

1  
2 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
3 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
4

5 PQ LABS, INC.,

No. 12-0450 CW

6 Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING IN  
PART PLAINTIFF'S  
RENEWED MOTION TO  
SEAL (Docket No.  
145)

7 v.

8 YANG QI, ZAAGTECH, INC., JINPENG  
9 LI, and HAIPENG LI,

10 Defendants.  
\_\_\_\_\_/

11  
12 On March 2, 2014, Plaintiff PQ Labs, Inc., filed a renewed  
13 motion to seal an exhibit filed in support of its motions in  
14 limine. Specifically, it moved to seal Exhibit A to the  
15 declaration of Stephen Ellenberg, which contains Sandeep  
16 Chatterjee's expert report.

17 Because the public interest favors filing all court documents  
18 in the public record, a party seeking to file a document under  
19 seal must demonstrate good cause to do so. Pintos v. Pac.  
20 Creditors Ass'n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010). This cannot  
21 be established simply by showing that the document is subject to a  
22 protective order or by stating in general terms that the material  
23 is considered to be confidential; rather, every sealing request  
24 must be supported by a sworn declaration demonstrating with  
25 particularity the need to file each document under seal. See  
26 Civil L.R. 79-5(d).  
27  
28

1 After reviewing the supporting declaration of Bonnie Wolf,  
2 the Court finds good cause for sealing most of the material that  
3 Plaintiff seeks to redact from Chatterjee's report. The redacted  
4 portions of the report contain various descriptions and diagrams  
5 of Plaintiff's proprietary technology and, therefore, may be filed  
6 under seal. However, the proposed redactions to paragraph 19 of  
7 the report and the first two sentences of paragraph 83 do not  
8 contain any specific references to proprietary information.  
9 Accordingly, these portions of the report must be unsealed.  
10 Plaintiff has established good cause for all of the other proposed  
11 redactions.  
12

13 For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff's renewed motion  
14 to seal (Docket No. 145) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.  
15 Within four days of this order, Plaintiff must file Chatterjee's  
16 report in the public record with the redactions outlined above.  
17 The document must be filed in a text-searchable format, as  
18 required by Civil Local Rule 5(e)(2). To ensure that all  
19 information is properly redacted, Plaintiff should consult the  
20 Court's instructions at: <http://cand.uscourts.gov/ecf/redaction>.  
21

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
23

24 Dated:

