26

27

28

1 WO 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 8 9 Medicis Pharmaceutical Corporation, No. CV 10-1780-PHX-JAT 10 Plaintiff, **ORDER** 11 VS. 12 Acella Pharmaceuticals Incorporated, 13 Defendant. 14 15 16 Acella filed a Motion for Leave to File Excess Pages in Support of its Reply in 17 Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 263) on September 26, 2011. Acella 18 requests an additional four pages for its Reply. Because of the length of Medicis's Response 19 and the complexity of the issues involved, the Court finds good cause for the additional 20 pages. The Court therefore will grant the Motion. 21 Acella has also filed a Motion for Leave to File Under Seal (Doc. 265). Acella seeks 22 to seal Exhibit C to its Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment. Exhibit C 23 contains excerpts from deposition testimony that Medicis has designated as Confidential 24 pursuant to the parties' Protective Order. 25 The Court starts with a strong presumption in favor of public access to court records.

Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003). A party that

wants to seal any part of a dispositive motion must overcome this strong presumption with

compelling reasons for sealing. Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172,

28

1179 (9th Cir. 2006). To seal any part of non-dispositive motion, a party still must demonstrate good cause. Id. at 1180.

The deposition testimony at issue deals with Medicis's process for handling consumer complaints. Acella asserts that the testimony should be sealed because the testimony represents a source of business information that might harm a litigant's competitive standing. The Court respectfully disagrees. The Court finds that Acella has demonstrated neither compelling reasons, nor good cause for sealing Exhibit C to the Reply. The Court therefore denies the Motion for Leave to File Under Seal (Doc. 265).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED GRANTING Acella's Motion for Leave to File Excess Pages in Support of its Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 263). The Clerk shall file the Reply currently lodged at Docket 264, except that the Clerk will not file Exhibit C to the Proposed Reply because of the Court's denial of the Motion to Seal.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED DENYING Acella's Motion for Leave to File Under Seal (Doc. 265). Pursuant to Local Rule of Civil Procedure 5.6(e), the Court will strike the the Sealed Lodged Proposed Exhibit at Docket 266. Acella shall have five (5) days from the date of this Order to resubmit Exhibit C to the Reply for filing in the public record.

DATED this 27th day of September, 2011.

James A. Teilborg

United States District Judge