

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
Plaintiff,

No. C 17-03786 WHA

v.

VALERO ENERGY CORPORATION,  
VALERO ENERGY PARTNERS LP, and  
PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE, L.P.,  
Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION  
TO UNSEAL**

A July 10 order permitted plaintiff, the state of California, to file its complaint and motion for a temporary restraining order under seal due to the time sensitive nature of the proceeding to ensure that the state expeditiously served all documents on defendants (Dkt. No. 12). Those filings were sealed and remain inaccessible to the public.

California now brings this unopposed motion to unseal redacted versions of the complaint, motion for temporary restraining order, and motion for preliminary injunction. The documents, which they propose to file on the public docket redact confidential third-party information. California has attached copies of the redacted motions, and served all third parties who provided information to the FTC or the California Attorney General in the course of their joint investigation into the underlying sale.

There is a “strong presumption in favor of access” when deciding whether to seal records. *Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (citing *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). When determining whether to keep materials sealed, the Court must “conscientiously balance the


1 competing interests of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records  
2 secret.” *Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016).  
3 (citation omitted). “Sources of business information that might harm a litigant's competitive  
4 standing” may constitute a compelling reason to keep a document sealed. *Id.*

5 Here, all sensitive third-party business information has been redacted from the relevant  
6 documents, and California’s motion is not opposed by defendants. California’s unopposed  
7 motion is **GRANTED**. California **SHALL FILE** redacted copies of the complaint, motion for  
8 temporary restraining order, and motion for preliminary injunction as separate docket entries.

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: September 6, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE