

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

DENNIS F., et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
AETNA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,
Defendant.

Case No. [12-cv-02819-MMC](#)

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL;
DIRECTIONS TO DEFENDANT**

Re: Dkt. No. 190

Before the Court is defendant Aetna Life Insurance Company's ("Aetna") motion to file under seal, filed September 16, 2016, by which Aetna seeks leave to file under seal ten administrative services agreements ("ASAs") between Aetna and various third parties, which have already been heavily redacted and are submitted in support of Aetna's Opposition to Memorandum Regarding Standard of Review; Aetna also seeks leave to file a redacted version of its Opposition and a supporting exhibit, in which the ASAs are quoted.

At the hearing conducted November 4, 2016, counsel for Aetna represented to the Court that the ASAs contain a confidentiality clause. By order filed November 7, 2016 ("November 7 Order"), the Court directed Aetna to file, no later than November 17, 2016, proof of service of the instant motion and the November 7 Order on each such third-party and also directed any third party who wished to file a declaration establishing the confidentiality of the above-referenced material to file such declaration no later than December 1, 2016.


On November 17, 2016, Aetna filed various proofs of service in compliance with the November 7 Order. To date, no declaration has been filed by any third party.

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

Accordingly, as the third parties in question have not asserted that the above-referenced material is confidential, Aetna's motion for administrative relief is hereby DENIED, and Aetna is hereby DIRECTED to file in the public record, no earlier than April 14, 2017, and no later than April 20, 2017, the following documents: (1) an unredacted version of Aetna's Opposition to Memorandum Regarding Standard of Review; (2) an unredacted version of Exhibit A to the Declaration of Heather Richardson in Support of Opposition to Memorandum Regarding Standard of Review; and (3) Exhibits D, F, I, K, N, P, R, T, W, and Y to the Declaration of Heather Richardson in Support of Opposition to Memorandum Regarding Standard of Review.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 10, 2017


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge