

THE HONORABLE JAMES L. ROBERT

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Plaintiff,
vs.
MOTOROLA, INC., et al.,
Defendants.
<hr/>
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
vs.
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Defendants.

Case No. C10-1823-JLR

MICROSOFT'S MOTION TO SEAL
TRIAL EXHIBITS THAT DISCLOSE
MICROSOFT'S TRADE SECRETS

Noted: Friday, November 9, 2012

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

MICROSOFT'S MOTION TO SEAL TRIAL
EXHIBITS THAT DISCLOSE MICROSOFT'S
TRADE SECRETS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	1
III. LEGAL AUTHORITY & ARGUMENT	3
A. Legal Standard	3
B. Compelling Reasons Exist To Seal Trial Exhibits That Disclose Microsoft’s Trade Secrets	4
1. Microsoft’s Confidential Patent License Agreements Should Be Publicly Disclosed only in Redacted Form, If at All.....	4
2. Microsoft’s Strategic Product Planning Documents Should Be Sealed	6
3. Microsoft Source Code Documents Should be Sealed	8
4. Technical Xbox-related Product Specifications Should Be Sealed	8
5. Microsoft’s Confidential Product-Specific Financial Information, Including Past and Projected Sales and Revenue Data, Should be Sealed	10
6. Motorola’s Summary Document Disclosing the Parties’ Settlement Negotiations Should be Sealed	11
IV. CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

1

2

3

4

5 *Abaxis, Inc. v. Cepheid,*
2011 WL 6002522 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2011)4

6 *Agency Solutions.Com, LLC v. TriZetto Group, Inc.,*
819 F. Supp. 2d 1001 (E.D. Cal. 2011)8, 10

7

8 *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,*
2012 WL 3283478 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2012)4, 5, 8

9

10 *Bauer Bros. LLC v. Nike, Inc.,*
2012 WL 1899838 (S.D. Cal. May 24, 2012)8, 11

11 *Bean v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,*
2012 WL 1078662 (D. Ariz. Mar. 30, 2012).....10

12

13 *Clark v. Bunker,*
453 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1972)3, 4, 9, 11, 12

14

15 *DISH Network, L.L.C. v. Sonicview USA, Inc.,*
2009 WL 2579052 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2009)7

16 *In re Electronic Arts,*
298 Fed. App’x 568 (9th Cir. 2008)4

17

18 *F.D.I.C. v. Tarkanian,*
2012 WL 1327856 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2012).....11

19

20 *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. Of Honolulu,*
447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006)3

21 *Krieger v. Atheros Communications, Inc.,*
2011 WL 2550831 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2011)8

22

23 *Network Appliance, Inc. v. Sun Microsystems Inc.,*
2010 WL 841274 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2010).....3, 5, 8

24

25 *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.,*
435 U.S. 589 (1978).....3

1 *Powertech Tech., Inc. v. Tessera, Inc.*,
2012 WL 3283420 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2012)4

2 *TriQuint Semiconductor, Inc. v. Avago Technologies Ltd.*,
3 2011 WL 6182346 (D. Ariz. Dec. 13, 2011)4, 8, 11

4 *Ultimate Timing, L.L.C. v. Simms*,
5 2010 WL 786021 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 4, 2010)3

6 *Wacom Co., Ltd. v. Hanvon Corp.*,
2007 WL 3026889 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 16, 2007)8

7 **Other Authorities**

8 *Restatement of Torts* § 757, cmt. b10, 11, 12

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

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Western District of Washington Local Civil Rule 5(g)(2), Microsoft respectfully moves for leave to file under seal certain exhibits that disclose confidential trade secret information and that may be introduced into evidence at trial. Microsoft does *not* anticipate that the introduction of sealed documents at trial will require closure of the courtroom, as the sealed documents need not be publicly displayed to be viewed by the Court, parties or witnesses. Microsoft is requesting only that 63 documents be sealed, 58 of them in their entirety and 5 of them only in part. As further detailed below, each document fits within at least one of the following categories of confidential and proprietary documents:

1. Microsoft Confidential Patent License Agreements;
2. Microsoft Strategic Product Planning Documents;
3. Microsoft Source Code;
4. Proprietary Technical Product Specifications;
5. Confidential Product-Specific Financial Information; and
6. Confidential Settlement Negotiations.

