

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  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TORREY PINES LOGIC, INC.,  
Plaintiff, Counterdefendant,  
v.  
GUNWERKS, LLC,  
Defendant, Counterclaimant.

Case No.: 19-cv-02195-H-DEB

**ORDER:**

**(1) GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S  
MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS  
UNDER SEAL;**

[Doc. No. 65.]

**(2) DIRECTING THE CLERK TO  
FILE THE PROPOSED  
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL; AND**

[Doc. No. 66.]

**(3) ORDERING PLAINTIFF TO  
PUBLICLY FILE A REVISED  
REDACTED VERSION OF ITS  
OPPOSITION**

On August 19, 2020, Defendant and Counterclaimant Gunwerks, LLC (“Gunwerks”) filed a motion for leave to file a first amended answer and counterclaims. (Doc. No. 62.) On September 4, 2020, Plaintiff and Counterdefendant Torrey Pines Logic,

1 Inc. (“TPL”) filed an opposition to Gunwerk’s motion. (Doc. Nos. 66, 67.) On September  
2 4, 2020, TPL also filed a motion to file under seal its opposition and Exhibit C to its  
3 opposition. (Doc. No. 65.)

4 TPL seeks to seal these documents pursuant to the Court’s protective order, (Doc.  
5 No. 63), because they contain confidential information. (Doc. No. 65 at 1.) After  
6 reviewing the documents in question, the Court concludes that good cause exists to seal  
7 the documents. Accordingly, the Court grants TPL’s request to file the documents under  
8 seal without prejudice to the Court modifying this order at a later time or using the  
9 information in a written order, and the Court directs the Clerk to file the proposed  
10 documents under seal.

11 Nevertheless, the Court notes that with respect to its opposition brief, TPL seeks to  
12 seal the entire document. Although the opposition contains some sealable information, the  
13 entire document is not sealable. (See Doc. No. 66.) Thus, TPL’s sealing request is not  
14 narrowly tailored. See Ervine v. Warden, 214 F. Supp. 3d 917, 919 (E.D. Cal. 2016) (“Any  
15 order sealing documents should be ‘narrowly tailored’ to remove from public view only  
16 the material that is protected.” (citing Press-Enterprise Co. v. Superior Court, 464 U.S. 501,  
17 513 (1984))). As a result, the Court orders TPL to publicly file a revised redacted version  
18 of its opposition within **seven (7) days** from the date this order is filed.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20 DATED: September 8, 2020

21   
22 MARILYN L. HUFF, District Judge  
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28