

1 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
 BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342  
 2 DAVID L. ANDERSON #149604  
 JACOB R. SORENSEN #209134  
 3 MARC H. AXELBAUM #209855  
 BRIAN J. WONG #226940  
 4 DANIEL J. RICHERT #232208  
 50 Fremont Street  
 5 Post Office Box 7880  
 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880  
 6 Telephone: (415) 983-1000  
 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200  
 7 Email: bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com

8 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
 DAVID W. CARPENTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 9 DAVID L. LAWSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 BRADFORD A. BERENSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 10 EDWARD R. McNICHOLAS (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 1501 K Street, N.W.  
 11 Washington, D.C. 20005  
 Telephone: (202) 736-8010  
 12 Facsimile: (202) 736-8711

13 Attorneys for Defendants  
 AT&T CORP. and AT&T INC.  
 14

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18

<p>19 TASH HEPTING, GREGORY HICKS,          CAROLYN JEWEL and ERIK KNUTZEN          20 on Behalf of Themselves and All Others          Similarly Situated,          21          Plaintiffs,          22          vs.          23 AT&amp;T CORP., AT&amp;T INC. and DOES 1-20,          24 inclusive,          25 Defendants.</p>	<p>No. C-06-0672-VRW</p> <p><b>RESPONSE OF AT&amp;T CORP. TO          PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE          MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS          UNDER SEAL [DKTS. 183-85]</b></p> <p>Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor          Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker          Hearing: June 23, 2006          Time: 9:30 a.m.</p>
--	--

26  
 27  
 28

1 On June 8, 2006, plaintiffs filed under seal Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to  
2 Dismiss Or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment by the United States of America  
3 Based on the State Secrets Privilege (*see* Dkt. 181, the "Opposition") and the Declaration of  
4 Michael M. Markman Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f) in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss  
5 or, in the Alternative, For Summary Judgment by the United States Based on State Secrets  
6 Privilege (*see* Dkt. 182, the "Markman Declaration"). Plaintiffs also filed an administrative  
7 motion and supporting documents (Dkts. 183-185) that address sealing. Defendant **AT&T**  
8 **CORP.** ("AT&T") hereby responds to plaintiffs' administrative motion.<sup>1</sup>

9 AT&T is not opposed to unsealing most of the Opposition and the Markman  
10 Declaration. However, certain information in these documents is confidential and  
11 proprietary and it needs to be protected. AT&T has engaged in a meet and confer process  
12 with plaintiffs' counsel and the parties have come to agreement on versions of the Klein  
13 declaration (Dkt. 147) and plaintiffs' preliminary injunction motion (Dkt. 149) that have  
14 been publicly filed. The parties are currently engaging in the same process with regard to  
15 the Marcus declaration (*see* Dkt. 32). Plaintiffs propose that the parties attempt to reach  
16 agreement and create redacted versions of the Opposition and Markman Declaration that  
17 can be publicly filed. Dkt. 183, 2:23-25. AT&T agrees and is optimistic that the parties  
18 will reach agreement, as they have on the other documents. The parties need time to  
19 complete this process. AT&T suggests that the parties be given until Monday, June 19 to  
20 reach agreement and file redacted versions, or else file short papers (not to exceed five  
21 pages per side) indicating why they cannot agree.

22 //

23 //

24 //

25

26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> As stated in AT&T's June 10 filing (Dkt. 190), AT&T takes no position on the part of the  
28 administrative motion regarding the length of Plaintiffs' 59-page brief. That is the  
government's fight.