Attached as Appendix A¹ is a spreadsheet that (a) identifies each of the 63 documents at issue by trial exhibit number, (b) provides a short description of the document, and (c) categorizes each document within one of the above-listed categories. As further explained below, there are compelling reasons to seal each of the exhibits listed on Appendix A.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Throughout this litigation, the parties have produced many confidential and highly sensitive documents regarding their business and licensing practices, business strategies, financial information, and technical developments, as well as documents that contain the

¹ Each of the potential trial exhibits listed on Appendix A are also listed among the 3,000 trial exhibits on the Joint Trial Exhibit List. (Dkt. No. 493, Ex. 1). As the parties will be providing the Court with hard copies of all potential trial exhibits on the Joint Trial Exhibit List prior to the noting date of this motion, Microsoft does not plan to separately submit an additional hard copy of the specific exhibits listed on Appendix A. However, for the Court's convenience, Microsoft will be providing chambers with a DVD containing electronic copies of each document listed on Appendix A, as well as proposed redactions for certain of those documents, as further explained below. Microsoft is providing Motorola with a courtesy copy of the DVD as well.

1 highly confidential information of third parties. To protect such material, the parties entered
2 into a stipulated Protective Order, approved by the Court on July 21, 2011. (Dkt. No. 72.)²

3 The Protective Order outlines categories of material that should be treated as
4 confidential, along with procedures for sealing such confidential material when filed with the
5 Court or introduced at trial. Since entry of the Protective Order, Microsoft, Motorola and
6 subpoenaed third parties have produced hundreds of thousands of pages designated as
7 “Confidential” or “Attorneys’ Eyes Only” material under the Protective Order, in reliance on
8 the protections offered by that Order and with the expectation that properly designated
9 materials would be protected from public disclosure. In cases where Microsoft has
10 confidential licensing or other commercially sensitive financial information of a third party in
11 its files, before producing such information it has notified the third party prior to producing
12 such information under the terms of the Protective Order.

13 As the Court is aware, over the course of this litigation, the parties have filed numerous
14 motions to seal in connection with various dispositive motions, which required a showing that
15 “compelling reasons” exist for sealing the supporting documents. (*See, e.g.*, Dkt. Nos. 227,
16 234, 271, 282, 287, 361, and 372). The Court granted several such motions. (*See, e.g.*, Dkt.
17 Nos. 294, 336, 337, 338, 384, and 385). In addition to granting motions as to highly
18 confidential business information and the parties’ historic licensing practices, the Court found
19 “compelling reasons” to seal Microsoft’s proprietary source code, “descriptions of Microsoft’s
20 licensing negotiations and agreements with third parties”, and copies of the parties’ license
21 agreements with third parties. (*See* Dkt. No. 292 at 2-4; Dkt. No. 384). Applying the same
22 legal standard, Microsoft believes that the 63 documents listed on Appendix A similarly should
23 be sealed, to the extent any such documents are admitted into evidence at trial.

24 _____
25 ² On October 3, 2012, the Court amended the Protective Order to permit the parties’ in-house counsel to have expanded access to confidential materials. (*See* Dkt. No. 447.)

1 **III. LEGAL AUTHORITY & ARGUMENT**

2 **A. Legal Standard.**

3 A party seeking to seal a judicial record attached to a dispositive motion or presented at
 4 trial must articulate “compelling reasons” that outweigh the public policies favoring disclosure.
 5 *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. Of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). Under LCR
 6 5(g)(2), the presumption of public access to evidence supporting dispositive motions “may be
 7 overcome only on a compelling showing that the public’s right of access is outweighed by the
 8 interests of the public and the parties in protecting the court’s files from public review.”
 9 However, “the public interest in understanding the judicial system would appear to be less
 10 where ... the documents in question are irrelevant to the Court’s decision.” *Network*
 11 *Appliance, Inc. v. Sun Microsystems Inc.*, 2010 WL 841274, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2010)
 12 (citing *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179) (documents supporting dispositive motion “[not] bearing
 13 on the resolution of the dispute on the merits ... are therefore more akin to the ‘unrelated,’ non-
 14 dispositive motion documents the Ninth Circuit contemplated in *Kamakana*”).

15 “In general, ‘compelling reasons’ . . . exist when such ‘court files might have become a
 16 vehicle for improper purposes,’ such as the use of records to . . . release trade secrets.”
 17 *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179 (citing *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598
 18 (1978)). The Ninth Circuit has adopted the Restatement’s definition of “trade secret.” *See*
 19 *Ultimate Timing, L.L.C. v. Simms*, 2010 WL 786021, at *1-2 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 4, 2010)
 20 (citing *Clark v. Bunker*, 453 F.2d 1006, 1009 (9th Cir. 1972)). Under that standard, a “trade
 21 secret may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used
 22 in one’s business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors
 23 who do not know or use it.” *Id.*, 2010 WL 786021, at *2 (quotations omitted).

1 **B. Compelling Reasons Exist To Seal Trial Exhibits that Disclose Microsoft’s Trade**
 2 **Secrets.**

3 1. Microsoft’s Confidential Patent License Agreements Should Be Publicly
 4 Disclosed only in Redacted Form, if at All.

5 Motorola has identified as potential trial exhibits five licenses between Microsoft and
 6 third parties. Four of these licenses are between Microsoft and third party licensees covering
 7 Microsoft’s patents applicable to various aspects of the Android operating system. (Exs. 2813;
 8 2828; 3076; 3077). The fifth is a confidential settlement and license agreement between third
 9 party Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) and Microsoft
 10 covering CSIRO’s declared 802.11 standard essential patents. (Ex. 3352). These licenses
 11 include sensitive, non-public trade secret information such as royalty rates and payment terms
 12 that courts in the Ninth Circuit regularly order sealed under the “compelling reasons” standard.
 13 *In re Electronic Arts*, 298 Fed. App’x 568, 569 (9th Cir. 2008) (finding that “pricing terms,
 14 royalty rates, and guaranteed minimum payment terms” in license agreements “plainly fall[]
 15 within the definition of ‘trade secrets’”); *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.*, 2012 WL
 3283478, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2012) (same).³

16 Within Microsoft, confidential information regarding licensing terms and conditions is
 17 restricted. Declaration of Tanya Moore in Support of Microsoft’s Motion to Seal Trial
 18 Exhibits (hereinafter “Moore Decl.”) ¶¶ 5-6. The employees in Microsoft’s licensing
 19 department understand the extremely sensitive nature of such information, and understand their
 20 duty to not disclose the terms of these agreements. *Id.* at ¶ 8. Prior to entering into each of the
 21 licenses at issue here, as part of its standard practice, Microsoft required its licensing partners

22
 23 ³ See also *Clark*, 453 F.2d at 1009 (“[A] detailed plan for the creation, promotion, financing, and sale of
 24 contracts” constitutes a trade secret); *TriQuint Semiconductor, Inc. v. Avago Techs., Ltd.*, 2011 WL 6182346, at
 25 *3-7 (D. Ariz. Dec. 13, 2011) (sealing documents containing sensitive financial information and licensing
 information); *Powertech Tech., Inc. v. Tessera, Inc.*, 2012 WL 3283420, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2012) (sealing
 details of license agreement); *Abaxis, Inc. v. Cepheid*, 2011 WL 6002522, at *1 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2011)
 (granting motion to seal exhibit to dispositive motion containing term sheet of licensing negotiations).

1 to agree to maintain the confidentiality of the licensing terms. *Id.* at ¶ 9. This commitment
2 also is expressly included as part of each executed license agreement.

3 The licenses at issue here were produced as “Confidential Business Information” under
4 the terms of the Protective Order entered in this case. *Id.* at ¶ 7. This is consistent with
5 Microsoft’s efforts to ensure that such confidential information is not disseminated more
6 widely than necessary or required by law. *Id.*

7 Public disclosure of such confidential licenses, settlements, and acquisitions would
8 have a profound impact on Microsoft and the third parties in future licensing negotiations and
9 settlements with others by creating an asymmetry of information. *Id.* at ¶¶ 3, 4. This
10 asymmetry of information would result in additional leverage and bargaining power that could
11 be used against Microsoft by its competitors and/or potential licensing partners. *Id.* at ¶ 10. In
12 particular, by learning the financial details of these license agreements, competitors and
13 potential counterparties to licensing and settlement agreements with Microsoft would gain an
14 unfair insight into Microsoft’s business strategies, licensing strategies, prior royalty grants,
15 negotiation tactics, and cost/benefit analyses. *See id.*

16 Here, Microsoft is not requesting that the Court seal the Microsoft licenses in their
17 entirety. Microsoft seeks only to have the Court seal those portions of its third party patent
18 license agreements that disclose the licensing parties’ trade secret information.⁴ This includes
19 the financial terms of the licenses, such as pricing, royalty and payment terms.⁵ Permitting
20 redaction of this information will minimize the harm to Microsoft and third-parties while also
21 giving due consideration to the public policies favoring disclosure. *See Apple*, 2012 WL

22
23 ⁴ Redacted versions of the five licenses are included on the DVDs being provided to the Court and Motorola.

24 ⁵ One Licensee, Quanta, has also requested that the definition of “Unlicensed Products” at page 4 of its license
25 (Ex. 3077) be redacted to avoid disclosure of certain Quanta customers and their products, which Quanta believes
should be maintained as confidential. Quanta is not a party to this suit and the identities of its clients and their
products are irrelevant to the issues before the Court. Compelling reasons exist to redact this information from the
Quanta license. *Network Appliance, Inc.*, 2010 WL 841274, at *2.

1 3283478, at *10.⁶ The Court should permit Microsoft to redact the portions of each license
2 that contain confidential “trade secret” information.

3 2. Microsoft’s Strategic Product Planning Documents Should Be Sealed.

4 Motorola has identified a number of potential trial exhibits that disclose Microsoft trade
5 secrets relating to its confidential business practices, product development plans, and its
6 marketing strategies with respect to both current and future products and services.⁷ These trial
7 exhibits relate to Microsoft’s (1) Xbox line of products and accessories (the “Confidential
8 Xbox Strategic Planning Documents”) and (2) Windows operating system software products
9 and services (the “Confidential Windows Strategic Planning Documents”). Compelling
10 reasons exist to maintain these exhibits under seal, in the event they are admitted at trial.

11 The Confidential Xbox Strategic Planning Documents⁸ contain detailed and highly
12 sensitive product development and marketing plans for current Xbox products and accessories
13 as well as the yet-to-be-released next generation Xbox game console. Declaration of Leo Del
14 Castillo in Support of Microsoft’s Motion to Seal Trial Exhibits (hereinafter “Del Castillo
15 Decl.”), ¶¶ 3-4. Similarly, the Confidential Windows Strategic Planning Documents⁹ contain
16 detailed and highly sensitive product development and marketing plans for Microsoft Windows
17 products and services, including but not limited to the Windows 7 operating system software,
18 the recently released Windows 8 operating system software, and key Cloud services such as
19 Windows Update. Declaration of Erich Andersen in Support of Microsoft’s Motion to Seal
20 Trial Exhibits (hereinafter “Andersen Decl.”), ¶ 3.

21
22
23 ⁶ Further, the four Microsoft licenses listed as Exs. 2813, 2828, 3076 and 3077 cover patents that are not relevant
24 to determining the RAND royalty for Motorola’s 802.11 and/or H.264 standard essential patents. The public’s
25 interest in having access to this licensing information is especially slight. *Id.*

⁷ These potential trial exhibits are identified on Appendix A within the “Product Planning” category.

⁸ Exs. 2125, 2138, 2353, 2366, 2385, 2584, 2585, 2687, 2688, 2689, 2727, 2730, 2908, and 3180.

⁹ Exs. 2371, 2372, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2737, and 3179.

1 These materials disclose Microsoft’s strategic objectives, feature descriptions and
2 analysis relating to significant products and services, technical product specifications,
3 development and marketing timelines, competitive market analyses, and cost information. Del
4 Castillo Decl., ¶¶ 3-4; Andersen Decl., ¶¶ 3-4. These are proprietary materials that consist of
5 trade secrets not known to the public or Microsoft’s competitors. *Id.* Microsoft takes pains to
6 ensure that such information remains confidential and protected against unauthorized
7 disclosure, including producing such materials only under appropriate non-disclosure
8 agreements and/or the terms of a Protective Order and even restricting internal access to such
9 materials. *Id.*

10 Public disclosure of the trade secrets pervading Microsoft’s strategic product planning
11 and marketing documents would cause competitive harm to Microsoft. Del Castillo Decl., ¶ 5;
12 Andersen Decl., ¶ 5. Microsoft seeks to differentiate its Xbox and Windows products and
13 services from those of its competitors, providing its customers with a higher quality product,
14 exclusive features and a superior user experience. *Id.* Microsoft invests heavily in its efforts to
15 achieve these goals, and expends significant time, effort and resources developing its product
16 and marketing plans to reach these objectives and maintain or increase market share. *Id.*
17 Disclosure of these materials would reveal Microsoft’s proprietary plans to its competitors,
18 exposing Microsoft’s strategic objectives and providing to its competitors at no cost the
19 comprehensive roadmaps that Microsoft has developed at substantial cost over many years. *Id.*
20 Microsoft’s competitors should not be afforded such an unfair advantage.

21 “Compelling reasons” exist to seal the type of strategic Microsoft planning documents
22 that Motorola intends to introduce at trial. *See, e.g., DISH Network, L.L.C. v. Sonicview USA,*
23 *Inc.*, 2009 WL 2579052, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2009) (sealing documents containing
24 “descriptions of Defendants’ products [that] could serve as a blueprint for others to design
25

1 similar products to circumvent DISH Network’s security system enabling more individuals to
2 steal DISH Network programming”).¹⁰

3 3. Microsoft’s Source Code Documents Should Be Sealed.

4 Microsoft also anticipates that exhibits may be introduced at trial containing its
5 confidential source code.¹¹ “[S]ource code is undoubtedly[sic] a trade secret” *Agency*
6 *Solutions.Com, LLC v. TriZetto Group, Inc.*, 819 F. Supp. 2d 1001, 1017 (E.D. Cal. 2011)).
7 District courts in the Ninth Circuit routinely hold that nonpublic, proprietary source code is
8 properly sealed under the “compelling reasons” standard. *See, e.g., Apple*, 2012 WL 3283478
9 at *14; *Network Appliance*, 2010 WL 841274, at *4-5; *Wacom Co., Ltd. v. Hanvon Corp.*,
10 2007 WL 3026889, *3 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 16, 2007). Here, any potential public interest in
11 access to judicial records is outweighed by Microsoft’s significant interest in protecting its
12 proprietary source code from disclosure to its competitors. The public disclosure of the source
13 code would cause significant competitive harm to Microsoft because its competitors would be
14 able to use Microsoft’s confidential and proprietary source code to Microsoft’s competitive
15 disadvantage. Moreover, Microsoft’s source code has little relevance to the issues to be
16 determined at the November trial in this case.

17 4. Technical Xbox-related Product Specifications Should Be Sealed.

