

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 TERADATA CORPORATION, et al.,

8 Plaintiffs,

9 v.

10 SAP SE, et al.,

11 Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-03670-WHO (JCS)

**ORDER REGARDING
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 339

12
13 Plaintiffs Teradata Corporation; Teradata US, Inc.; and Teradata Operations, Inc.
14 (collectively, “Teradata”) moved to file under seal exhibits to a joint letter brief. Defendants SAP
15 SE; SAP of America, Inc.; and SAP Labs, LLC (collectively, “SAP”) filed a responsive
16 declaration withdrawing some of SAP’s assertions of confidentiality but supporting sealing some
17 of the material at issue.

18 In civil action in federal court, a party generally must show “compelling reasons” to file a
19 document under seal rather than in the public record. *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*,
20 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016). Where discovery documents designated as confidential
21 under a protective order are filed in connection with a motion that is not “more than tangentially
22 related to the underlying cause of action,” however, a lower standard of “good cause” may suffice
23 to warrant sealing. *See id.* at 1097, 1101. The “good cause” standard is often applied to
24 “discovery-related motions,” and is appropriate here. *See id.* at 1097.

25 Most of the material that Teradata initially sought to seal was based solely on SAP’s
26 designations of confidentiality, which SAP withdrew in its response. The remaining material
27 consists of portions of Exhibits 6, 15, and 17. Teradata seeks to seal a several-page portion of
28 Exhibit 17 on the basis that it “contains a discussion of unfounded allegations by SAP that, if


United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 made public, would reveal confidential commercial information and may negatively impact
 2 Teradata’s relationship with customers, potential customers, or partners,” and “could harm
 3 Teradata’s competitive standing by revealing confidential commercial information and may
 4 negatively impact Teradata’s relationship with other parties.” Prendergast Decl. (dkt. 339-1) ¶¶ 2–
 5 3. SAP seeks to seal portions of Exhibits 6 and 15 on the basis that they “consist of unproven
 6 allegations by Teradata’s counsel (e.g., that certain information constitutes Teradata’s ‘trade
 7 secrets,’ or that certain acts constitute ‘misappropriation’) that are not mentioned in the joint
 8 discovery letter or in Teradata’s amended complaints” and “draw inferences about employees’
 9 intentions that have not been proven.” Lanier Decl. (dkt. 342) ¶ 8.

10 The Court has reviewed the material at issue, in which counsel for both parties accuse their
 11 opponents’ employees of stealing or misusing trade secrets and other confidential information.
 12 The confidential information is not itself included in these letters. Parties’ “unproven allegations”
 13 are routinely disclosed in litigation, and neither party cites authority for sealing such allegations
 14 under comparable circumstances.¹ Teradata’s administrative motion to file under seal is therefore
 15 DENIED in its entirety, and Teradata shall file all of the documents at issue in the public record no
 16 later than February 1, 2021.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: January 26, 2021

19 
 20 _____
 JOSEPH C. SPERO
 Chief Magistrate Judge

21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27 _____
 28 ¹ Neither party’s declaration seeks to seal the party’s *own* allegations against its opponent, and the
 Court does not reach the question of whether the outcome might differ if *both* parties had
 supported sealing particular communications between counsel that were intended to remain
 private.