

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>OMNIBUS ORDER RE: MOTIONS</b>
	)	<b>TO SEAL</b>
v.	)	
	)	
UNITED MEMORIES, INC., et al.,	)	<b>(Re: Docket Nos. 768, 777, 784, 791)</b>
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Before the court are four motions to file seven documents under seal.<sup>1</sup> “Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’”<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, “a ‘strong presumption in favor of access’ is the starting point.”<sup>3</sup> Parties seeking to seal judicial records

<sup>1</sup> See Docket Nos. 768, 777, 784, 791.

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

1 relating to dispositive motions bear the burden of overcoming the presumption with “compelling  
2 reasons” that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.<sup>4</sup>

3 However, “while protecting the public's interest in access to the courts, we must remain  
4 mindful of the parties' right to access those same courts upon terms which will not unduly harm  
5 their competitive interest.”<sup>5</sup> Records attached to nondispositive motions therefore are not subject  
6 to the strong presumption of access.<sup>6</sup> Because the documents attached to nondispositive motions  
7 “are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action,” parties moving  
8 to seal must meet the lower “good cause” standard of Rule 26(c).<sup>7</sup> As with dispositive motions, the  
9 standard applicable to nondispositive motions requires a “particularized showing”<sup>8</sup> that “specific  
10 prejudice or harm will result” if the information is disclosed.<sup>9</sup> “Broad allegations of harm,  
11 unsubstantiated by specific examples of articulated reasoning” will not suffice.<sup>10</sup> A protective  
12 order sealing the documents during discovery may reflect the court’s previous determination that  
13 good cause exists to keep the documents sealed,<sup>11</sup> but a blanket protective order that allows the  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 <sup>4</sup> Id. at 1178-79.

21 <sup>5</sup> *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.*, 727 F.3d 1214, 1228-29 (Fed. Cir. 2013).

22 <sup>6</sup> See *id.* at 1180.

23 <sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 1179 (internal quotations and citations omitted).

24 <sup>8</sup> *Id.*

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

27 <sup>10</sup> *Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int’l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992).

28 <sup>11</sup> See *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179-80.

1 parties to designate confidential documents does not provide sufficient judicial scrutiny to  
2 determine whether each particular document should remain sealed.<sup>12</sup>

3 In addition to making particularized showings of good cause, parties moving to seal  
4 documents must comply with the procedures established by Civ. L.R. 79-5. Pursuant to  
5 Civ. L.R. 79-5(b), a sealing order is appropriate only upon a request that establishes the document  
6 is “sealable,” or “privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under  
7 the law.” “The request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material, and  
8 must conform with Civil L.R. 79-5(d).”<sup>13</sup> “Within 4 days of the filing of the Administrative  
9 Motion to File Under Seal, the Designating Party must file a declaration as required by subsection  
10 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that all of the designated material is sealable.”<sup>14</sup>

11 With these standards in mind, the courts rules on the instant motion as follows:

<u>Motion</u>	<u>Document to be Sealed</u>	<u>Result</u>	<u>Reason/Explanation</u>
Docket No. 768-4	UMI’s Trial Brief	UNSEALED.	No declaration filed in support.
Docket No. 777-4	GSI’s Motion in Limine No. 6 to Exclude Evidence and Argument of GSI’s 2007 and 2008 Investigation of UMI	Designations highlighted in yellow at 2:12-14, 4:13-15, 4:21-26 SEALED; remainder UNSEALED.	Only sealed portions narrowly tailored to confidential business information and supported by a declaration.
Docket No. 784-4	May 8, 2015 Expert Report of Robert J.	Designations highlighted in	Sealed portions previously sealed by court order as

21  
22 <sup>12</sup> See Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A) (“Reference to a stipulation or protective order that allows a party to  
23 designate certain documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a document, or  
portions thereof, are sealable.”).

24 <sup>13</sup> Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). In part, Civ. L.R. 79-5(d) requires the submitting party to attach a “proposed  
25 order that is narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material” which “lists in table format each  
26 document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed,” Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(b), and an  
27 “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).

28 <sup>14</sup> Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(1).

1		Murphy	yellow SEALED.	narrowly tailored to confidential business information. <sup>15</sup>
2	Docket No. 784-6	Deposition of Robert J. Murphy	UNSEALED.	No declaration filed in support.
3	Docket No. 791-2	UMI's Omnibus Motion in Limine	UNSEALED	No declaration filed in support.
4	Docket No. 791-5	Ex. 1 to UMI's Omnibus Motion in Limine, July 24, 2015 deposition of Paul Mphor Chiang	Designations specified at 209:4-210:17; 227:23-228:9; 229:13-23; 233:23-234:25; 235:9-12; 236:19-237:2; 240:3-24; 241:25-242:6; 242:14-243:5; 244:8- 245:8; 249:12-250:14; 252:10-14; 252:19-253:12; 258:7-259:20; 260:7-14; 261:10-17; 263:1-18; 267:7-15; 268:11-25; 269:9- 270:13; 272:12-273:3; 283:23-284:17; 288:6-9; 293:9-15; 302:8-16; 335:17- 336:10; 340:3-342:13 343:16-345:15; and 346:20-347:5	Only sealed portions narrowly tailored to confidential business information and supported by a declaration.
5			SEALED; remainder UNSEALED.	
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23	Docket No. 791-7	Ex. 2 to UMI's Omnibus Motion in Limine, July 17, 2015 deposition of Robert J. Murphy	Designations specified at 134:22-135:4; 135:9-24; 136:1-4; 136:12-137:11; 137:25-138:7;	Only sealed portions narrowly tailored to confidential business information and supported by a declaration.
24				
25				
26				
27				

<sup>15</sup> See Docket No. 740 at 15.

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

		138:22-139:4; 139:16-140:13; 150:2-151:9; 151:22-152:9; 154:7-9; 155:11-14; 156:8-16; 156:24-157:24; 160:10-162:5; 165:8-167:2; 168:5-22; 177:11-179:20; 182:13-184:5; 184:10-21; 185:1-16; 258:16-260:25; 338:1-24; 360:23-363:7; 364:18-365:11; and 368:5-368:25 SEALED; remainder UNSEALED.	
--	--	---	--

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 1, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL S. GREWAL  
United States Magistrate Judge