

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

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

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
GOOGLE LLC,  
Defendant.

Case No. [20-cv-04688-RS](#) (AGT)  
**ORDER RE: OUTSTANDING  
MOTIONS TO SEAL**  
Re: Dkt. Nos. 152, 176, 179

The request to seal portions of the plaintiffs’ motion for relief from the case management schedule (Dkt. 152) is granted in part. Google’s internal project name may be redacted on page fifteen of the motion and in paragraph twenty of the Mao declaration. Exhibit F to the motion may be redacted in full. With these exceptions, Google, the designating party, hasn’t convinced the Court that “specific prejudice or harm will result” if the confidential information appearing in, and attached to, the motion is publicly disclosed. *Phillips ex rel. Ests. of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210–11 (9th Cir. 2002).

The request to seal portions of the plaintiffs’ reply brief in support of the motion for relief from the case management schedule (Dkt. 176, as modified by Dkt. 179) is denied. Google, the designating party, hasn’t convinced the Court that specific prejudice or harm will result if the confidential information appearing in, and attached to, the reply brief is publicly disclosed.

By December 8, 2021, the plaintiffs must file versions of their motion and reply brief that comply with this order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 1, 2021



ALEX G. TSE  
United States Magistrate Judge