

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
DOES 1-10,  
  
Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
) Case No. 1:25-CV-2695-MHC  
)  
) **FILED UNDER SEAL**  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

# INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff has filed a Complaint and Application For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief (“TRO Application”) to stop the harmful and malicious Internet activities of Defendants Does 1-10, which are aimed at Microsoft Corporation, their customers, members, and the public. Plaintiffs seek *ex parte* relief in the TRO Application that will cease the irreparable harm resulting from Defendants’ conduct. Plaintiff’s seek *ex parte* relief under seal because advance public disclosure or notice of the requested relief would allow Defendants to evade such relief and further prosecution of this action, thereby perpetuating the irreparable harm at issue. The reasons for Plaintiff’s

request are set forth in detail in its TRO Application and supporting declarations. Therefore, Plaintiff requests that this case and all documents filed in this case be sealed pending execution of the temporary restraining order sought in Plaintiff's TRO Application. Plaintiff's request is narrowly tailored to impose the least restriction on the public's right of access to information. Plaintiff requests that all sealed documents be immediately unsealed upon execution of the temporary restraining order.

### **ARGUMENT**

The public has a right to access judicial records and documents, but this right is not absolute. *Romero v. Drummond Co., Inc.*, 480 F.3d 1234, 1245 (11th Cir. 2013). "The right of access does not apply to discovery and, where it does apply, may be overcome by a showing of good cause." *Id.* Pleadings and motions that are "'presented to the court to invoke its powers or affect its decisions,' whether or not characterized as dispositive," are subject to the public's right of access, and a showing of good cause must be made to seal them. *Id.* (citation omitted); *see also FTC. v. AbbVie Prods. LLC*, 713 F.3d 54, (11th Cir. 2013).

"When deciding whether to grant a party's motion to seal, the court is required to balance the historical presumption of access against any significant interests raised by the party seeking to file under seal." *Sheffield v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co.*, No. 5:14-CV-38, 2016 WL 3546373, at \*1 (S.D. Ga. June 23,

2016); *see also Romero*, 480 F.3d at 1246. In balancing these interests, courts look to “whether allowing access would impair court functions or harm legitimate privacy interests, the degree of and likelihood of injury if made public, the reliability of the information, whether there will be an opportunity to respond to the information, whether the information concerns public officials or public concerns, and the availability of a less onerous alternative to sealing the documents.” *Romero*, 480 F.3d at 1246.

Good cause can exist under a variety of circumstances where the moving party’s right to protect a legitimate interest outweighs the public’s right of access. One such circumstance is “when disclosure will cause the party to suffer a clearly defined and serious injury.” *Reid v. Viacom International Inc.*, No. 1:14-CV-1252-MHC, 2016 WL 4157208, at \*2 (N.D. Ga., Jan. 25, 2016). Another is when a party’s privacy or proprietary interests are at stake, such as trade secrets. *Romero*, 480 F.3d at 1246; *see also Danimer Scientific, LLC v. Metabolix, Inc.*, No. 1:10-CV-102 (WLS), 2010 WL 11470643, at \*2 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 9, 2010) (finding good cause to protect trade secrets and other confidential, proprietary information when disclosure would harm the parties' legitimate privacy interest in the information).

This Court has sealed records in a case similar to the one at hand. *See Microsoft Corp. v. Malikov*, No. 1:22-CV-1328-MHC, 2022 WL 1742862, at \*5 (N.D. Ga. Apr. 8, 2022) (directing Plaintiffs to “move the Court to unseal this case

and make the appropriate portions of the filings in this action accessible to the public.”) Moreover, courts in other judicial districts have sealed records when doing so was necessary to protect against cybercrime. *E.g.*, *Oneamerica Financial Partners, Inc. v. T-Systems North America, Inc.*, No. 115CV01534TWPKL, 2016 WL 891349, at \*4 (S.D. Ind., Mar. 9, 2016) (granting motion to seal information regarding plaintiffs’ IT security and infrastructure that if disclosed, could make plaintiff vulnerable to a hacker attack); *In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013) (holding that compelling reasons existed to seal complaint because it contained information that could be used “to circumvent Google's anti-virus and anti-spam mechanisms”). Thus, an effort to thwart future cyberattacks is sufficient good cause to seal sensitive information. *See Music Group Macao Commercial Offshore Ltd v. Foote*, No. 14-cv-03078-JSC, 2015 WL 3993147, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 30, 2015) (“Weighing the public interest in understanding the judicial process against Plaintiff’s allegation that disclosing server data may harm it by encouraging another cyberattack, or at least making it feasible, the Court finds a compelling reason to seal ....”).

In this case, Plaintiff’s right and interest in protecting its ability to obtain *ex parte* temporary relief, and the necessity of sealing to Plaintiff’s ability to obtain such relief, is paramount over any competing public interest to immediate access to the information Plaintiff requests to be sealed. If Plaintiff’s papers are not sealed,

the relief sought would very likely be rendered fruitless, and there is substantial risk Defendants would destroy evidence. The harm that would be caused by public filing of Plaintiff's Complaint and moving papers would far outweigh the public's right to access that information. Moreover, there is no need for public access to these documents while Plaintiff is seeking *ex parte* temporary relief, which will only be effective if the materials remain under seal until after Plaintiff is able to obtain that relief. Applying the balancing test demonstrates that Plaintiff's interest in protecting the confidentiality of the pleadings far outweighs any public right to disclosure of that information.

There is a real and substantial risk that if this case and documents filed are made public before Plaintiff can execute the temporary restraining order, Defendants will destroy all evidence of their prior activities, change their online identities, and move their infrastructure to different servers to continue carrying out their illicit activities. Further, Plaintiff only seeks to seal such information for a limited period of time. After Plaintiff obtains effective *ex parte* temporary relief, Plaintiff intends to immediately commence its efforts to provide Defendants notice of the preliminary injunction hearing and service of the Complaint. All documents will then be unsealed and the public will be given full access to these proceedings. Plaintiff, upon execution of the *ex parte* relief, will file with the Clerk of the Court a Notice that the temporary restraining order has been executed.

Should, however, the Court decide not to grant the *ex parte* temporary relief that Plaintiff requests in the TRO Application, Plaintiff respectfully requests that such materials remain sealed for an indefinite period, as public disclosure or notice absent the *ex parte* relief requested would facilitate Defendants' harmful and malicious Internet activities.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff requests that this case and the following documents be kept under seal in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1) pending execution of the *ex parte* relief sought in the TRO Application:

1. Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief;
2. Brief in Support of Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief;
3. Emergency Motion to Waive Time Requirements;
4. [Proposed] Order Granting Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief;
5. Declaration of Derek Richardson in Support of Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief, and exhibits thereto;

6. Declaration of Igor Aronov in Support of Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief, and exhibits thereto;
7. Declaration of Rodelio Finones in Support of Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief, and exhibits thereto;
8. Declaration of Jakub Tomanek in Support of Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief, and exhibits thereto;
9. Declaration of Robert Uriarte in Support of Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief;
10. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Exceed Page Limits Re: Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief;
11. Brief in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Exceed Page Limits Re: Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief;

- 12.[Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Exceed Page Limits Re: Application of Microsoft Corporation For An Emergency *Ex Parte* Order For Temporary Restraining Order and Related Relief;
- 13.Motion for Protective Order Temporarily Sealing Documents;
- 14.Brief in Support of Motion for Protective Order Temporarily Sealing Documents;
- 15.Declaration of Robert Uriarte in Support of Motion for Protective Order Temporarily Sealing Documents;
- 16.[Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order Temporarily Sealing Documents;
- 17.Plaintiff's Motion for Issuance of Summons and Authorization to Serve Process on Defendants by Electronic Means Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3);
- 18.Brief in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Issuance of Summons and Authorization to Serve Process on Defendants by Electronic Means Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3);
- 19.[Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Issuance of Summons and Authorization to Serve Process on Defendants by Electronic Means Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3);
- 20.Plaintiff's *Ex Parte* Motion for Expedited Discovery;



21. Brief in Support of Plaintiff's *Ex Parte* Motion for Expedited Discovery;

22. [Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiff's *Ex Parte* Motion for Expedited Discovery;

23. *Pro Hac Vice* Applications for Robert L. Uriarte, Jacob Heath, Lauren Baron, and Ana Mendez-Villamil.

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the case and these materials be sealed pending execution of the *ex parte* temporary relief sought in the TRO Application. Plaintiff respectfully requests that immediately upon execution of the temporary restraining order, the instant case be unsealed and the foregoing documents be filed in the public docket. Upon execution of the *ex parte* relief, Plaintiff will file with the Clerk of the Court a Notice that the temporary restraining order has been executed. Plaintiff further requests that upon execution of the temporary restraining order, Plaintiff be permitted to disclose such materials as it deems necessary, including to commence its efforts to provide Defendants notice of the preliminary injunction hearing and service of the Complaint.

Plaintiff respectfully requests that should the Court decide not to grant the *ex parte* temporary relief requested in the TRO Application, that the materials be sealed indefinitely.

Dated: May 14, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Joshua D. Curry

Joshua D. Curry

Joshua D. Curry (Georgia Bar No. 117378)  
Jonathan D. Goins (Georgia Bar No. 738593)  
LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP  
600 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 4700  
Atlanta, GA 30308  
Tel: 404.348.8585  
Fax: 404.467.8845  
josh.curry@lewisbrisbois.com  
jonathan.goins@lewisbrisbois.com

Robert L. Uriarte (*pro hac vice*)  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
355 S. Grand Ave.  
Ste. 2700  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Tel: (213) 629-2020  
Fax: (213) 612-2499  
ruriarte@orrick.com

Jacob M. Heath (*pro hac vice*)  
Ana M. Mendez-Villamil (*pro hac vice*)  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: (415) 773-5700  
Fax: (415) 773-5759  
jheath@orrick.com  
amendez-villamil@orrick.com

Lauren Baron (*pro hac vice*)  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
51 West 52nd Street  
New York, NY 10019  
Tel: (212) 506-5000  
Fax: (212) 506-5151  
lbaron@orrick.com

*Of Counsel:*  
Richard Boscovich  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
Microsoft Redwest Building C  
5600 148th Ave NE  
Redmond, Washington 98052  
Tel: (425) 704-0867  
Fax: (425) 936-7329  
rbosco@microsoft.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation*

**CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE**

Pursuant to L.R. 7.1(D), N.D. Ga., counsel for Plaintiff hereby certifies that this Motion has been prepared with one of the font and point selections approved by the Court in L.R. 5.1, N.D. Ga.

Dated: May 14, 2025

/s/ Joshua D. Curry