

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

COPART, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPARTA CONSULTING, INC., KPIT  
INFOSYSTEMS, INC., and KPIT  
TECHNOLOGIES, LTD.,

Defendants.

Case No: 2:14-CV-00046-KJM-CKD

ORDER GRANTING  
PLAINTIFF/COUNTERDEFENDANT  
COPART, INC.'S REQUEST TO SEAL  
CERTAIN EXHIBITS SUBMITTED IN  
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

---

SPARTA CONSULTING, INC.,

Counterplaintiff,

v.

COPART, INC.,

Counterdefendant.

Having considered Plaintiff/Counterdefendant Copart, Inc.'s Request To Seal Portions of  
Certain Exhibits Submitted in Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, and the  
papers filed in relation thereto, and finding compelling reasons therefor:

1 Copart's request to seal is HEREBY GRANTED as explained below.

2 The court finds that the portions of the Expert Report of Michael Shamos ("Shamos  
3 Report") highlighted in Exhibit A to the Declaration of Dianne Yassa in support of Copart's  
4 request to seal disclose the detailed technical specifications, including the software source code,  
5 for the Copart imaging technology that forms the basis of Copart's trade secrets claims in this  
6 action. Preventing disclosure of trade secret information is a "compelling reason" justifying the  
7 sealing of documents. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir.  
8 2006). Copart's request to seal is narrowly tailored to seal only the information in the Shamos  
9 report that discloses Copart's claimed trade secrets.

10 The portions of the deposition of Jayson Adair highlighted in Exhibit C to the Yassa  
11 Declaration ("Adair Testimony") discuss Copart's confidential settlement negotiations and  
12 agreement with third party Accenture, Inc. Sealing is appropriate here, particularly because the  
13 confidential settlement agreement between Copart and Accenture was of a purely commercial  
14 dispute that did not implicate the public interest. *Salazar v. Sysco Cent. California, Inc.*,  
15 No. 1:15-CV-01758-DAD-SKO, 2017 WL 68114, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2017). Copart's  
16 sealing request is narrowly tailored, targeting portions of six pages of deposition testimony.

17 Therefore, the court approves Copart's request to file under seal the portions of the  
18 Shamos Report and Adair Testimony identified in Exhibits A and C to the Yassa Declaration,  
19 respectively. At the same time, consistent with Local Rule 140, the parties shall file redacted  
20 versions of the Shamos Report and Adair Testimony on the public docket, reflecting redactions  
21 identified in Exhibits B and D to the Yassa Declaration.

22 This order does not predetermine sealing for the purposes of trial. In addition, the court  
23 may revisit this order if it determines certain information should be disclosed to properly resolve  
24 the motions for summary judgment in a public order.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 DATED: March 2, 2017

27

28

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE