

**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

IN RE CLOROX CONSUMER LITIGATION	)	Master File No. 12-00280 SC
	)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
	)	<u>DENYING IN PART MOTION TO SEAL</u>
<hr/>		
This Document Relates To:	)	
ALL ACTIONS	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
<hr/>		

Now pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion to file under seal portions of their motion for class certification and certain exhibits filed in support of the motion. ECF No. 89. The exhibits were produced by Defendant and are subject to a protective order. Defendant has filed a declaration explaining why much of the subject material constitutes trade secrets. ECF No. 92 ("Lee Decl."). As Defendant does not object to filing some of the relevant material in the public record, the Court declines to seal that information. The Court finds that the remainder of the subject material may be properly filed under seal.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs' motion to seal is GRANTED in part and

1 DENIED in part. Plaintiffs shall file under seal their motion for  
2 class certification, as well as exhibits 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13,  
3 and 14 to the Dearman Declaration. Plaintiffs shall also file  
4 redacted copies of the motion for class certification and exhibits  
5 1, 2, 8, and 14 in the public record. Plaintiff shall work with  
6 Defendant to ensure that the trade secrets in exhibits 1, 2, 8, and  
7 14 -- identified in the Lee Declaration -- are redacted.  
8 Plaintiffs' motion to seal exhibit 9 is DENIED, since Defendant  
9 does not object to filing that exhibit in the public record.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 18, 2014

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE