

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**

ROBERT HEATH, ET AL.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
GOOGLE LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. [15-cv-01824-BLF](#)

**ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE LLC'S
UNOPPOSED MOTION TO REDACT
[RE: ECF 378]**

On September 21, 2018, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) filed an Unopposed Administrative Motion to Redact Portions of the Court’s Order Denying Defendant Google LLC’s Motion for Leave to File Motion for Reconsideration of Order Denying Motion to Decertify Collection Action (“Order”) (ECF 367) pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11. *See* ECF 378.

“Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. 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)). Consequently, filings that are “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case” may be sealed only upon a showing of “compelling reasons” for sealing. *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101–02 (9th Cir. 2016). Filings that are only tangentially related to the merits may be sealed upon a lesser showing of “good cause.” *Id.* at 1097.

Sealing motions filed in this district also must be “narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” Civil L.R. 79-5(b). A party moving to seal a document in whole or in part must file a declaration establishing that the identified material is “sealable.” Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A). “Reference to a stipulation or protective order that allows a party to designate certain

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

documents as confidential is not sufficient to establish that a document, or portions thereof, are sealable.” *Id.*

The Court has reviewed the administrative motion and the declaration submitted in support thereof and finds that the parties have articulated compelling reasons and good cause to seal portions of the Order. The Court has previously sealed the same and similar information as that included in those portions Google seeks to redact, which include figures and statements from the expert reports analyzing Google’s commercially sensitive gHire documents. *See* ECF 105; ECF 198; ECF 253; ECF 302; ECF 334.

Accordingly, the Court hereby **GRANTS** the motion and directs Google to file a redacted version of the Order as a separate docket entry on or before **October 3, 2018**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 26, 2018


BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge