

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

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 TRAUERIG, 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 REID MULLEN IN  
SUPPORT OF ORACLE AMERICA,  
INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL (DKT.  
NO. 557)**

Judge: Hon. William Alsup

Date Comp. Filed: October 27, 2010

1 I, Reid Mullen, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an associate in the law firm of Kecker & Van Nest LLP, counsel to Google  
3 Inc. (“Google”) in the present case. I submit this declaration in support of Oracle America Inc.’s  
4 (“Oracle”) Administrative Motion to File Under Seal Portions of Oracle’s Motion to Exclude  
5 Portions of the Expert Reports of Gregory K. Leonard and Alan J. Cox (Dkt. No. 557). I have  
6 knowledge of the facts set forth herein, and if called to testify as a witness thereto could do so  
7 competently under oath.

8 2. Oracle moves to file under seal the following documents:

- 9 • Exhibits 1, 2, and 4 through 9 of the Declaration of Meredith Dearborn in Support  
10 of Oracle’s Motion to Exclude Portions of the Expert Reports of Gregory K.  
Leonard and Alan J. Cox (Dkt. No. 559) (“Dearborn Decl.”)
- 11 • Portions of Oracle’s Motion to Exclude Portions of the Expert Reports of Gregory  
12 K. Leonard and Alan J. Cox (Dkt No. 557) (“Motion to Exclude”)

13 3. Exhibit 1 to the Dearborn Decl. (Dkt. 559) is the complete Expert Report of Dr.  
14 Gregory K. Leonard. Dr. Leonard’s report contains information that has been designated  
15 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY pursuant to the stipulated  
16 protective order in this case. The report and the underlying documents contain Google’s  
17 sensitive, non-public financial data, such as costs, revenues, and profits associated with Android.  
18 The report and underlying documents also contain non-public information about Google’s  
19 consideration of and potential financial impact from alternatives to the intellectual property at  
20 issue in this lawsuit. Additionally, Dr. Leonard’s report contains non-public information about  
21 Google’s licensing arrangements with third-parties, which are protected by confidentiality  
22 clauses with those third-parties. Google does not make this information available to the public.  
23 Public disclosure of this confidential information would cause great and undue harm to Google,  
24 and place it at a competitive disadvantage.

25 4. Exhibit 2 to the Dearborn Decl. (Dkt. 559) is the complete Expert Report of Dr.  
26 Alan J. Cox. Dr. Cox’s report contains information that has been designated HIGHLY  
27 CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY pursuant to the stipulated protective order in  
28 this case. The report and the underlying documents contain Google’s sensitive, non-public

1 financial data, such as costs, revenues, and profits associated with Android. Dr. Cox's report  
2 also contains non-public information about Google's consideration of and potential impact from  
3 alternatives to the intellectual property at issue in this lawsuit. Google does not make this  
4 information available to the public. Public disclosure of this confidential information would  
5 cause great and undue harm to Google, and place it at a competitive disadvantage.

6 5. Google does not request sealing of Exhibits 4 through 9 of the Dearborn Decl.  
7 Nor does Google request sealing of the redacted portions of Oracle's Motion to Exclude.

8  
9 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this  
10 declaration was executed at San Francisco, California on October 28, 2011.

11  
12 By: /s/ Reid Mullen  
13 REID MULLEN  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28