

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
SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
ALL ACTIONS

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFFS'
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO UNSEAL

On September 19, 2014, Plaintiffs filed an Administrative Motion to Unseal “all papers filed in connection with Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel” (ECF No. 789-2). ECF No. 991. On September 23, 2014, Defendants opposed. ECF No. 994.

After considering the parties’ submissions, the Court on November 19, 2014, ordered Defendants to file a declaration in support of sealing any papers filed in connection with Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel, along with any proposed redactions, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5. ECF No. 1024. Defendants did so on December 3, 2014. ECF No. 1029. In their declaration, Defendants sought to seal six docket entries: ECF Nos. 789-2, 789-3, 878-1, 878-2, 878-3, 991-1. The Court addresses each under the “good cause” standard appropriate for sealing requests attached to nondispositive motions, such as Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). The “good cause” standard requires a “particularized showing” that “specific prejudice or harm will result” if the information is

Master Docket No. 11-CV-02509-LHK
ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFFS’ ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO UNSEAL

disclosed. *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002) (internal quotation marks omitted); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c).

With this standard in mind, the Court rules on Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to Unseal as follows:

<u>Motion</u>	<u>ECF No.</u>	<u>Document (as Highlighted)</u>	<u>Ruling</u>
991	789-2	Plaintiffs' Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel	DENIED. The Court accepts Defendants' proposed redactions.
991	789-3	Declaration of Kelly M. Dermody	GRANTED as to Exhibit A (the <i>Terazosin</i> order) and the reference thereto at 1:19-20 (¶ 6) because Exhibit A is a publicly available document. DENIED otherwise. The Court accepts Defendants' other proposed redactions.
991	878-1	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel	DENIED. The Court accepts Defendants' proposed redactions.
991	878-2	Declaration of Cody S. Harris	GRANTED because the reference at 1:8-9 (¶ 3) is to a publicly available document.
991	878-3	Exhibit A to Declaration of Cody S. Harris: <i>In re Terazosin</i> Reply Memorandum	GRANTED because this document is publicly available.
991	991-1	Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Motion to Compel	DENIED. The Court accepts Defendants' proposed redactions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 30, 2015


LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge