	DENIED
Ong 66:01 - 66:04	Match	DENIED
Ong 66:12 - 66:24	Match	DENIED
Ong 67:23 - 68:05	Match	DENIED
Ong 69:17 - 69:21	Match	GRANTED as to the number disclosed on line 69:19, which identifies the percentage of Tinder revenue attributable to iOS. Although relevant, the information could cause Match competitive harm, such as in business negotiations with third parties or through rival allocation of marketing across platforms, and may be referred to in summary form at trial. (Dkt. No. 529 ¶ 11.)
Ong 69:23 - 70:09	Match	DENIED
Ong 70:11 - 70:15	Match	DENIED
Ong 72:07 - 72:10	Match	DENIED

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

Ong 74:12 - 74:12	Match	DENIED
Ong 84:01 - 84:03	Match	DENIED
Ong 84:05 - 84:06	Match	DENIED
Ong 84:22 - 85:03	Match	DENIED
Ong 85:05 - 85:07	Match	DENIED
Ong 120:12 - 120:13	Match	DENIED
Ong 120:16 - 120:21	Match	DENIED
Ong 120:24 - 120:25	Match	DENIED
Ong 121:02 - 121:04	Match	DENIED
Ong 152:04 - 152:23	Match	DENIED
Ong 158:04 - 159:14	Match	GRANTED as to the numbers disclosed on lines 152:11 and 16, which refer to specific percentage of users driven to Match products by the Apple App Store versus user searches. Although relevant, the information could cause Match competitive harm, such as by helping rivals determine bids for keywords, and may be referred to in summary form. (Dkt. No. 529 ¶ 10.)
Ong 162:03 - 162:22	Match	DENIED
Ong 167:01 - 167:04	Match	DENIED
Ong 167:06 - 167:20	Match	DENIED
Ong 169:24 - 170:08	Match	DENIED
Ong 170:10 - 170:19	Match	DENIED
Ong 171:14 - 172:16	Match	DENIED
Ong 172:18 - 173:06	Match	DENIED
Ong 182:20 - 183:25	Match	DENIED
Apple's Motion to Seal (Dkt. No. 505)²		
Kreiner 32:13-14	Third-Party	DENIED
Kreiner 32:25-33:4	Third-Party	DENIED
Kreiner 35:20-36:6	Sony	GRANTED. This discloses a confidential pricing term between Sony and Epic Games. To the Court's knowledge, this information has not been publicly disclosed, and disclosure may harm Sony in future negotiations. (Dkt. No. 576-22 ¶¶ 6-7.)
Kreiner 37:4-8, 37:14	Sony	GRANTED. This discloses a confidential pricing term between Sony and Epic Games. To the Court's knowledge, this information has not been publicly disclosed, and disclosure may harm Sony in future negotiations. (Dkt. No. 576-22 ¶¶ 6-7.)
Kreiner 39:11-13	Third-Party	DENIED

² Apple seeks to seal information designated as third-party confidential under the protective order. The Court denies the motion without comment sealing where no party filed a supporting declaration. *See* Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(2).

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.