18 At trial the parties may seek to introduce exhibits that include confidential technical
19 information relating to the Xbox 360. This includes Microsoft’s Technical Publisher’s Guide

20 _____
21 ¹⁰ *See also, TriQuint Semiconductor*, 2011 WL 6182346, at *3 (finding “compelling reasons” to seal where
22 competitive standing would be harmed if competitors obtain information regarding business strategies, including
23 “development spending, budgets, and development processes” because disclosure would significantly harm
24 competitive standing by allowing “competitors to tailor their own capital expenditures, budgets, and business
25 strategies to compete against TriQuint more effectively”); *Krieger v. Atheros Communications, Inc.*, 2011 WL
2550831, *1 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2011) (sealing document containing “long-term financial projections, discussions
of business strategy, and competitive analyses.”); *Bauer Bros. LLC v. Nike, Inc.*, 2012 WL 1899838, *3 (S.D. Cal.
May 24, 2012) (sealing documents containing confidential sales and advertising data and including a detailed
discussion of “sales, merchandise costs, costs of goods sold, royalty costs, promotional costs, and personnel
costs.”).

¹¹ Such potential trial exhibits are identified in Appendix A within the “Source Code” category.

1 (Ex. 288) and third-party Marvell Semiconductor's technical data sheets for certain of its
2 802.11-enabled chips (Exs. 84 and 524).

3 Microsoft's Technical Publisher's Guide contains detailed technical information
4 necessary for third party publishers to develop applications for Xbox Live and Xbox 360. Del
5 Castillo Decl., ¶ 6. The Xbox Technical Publisher's Guide details the set of guidelines and
6 requirements Microsoft has developed, through investment of significant time, effort, and
7 resources, as a means to guarantee a level of quality in the product that Microsoft deems a
8 differentiating advantage. *Id.* This information is proprietary, and is shared only with third
9 party publishers under a non-disclosure agreement. *Id.* Public disclosure of these materials
10 would provide Microsoft's competitors with an unfair and unearned competitive advantage
11 conferring the benefits of Microsoft's work without a commensurate level of investment. *Id.*

12 Marvell supplies Microsoft with the semiconductor chips that provide the 802.11
13 wireless networking capabilities in Microsoft's Xbox 360 game consoles. As explained in the
14 accompanying declaration of Jennifer Ochs, Marvell's Director of IP Licensing, these data
15 sheets disclose the design and operation of Marvell's chips. Declaration of Jennifer Ochs in
16 Support of Microsoft's Motion to Seal Trial Exhibits (hereinafter "Ochs Decl."), ¶¶ 5-7.
17 Marvell considers this to be confidential and proprietary trade secret information, which
18 Marvell supplies to its customers only subject to a non-disclosure agreement. *Id.* Marvell
19 would suffer a significant competitive disadvantage if its competitors were provided access to
20 Marvell's confidential, proprietary design and operations information, which could facilitate
21 development of competing chipsets. *Id.*

22 In light of the potential competitive harm resulting from disclosure of the proprietary
23 information contained in Exhibits 84, 288, and 524 and the reasonable efforts to maintain the
24 confidentiality of these documents, these exhibits – like proprietary source code – qualify as
25 trade secrets. *See Clark*, 453 F.2d at 1009 (quoting *Restatement of Torts* § 757, cmt. b); *see*

1 also *In re Elec. Arts*, 298 Fed. App'x at 569-70; cf. *Agency Solutions.com*, 819 F. Supp. 2d at
2 1017. The competitive harm resulting from disclosure of these materials outweighs any
3 interest in public access to these records. These exhibits should therefore be sealed.

4 5. Microsoft's Confidential Product-Specific Financial Information, Including Past
5 and Projected Sales and Revenue Data, Should be Sealed.

