4		
1 2		
2		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	DOUGLAS O'CONNOR, et al.,	No. C-13-3826 EMC
9	Plaintiffs,	
10	v.	ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL (Docket No. 210)
11	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.,	
12	Defendants.	(Docket 110, 210)
13	/	
14		
15	On December 4, 2014, Defendant Uber Technologies submitted an administrative motion to	
16	file documents under seal that had been designated as confidential by both Plaintiffs and third-party	
17	Lyft. Docket No. 210. The Court denied the motion without prejudice on January 26, 2015, because	
18	neither the Plaintiffs nor Lyft filed a supporting declaration as required by this Court's Local Rules.	
19	See Docket No. 230. The Court gave Plaintiffs and Lyft an additional four days to file a compliant	
20	supporting declaration. Id. Plaintiffs' counsel filed a declaration that same day. Docket No. 232.	
21	Lyft, however, did not file a supporting declaration.	
22	A. <u>Applicable Legal Standard</u>	
23	As recently explained in detail in this Court's Order on Plaintiffs' administrative motion to	
24	seal, O'Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc., No. C-13-3826 EMC, 2015 WL 355496, at *1 (N.D. Cal.	
25	Jan. 27, 2015), a party seeking to seal a judicial record submitted in connection with a dispositive	
26	motion bears the burden of establishing that "compelling reasons" support the sealing request. See	
27	Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006); see also Apple,	
28		

United States District Court For the Northern District of California *Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.*, No. 11-cv-1846-LHK, 2012 WL 2913669, at *1-2 (N.D. Cal.
 Jul. 17, 2012).

B. <u>Application of the Compelling Reasons Standard</u>

The Court now applies the compelling reasons standard to the discovery materials sought to be sealed in Uber's administrative motion:

6

1.

3

4

5

Plaintiffs' Tax Return Information

7 Plaintiffs seek to maintain under seal certain interrogatory responses of the four named 8 Plaintiffs that contain detailed information regarding their personal tax returns. Plaintiffs argue that 9 such information is highly personal and confidential, and that compelling reasons do not support 10 making this information public. Plaintiffs acknowledge, however, that the public does have some 11 interest in how the named Plaintiffs reported their income to the IRS, and agree that Defendants' 12 motion for summary judgment, which summarizes this information, should be unsealed. The Court agrees that the information about the Plaintiffs' tax filings contained in Defendants' motion is 13 relevant to the issues at the heart of Uber's motion, and that this information should be disclosed to 14 15 the public. But the Court is not convinced that there are compelling reasons to disclose more 16 detailed information about the named Plaintiffs' taxes given that the gist of the information is 17 already disclosed in the unsealed brief, and therefore will grant Plaintiffs' request to keep the 18 interrogatory responses under seal.

19

2. Lyft Records (Exhibit 6)

Uber filed certain documents produced by non-party Lyft under seal, as presumably required
by the terms of a protective order between the parties and Lyft. Lyft did not file a supporting
declaration to maintain the confidentiality of its records either time this Court afforded it the
opportunity to do so. Therefore, Uber's request to maintain these records under seal is denied. *See*N.D. Cal. Local Rule 79-5(e).

25 ///

26 ///

- 27 ///
- 28

Uber shall file an un-redacted version of its summary judgment motion and a copy of Exhibit 6 on the public docket. Plaintiffs' interrogatory responses shall remain under seal. This order disposes of Docket No. 210. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: February 2, 2015

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge

United States District Court For the Northern District of California