

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

FRANK LUCIDO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NESTLE PURINA PET CARE COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-00569-EMC

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFFS’  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE  
UNDER SEAL**

Docket No. 154

Plaintiffs moved to file under seal certain documents in support of their opposition to Purina’s summary judgment motion. After reviewing the motion, the Court instructed the parties to meet and confer and agree upon a more narrowly tailored request to file under seal. *See* Docket No. 171 (order). The parties did so and, after reviewing the parties’ submission, the Court allowed certain documents to be filed under seal but ordered Purina to provide a more specific declaration as to why other documents should be filed under seal, particularly under the compelling reasons standard adopted by the Ninth Circuit. *See* Docket No. 178 (order).

Purina has now submitted a new declaration in which it withdraws the request to file under seal for the following documents: Exhibits 2-4, 7-8, 11-12, 15-19, and 21-29. **Accordingly, the Court orders Plaintiffs to immediately file those exhibits publicly.**

In the declaration, Purina has also asked the Court to maintain Exhibit 31 under seal. Purina has provided a sufficient justification for the sealing, and therefore the Court grants that request to file under seal.

Finally, Purina has now publicly filed redacted versions of Exhibits 10, 13, 14, 20, 30, and 38 and, in the declaration, requests that only the unredacted portions remain under seal. Purina has provided a sufficient justification for maintaining the unredacted portions under seal, and

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

therefore the Court grants that request to file under seal as well.

This order, along with the order at Docket No. 178, disposes of Docket No. 154.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 13, 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge