UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PINTEREST, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PINTRIPS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 13-cv-04608-RS (KAW)

ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL

Re: Dkt. No. 103

Plaintiff Pinterest, Inc. moves to file four exhibits to its motion for sanctions under seal. (Pl.'s Mot., Dkt. No. 103.) These exhibits include a list of investors and potential investors, portions of deposition transcripts, and responses to interrogatories. (Pl.'s Mot., Exs. G-I, K.) Plaintiff brings the motion for the sole reason that the exhibits "contain information disclosed during discovery that Defendant . . . designated as 'Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes Only.'" (Id. at 1, 2.) This, however, is insufficient to establish that these documents should be filed under seal. See Civil L.R. 79-5(b). Reference to a stipulation or protective order that allows a party to designate certain documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a document, or portions thereof, are sealable. See Civil L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A). Moreover, Defendant has not, as ///

Doc. 104

United States District Court Northern District of California

required by Civil Local Rule 79-5(e)(1), filed "a declaration . . . establishing that all of the designated material is sealable." Accordingly, the instant motion is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 11/07/2014

KANDIS A. WESTMORE United States Magistrate Judge

¹ In her declaration in support of the motion, Plaintiff's counsel states: "On October 24, 2014, at 2:42 PM, Counsel for Pinterest sent Counsel for Pintrips an email requesting his position as to this Motion. As of the time of filing, Counsel for Pintrips stated that he could not express a position." Pl.'s Mot., Dkt. No. 103-1. The Court's CM/ECF system shows that Plaintiff filed the instant motion on October 28, 2014 at 4:14 p.m.