

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

CIRCLE CLICK MEDIA LLC; METRO)	Case No. 12-cv-04000-SC
TALENT, LLC; and CTNY INSURANCE)	
GROUP LLC,)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
)	DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFFS'
Plaintiffs,)	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
)	<u>UNDER SEAL</u>
v.)	
)	
REGUS MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC, et)	
al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

Now before the Court is Plaintiffs Circle Click Media LLC and CTNY Insurance Group, LLC's (collectively "Plaintiffs") administrative motion to file under seal. ECF No. 187. Plaintiffs identify several documents and some information designated as confidential by Defendants, including: (1) portions of Plaintiffs' opposition brief to Defendant Regus plc's renewed motion to dismiss; (2) portions of a stipulation regarding Defendants' revenues; (3) portions of exhibits 4, 5, 6, and 9 to the declaration of Joseph A. Garofolo; and (4) exhibits A, B, and C to the declaration of Anne A. Ward.

Defendants have submitted two documents in response. See ECF

1 Nos. 193 ("Blazewicz Decl."); 194 ("Osburn Decl."). Michael
2 Osburn, the treasurer of Regus Corporation, declares that certain
3 portions of the stipulation and opposition brief contain sensitive
4 financial information that Regus employees are required to keep
5 confidential. Osburn Decl. ¶ 2. The Court finds Mr. Osburn's
6 statements to be a valid basis for sealing that information.
7 Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED with respect to the stipulation and
8 the redacted portions of their opposition on page 10, lines 23-25,
9 and page 11, line 1. However, the other redacted portions of
10 Plaintiffs' opposition brief refer to documents that Defendants
11 have determined need not be sealed. Plaintiffs' motion is
12 therefore DENIED with respect to the redactions on page 8 of their
13 opposition brief.

14 Defendants have determined that Exhibits 4, 5, 6, and 9 to the
15 Garofolo declaration do not need to be sealed. Blazewicz Decl. ¶¶
16 3-6. Plaintiffs' motion is therefore DENIED with respect to those
17 exhibits.

18 Defendants assert that exhibits A, B, and C to the Ward
19 Declaration contain email correspondence produced and designated as
20 confidential by Plaintiffs. Defendants do not believe that those
21 documents need to be sealed. Id. ¶ 7. Plaintiffs, however, are
22 under the impression that Defendants have designated the emails as
23 confidential. See ECF No. 187-1 ("Garofolo Decl.") ¶ 3(vii)-(vix).
24 Therefore, neither party considers these emails confidential, and
25 neither party's filings include any basis for sealing them.
26 Plaintiffs' motion is DENIED with respect to exhibits A, B, and C
27 to the Ward declaration.

28 In accordance with Civil Local Rule 79(f), Plaintiffs shall

1 file revised versions of their motion and supporting documents as
2 specified below, within seven (7) days of the signature date of
3 this order:

- 4 • Exhibits 4, 5, 6, and 9 to the Garofolo Declaration (ECF Nos.
5 187-7, 187-8, 187-9, 187-10) shall be filed in the public
6 record with no redactions.
- 7 • Exhibits A, B, and C to the Ward Declaration (ECF Nos. 187-11,
8 187-12, 187-13) shall be filed in the public record with no
9 redactions.
- 10 • Plaintiffs' opposition brief (ECF Nos. 187-3, 187-4) shall be
11 filed with no redactions on page 8, but with the redactions on
12 page 10 and 11 as in the original.
- 13 • The stipulation regarding Regus' Revenue (ECF No. 187-5) may
14 remain as originally filed.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17
18 Dated: August 14, 2014



19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28