

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation; )	
ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware )	
corporation; and ORACLE )	2:10-CV-00106-LRH-PAL
INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, a )	
California corporation; )	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
Plaintiffs, )	
)	
v. )	
)	
RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada )	
corporation; SETH RAVIN, an individual; )	
)	
Defendants. )	
)	

Before the court are defendants Rimini Street, Inc. (“Rimini Street”) and Seth Ravin’s (“Ravin”) (collectively “defendants”) motion for extension of time to respond (ECF No. 990) and motion to seal portions of their opposition to motion for attorney’s fees (ECF No. 1014).

Also before the court are plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International Corporation’s (collectively “Oracle”) motion to seal portions of its reply to the motion for attorney’s fees (ECF No. 1029) and motion to seal response to objections to evidence (ECF No. 1034).

As an initial matter, the court is acutely cognizant of the presumption in favor of public access to papers filed in the district court. *See Hagestad v. Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995). Therefore, a party seeking to file materials under seal bears the burden of overcoming that

1 presumption by showing that the materials are covered by an operative protective order and are  
2 also deserving of confidentiality. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135  
3 (9th Cir. 2005). Specifically, a party must “articulate compelling reasons supported by specific  
4 factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring  
5 disclosure.” *Kamakana, City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006)  
6 (internal citations omitted).


7 Here, in this intellectual property action, the court has entered a protective order governing  
8 documentation and testimony that is confidential to the parties’ internal research and development,  
9 internal business strategies, and other highly sensitive areas. The court has reviewed the documents  
10 and pleadings on file in this matter and finds that the documents at issue in the present motions  
11 contain information that is either designated “Confidential” and/or “Highly Confidential” under the  
12 protective order. The court finds that the parties have satisfied their burdens to show compelling  
13 reasons for filing the various pleadings under seal. Further, the court notes that the parties  
14 appropriately filed redacted versions of the same pleadings for public record. Accordingly, the  
15 court shall grant the parties’ motions.

16  
17 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties’ various motions to seal (ECF Nos. 1014,  
18 1029, 1034) are GRANTED.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendants’ motion for an extension of time (ECF  
20 No. 990) is GRANTED *nunc pro tunc*.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 DATED this 1st day of August, 2016.

23  
24  
25  
26  
  
LARRY R. HICKS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE