In re Google, Inc.		Privacy Policy Litigation	Doc. 1	27			
	1						
	2						
	3						
	4						
	5						
	6						
	7						
	8						
	9						
	10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
rmia	11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
ourt alifo	12	SAN JOSE DIVISION					
ict C t of C	13	IN RE GOOGLE, INC. PRIVACY POLICY) Case No.: 5:12-cv-01382-PSG					
Distr istric	14	LITIGATION) ORDER RE: MOTION TO SEAL					
United States District Court For the Northern District of California	15)					
	16) (Re: Docket No. 119)					
Unit the N	17)					
Fort	18	<u> </u>					
	19	Before the court is an administrative motion to seal six documents. "Historically, courts					
	20	have recognized a 'general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including					
	21	judicial records and documents." Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, "a 'strong					
	22	presumption in favor of access' is the starting point." ² Parties seeking to seal judicial records					
	23						
	24						
	25						
	26	¹ Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Nixon v.					
	27	Warner Commc'ns, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 597 & n. 7 (1978)).					
	28	² Id. (quoting Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)).					
		Case No.: 5:12-cv-01382-PSG ORDER RE: MOTION TO SEAL					

Dockets.Justia.com

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

relating to dispositive motions bear the burden of overcoming the presumption with "compelling reasons" that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.³

However, "while protecting the public's interest in access to the courts, we must remain mindful of the parties' right to access those same courts upon terms which will not unduly harm their competitive interest." Records attached to nondispositive motions therefore are not subject to the strong presumption of access.⁵ Because the documents attached to nondispositive motions "are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action," parties moving to seal must meet the lower "good cause" standard of Rule 26(c). As with dispositive motions, the standard applicable to nondispositive motions requires a "particularized showing" that "specific prejudice or harm will result" if the information is disclosed. Broad allegations of harm, unsubstantiated by specific examples of articulated reasoning" will not suffice. 9 A protective order sealing the documents during discovery may reflect the court's previous determination that good cause exists to keep the documents sealed, 10 but a blanket protective order that allows the parties to designate confidential documents does not provide sufficient judicial scrutiny to determine whether each particular document should remain sealed.¹¹

Case No.: 5:12-cv-01382-PSG ORDER RE: MOTION TO SEAL

³ *Id.* at 1178-79.

⁴ Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., 727 F.3d 1214, 1228-29 (Fed. Cir. 2013).

⁵ *See id.* at 1180.

⁶ *Id.* at 1179 (internal quotations and citations omitted).

⁷ *Id*.

⁸ Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c).

⁹ Beckman Indus.. Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co., 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992).

¹⁰ See Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179-80.

¹¹ See Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A) ("Reference to a stipulation or protective order that allows a party to designate certain documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a document, or portions thereof, are sealable.").

In addition to making particularized showings of good cause, parties moving to seal documents must comply with the procedures established by Civ. L.R. 79-5. Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 79-5(b), a sealing order is appropriate only upon a request that establishes the document is "sealable," or "privileged or 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, and must conform with Civil L.R. 79-5(d)." "Within 4 days of the filing of the Administrative Motion to File Under Seal, the Designating Party must file a declaration as required by subsection 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that all of the designated material is sealable."¹³

With these standards in mind, the court rules on the instant motions as follows:

Motion	Document to be Sealed	Result	Reason/Explanation
Docket No.	Exhibit E to the	SEALED.	Narrowly tailored to personal
119-3	Declaration of James J.		information (previously sealed as
	Sabella		Exhibit J, see Docket No. 112).
Docket No.	Exhibit F to the	SEALED.	Narrowly tailored to personal
119-3	Declaration of James J.		information (previously sealed as
	Sabella		Exhibit K, see Docket No. 112).
Docket No.	Exhibit G to the	SEALED.	Narrowly tailored to personal
119-3	Declaration of James J.		information (previously sealed as
	Sabella		Exhibit L, see Docket No. 112).
Docket No.	Exhibit K to the	SEALED.	Narrowly tailored to confidential
119-3	Declaration of James J.		business information (previously
	Sabella		sealed as Exhibit D, see Docket
			No. 112).
Docket No.	Exhibit M to the	UNSEALED.	Not narrowly tailored to
119-3	Declaration of James J.		confidential business information.
	Sabella		
Docket No.	Attachment to Exhibit M	SEALED.	Narrowly tailored to personal
119-3	to the Declaration of		information.
	James J. Sabella		
	("Goldberg Purchases")		

Case No.: 5:12-cv-01382-PSG ORDER RE: MOTION TO SEAL

¹² Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). In part, Civ. L.R. 79-5(d) requires the submitting party to attach a "proposed order that is narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material" which "lists in table format each document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed," Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(b), and an "unreadacted version of the document" that indicates "by highlighting or other clear method, the portions of the document that have been omitted from the redacted version." Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(d).

¹³ Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(1).

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

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

Within seven days, the designating party may file a more narrowly tailored motion to file
Exhibit M under seal. Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 79-5, a proposed order must contain a chart
specifically showing what the party seeks to seal. An unredacted version must contain highlighting
showing the court what the designating party seeks to seal within that document.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 11, 2015

PAUL S. GREWAL

United States Magistrate Judge

Case No.: 5:12-cv-01382-PSG ORDER RE: MOTION TO SEAL