

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAFrancisco Berlanga, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
Polaris Industries, Inc., et al.,
Defendants.Case No. 2:21-cv-00949-KJM-DMC
ORDER

16 Plaintiffs and defendants jointly filed a renewed request to redact, in part, two documents
17 related to plaintiffs' motion for class certification. Notice of Mot., ECF No. 83; Joint Request at
18 5.¹ The court has previously discussed the applicable legal standard and incorporates it by
19 reference in this order. *See* Prior Order (Apr. 28, 2023) at 1–2, ECF No. 77.

20 The court finds the parties' request now satisfies the "compelling reason" standard
21 necessary for redaction and sealing, *Kamakana v. City of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir.
22 2006), because the information to be redacted contains "product development plans" and other
23 confidential information, which could be used by "competitors seeking to replicate [products] and
24 circumvent the time and resources necessary in developing their own practices and strategies,"
25 *Algarin v. Maybelline, LLC*, No. 12-3000, 2014 WL 690410, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2014).

¹ The joint request to seal and corresponding materials are not publicly available on the court's docket, but the parties have sent the documents to the court for review pursuant to Local Rule 141(b).

1 Thus, the court **grants the joint request**. Plaintiffs are directed to file the redacted documents on
2 the public docket at the time they file the motion for class certification.

3 This order resolves ECF No. 83.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: May 18, 2023.

6



CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE