

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED TACTICAL SYSTEMS, LLC,
Plaintiff,
v.
REAL ACTION PAINTBALL, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

AND RELATED ACTION AND CROSS
ACTION

Case No. [14-cv-04050-MEJ](#)
**ORDER TO RE-FILE REDACTED
DOCUMENT**
Re: Dkt. Nos. 186, 192-2

In response to the Court’s recent Order concerning various Motions to Seal (Sealing Order, Dkt. No. 186), Real Action Paintball, Inc. (“Real Action”) re-filed a redacted version of its earlier filed Opposition to the Motions to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (original Opp’n, Dkt. No. 131) as well as a document supporting that Opposition: a letter concerning the ATO-Sun agreement with proposed settlement terms (original letter, Dkt. No. 131-9). Dkt. Nos. 192-1 (redacted letter), 192-2 (redacted Opp’n). In its Sealing Order, the Court found that the letter contains only one paragraph on the last page that constitutes sealable material and ordered Real Action to re-file this document, redacting only the following portion: on the last page of the letter (page 3), the second-to-last paragraph’s last line, starting with “Conrad” and concluding “by Plaintiff.” Sealing Order at 5-6. The Sealing Order also sealed a number of documents that Real Action had cited in its Opposition, and as such, the Court ordered Real Action to re-file the Opposition “in accordance with th[e Sealing] Order[.]” *Id.* at 7.

Real Action properly re-filed a redacted form of the letter (Dkt. No. 192-1) but re-filed its Opposition without redacting the very same language sealed and redacted in the letter. *See* Dkt.

1 No. 192-2 at 7 (citing Exhibit 9 to Real Action’s Opp’n to Mots. to Dismiss for Lack of Personal
2 Jurisdiction, i.e., Dkt. No. 131-9). The Court therefore seals that document at Dkt. No. 192-2 and
3 **ORDERS** Real Action to re-file its Opposition in accordance with this Order and the Court’s
4 previous Sealing Order—in other words, Real Action must redact its Opposition to ensure that
5 nothing the Court has sealed is made public. Real Action must re-file this document **by**
6 **November 23, 2015.**

7 As a final note, if in the future any of the parties publicly file documents that the Court has
8 sealed, the Court will consider sanctions, regardless of whether that filing was intentional or
9 merely negligent. All parties must ensure that they fully comply with the Court’s Orders.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11

12 Dated: November 16, 2015

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



MARIA-ELENA JAMES
United States Magistrate Judge