

1
2
3
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
5 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
6

7 G.P.P., INC. d/b/a GUARDIAN
8 INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS,
9

v.
10 Plaintiff,

11 GUARDIAN PROTECTION PRODUCTS,
12 INC., RPM WOOD FINISHES GROUP,
13 INC.,

14 Defendants.
15

Case No. 1:15-cv-00321-SKO

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT
GUARDIAN PROTECTION PRODUCTS,
INC.’S UNOPPOSED REQUEST TO SEAL
DOCUMENTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH
LOCAL RULE 141**

(Doc. 449)

16 On November 15, 2021, Defendant Guardian Protection Products, Inc. (“Guardian”)
17 submitted a notice of request to seal exhibits 1, 10–13, 15, 18, 20, 24–26, and 28–32 to the
18 Declaration of Aaron P. Rudin in support of Guardian’s Motions in Limine Nos. 1–7 (“Rudin
19 Declaration”) and to seal an unredacted version of Guardian’s Motion in Limine No. 2, which
20 contains quotations from the Revised Expert Report of Peter D. Wrobel (the “Request to Seal”).
21 (Doc. 449.) Guardian’s Request to Seal state that these documents “have been marked by one of
22 the parties to this action as confidential and/or highly confidential attorneys’ eyes only pursuant to
23 the Stipulated Protective Order in this matter.” (*Id.* at 2.) The parties’ Stipulated Protective Order
24 provides that “[i]n the event that a party wishes to use any Confidential Information, or any
25 document containing or making reference to the contents of such information, in any pleading or
26 document filed with the Court, such pleading or document shall be filed under seal pursuant to the
27 Local Civil Rules.”¹ (Doc. 45 at 9.)

28 ¹ “Confidential Information” is defined as “any information in any of the Discovery Material that is designated as

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 141(b), a request to seal a document “shall set forth the statutory or
2 other authority for sealing, the requested duration, the identity, by name or category, of persons to
3 be permitted access to the documents, and all other relevant information.” L.R. 141(b). “Only if
4 good cause exists may the Court seal the information from public view after balancing ‘the needs
5 for discovery against the need for confidentiality.’” *Koloff v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, No.
6 113CV02060AWIJLT, 2014 WL 12573330, at *1 (E.D. Cal. July 9, 2014) (quoting *Pintos v. Pac.*
7 *Creditors Ass ’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. Cal. 2010)). A party may submit an opposition to a
8 request to seal documents within three days of the date of service of the request. L.R. 141(c).

9 Plaintiff G.P.P., Inc. d/b/a Guardian Innovative Solutions has not submitted an opposition
10 to Guardian’s Request to Seal, and the time to do so has expired. Guardian’s Request to Seal is
11 therefore deemed unopposed. Guardian has complied with Local Rule 141, and in view of the
12 documents’ designation under the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order, to which there has been no
13 challenge (see Doc. 45 at 7–8), the Court finds there is good cause to allow Guardian to file them
14 under seal.

15 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Guardian’s unopposed Request to Seal (Doc. 449), and
16 ORDERS exhibits 1, 10–13, 15, 18, 20, 24–26, and 28–32 to the Rudin Declaration and the
17 unredacted version of Guardian’s Motion in Limine No. 2 be FILED UNDER SEAL in accordance
18 with Local Rule 141(e)(2).

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: November 19, 2021

22 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27

28 _____
29 ‘CONFIDENTIAL’ or ‘CONFIDENTIAL: ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY’ by one or more of the parties to this action
30 or a third party responding to a subpoena served in this action. (Doc. 45 at 2.)