

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

MATTHEW ENTERPRISE, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CHRYSLER GROUP LLC,  
Defendant.

Case No. [13-cv-04236-BLF](#)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION TO FILE PORTIONS OF ITS  
REPLY UNDER SEAL**


Before the Court is Defendant's Administrative Motion to file under seal portions of its Reply in Support of its Partial Motion to Dismiss. The Court has previously granted requests by both parties to seal portions of documents that contain confidential information regarding a contractual agreement between Defendant and a third-party. *See* ECF 58, ECF 63.

Defendant seeks to seal information contained in its Reply regarding this same agreement. Defendant has once again narrowly-tailored its request, and has filed a public, redacted version of the Reply, consistent with Civil Local Rule 79-5(d)(1)(C). Defendant provides this Court with a declaration ("Nagel Decl.") which states reasons why disclosure of this information could competitively disadvantage Defendant. Nagel Decl., ECF 65-1 ¶ 3.

As such, Defendant's sealing request meets the "compelling reasons" standard, articulated by the Ninth Circuit in *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1213 (9th Cir. 2002). For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS Defendant's Motion to Seal.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 6, 2014

  
BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
United States District Judge