



GRANTED

EFiled: Oct 26 2023 06:07PM
EDT Transaction ID 71208639
Case No. 2023-0445-MTZ



IN THE COURT OF CHANCERY OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

ROBERT GARFIELD,

Plaintiff,

v.

GETAROUND, INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 2023-0445-MTZ

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SEAL

Defendant Getaround, Inc. having filed its Motion to Seal Plaintiff's Reply Brief in Further Support of His Motion for Summary Judgment and Application for an Award of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses (the "Motion") and the Court having found good cause,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED this ____ day of _____, 2023 that:

1. Defendant's Motion is GRANTED:
2. The Register in Chancery is directed to Seal Plaintiff's Reply Brief in Further Support of His Motion for Summary Judgment and Application for an Award of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses (the "Reply") (Transaction ID 71181675), filed on October 24, 2023; and
3. After the Reply is sealed, the parties shall comply with the procedures in Court of Chancery Rule 5.1.

Vice Chancellor Zurn

This document constitutes a ruling of the court and should be treated as such.

Court: DE Court of Chancery Civil Action

Judge: Morgan Zurn

Alternate Judge: Unassigned

File & Serve

Transaction ID: 71199445

Current Date: Oct 26, 2023

Case Number: 2023-0445-MTZ

Case Name: CONF ORD - Def. Oppos. /Affidt./ Exhib A - Robert Garfield v. Getaround, Inc.

Court Authorizer: Morgan Zurn

Court Authorizer

Comments:

It was not for Plaintiff to unilaterally decide that information Defendant had designated and redacted as confidential in its opposition could be publicized in Plaintiff's reply. Defendant bore the burden of designation under Rule 5.1(b)(3). Nor was it for Plaintiff to resist Defendant's call to withdraw Plaintiff's reply that publicized information Defendant had designated. Rather, Plaintiff's recourse was to file a notice of challenge to the opposition and the reply under Rule 5.1(f).

The parties shall work with the Register in Chancery to place Plaintiff's reply under seal. The parties shall follow Rule 5.1's procedures to address any remaining disagreements as to whether information in that reply is fairly designated as confidential.

/s/ Judge Morgan Zurn