|   | Case 5:17-cv-04467-BLF Document 257  | Filed 05/04/20 Page 1 of 6   |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | DUANE MORRIS LLP<br>D. Stuart Bartow (SBN 233107)<br>Email: DSBartow@duanemorris.com<br>Nicole E. Grigg (SBN 307733)<br>2475 Hanover Street<br>Palo Alto, CA 94304-1194<br>Telephone: 650.847.4150<br>Facsimile: 650.847.4151<br>DUANE MORRIS LLP<br>Joseph A. Powers (PA SBN 84590)<br>Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i><br>japowers@duanemorris.com<br>Jarrad M. Gunther (PA SBN 207038)<br>Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i><br>jmgunther@duanemorris.com<br>30 South 17th Street<br>Philadelphia, PA 19103<br>Telephone: 215.979.1000<br>Facsimile: 215.979.1020 | DUANE MORRIS LLP<br>Matthew C. Gaudet (GA SBN 287759)<br>Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i><br>mcgaudet@duanemorris.com<br>Robin L. McGrath (GA SBN 493115)<br>Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i><br>rlmcgrath@duanemorris.com<br>David C. Dotson (GA SBN 138040)<br>Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i><br>dcdotson@duanemorris.com<br>Jennifer H. Forte (GA SBN 940650)<br>Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i><br>jhforte@duanemorris.com<br>1075 Peachtree Street, Ste. 2000<br>Atlanta, GA 30309<br>Telephone: 404.253.6900<br>Facsimile: 404.253.6901 |  |  |
| 12<br>13  | SONICWALL INC.   | STRICT COURT   |  |  |
| 13  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT<br>NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |  |  |
| 15  | SAN JOSE DIVISION  |  |  |  |
| 16  | FINJAN, INC., a Delaware Corporation,  | Case No. 5:17-cv-04467-BLF-VKD   |  |  |
| 17  | Plaintiff,   | DEFENDANT SONICWALL INC.'S<br>ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO   |  |  |
| 18  | VS.  | FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL  |  |  |
| 19  | SONICWALL INC., a Delaware Corporation   |  |  |  |
| 20  | Defendant.   |  |  |  |
| 21  |  |  |  |  |
| 22  |  |  |  |  |
| 23  |  |  |  |  |
| 24<br>25  |  |  |  |  |
| 23<br>26  |  |  |  |  |
| 20<br>27  |  |  |  |  |
| 27  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>DOCKET</b><br><b>A L A R M</b> Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> . |  |  |  |  |

### I. INTRODUCTION

1

2

3

4

5

6

R

Μ

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11 and 79-5, this Court's Standing Civil Order Re: Civil Cases, the Parties Stipulated Protective Order (Dkt. 68), the Parties Stipulated Order Regarding Discovery of Electronically Stored Information (Dkt. 69), and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(5)(B), Defendant SonicWall Inc. ("SonicWall") hereby moves the Court for leave to file under seal, pursuant to Civil L.R. 79-5(d)-(e), the items identified in the table below.

| Exhibit No. | Document Title   | Portion(s) to Seal | Reason(s) for Sealing   |
|-------------|--|--------------------|---|
| Ex. 1       | Cisco Systems, Inc.<br>Mutual Non-Disclosure<br>Agreement dated<br>January 19, 2004                  | Entire Document    | The parties in <i>Finjan</i> ,<br><i>Inc. v. Cisco Systems</i> ,<br><i>Inc., No. 5:17-cv-00072</i><br><i>BLF-SVK</i> designated thi<br>document as "Highly<br>Confidential –<br>Attorneys' Eyes Only"<br>pursuant to the<br>Stipulated Protective<br>Order. See Declaration<br>of Jennifer Forte in<br>Support of<br>Administrative Motion<br>to File Documents Under<br>Seal ("Forte<br>Declaration"), ¶¶ 2-4. |
| Ex. 2       | Finjan Software Inc.<br>Amended and Restated<br>Investors' Rights<br>Agreement dated June<br>2, 2004 | Entire Document    | The parties in <i>Finjan</i> ,<br><i>Inc. v. Cisco Systems</i> ,<br><i>Inc., No. 5:17-cv-00072</i><br><i>BLF-SVK</i> designated thi<br>document as "Highly<br>Confidential –<br>Attorneys' Eyes Only"<br>pursuant to the<br>Stipulated Protective   |
|             |  |                    | Order. <i>See</i> Forte Declaration, ¶¶ 2-4.  |
|             | L  |                    |   |
|             |  |                    |   |
|             |  |                    |   |
|             |  |                    |   |
|             |  |                    |   |

