

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
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE
LITIGATION

No. 3:12-cv-06003-CRB

**ORDER DENYING PENDING
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTIONS TO
FILE UNDER SEAL**

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
ALL ACTIONS

_____ /

This litigation now having been resolved, the Court must determine which documents, or portions thereof, should remain permanently shielded from public view. The Court has received numerous motions to seal certain portions of documents which number in the thousands of pages, most of which are heavily or entirely redacted. Specifically, the Court now has before it the following pending motions: Hewlett Packard’s Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 337); Hewlett Packard’s Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 367); Objector A.J. Copeland’s Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 378); Objector Harriet Steinberg’s Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 380); Objectors A.J. Copeland’s and Harriet Steinberg’s Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 390); Hewlett Packard’s Objection re Unsealing in Part of Consolidated Shareholder Derivative Complaint; Hewlett Packard’s Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 398); Directors’ Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 401); and Objector Harriet Steinberg’s Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (dkt. 404).

1 For the following reasons, all pending motions to seal are hereby DENIED. As an
2 initial matter, [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]

12 It has also not escaped the Court's attention that [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED]
26 [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED]
28 [REDACTED]

United States District Court
For the 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

[REDACTED]

Moreover, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

In that same vein, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

For the foregoing reasons, the pending administrative motions to seal are DENIED.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 28, 2015

CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

¹ No motion for reconsideration will be entertained unless HP identifies within three days “a limited amount of exceptionally sensitive information that truly deserves protection” under the “compelling reasons” standard of Kamakana v. City and Cty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178–79 (9th Cir. 2006), outlined by page and line number and including “specific factual findings” for each. See O’Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc., No. c-13-3826-EMC, 2015 WL 355496, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 27, 2015). In light of the “public interest in understanding the judicial process” as it relates to the settlement of these claims, the Court will not countenance arguments that public filing would put HP at a competitive or legal disadvantage. See Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1178–79.