

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

GSI TECHNOLOGY, INC.,	)	Case No. 5:13-cv-01081-PSG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO</b>
v.	)	<b>SEAL</b>
	)	
UNITED MEMORIES, INC., and	)	<b>(Re: Docket Nos. 233, 235, 237)</b>
INTEGRATED SILICON SOLUTION, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

The court has before three motions to seal the answers to Plaintiff GSI Technology Inc’s second amended complaint. “Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’”<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, “a ‘strong presumption in favor of access’ is the starting point.”<sup>2</sup> Parties seeking to seal judicial records 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.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597 & n. 7 (1978)).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 1178-79.

1           However, “while protecting the public's interest in access to the courts, we must remain  
2 mindful of the parties' right to access those same courts upon terms which will not unduly harm  
3 their competitive interest.”<sup>4</sup> Records attached to nondispositive motions therefore are not subject  
4 to the strong presumption of access.<sup>5</sup> Because the documents attached to nondispositive motions  
5 “are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action,” parties moving  
6 to seal must meet the lower “good cause” standard of Rule 26(c).<sup>6</sup> As with dispositive motions, the  
7 standard applicable to nondispositive motions requires a “particularized showing”<sup>7</sup> that “specific  
8 prejudice or harm will result” if the information is disclosed.<sup>8</sup> “Broad allegations of harm,  
9 unsubstantiated by specific examples of articulated reasoning” will not suffice.<sup>9</sup> A protective order  
10 sealing the documents during discovery may reflect the court’s previous determination that good  
11 cause exists to keep the documents sealed,<sup>10</sup> but a blanket protective order that allows the parties to  
12 designate confidential documents does not provide sufficient judicial scrutiny to determine whether  
13 each particular document should remain sealed.<sup>11</sup>

14  
15           In addition to making particularized showings of good cause, parties moving to seal  
16 documents must comply with the procedures established by Civ. L.R. 79-5. Pursuant to  
17 Civ. L.R. 79-5(b), a sealing order is appropriate only upon a request that establishes the document

18  
19 <sup>4</sup> *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.*, 727 F.3d 1214, 1228-29 (Fed. Cir. 2013).

20 <sup>5</sup> *See id.* at 1180.

21 <sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 1179 (internal quotations and citations omitted).

22 <sup>7</sup> *Id.*

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

25 <sup>9</sup> *Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int’l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992).

26 <sup>10</sup> *See Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179-80.


27 <sup>11</sup> *See Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A)* (“Reference to a stipulation or protective order that allows a party to  
28 designate certain documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a document, or  
portions thereof, are sealable.”).

1 is “sealable,” or “privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under  
 2 the law.” “The request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material, and  
 3 must conform with Civil L.R. 79-5(d).”<sup>12</sup> “Within 4 days of the filing of the Administrative  
 4 Motion to File Under Seal, the Designating Party must file a declaration as required by subsection  
 5 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that all of the designated material is sealable.”<sup>13</sup>

<u>Motion to Seal</u>	<u>Document to be Sealed</u>	<u>Result</u>	<u>Reason</u>
233	ISSI’s Answer to the Second Amended Complaint	UNSEALED	No supporting declaration filed or redactions are not narrowly tailored to confidential business information
235	UMI’s Answer to the Second Amended Complaint	UNSEALED	No supporting declarations filed
237	¶ 74 of ISSI’s Answer to the Second Amended Complaint	UNSEALED	Redactions are not narrowly tailored to confidential business information

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: June 16, 2014

20   
 21 PAUL S. GREWAL  
 22 United States Magistrate Judge

23 <sup>12</sup> Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). In part, Civ. L.R. 79-5(d) requires the submitting party to attach a “proposed  
 24 order that is narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material” which “lists in table format each  
 25 document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed,” Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(b), and an  
 26 “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).

27 <sup>13</sup> Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(1). The Civil Local Rules have recently been amended shortening the time  
 28 available to the designating party to file a supporting declaration from seven days to four days. As  
 this rule change was only recently implemented the court applies the prior form of Civ. L.R. 79-5  
 for the purposes of this order.