

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, on behalf
of itself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

No. C 05-03740 WHA

v.

ASTRA USA, INC., ASTRA ZENECA
PHARMACEUTICALS LP, EVENTS
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., BAYER
CORPORATION, BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB
COMPANY, PFIZER, INC.,
SCHERING-PLOUGH CORPORATION TAP
PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCTS, INC.,
ZENECCA, INC., ZLB BEHRING LLC,
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION,
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION
d/b/a GLAXO SMITHKLINE, WYETH, INC.,
WYETH PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANT AVENTIS'S
MOTION TO SEAL
PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE AND
EXHIBIT 6 TO DEFENDANT
AVENTIS'S OBJECTIONS TO
PLAINTIFFS' DESIGNATION
OF AMBIEN**

The same day as an order denied plaintiffs' motion to seal documents that defendant
Aventis had designated as confidential, it filed a further motion asking for the same relief. The
motion stated that defendant "omitted to file a declaration in support of Plaintiffs' motion to seal
pursuant to 79-5[(d)]." The documents at issue in the previous order were plaintiffs' response in
a discovery dispute and two exhibits to the supporting declaration. The documents at issue in
defendant Aventis's new motion are plaintiffs' response and only one of the two exhibits that
were previously at issue.

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

The prior order will stand. First, despite the fact that the order stated that a request to file plaintiffs' entire response under seal was not narrowly tailored in accordance with Civil Local Rule 79-5(a), defendant Aventis still moves to file the whole response under seal in its new motion. Civil Local Rule 79-5(a) does not allow this. Second, the documents at issue were put on the public docket, pursuant to the previous order. Finally, defendant cites no authority to overcome the presumption in favor of public access to court records.

Defendant Aventis's motion (Dkt. No. 697) is therefore **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 30, 2010.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE