

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
OAKLAND DIVISION**

CHRISTOPHER SLAIGHT, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TATA CONSULTANCY SERVICES, LTD.,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:15-cv-01696-YGR (SK)

CLASS ACTION

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE UNDER
SEAL**

Complaint Filed: April 14, 2015

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**

Having considered Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to File Under Seal, the Court finds that good cause does not exist to seal the materials at issue.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Administrative Motion to File Under Seal is **DENIED**.

Accordingly, the following documents may not be filed under seal:

Document or Portion of Document Sought to be Sealed	Evidence Offered in Support of Sealing	Order
Plaintiffs' Motion to Permit Contemporaneous Testimony From A Remote Location Under Rule 43(a): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 4:19-5:8• Footnotes 6, 7, 9, 11	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.
Exhibit 5: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.
Exhibit 6: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.
Exhibit 7: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.
Exhibit 8: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.
Exhibit 9: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.

1 2 3	Exhibit 10: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.
4 5 6	Exhibit 11: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.
7 8 9	Exhibit 12: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.
10 11 12	Exhibit 13: Entire document	None - Designated Confidential by Defendant Tata Consultancy Services, Ltd., which has not filed a supporting declaration as required by L.R. 79-5(e)(1).	DENIED.

13 The Order terminates Docket Number 496.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 DATED: October 11, 2018

16 
 17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE