

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

**ADT SECURITY SERVICES, INC.,**  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
**SECURITY ONE INTERNATIONAL, INC., ET AL.,**  
Defendants.

Case No. 11-cv-05149-YGR  
**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING  
IN PART ADMINISTRATIVE MOTIONS TO  
SEAL IN CONNECTION WITH FURTHER  
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING**  
Re: Dkt. Nos. 405, 408, 411

Plaintiff ADT Security Services, Inc. filed an Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (Dkt. No. 405) and an Amended Administrative Motion to File Materials Under Seal (Dkt. No. 408) in connection with its Supplemental Brief in Further Support of ADT's Application for an Order to Show Cause Why Defendant Should Not be Found in Contempt of the Court's October 1, 2013 Order. Defendants Security One International Inc. and Claudio Hand likewise filed their Administrative Motion to File Under Seal in connection with their supplemental briefing on the same matter. (Dkt. No. 411.)

The Court having carefully considered those motions, and the declarations submitted in support thereof, finds that compelling reasons have not been established for sealing the deposition and documentary evidence as set forth in this Court's Order on Cross-Motions For Orders To Show Cause RE: Contempt Of Permanent Injunction And Protective Order (Dkt. No. 412, "Contempt Order".) Therefore, the Court **ORDERS** that the motions to seal are **DENIED IN PART** and the following documents shall be filed on the public docket forthwith:

- the unredacted version of Security One's Response to ADT's Supplemental Brief In Further Support of ADT's Application (Dkt. No. 411-6);

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

- the unredacted version of the Declaration of John O’ Bryan ISO Defendants’ Reply to ADT’s Supplemental Brief and all exhibits thereto (Dkt. No. 411-7);
- the unredacted Supplemental Brief in Further Support of ADT’s Application for an Order to Show Cause Why Defendant Should Not Be Found in Contempt of the Court’s October 1, 2013 Order (Dkt. No. 408-8);
- the unredacted Declaration of Matthew J. Vanis, including:
  - Exhibits 2 and 3 to that declaration in their entirety; and
  - Exhibit 1, the deposition transcript of Emanuel Alexander Troise, III, to the extent portions of that deposition are cited and discussion in the Court’s Contempt Order. (Dkt. Nos. 408-9 to 408-12.) As to any portions of the deposition transcript not cited in the Contempt Order, those portions are **ORDERED SEALED** on the grounds that they are proprietary business information of third party UTC.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

This terminates Docket Nos. 405, 408, and 411.

Dated: October 19, 2016



**YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE**