

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 v.  
14 AAFE PRODUCTS CORP. a California  
15 corporation, JBE INTERNATIONAL,  
16 LLC, a California limited liability  
17 company, et al.,  
18 Defendants.

Case No.: 17-cv-00575-AJB-JMA

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’  
MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS  
UNDER SEAL**

(Doc. No. 22)

19 Presently before the Court is Defendants Joshua Bernheim and Brian Bernheim’s  
20 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) motion to seal portions of the proposed  
21 Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunction and Other Equitable Relief as to AAFE Products  
22 Corp., JBE International LLC, BSDC, Inc., KADC, Inc., Purestrike, Inc., BNRI Corp., fka  
23 Bernheim & Rice, Inc., Brian Bernheim, Joshua Bernheim, and Jared Coates (“AAFE  
24 Stipulated Order”). (Doc. No. 22.)

25 Courts have historically recognized a “general right to inspect and copy public  
26 records and documents, including judicial records and documents.” *Nixon v. Warner  
27 Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978). “Unless a particular court record is one  
28 ‘traditionally kept secret,’ a ‘strong presumption in favor of access’ is the starting point.”

1 *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Foltz*  
2 *v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). In order to  
3 overcome this strong presumption, a party seeking to seal a judicial record must articulate  
4 justifications for sealing that outweigh the public policies favoring disclosure. *See*  
5 *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178–79. “In turn, the court must ‘conscientiously balance[] the  
6 competing interests’ of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records  
7 secret.” *Id.* at 1179 (quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1135).

8 Here, Defendants seek to seal the AAFE Stipulated Order as it identifies by name  
9 and residential addresses non-party individuals, who share an ownership interest in real  
10 property used as collateral for the security of the monetary judgment. (Doc. No. 22 at 1.)  
11 Additionally, the motion is unopposed and is redacted in a limited fashion as to only  
12 prevent disclosure of the identity, status, and addresses of the non-party individuals. (*Id.* at  
13 1, 3.)

14 Consequently, finding the motion narrowly tailored and that the justifications for  
15 sealing outweigh the public’s interest in the non-party’s personal information, the Court  
16 **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion to seal. *See Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1137 (acknowledging the  
17 privacy interests implicated by sensitive, personal identifying information); *see also*  
18 *Opperman v. Path, Inc.*, Case No. 13-cv-00453-JST, 2017 WL 1036652, at \*4 (N.D. Cal.  
19 Mar. 17, 2017) (finding a motion to seal an exhibit that contained the names, email  
20 addresses, and phone numbers of non-party users warranted).

21  
22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 Dated: August 29, 2017

24   
25 Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia  
26 United States District Judge  
27  
28