

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065
 rvannest@kvn.com
 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - #184325
 canderson@kvn.com
 DANIEL PURCELL - #191424
 dpurcell@kvn.com
 633 Battery Street
 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
 Telephone: 415.391.5400
 Facsimile: 415.397.7188

KING & SPALDING LLP
 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279
 fzimmer@kslaw.com
 CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323
 csabnis@kslaw.com
 101 Second St., Suite 2300
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Tel: 415.318.1200
 Fax: 415.318.1300

KING & SPALDING LLP
 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 sweingaertner@kslaw.com
 ROBERT F. PERRY
 rperry@kslaw.com
 BRUCE W. BABER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 1185 Avenue of the Americas
 New York, NY 10036
 Tel: 212.556.2100
 Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819
 ballon@gtlaw.com
 HEATHER MEEKER - #172148
 meekerh@gtlaw.com
 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
 1900 University Avenue
 East Palo Alto, CA 94303
 Tel: 650.328.8500
 Fax: 650.328-8508

Attorneys for Defendant
 GOOGLE INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561-WHA

**DECLARATION OF DANIEL PURCELL
 IN SUPPORT OF ORACLE AMERICA,
 INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
 FILE UNDER SEAL EXHIBITS 1 AND 4
 AND PORTIONS OF THE SECOND
 DECLARATION OF FRED NORTON**

Judge: Hon. Donna M. Ryu

Date Comp. Filed: October 27, 2010

Trial Date: October 31, 2011

DECLARATION OF DANIEL PURCELL IN SUPPORT OF ORACLE AMERICA, INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL EXHIBITS 1 AND 4 AND PORTIONS OF THE SECOND DECLARATION
 OF FRED NORTON

CASE NO. 3:10-cv-03561-WHA

1 I, Daniel Purcell, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a partner in the law firm of Keker & Van Nest LLP, counsel to Google Inc.
3 (“Google”) in the present case. I submit this declaration in support of Oracle America, Inc.’s
4 (“Oracle”) Administrative Motion to File Under Seal Exhibits 1 and 4 and Portions of the
5 Second Declaration of Fred Norton. [Dkt. No. 335]. I have knowledge of the facts set forth
6 herein, and if called to testify as a witness thereto could do so competently under oath.

7 2. On August 25, 2011 this Court issued an Order granting in part and denying in
8 part Oracle’s motion to seal Exhibits 1 and 4 and portions of the Second Norton Declaration.
9 [Dkt. No. 356]. The Court denied Oracle’s motion to seal Exhibit 1 and the portions of the
10 Second Norton Declaration. As explained below, Exhibit 1 and portions of the Second Norton
11 Declaration contain Google’s confidential information. Under N.D. Cal. Local Civil Rule 79-
12 5(d), Google has seven days from the date Oracle lodged Google’s confidential information to
13 “file with the Court and serve a declaration establishing that the designated information is
14 sealable.” Oracle lodged Google’s confidential information and filed its motion to seal on
15 August 19, 2011. [Dkt. Nos. 335, 336]. Under Local Rule 79-5(d), Google’s deadline to submit
16 declarations in support of Oracle’s motion is August 26, 2011.

17 3. Exhibit 1 to the Second Norton Declaration is an excerpt of Google’s privilege
18 log for this case, which Google designated “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEY’S
19 EYES ONLY.” At the outset of this case, Oracle stipulated to a protective order, and the Court
20 entered an Order Approving Stipulated Protective Order Subject to Stated Conditions [Dkt. No.
21 68] that governs use in this case of documents designated “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL –
22 ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY” in this case. Under that order, Oracle was obligated to file
23 Exhibit 1 under seal because Google’s privilege log contains confidential information regarding
24 the date and general subject matter of privileged communications between Google and its
25 counsel. Google considers the timing, frequency, and subject matter of its communications with
26 its counsel to be highly confidential information. Under no circumstances does Google disclose
27 any such information to the public during the normal course of business, or absent a direct court
28

1 order. Public disclosure of facts underlying Google's communications with its counsel would
2 cause significant and undue harm to Google's business.

3 4. Portions of the Second Norton Declaration quote passages from the transcript of
4 this Court's July 21, 2011 discovery hearing. For all the reasons stated in Google's motion to
5 seal and redact those passages from the discovery-hearing transcript, [Dkt. No. 297], the
6 corresponding portions of the Norton Declaration should be redacted and sealed until the
7 privilege status of the Lindholm email is finally adjudicated. Google acknowledges that the
8 Magistrate Judge has denied Google's motion to seal and redact the July 21, 2011 transcript, but
9 Google retains the right to seek review of that ruling by Judge Alsup or the Federal Circuit.

10 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this
11 declaration was executed at San Francisco, California on August 26, 2011.

12
13 By: /s/ Daniel Purcell
14 DANIEL PURCELL
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28