

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

CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SYNTRONIC AB, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-03610-SI (JCS)

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

Re: Dkt. No. 99

The parties filed a joint discovery letter brief on March 23, 2022, and Defendants Syntronic AB, et al. (collectively, “Syntronic”) filed an administrative motion under Civil Local Rule 79-5(f) to consider whether certain category labels that Plaintiff Cadence Design Systems, Inc. (“Cadence”) considers confidential should be filed under seal. Dkt. 99. Cadence filed a responsive declaration asserting that disclosing that information could reveal propriety aspects of the software it uses, dkt. 103, and Syntronic filed an opposition to sealing it, dkt. 107.

As a starting point, the procedure the parties have used is questionable. Local Rule 79-5(f) is appropriate where one party’s filing contains material an opposing party has designated as confidential. Although the material at issue here was included in Syntronic’s portion of the letter brief, that brief was a joint filing by both parties. Going forward, the parties are instructed to collaborate to ensure that motions to seal any future joint filings include all relevant declarations at the time of filing, unless exigent circumstances require the use of Local Rule 79-5(f).

Turning to the merits of the sealing motion, Cadence has submitted a declaration that it keeps the details of the programs it uses to monitor for software piracy confidential to avoid potential circumvention, and that the redacted information would disclose categories of information that the software collects. The fact that Syntronic does not understand the meaning of these category names does not prove that others who might wish to misuse that information also

1 would not understand them. Nor do the broad categories of information that Syntronic asserts
2 (without citation) Cadence has publicly disclosed it collects correspond directly to the category
3 names redacted in the joint letter. Without reaching the question of whether Cadence’s declaration
4 is sufficiently specific to establish “compelling reasons” to seal, as would be necessary for a
5 motion more than tangentially related to the merits of the case, the Court finds that Cadence has
6 shown “good cause” to seal the redacted portion of the discovery letter brief, and GRANTS the
7 motion to seal on that basis.

8 This order is limited to the motion to seal and does not resolve the parties’ discovery
9 dispute.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated: April 5, 2022

12 
13 _____
14 JOSEPH C. SPERO
15 Chief Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28