Case No. C06-03361-JF
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL (JfEx2)

Doc. 73

Certain exhibits attached to the Berger Declaration were produced by Defendant and designated as either "Restricted Information" or "Restricted Outside Counsel Only Information", making them subject to the terms of the Protective Order. Portions of the plaintiff's memorandum quote, refer to or analyze these exhibits. In its response to the instant motion, Defendant Hewlett-Packard ("HP") requests that newly redacted versions of Exhibits 2 and 3 and the memorandum be filed to reflect its withdrawal of certain designations and to include additional redactions.

LEGAL STANDARD

"A party seeking to seal a judicial record bears the burden of overcoming the strong presumption in favor of public access to records by meeting the compelling reasons standard. That is, the party must articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings." *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2008).

"[T]he presumption of access is not rebutted where. . . documents subject to a protective order are filed under seal as attachments to a dispositive motion. The. . . 'compelling reasons' standard continues to apply." *Foltz v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Insurance Company*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1136 (9th Cir. 2003) (internal citations omitted). However, to preserve the secrecy of sealed discovery material attached to non-dispositive motions, a "good cause" showing under Rule 26(c) will suffice. *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1180.

DISCUSSION

To determine the standard of review, the Court first must determine whether the class certification motion to which the documents are attached is dispositive. The Eleventh Circuit has observed that a motion for class certification might be dispositive if "a denial of class status means that the stakes are too low for the named plaintiffs to continue the matter." *Prado v. Bush*, 221 F.3d 1266, 1274 (11th Cir. 2000). The instant case presents such a situation. However, the rationale for distinguishing between dispositive and non-dispositive motions in the present context is that "the public has less of a need for access to court records attached only to non-dispositive motions because those documents are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action." *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1180. The contested issues

in Plaintiffs' motion for class certification involve the procedural requirements of F. R. Civ. Pro. 1 2 23 and relate only tangentially to the underlying merits of Plaintiffs' claim. The motion thus is 3 not "dispositive" in the relevant sense, and a showing of good cause is sufficient to justify filing 4 these documents under seal. 5 "When a district court grants a protective order to seal documents during discovery, it already has determined that good cause exists to protect this information from being disclosed to 6 7 the public by balancing the needs for discovery against the need for confidentiality." Kamakana, 8 447 F.3d at 1179. Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 to the Berger Declaration are subject to the Protective Order, and the Declaration contains no other material content. Accordingly, the Berger 10 Declaration and the portions of the motion for class certification that discuss it should be filed 11 under seal. Because Plaintiff proposes to file the entire Berger Declaration under seal, HP's 12 requested relief is unnecessary. 13 **ORDER** 14 Good cause therefor appearing, Plaintiffs' motion to file documents under seal is 15 GRANTED. 16 IT IS SO ORDERED. 17 18 DATED: July 20, 2009 19 20 21 United States 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1	Copies of Order served on:
2	Alfredo Torrijos at@kbklawyers.com, icd@kbklawyers.com
3	Brian Stephen Kabateck bsk@kbklawyers.com
4	Bruce Lee Simon bsimon@pswplaw.com, avargas@pswplaw.com, bpouya@pswplaw.com,
5	cpearson@pswplaw.com, dwarshaw@pswplaw.com, eklisura@pswplaw.com,
6	jwatkins@pswplaw.com, nhalpern@pswplaw.com, pautio@pswplaw.com
7	Christina Jean Smith cjs@mcnicholaslaw.com
8	Christopher Chorba cchorba@gibsondunn.com, Dmanthripragada@gibsondunn.com,
9	psullivan@gibsondunn.com, sliversidge@gibsondunn.com
10	Esther L Klisura eklisura@pswplaw.com
11	John Patrick McNicholas, IV pmc@mcnicholaslaw.com, cmi@mcnicholaslaw.com
12	Justin Theodore Berger jberger@cpmlegal.com, abanis@cpmlegal.com,
13	imartinez@cpmlegal.com
14	Laura Elizabeth Schlichtmann lschlichtmann@cpmlegal.com, jacosta@cpmlegal.com
15	Niall Padraic McCarthy nmccarthy@cpmlegal.com, abanis@cpmlegal.com,
16	amurphy@cpmlegal.com, dkelley@cpmlegal.com, jberger@cpmlegal.com,
17	lschlichtmann@cpmlegal.com, spinkham@cpmlegal.com
18	Richard Kellner rlk@kbklawyers.com, icd@kbklawyers.com
19	Stephen Michael Garcia jmobley@lawgarcia.com, nortiz@lawgarcia.com
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	