

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MATTHEW F. SAUER,
Plaintiff,

v.

LATEEF INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT
LP, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-02802-VC

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

Re: Dkt. No. 9

The defendants' motion file portions of the complaint and an attached exhibit under seal is denied in part, and granted in part. As to the portions of paragraphs 23–24, 28, 35, 42, and 79 of the complaint, as well as portions of Exhibit 2, the motion is denied, because the defendants have offered no concrete explanation for why publicly revealing this information could be harmful to them. As to paragraphs 55–65 in their entirety, and the portions of paragraphs 41, 66, 91, 97, 139–141, and 143, the Court finds there are compelling reasons to seal this material. These paragraphs include information about the defendants' business that could harm its competitive standing. See *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096–97 (9th Cir. 2016). The plaintiff is ordered to refile a redacted version of the complaint publicly, consistent with this ruling, by 5 p.m. on July 28, 2016.


After Sauer filed his opposition to the motion to file the complaint under seal, the defendants filed a letter requesting his opposition (and associated materials) be provisionally sealed because in their view, it revealed some of the information they sought to keep under seal in their initial motion. Dkt. No. 19. In light of the Court's ruling on the motion to file under seal, if the defendants still wish to keep portions of the opposition (and associated materials) under

seal, they may file a narrow sealing request, consistent with the Court's ruling regarding the complaint, by no later than 5 p.m. on July 28, 2016. Assuming the defendants wish for a portion of the opposition to be under seal, they should submit a redacted version, and the Court will order it filed if the request is sufficiently narrow and consistent with this ruling. Otherwise, the opposition (and associated materials) will be filed publicly.

In response to the Court's ordering the parties to file certain contracts, Dkt. No. 36, the defendants provisionally filed them under seal, Dkt. No. 37. If the defendants wish to keep any portion of these contracts under seal, they may file a narrowly tailored request that explains in detail why this material should be kept from the public by no later than 5 p.m. on July 28, 2016. Assuming the defendants wish for a portion of the contracts to be kept under seal, they should submit redacted versions, and the Court will order them filed if the request is sufficiently narrow. Otherwise, the contracts will be filed publicly.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 26, 2016



VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge