

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

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT,
INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. [14-cv-05330-HSG](#)

**ORDER ON ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTIONS TO SEAL**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 222, 235, 243, 257, 261, 262,
267, 269, 275, 303, 311, 313, 319, 321, 323,
325, 327, 333, 358, 360, 362, 365, 366, 403,
405

Pending before the Court are the parties’ administrative motions to file under seal portions of documents in connection with the parties’ motions for (partial) summary judgment, Daubert motions, and motions in limine as well as Apple’s motion for leave to file an amended answer. (twenty-five sealing motions in total). The Court **GRANTS** the motions to file under seal.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

Courts generally apply a “compelling reasons” standard when considering motions to seal documents. *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)). “This standard derives from the common law right ‘to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *Id.* (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178). “[A] strong presumption in favor of access is the starting point.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178 (quotations omitted). To overcome this strong presumption, the party seeking to seal a judicial record attached to a dispositive motion must “articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure, such as the public interest in understanding the judicial process” and “significant public events.” *Id.* at 1178–79 (quotations omitted). “In general, ‘compelling reasons’ sufficient to outweigh the public’s interest in

1 disclosure and justify sealing court records exist when such ‘court files might have become a
2 vehicle for improper purposes,’ such as the use of records to gratify private spite, promote public
3 scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release trade secrets.” Id. at 1179 (quoting *Nixon v.*
4 *Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)). “The mere fact that the production of records
5 may lead to a litigant’s embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not,
6 without more, compel the court to seal its records.” Id.

7 Civil Local Rule 79-5 supplements the “compelling reasons” standard. The party seeking
8 to file under seal must submit “a request that establishes that the document, or portions thereof, are
9 privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law The
10 request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material” Civil L.R. 79-
11 5(b). Courts have found that “confidential business information” in the form of “license
12 agreements, financial terms, details of confidential licensing negotiations, and business strategies”
13 satisfies the “compelling reasons” standard. See *In re Qualcomm Litig.*, No. 3:17-cv-0108-GPC-
14 MDD, 2017 WL 5176922, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2017) (observing that sealing such information
15 “prevent[ed] competitors from gaining insight into the parties’ business model and strategy”);
16 *Finisar Corp. v. Nistica, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-03345-BLF (JSC), 2015 WL 3988132, at *5 (N.D. Cal.
17 June 30, 2015).

18 Records attached to nondispositive motions must meet the lower “good cause” standard of
19 Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as such records “are often unrelated, or only
20 tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action.” Id. at 1179–80 (quotations omitted). This
21 requires a “particularized showing” that “specific prejudice or harm will result” if the information
22 is disclosed. *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210–11 (9th
23 Cir. 2002); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). “Broad allegations of harm, unsubstantiated by specific
24 examples of articulated reasoning” will not suffice. *Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int’l Ins. Co.*, 966
25 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992) (quotation omitted).

26 II. DISCUSSION

27 Because the parties seek to seal portions and documents which pertain to summary
28 judgment motions, the Court applies the compelling reasons standard. The Court will apply the

1 lower good cause standard for documents related to the Daubert motions, motions in limine, and
2 Apple’s motion for leave to file an amended answer.

3 The parties have satisfied the standards for sealing because the unredacted information
4 contains confidential business and proprietary information relating to the operations of the parties.
5 See *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, No. 11-CV-01846-LHK, 2012 WL 6115623 (N.D.
6 Cal. Dec. 10, 2012); see also *Agency Solutions.Com, LLC v. TriZetto Group, Inc.*, 819 F. Supp. 2d
7 1001, 1017 (E.D. Cal. 2011); *Linex Techs., Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, No. C 13-159 CW, 2014
8 WL 6901744 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2014). The parties filed supporting declarations representing that
9 the identified portions of the unredacted versions of motions and exhibits contain information
10 disclosing confidential business information of third parties, licensing information, financial
11 information, and non-public technical descriptions of their and third-party products. See, e.g.,
12 Dkt. Nos. 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 300, 345, 349, 355, 356, 389, 390.

13 The Court did not rely on any of the documents that are the subject of the parties’
14 administrative motions to seal. The parties stipulated to an entry of final judgment of
15 noninfringement, which the Court granted. See Dkt. No. 446, 447. Thus, these documents are
16 unrelated to the public’s understanding of the judicial proceedings in this case, and the public’s
17 interest in disclosure of these documents is minimal given that the Court will not rule on the
18 motions. See *In re iPhone Application Litig.*, No. 11-MD-02250-LHK, 2013 WL 12335013, at *2
19 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2013) (“The public’s interest in accessing these documents is even further
20 diminished in light of the fact that the Court will not have occasion to rule on Plaintiffs’ Motion
21 for Class Certification.”). Accordingly, because the documents divulge proprietary and
22 confidential information unrelated to the public’s understanding of the judicial proceedings in this
23 action, the Court finds that there are compelling reasons to file the documents under seal. See
24 *Economus v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, No. 18-CV-01071-HSG, 2019 WL 1483804, at *9
25 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2019) (finding compelling reason to seal because the sealing request divulges
26 sensitive information no longer related to the case); *In re iPhone*, 2013 WL 12335013 (same); *Doe*
27 *v. City of San Diego*, No. 12-CV-689-MMA-DHB, 2014 WL 1921742, at *4 (S.D. Cal. May 14,
28 2014) (exhibit’s disclosure of personal information and irrelevance to the matter are compelling

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


reasons to seal the exhibit).

III. CONCLUSION

The Court **GRANTS** the parties' administrative motions to file under seal. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(f)(1), documents filed under seal as to which the administrative motions are granted will remain under seal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 2/26/2020


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge