11

13

14

15

16

17

18

1					
2					
3					
4	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT			
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
6					
7	PHOENIX TECHNOLOGIES LTD., Plaintiff,	Case No. <u>15-cv-01414-HSG</u>			
8	v.	ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART THE PARTIES'			
9 10	VMWARE, INC.,	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTIONS TO FILE UNDER SEAL			
10	Defendant.	Re: Dkt. Nos. 181, 182, 230, 247, 279, 280			
12	Pending before the Court are several administrative motions to file various documents				

Pending before the Court are several administrative motions to file various documents under seal pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5, relating to Plaintiff Phoenix Technologies' ("Plaintiff") and Defendant VMware, Inc.'s ("Defendant") motions in limine ("MIL") and charging conference statements. See Dkt. Nos. 181, 182, 230, 247, 279, 280. No oppositions to the motions were filed. Having carefully considered each of the requested redactions, the Court **GRANTS IN PART** and **DENIES IN PART** the administrative motions to seal.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

19 Courts generally apply a "compelling reasons" standard when considering motions to seal 20 documents. Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n, 605 F.3d 665, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2010). "This standard derives from the common law right 'to inspect and copy public records and documents, including 21 judicial records and documents." Id. (quoting Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 22 23 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)). "[A] strong presumption in favor of access is the starting point." 24 Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1178 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). To overcome this 25 strong presumption, the moving party must "articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring 26 27 disclosure, such as the public interest in understanding the judicial process." Id. at 1178-79 28 (citations, internal quotation marks, and alterations omitted). "In general, compelling reasons

Northern District of California United States District Court

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

sufficient to outweigh the public's interest in disclosure and justify sealing court records exist when such court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes, such as the use of records to gratify private spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release trade secrets." Id. at 1179 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). The court must "balance the competing interests of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records secret. After considering these interests, if the court decides to seal certain judicial 6 records, it must base its decision on a compelling reason and articulate the factual basis for its ruling, without relying on hypothesis or conjecture." Id. (citations, brackets, and internal quotation marks omitted).

Civil Local Rule 79-5 supplements the "compelling reasons" standard. The party seeking to file under seal must "establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law. . . . The request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material" Civ. L.R. 79-5(b).

Finally, records attached to motions that are only "tangentially related to the merits of a case" are not subject to the strong presumption of access. Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2016). Accordingly, parties moving to seal such records must meet the lower "good cause" standard of Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Id. at 1097. The "good cause" standard requires a "particularized showing" that "specific prejudice or harm will result" if the information is disclosed. Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c).

II. DISCUSSION

23 Here, the Court applies the "compelling reasons" standard because the documents at issue have more than a tangential relation to the merits of the case. See Ctr. for Auto Safety, 809 F.3d at 24 25 1099 (stating that "plenty of technically non-dispositive motions—including routine motions in limine—are strongly correlative to the merits of a case."). The Court rules as follows: 26

27

//

//

28

2

Northern District of California United States District Court

Motion	Document	Ruling	Reason
181	Plaintiff's MIL No. 2	GRANTED	Confidential Business Agreement
181	Plaintiff's MIL No. 3	DENIED as to 2:21; 3:10-12;	No Declaration in Support
		3:21-22; 3:27; 4:1;	
181	Declaration of Whitty	GRANTED as to 93:17-95:11	Confidential Business Agreement
	Somvichian in Support of		6
	Plaintiff's MIL ("Somvichian		
	Decl."), Exhibit 4		
181	Somvichian Decl., Exhibit 5	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
181	Somvichian Decl., Exhibit 6	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
181	Somvichian Decl., Exhibit 7	GRANTED	Confidential Business Information
181	Somvichian Decl., Exhibit 8	GRANTED as to 111:12,	Confidential Business Information
101	Somvienium Deen, Exilient o	111:18-113:21; 127:15	
181	Somvichian Decl., Exhibit 11	GRANTED	Confidential Business Agreement
181	Somvichian Decl., Exhibit 12	GRANTED	Confidential Business Agreement
181		DENIED as to 2:1-28	
181	Somvichian Decl., Exhibit 14	DENIED as to 2:1-28	No Declaration in Support
		DENIED as to rest of Exhibit	
182	Defendant's MIL #1	DENIED as to 3:7-9; 3:15-17;	No Declaration in Support.
102		3:21-22; 3:27; 4:25; 4:25-26	The Declaration in Support.
182	Defendant's MIL #2	GRANTED as to 1:19; 2:24-28	No Declaration in Support
182	Defendant's MIL #3	GRANTED as to 1:19, 2:24-28 GRANTED as to 1:20; 1:21;	Confidential Business Information
102	Detendant 8 will #3	GRANTED as to 1:20; 1:21; 1:22	Confidential Dusiness Information
182	Defendant's MIL #4	GRANTED as to 1:8; 1:9; 1:10;	Confidential Business Information
182	Defendant's MIL #4		Confidential Business Information
100	D. C 1	2:23; 2:24	C. C. L. C. L. C
182	Defendant's MIL #5	GRANTED as to 1:12; 1:13;	Confidential Business Information
100		2:13; 2:15	NDI
182	Declaration of Michael A.	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
	Jacobs in Support of		
	Defendant's MIL # 1-5		
100	("Jacobs Decl."), Exhibit 2		
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 3	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 4	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 5	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 7	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 9	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 10	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 13	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 16	GRANTED	Confidential Business Information
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 17	GRANTED	Confidential Business Information
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 18	GRANTED	Confidential Business Information
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 21	GRANTED as to 409:1-15,	Confidential Business Information
10-		409:22-410:1, 410:5-15,	
		410:24-411:4, 411:12-18,	
		411:23-412:3, 412:6, 413:14	
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 22	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
182	Jacobs Decl., Exhibit 23	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
230	Defendant's Opposition to	GRANTED as to 1:2-3; 1:22-	Confidential Business Information
230	Plaintiff's MIL No. 2	24; 2:4; 3:3; 3:4-5; 3:7; 3:10-	
		11; 3:28-4:4; 4:13; 4:27; and 5:1	
230	Defendent's Opposition to	5:1 DENIED as to 1:4-6; 1:7-9	No Declaration in Support
230	Defendant's Opposition to	DEMIED as to 1:4-0; 1:7-9	No Declaration in Support
220	Plaintiff's MIL No. 4	DENIED	No Declaration in C
230	Defendant's Opposition to	DENIED as to 1:8-12; 1:14-15	No Declaration in Support
220	Plaintiff's MIL No. 5		
230	Declaration of Michael A.	GRANTED as to 333:20-335:6	Confidential Business Information
	Jacobs in Opposition to		

1		Plaintiff's MIL Nos. 1-5 ("Jacobs Decl. in Opposition"),		
2	230	Exhibit 12 Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 13	GRANTED	Confidential Business Agreement.
3	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 14	GRANTED as to 227:11-229:2	Confidential Business Information.
4	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 15	GRANTED	Confidential Business Agreement.
5	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 18	GRANTED	Confidential Business Agreement.
6	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 21	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
7	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 22	DENIED as to 50:1-51:25	No Declaration in Support
8	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 25	GRANTED	Proprietary Third Party Information
9	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 26	DENIED as to 44:1-48:25	No Declaration in Support
0	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 30	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
1	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 36	DENIED as to 45:1-48:25	No Declaration in Support
2	230	Jacobs Decl. in Opposition, Exhibit 38	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
3	247	Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's MIL No. 5	GRANTED as to 5:6-7; 5:n.3; 5:n.5	Confidential Commercial Information.
4 5	247	Declaration of Whitty Somvichian in Support of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's MIL Nos. 1-5,	DENIED	No Declaration in Support.
6	279	Exhibit 77 Trial Exhibit 163	DENIED	No Declaration in Support
7	280	VMware's Charging Conference Statement	DENIED as to 8:10 8:13-16	No Declaration in Support
8	280	Gonzalez Exhibit 1	DENIED as to 122:7 122:17-18 123:3 123:6 123:8 124:2	No Declaration in Support
9	//			
0	//			
1	//			
2	//			
3	//			
4	//			
5	//			
6	//			
7	//			
8	//			
			4	

United States District Court Northern District of California

III. CONCLUSION

While Civil Local Rule 79-5(f)(3) typically requires the parties to file all required revised redacted versions within 7 days, in the interest of receiving all revised documents in advance of the April 17, 2017 charging conference, the parties are **ORDERED** to file all revised documents by 5:00 p.m. on April 12, 2017. In addition, while VMware attorney Krystia Przepiorski provided a specific reason for sealing Exhibits 19 and 20 to the Declaration of Michael A. Jacobs in Opposition to Plaintiff's MIL Nos. 1-5, see Dkt. No. 230-2, such a request was not included in the motion to seal itself, see Dkt. No. 230. The Court will thus allow VMware the opportunity to file such a request by 5:00 p.m. on April 12, 2017, if it chooses to do so.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/10/2017

& Jull

HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR. United States District Judge

United States District Court Northern District of California