6 The parties may seek to introduce evidence regarding Microsoft's highly confidential
7 past sales and revenue data, as well as Microsoft's highly confidential future sales and revenue
8 projections for its products and services.¹² Disclosure of this evidence, and in particular
9 disclosure of Microsoft's sales and revenue projections, would have the potential to lead to
10 competitive harm by creating an asymmetry of information between Microsoft and
11 competitors, whose sales and revenue results and projections are not public. Moore Decl. at ¶
12 12, Del Castillo Decl., ¶ 9, Andersen Decl., ¶ 7. More importantly, Microsoft's competitors
13 would be able to use this information to discern and anticipate Microsoft's past and future
14 confidential business and marketing strategies, and to evaluate the success of those confidential
15 strategies. For example, competitors might target Microsoft through advertising, or might
16 adjust their own marketing strategies in order to undercut the parties' anticipated revenues and
17 sales. This would provide Microsoft's competitors with an unfair and undeserved competitive
18 advantage. *Id.*

19 Past and future sales and revenue data of this type constitute protectable trade secrets.
20 *Bean v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.*, 2012 WL 1078662, at *5-6 (D. Ariz. Mar. 30, 2012) (sealing
21 "precise revenue results" and "exact sales and production numbers," in charts summarizing
22 defendant's sales and revenue figures broken out by product). The competitive harm that
23 would result from disclosure of this information outweighs the public's interest in access to

24 ¹² Microsoft's confidential and proprietary financial information is contained in the trial exhibits listed on
25 Appendix A within the "Financial Information" category as well as in many of the documents within the "Product
Planning" category including, but not limited to, Ex. 3179.

1 this information. Further, these sales and revenue figures for Microsoft's products are not
 2 related to the central issues to be decided at the November trial – the appropriate RAND
 3 royalty and RAND range for Motorola's 802.11 and H.264 standard essential patents.
 4 Accordingly, any exhibits that reveal this proprietary and confidential information should be
 5 sealed. *See, e.g., Clark*, 453 F.2d at 1009 (quoting *Restatement of Torts* § 757, cmt. b); *In re*
 6 *Elec. Arts*, 298 F. App'x at 569-70.¹³

7 6. Motorola's Summary Document Disclosing the Parties' Settlement Negotiations
 8 Should Be Sealed.

9 Motorola has indicated that it intends to submit a summary exhibit of its settlement
 10 negotiations with Microsoft (Ex. 3335). Motorola's summary exhibit references confidential
 11 negotiations that took place under the terms of the parties' November 12, 2010 Non-Disclosure
 12 Agreement, pursuant to which the parties agreed to keep their negotiations confidential. (*See*
 13 *Dkt. No 452.*) Both parties are requesting that such exhibit be sealed – if the exhibit is
 14 admitted into evidence at trial. If Motorola is *not* barred from introducing such information
 15 either by Fed. R. Evid. 408 or the terms of the parties' Non-Disclosure Agreement, it should be
 16 maintained under seal. Public disclosure of such negotiations would negatively affect
 17 Microsoft in future settlement negotiations by permitting competitors and potential
 18 counterparties to such negotiations to enter those negotiations with unfair insight into
 19 Microsoft's and Motorola's business and licensing strategies, proposed licensing terms, and
 20 cost/benefit analyses. Moore Decl. at ¶ 13. Because public disclosure of these documents
 21 would thus have the potential to lead to an unfair business advantage and competitive harm,

22 ¹³ *See also Bauer Bros.*, 2012 WL 1899838, at *3 (sealing documents containing confidential sales and
 23 advertising data and including a detailed discussion of “sales, merchandise costs, costs of goods sold, royalty
 24 costs, promotional costs, and personnel costs”); *F.D.I.C. v. Tarkanian*, 2012 WL 1327856, * 2 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 17,
 25 2012) (sealing documents containing financial information); *TriQuint Semiconductor*, 2011 WL 6182346, at *6
 (permitting redaction of information of “product-specific pricing, target prices, price proposals, and price
 forecasts” under “compelling reasons” standard because disclosure will harm bargaining position and give
 competitors the ability to undercut prices).

1 these documents qualify as trade secrets that should be sealed. *See, e.g., Clark*, 453 F.2d at
2 1009 (quoting *Restatement of Torts* § 757, cmt. b); *In re Elec. Arts*, 298 F. App'x at 569-70.

3 Moreover, the parties' settlement negotiations are irrelevant to the determination of a
4 RAND royalty and range for Motorola's patents. Microsoft's compelling interest in
5 maintaining the confidentiality of settlement negotiations outweighs any slight interest the
6 public may have in access to that information.

7 IV. CONCLUSION

8 For the foregoing reasons, Microsoft respectfully requests an order directing that each
9 of the potential trial exhibits listed in Appendix A be sealed, if admitted into evidence at trial.

10 In addition, because it is not possible to reliably predict which exhibits the parties will
11 choose to introduce at trial (and which of those exhibits ultimately will be admitted into
12 evidence), Microsoft requests the opportunity to submit a supplemental – and potentially
13 superseding – motion to seal by no later than five (5) business days after conclusion of trial.
14 The purpose of the proposed supplemental/superseding motion to seal would be to allow an
15 opportunity for the parties to identify:

- 16 (a) any additional admitted exhibits that should be sealed, along with the basis for
17 such request; and
18 (b) any exhibits listed on Appendix A that were not admitted at trial, and which
19 therefore would not be made publicly available even in the absence of a
20 successful motion to seal.

21 Microsoft believes that this process, if acceptable to the Court, would streamline and
22 facilitate consideration of the various pending motions to seal.
23
24
25

1 DATED this 1st day of November, 2012.

2 CALFO HARRIGAN LEYH & EAKES LLP

3 By s/ Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr.

4 Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr., WSBA #1751
5 Christopher Wion, WSBA #33207
6 Shane P. Cramer, WSBA #35099

7 By s/ T. Andrew Culbert

8 T. Andrew Culbert
9 David E. Killough
10 MICROSOFT CORPORATION
11 1 Microsoft Way
12 Redmond, WA 98052
13 Phone: 425-882-8080
14 Fax: 425-869-1327

15 David T. Pritikin
16 Richard A. Cederoth
17 Constantine L. Trela, Jr.
18 William H. Baumgartner, Jr.
19 Ellen S. Robbins
20 Douglas I. Lewis
21 David C. Giardina
22 John W. McBride
23 David Greenfield

24 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
25 One South Dearborn
Chicago, IL 60603
Phone: 312-853-7000
Fax: 312-853-7036

Carter G. Phillips
Brian R. Nester

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: 202-736-8000
Fax: 202-736-8711

Counsel for Microsoft Corp.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Linda Bledsoe, swear under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington to the following:

- 1. I am over the age of 21 and not a party to this action.
2. On the 1st day of November, 2012, I caused the preceding document to be served on counsel of record in the following manner:

Attorneys for Motorola Solutions, Inc., and Motorola Mobility, Inc.:

Ralph Palumbo, WSBA #04751
Philip S. McCune, WSBA #21081
Lynn M. Engel, WSBA #21934
Summit Law Group
315 Fifth Ave. South, Suite 1000
Seattle, WA 98104-2682
Telephone: 206-676-7000
Email: Summit1823@summitlaw.com

Messenger
US Mail
Facsimile
X ECF

Steven Pepe (pro hac vice)
Jesse J. Jenner (pro hac vice)
Ropes & Gray LLP
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-8704
Telephone: (212) 596-9046
Email: steven.pepe@ropesgray.com
Email: jesse.jenner@ropesgray.com

Messenger
US Mail
Facsimile
X ECF

Norman H. Beamer (pro hac vice)
Ropes & Gray LLP
1900 University Avenue, 6th Floor
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2284
Telephone: (650) 617-4030
Email: norman.beamer@ropesgray.com

Messenger
US Mail
Facsimile
X ECF

Paul M. Schoenhard (*pro hac vice*)
Ropes & Gray LLP
One Metro Center
700 12th Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005-3948
Telephone: (202) 508-4693
Email: Paul.schoenhard@ropesgray.com

_____ Messenger
_____ US Mail
_____ Facsimile
 X ECF

DATED this 1st day of November, 2012.

s/ Linda Bledsoe
LINDA BLEDSOE

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