

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE NEO WIRELESS, LLC
PATENT LITIG.

Case No. 2:22-md-03034-TGB
HON. TERRENCE G. BERG
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO FILE PLAINTIFF’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
NEO’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT UNDER SEAL**

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.3(b), Plaintiff Neo Wireless, LLC (“Neo”), respectfully requests entry of an order granting leave to file under seal their Reply in Support of Neo’s Motion for Summary Judgment Under Seal.

Plaintiff’s Reply contains “Confidential” and/or “Highly Confidential – Attorneys Eyes Only” information pursuant to the Protective Order (ECF No. 125) entered in this case, or otherwise describes or quotes such designated materials. Such information was designated by Neo, Defendants, and/or third parties (such as AT&T) and relates to expert reports and discussions of AT&T’s confidential materials related to the Project Angel reference.

Determination of a motion for leave to file under seal is within the sound discretion of the district court. *Meyer Goldberg, Inc. v. Fisher Foods, Inc.*, 823 F.2d 159, 161 (6th Cir. 1987). The right of the public to access judicial records “is not absolute,” and the Sixth Circuit recognizes that “certain privacy rights of participants” are significant interests which can outweigh the public’s right to access.

Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. F.T.C., 710 F.2d 1165, 1179 (6th Cir. 1983) (citing *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)) (additional citations omitted).

Here, the information sought to be filed under seal includes confidential and highly confidential information (such as source code, financials, licensing communications, technical information, etc.) for the parties in this case, as well as relevant third parties. Neo's Motion, the supporting Brief, and the exhibits thereto should be permitted to be filed under seal to respect the privacy rights of the parties. *See id.* at 1179. These exhibits should be permitted to be filed under seal to respect the competitive advantage that the parties achieve by keeping detailed financial information private. *See Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs., Co.*, 727 F3d 1214, 1225–26 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (holding the district court abused its discretion in ordering unsealing as such the parties have “a significant interest in preventing the release of their detailed financial information.”). Good cause therefore exists for the proposed sealed filing, and no opposition exists.

For the reasons set forth above, the Neo respectfully requests that the Court grant its Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Under Seal.

A proposed Order is concurrently submitted through the ECF system.

DATED: July 18, 2024

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Christopher S. Stewart

Jason D. Cassady
Texas Bar No. 24045625

Email: jcassady@caldwellcc.com

Christopher S. Stewart

Texas Bar No. 24079399

Email: cstewart@caldwellcc.com

Daniel R. Pearson

Texas Bar No. 24070398

Email: dpearson@caldwellcc.com

Hamad M. Hamad

Texas Bar No. 24061268

Email: hhamad@caldwellcc.com

Bailey A. Blaies

Texas Bar No. 24109297

Email: bblaies@caldwellcc.com

Bjorn. A. Blomquist

Texas Bar No. 24125125

Email: bblomquist@caldwellcc.com

James F. Smith

Texas Bar No. 24129800

Email: jsmith@caldwellcc.com

James Yang

California Bar No. 329979

Email: jyang@caldwellcc.com

Alexander J. Gras

Texas Bar No. 24125252

Email: agras@caldwellcc.com

CALDWELL CASSADY CURRY P.C.

2121 N. Pearl St., Suite 1200

Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 888-4848

Facsimile: (214) 888-4849

Jaye Quadrozzi (P71646)

Email: jcquadrozzi@varnumlaw.com

VARNUM LLP

480 Pierce Street, Suite 300

Birmingham, Michigan 48009

Telephone: (248) 567-7800

Facsimile: (214) 567-7423

**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
NEO WIRELESS LLC**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that counsel of record is being served with a copy of the foregoing document via the Court CM/ECF system on **August 1, 2024**

/s/ Christopher S. Stewart

Christopher S. Stewart

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

Counsel for Neo communicated with counsel for Defendants on July 31st, 2024, via electronic mail, regarding the relief requested in this motion. Counsel for Defendants concur in the relief requested in this motion.

/s/ Christopher S. Stewart

Christopher S. Stewart