

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

FITEQ, INC.,)	Case No. 5:13-cv-01946-BLF
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
v.)	
)	(Re: Docket No. 239)
VENTURE CORPORATION, LTD., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Defendants Venture Corporation, LTD and Cebelian Holding, Pte, LTD seek reconsideration of this court’s order denying their motion to retroactively seal certain documents.¹ The burden to a party seeking reconsideration is high, and as a result courts rarely grant such relief.² Venture fails to meet this burden. Venture does not explain how the court can seal information on one part of the public docket, but leave the same information available to the public on other parts of the docket. Plaintiff Fiteq, Inc. has the better of the argument. The motion is DENIED.


¹ See Docket No. 264.

² See Civ. L.R. 7-9; *Samet v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, Case No. 12-cv-01891, 2014 WL 1782821, at *2 (N.D. Cal. May 5, 2014) (“Although Rule 59(e) permits a district court to reconsider and amend a previous order, the rule offers an extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources.” (quoting *Kona Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000))).

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

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 15, 2015


PAUL S. GREWAL
United States Magistrate Judge