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

# Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
ORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CORNING OPTICAL** COMMUNICATIONS WIRELESS LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SOLID, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 14-cv-03750-PSG

**OMNIBUS ORDER RE: MOTIONS TO SEAL** 

(Re: Docket Nos. 296, 308, 317, 327, 343, 346, 364)

Before the court are seven administrative motions to seal. "Historically, courts have recognized a 'general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents." Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, "a 'strong presumption in favor of access' is the starting point."<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

However, "while protecting the public's interest in access to the courts, we must remain mindful of the parties' right to access those same courts upon terms which will not unduly harm their competitive interest." Records attached to nondispositive motions therefore are not subject

1

Case No. 14-cv-03750-PSG

OMNIBUS ORDER RE: MOTIONS TO SEAL

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Id. at 1178-79.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., 727 F.3d 1214, 1228-29 (Fed. Cir. 2013).

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

to the strong presumption of access.<sup>5</sup> Because the documents attached to nondispositive motions "are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action," parties moving to seal must meet the lower "good cause" standard of Rule 26(c). As with dispositive motions, the standard applicable to nondispositive motions requires a "particularized showing"<sup>7</sup> that "specific prejudice or harm will result" if the information is disclosed. Broad allegations of harm, unsubstantiated by specific examples of articulated reasoning" will not suffice. A protective order sealing the documents during discovery may reflect the court's previous determination that good cause exists to keep the documents sealed, 10 but a blanket protective order that allows the parties to designate confidential documents does not provide sufficient judicial scrutiny to determine whether each particular document should remain sealed. 11

In addition to making particularized showings of good cause, parties moving to seal documents must comply with the procedures established by Civ. L.R. 79-5. Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 79-5(b), a sealing order is appropriate only upon a request that establishes the document is "sealable," or "privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law." "The request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material, and must conform with Civil L.R. 79-5(d)."12 "Within 4 days of the filing of the Administrative

Case No. 14-cv-03750-PSG

OMNIBUS ORDER RE: MOTIONS TO SEAL

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See id. at 1180.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Id. at 1179 (internal quotations and citations omitted).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co., 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179-80.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> See Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A) ("Reference to a stipulation or protective order that allows a party to designate certain documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a document, or portions thereof, are sealable.").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). In part, Civ. L.R. 79-5(d) requires the submitting party to attach a "proposed

#### Northern District of California United States District Court

Motion to File Under Seal, the Designating Party must file a declaration as required by subsection 79-5(d)(1)(A) establishing that all of the designated material is sealable."13

With these standards in mind, the court rules on the instant motions as follows:

Motion to Seal	Document to be Sealed	Result	Reason/Explanation
296	Supplemental Declaration of Barry Bruce in Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions sought to be sealed contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.
308	Defendants' August 31, 2015 Letter Brief	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions of document contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.
308	Exhibit 1 to Defendants' Letter Brief	Docket No. 308-4 at pages 4-7 (Appendix) SEALED; all other designations UNSEALED.	Only sealed portions narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions of document contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.

order that is narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material" which "lists in table format each document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed," Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(b), and an "unredacted 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).

Case No. 14-cv-03750-PSG

OMNIBUS ORDER RE: MOTIONS TO SEAL

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(1).

## Northern District of California United States District Court

1 2 3	317	Plaintiff's Motion in Limine #2	UNSEALED	Portions sought to be sealed contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.
5	317	Exhibit A to Plaintiff's Motion in Limine #2	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential
6		Motion in Limine #2		business information; portions of document
7				contain information later publicly
8				disclosed at trial.
9	327	Defendants' Motions in	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored
10		Limine		to confidential business information;
11				some portions sought to be sealed contain
12				information later publicly disclosed at
13				trial.
14	327	Defendants' Motion to	UNSEALED	Portions sought to be
15		Exclude Expert Testimony of Michele Riley		sealed contain information later
16				publicly disclosed at trial.
17	327	Defendants' Trial Exhibit	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored
18	321	List (Exhibit F to Joint	CHOLINED	to confidential business information.
19		Pretrial Statement)		
20   21	327	Exhibit 2 to the Platt Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential
22				business information.
23	327	Exhibit 3 to the Platt Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information.
24				
	1			

### Northern District of California United States District Court

327	Exhibit 5 to the Platt Declaration	UNSEALED	Portions sought to be sealed contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.
327	Exhibit 6 to the Platt Declaration	SEALED	Narrowly tailored to confidential business information.
327	Exhibit 8 to the Platt Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions of document contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.
327	Exhibit 12 to the Platt Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions of document contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.
327	Exhibit 13 to the Platt Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions of document contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.
327	Exhibit 14 to the Platt Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions of document contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.

# United States District Court Northern District of California

1 2 3	343	Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Exclude Expert Testimony of Michele Riley	UNSEALED	Portions sought to be sealed contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.		
4 5 6 7	343	Exhibit D to the Stover Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions of document contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.		
8 9 10 11 12	346	Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motions in Limine	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; some portions sought to be sealed contain information later publicly disclosed at		
13 14 15 16	346	Exhibit 1 to the Hunt Declaration	UNSEALED	No declaration in support filed with the court as required by Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(1).		
17 18	346	Exhibit 2 to the Hunt Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information.		
<ul><li>19</li><li>20</li><li>21</li></ul>	346	Exhibit 3 to the Hunt Declaration	SEALED	Narrowly tailored to confidential business information.		
22 23 24 25 26	346	Exhibit 4 to the Hunt Declaration	UNSEALED	Not narrowly tailored to confidential business information; portions of document contain information later publicly disclosed at trial.		

27

28 Case No. 14-cy-03750-PSC

Northern District of California
ern District o
Northe

364	Defendants' Opposition to	UNSEALED	No declaration in
	Plaintiff's Motion for		support filed with the
	Reconsideration of		court as required by
	Summary Judgment Order		Civ. L.R. 79-5(e)(1).

#### SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 2, 2015

United States Magistrate Judge