

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

CISCO SYSTEMS INC,
Plaintiff,
v.
STMICROELECTRONICS INC, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 5:14-cv-03236-RMW

**ORDER RE: ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL
PORTIONS OF
STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.’S
COUNTER-COMPLAINT**

Re: Dkt. No. 129

Before the court is defendant STMicroelectronics, Inc.’s administrative motion to seal portions of its counter-complaint against plaintiff Cisco. “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 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.

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

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

21 With these standards in mind, the courts rules on the instant motion as follows.

<u>Motion to Seal</u>	<u>Document to be Sealed</u>	<u>Ruling</u>	<u>Reason/Explanation</u>
129	Defendant STMicroelectronics, Inc.’s Amended Answer to Third Amended Complaint and Counter-complaint (129-4)	GRANTED as to proposed redactions (highlights).	Narrowly tailored to confidential business information.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 13, 2016



Ronald M. Whyte
United States District Judge