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

|          | Case 5:17   | '-cv-04467-BLF Docum  | ent 257 Filed 05/04/20 P | age 3 of 6  |  |  |
|----------|---|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1        | Ex. 3   | Cisco – Finjan  | Entire Document          | The parties in <i>Finjan</i> ,  |  |  |
| 2        |   | Holdings, Inc. Mutual<br>Non-Disclosure                           |                          | Inc. v. Cisco Systems,<br>Inc., No. 5:17-cv-00072-  |  |  |
| 3<br>4   |   | Agreement dated March 21, 2014                                    |                          | <i>BLF-SVK</i> designated this document as "Highly Confidential –                                   |  |  |
| 5        |   |   |                          | Attorneys' Eyes Only"<br>pursuant to the<br>Stipulated Protective                                   |  |  |
| 6        |   |   |                          | Order. <i>See</i> Forte Declaration, ¶¶ 2-4.  |  |  |
| 7<br>8   | Ex. 4   | Excerpts from the<br>February 1, 2019<br>Deposition of Yoav       | Entire Document          | The parties in <i>Finjan</i> ,<br>Inc. v. Cisco Systems,<br>Inc., No. 5:17-cv-00072-                |  |  |
| 9        |   | Samet   |                          | <i>BLF-SVK</i> designated this document as "Highly  |  |  |
| 10       |   |   |                          | Confidential –<br>Attorneys' Eyes Only"   |  |  |
| 11<br>12 |   |   |                          | pursuant to the<br>Stipulated Protective<br>Order. <i>See</i> Forte<br>Declaration, ¶¶ 2-4.         |  |  |
| 13       | Ex. 5   | Excerpts from the April   | Entire Document          | The parties in <i>Finjan</i> ,  |  |  |
| 14<br>15 |   | 10, 2019 Deposition of<br>Daniel Chinn                            |                          | Inc. v. Cisco Systems,<br>Inc., No. 5:17-cv-00072-<br>BLF-SVK designated this                       |  |  |
| 16       |   |   |                          | document as "Highly<br>Confidential –<br>Attorneys' Eyes Only"                                      |  |  |
| 17<br>18 |   |   |                          | pursuant to the<br>Stipulated Protective<br>Order. See Forte  |  |  |
| 19       |   | F-1:1:4:2.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4.4                     | Entire Decomposit        | Declaration, ¶¶ 2-4.  |  |  |
| 20       | Ex. 6   | Exhibit 34 to the April<br>10, 2019 deposition of<br>Daniel Chinn | Entire Document          | The parties in <i>Finjan</i> ,<br><i>Inc. v. Cisco Systems</i> ,<br><i>Inc., No. 5:17-cv-00072-</i> |  |  |
| 21       |   |   |                          | <i>BLF-SVK</i> designated this document as "Highly  |  |  |
| 22       |   |   |                          | Confidential –<br>Attorneys' Eyes Only"   |  |  |
| 23<br>24 |   |   |                          | pursuant to the<br>Stipulated Protective<br>Order. <i>See</i> Forte<br>Declaration, ¶¶ 2-4.         |  |  |
| 25       | II. ARGUM   | IENT  |                          |   |  |  |
| 26       |   | egal Standard   |                          |   |  |  |
| 27       | There is a presumption of public access to judicial records and documents. <i>Nixon v. Warner</i> |   |                          |   |  |  |
| 28       |   |   | -                        |   |  |  |

