

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

CAVE CONSULTING GROUP, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

OPTUMINSIGHT, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. [15-cv-03424-JCS](#)

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

Re: Dkt. No. 223

The Court previously granted in part and denied in part the parties' motions to file documents related to a discovery dispute under seal, and allowed time for a non-party to file a response stating its interest in sealing certain material at issue, specifically Exhibit 8 to the parties' joint letter brief (dkt. 225) and references in the letter brief to the contents of that exhibit. *See* dkts. 229, 231. As permitted by the Court's previous order, Defendant OptumInsight, Inc. has filed a declaration stating the non-party's interest in sealing, in order to preserve the confidentiality of the non-party's identity. *See generally* Bjorklund Decl. (dkt. 234). The non-party objects to disclosure of its identity on the basis that its use of certain software and allegations that such use constitutes patent infringement are not part of the public record. *Id.* ¶ 5. The non-party does not object to filing Exhibit 8 in the public record so long as references to the non-party's identity are redacted. *Id.* ¶ 7. Accordingly, OptumInsight is ORDERED to file redacted versions of Exhibit 8 and the joint letter brief in the public record no later than January 10, 2018, redacting only identifying information of the non-party and its employee.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 3, 2018



JOSEPH C. SPERO
Chief Magistrate Judge