

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 OJMAR US, LLC,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 SECURITY PEOPLE, INC., et al.,

11 Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-04948-HSG](#)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
RENEWED ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 135

12 Pending before the Court is Defendants' renewed administrative motion to file under seal
13 documents associated with Plaintiff's opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss Plaintiff's
14 second amended complaint. Dkt. No. 135 ("Mot.") at 1. In its order of November 29, 2017, the
15 Court denied in part Plaintiff's unopposed motion to seal, finding that Plaintiff's sealing request
16 was not narrowly tailored as applied to three confidential business agreements. See Dkt. No. 134
17 at 3-4.¹ As the party claiming confidentiality, Defendants have resubmitted this request, and
18 complied with the Court's prior order. See *id.*; Mot. at 1. The Court finds that the versions of the
19 documents now sought to be sealed are narrowly tailored and contain confidential business
20 information. See *id.*; *In re Qualcomm Litig.*, No. 3:17-CV-0108-GPC-MDD, 2017 WL 5176922,
21 at *2 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2017). The Court therefore **GRANTS** Defendants' renewed
22 administrative motion to seal.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: 12/1/2017

25 
26 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
27 United States District Judge

28 ¹ The Court detailed the applicable legal standards in its prior sealing order, and incorporates that analysis here.