

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

ADOBE SYSTEMS INCORPORATED,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
SOFTWARE TECH, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 5:14-cv-02140-RMW

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
SEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 111

Before the court is Adobe’s administrative motion to seal an exhibit in support of its motion for default judgment. Dkt. No. 111. “Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *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)). Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, “a ‘strong presumption in favor of access’ is the starting point.” *Id.* (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). 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. *Id.* at 1178-79.

A protective order sealing the documents during discovery may reflect the court’s previous

1 determination that good cause exists to keep the documents sealed, *see Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at  
 2 1179-80, but a blanket protective order that allows the parties to designate confidential documents  
 3 does not provide sufficient judicial scrutiny to determine whether each particular document should  
 4 remain sealed. *See* Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A) (“Reference to a stipulation or protective order that  
 5 allows a party to designate certain documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a  
 6 document, or portions thereof, are sealable.”).

7 In addition to making particularized showings of good cause, parties moving to seal  
 8 documents must comply with the procedures established by Civ. L.R. 79-5. Pursuant to Civ. L.R.  
 9 79-5(b), a sealing order is appropriate only upon a request that establishes the document is  
 10 “sealable,” or “privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under  
 11 the law.” “The request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material, and  
 12 must conform with Civil L.R. 79-5(d).” Civ. L.R. 79-5(b) (requiring the submitting party to attach  
 13 a “proposed order that is narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material” which “lists in table  
 14 format each document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed,” and an “unredacted version  
 15 of the document” that indicates “by highlighting or other clear method, the portions of the  
 16 document that have been omitted from the redacted version.”). “Within 4 days of the filing of the  
 17 Administrative Motion to File Under Seal, the Designating Party must file a declaration as  
 18 required by subsection 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that all of the designated material is sealable.”  
 19 Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(1).

20 With these standards in mind, the courts rules on the instant motions as follows.

<u>Motion to Seal</u>	<u>Document to be Sealed</u>	<u>Ruling</u>	<u>Reason/Explanation</u>
111	Adobe Sales and Profit Spreadsheet (111-3)	GRANTED	Narrowly tailored to confidential business information

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: September 8, 2016

25   
 26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Ronald M. Whyte  
 United States District Judge