

1 Timothy T. Scott (State Bar No. 126971)  
 tscott@kslaw.com  
 2 Geoffrey M. Ezgar (State Bar No. 184243)  
 gezgar@kslaw.com  
 3 Leo Spooner, III (State Bar No. 241541)  
 lspooneer@kslaw.com  
 4 KING & SPALDING LLP  
 5 333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 400  
 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
 6 Telephone: +1 650 590 0700  
 7 Facsimile: +1 650 590 1900

8 Attorneys for Non-Party  
 INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 11 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
 12

13  
 14 APPLE INC., a California corporation,  
 15 Plaintiff,

16 V.

17 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a  
 Korean corporation; SAMSUNG  
 18 ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New  
 York corporation; and SAMSUNG  
 19 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA,  
 20 LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,  
 21 Defendants.

CASE NO. 11-CV-01846-LHK (PSG)

**NON-PARTY IBM'S MOTION FOR  
 TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER  
 PROHIBITING THIRD-PARTY  
 INTERVENOR REUTERS FROM  
 DISCLOSING HIGHLY SENSITIVE  
 INFORMATION OF IBM, CURRENTLY  
 SUBJECT TO A MOTION TO SEAL**

22  
 23 **IBM'S MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

24 On July 26, 2012, non-party International Business Machines Corporation ("IBM") filed a  
 25 motion to seal limited, but highly sensitive, commercial information in potential trial exhibit 630  
 26 in the above captioned matter. Specifically, IBM seeks to seal the payment amounts under a  
 27 contract between Defendant Samsung and IBM.  
 28

1 IBM understood that Local Rule 79-5(c)(3) and General Order 62 required Reuters to be  
2 served with an unredacted copy of proposed trial exhibit 630, the subject of IBM's motion to seal.  
3 Furthermore, IBM believed that Reuters would be bound by the terms of the protective order in  
4 this case, entered on January 30, 2012 (the "Protective Order"). Paragraph 15 of the Protective  
5 Order states that "absent written permission from the producing party, or a court order secured  
6 after appropriate notice to all interested persons, a receiving party may not file in the public  
7 record any protected material." Paragraph 18 of the Protective Order stated that inadvertent  
8 disclosure of the protected material does not change the status of the material or waive the right to  
9 hold the disclosed document or information as protected.

10 Rather than immediately informing IBM that Reuters would not abide by the terms of the  
11 Protective Order or return the unredacted document, on July 29 at approximately 9:52 p.m. IBM  
12 received an electronic message from Mr. Dan Levin, a legal reporter with Reuters in California.  
13 Mr. Levine suggested that he was in possession of the unredacted exhibit and that he intended to  
14 publish IBM's highly confidential payment terms with Samsung immediately, stating that the  
15 deadline for publication was 11 a.m. PST on Monday July 30. That publication would not only  
16 be in direct violation of the protective order in this matter, but would moot the very motion to seal  
17 currently before this Court.

18 At the very least, and to the extent Reuters is not bound by the terms of the Protective  
19 Order, IBM requested that the document be immediately returned and all copies destroyed  
20 pursuant to paragraph 18(a) of the Protective Order.

21 Based on the foregoing, IBM hereby seeks a temporary restraining order prohibiting  
22 Reuters from publishing or otherwise using in any way, IBM's confidential information unless  
23 and until IBM's motion to seal is denied, and an Order abiding by the terms of the Protective  
24 Order, or otherwise returning or destroying IBM's confidential material.

25  
26  
27  
28

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

DATED: July 30, 2012

By: Timothy T. Scott / TS  
TIMOTHY T. SCOTT

Attorneys for Non-Party  
INTERNATIONAL  
BUSINESS MACHINES  
CORPORATION