**DOCKET A L A R M** Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. 1

2

3

5

6

7

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Commc'ns, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 597 (1978). However, records attached to non-dispositive motions, such is the case here, are not subject to the strong presumption of access. Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc, No. 13-CV-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 9023164, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2015) (internal citation omitted). Because the documents attached to non-dispositive motions "are often unrelated, or only 4 tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action," parties moving to seal must meet the lower "good cause" standard of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 26(c). Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). The "good cause" standard requires a "particularized showing" that "specific prejudice or harm will result" if the information is disclosed. Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. 8 Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002) (internal quotation marks omitted); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). "Broad allegations of harm, unsubstantiated by specific examples of articulated 10 reasoning" will not suffice. Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co., 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992). 12

Sealing is appropriate where the requesting party "establishes that the document, or portions" thereof is privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law." N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 79–5(a). A party must "narrowly tailor" its request to sealable material only. Id.

#### B. SonicWall's Administrative Motion to Seal Is Supported By Good Cause and Is **Narrowly Tailored**

SonicWall seeks to seal Exhibits 1-6 to the Declaration of Matthew Gaudet Pursuant to Interim Order Re: April 17, 2020 Joint Discovery Letter Brief at Dkt. 255 ("Gaudet Declaration") because the parties in Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc., No. 5:17-cv-00072-BLF-SVK designated these documents as "Highly Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only" pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order.

23 SonicWall contends that public disclosure of this information could cause harm to Finjan. 24 Id.; see also Andrx Pharms., LLC v. GlaxoSmithKline, 236 F.R.D. 583, 586 (S.D. Fla. 2006) ("Courts 25 dress technical information with a heavy cloak of judicial protection because of the threat of serious 26 economic injury to the disclosure of scientific information."); Network Appliance, Inc. v. Sun 27 Microsys. Inc., 2010 WL 841274, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2010) (granting application to seal 28 "information regarding NetApp's internal usability testing of its software").

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

SonicWall's administrative motion is narrowly tailored and only seeks to seal the select
exhibits that contain the information designated as Highly Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only. *See Kowalsky v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 2012 WL 892427, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2012) (finding
sealing appropriate where "[t]he proposed redactions contain[ed] . . . confidential product
development information, the disclosure of which could harm [the defendant's] competitive
advantage in the marketplace.").

**III. CONCLUSION** 

7

8

9

11

For these reasons, SonicWall respectfully requests that the Court grant its Administrative Motion to Seal.

10 Dated: May 4, 2020

М

Respectfully submitted,

#### /s/ Nicole E. Grigg

| 12 | /s/ Nicole E. Grigg  |
|----|--|
| 13 | Nicole E. Grigg (CA SBN 307733)  |
| 14 | negrigg@duanemorris.com<br>DUANE MORRIS LLP  |
| 15 | D. Stuart Bartow (CA SBN 233107)<br>dsbartow@duanemorris.com                         |
| 16 | 2475 Hanover Street<br>Palo Alto, CA 94304-1194                                      |
| 17 | Telephone: 650.847.4146<br>Facsimile: 650.847.4151                                   |
| 18 |  |
| 19 | Robin L. McGrath (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> )<br>Email: rlmcgrath@duanemorris.com |
| 20 | 1075 Peachtree Street, Ste. 2000<br>Atlanta, GA 30309                                |
| 21 | Telephone: 404.253.6901<br>Facsimile: 404.253.6901                                   |
| 22 | 1 acsimic. 404.255.0701  |
| 23 | Matthew C. Gaudet (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> )<br>Email: mcgaudet@duanemorris.com |
| 24 | Robin L. McGrath (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> )<br>Email: rlmcgrath@duanemorris.com |
| 25 | David C. Dotson (admitted pro hac vice)  |
| 26 | Email: dcdotson@duanemorris.com<br>Jennifer H. Forte (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) |
| 27 | Email: jhforte@duanemorris.com<br>1075 Peachtree Street, Ste. 2000                   |
| 28 | Atlanta, GA 30309  |
| -  | VET  |

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

## DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.