

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

VIRTUE GLOBAL HOLDINGS LIMITED,
Plaintiff,
v.
REARDEN LLC, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-00797-JST (SK)

**ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANT'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL**

Regarding Docket No. 160

Defendants move to file under seal the exhibits supporting their Motion for Reconsideration. (Dkt. 161.) Defendants seek to file documentation under seal because Plaintiff previously designated the material as confidential. Civil Local Rule 79-5(e)(1) requires that the party designating the material as confidential, in this case, the Plaintiff, submit a declaration establishing that all of the designated material is sealable within four days of the filing of the administrative motion. Plaintiff failed to file a declaration in support of the sealing within four days of May 27, 2016.¹ Thus, there is currently no justification before this Court to warrant granting the motion to seal. Plaintiff is given an extension of time to provide justification for filing to June 7, 2016. If Plaintiff fails to provide any justification by that date, the Court will deny the motion to file under seal and Defendants may file the documents in the public record.

While the burden was on the Plaintiff to justify sealing the materials at issue, the Court disapproves of requests for the wholesale sealing of documents, particularly where the Court has previously denied sealing the same or other versions of the same document. For example, the

¹ This is not the first time that Plaintiff has failed to timely file a declaration establishing the confidential nature of the information submitted by Defendants in an administrative motion to seal. *See* Dkt. 97 and 98.

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

Court previously made a determination regarding the redaction of the asset purchase agreement at Docket 71, earlier versions of which are included in the current administrative motion. (Dkt. 71.) **The parties are admonished to advise the Court whether or not a specific document or a version of that document has been the subject of a previous motion to seal.** Further, the parties should be respectful of third party information that is either privileged or protected, regardless of whose duty it is to seek the sealing of information. For example, it appears that, in this case, the documents that are the subject of this pending motion to file under seal contain bank account information and salary information for third parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 3, 2016



SALLIE KIM
United States Magistrate Judge