

1 LAURENCE F. PULGRAM (CA State Bar No. 115163) (*pro hac vice*)  
[lpulgram@fenwick.com](mailto:lpulgram@fenwick.com)  
 2 CLIFFORD C. WEBB (CA State Bar No. 260885) (*pro hac vice*)  
[cwebb@fenwick.com](mailto:cwebb@fenwick.com)  
 3 FENWICK & WEST LLP  
 555 California Street, 12th Floor  
 4 San Francisco, California 94104  
 Telephone: (415) 875-2300  
 5 Facsimile: (415) 281-1350

6 KURT OPSAHL (CA State Bar No. 191303) (*pro hac vice*)  
[kurt@eff.org](mailto:kurt@eff.org)  
 7 CORYNNE MCSHERRY (CA State Bar No. 221504) (*pro hac vice*)  
[corynne@eff.org](mailto:corynne@eff.org)  
 8 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION  
 454 Shotwell Street  
 9 San Francisco, California 94110  
 Telephone: (415) 436-9333  
 10 Facsimile: (415) 436-9993

11 CHAD BOWERS (NV State Bar No. 7283)  
[bowers@lawyer.com](mailto:bowers@lawyer.com)  
 12 CHAD A. BOWERS, LTD  
 3202 West Charleston Boulevard  
 13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102  
 Telephone: (702) 457-1001  
 14 Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant  
 15 DEMOCRATIC UNDERGROUND, LLC, and  
 Defendant DAVID ALLEN

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 17 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

18 RIGHTHAVEN LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,  
 Plaintiff,  
 19 v.  
 20 DEMOCRATIC UNDERGROUND, LLC, a District of  
 Columbia limited-liability company; and DAVID ALLEN,  
 21 an individual,  
 22 Defendants.

23 DEMOCRATIC UNDERGROUND, LLC, a District of  
 Columbia limited-liability company,  
 24 Counterclaimant,  
 25 v.  
 26 RIGHTHAVEN LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,  
 and STEPHENS MEDIA LLC, a Nevada limited-liability  
 27 company,  
 28 Counterdefendants.

Case No. 10-01356-RLH (GWF)

**DEFENDANTS' REQUEST  
 TO UNSEAL EXHIBIT A TO  
 PULGRAM DECLARATION  
 AND RELATED FILINGS  
 [DKT NOS. 74, 79]**

1 **REQUEST TO UNSEAL**

2 On March 8, 2011, this Court ordered that Defendants' Supplemental Memorandum  
3 Addressing Recently Produced Evidence Relevant to Pending Motions (Dkt. 74) and  
4 accompanying documents be temporarily placed under seal, but also provided that:

5 within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Order, (i) the parties  
6 shall file a stipulation as to which portions of said Exhibit A and the  
7 Supplemental Memorandum shall remain under seal or, (ii) if no  
8 stipulation is reached by the parties, Counterdefendants Stephens  
Media, LLC and Righthaven, LLC shall file with the Court their  
justification for retaining Exhibit A under seal, with any Reply  
thereto by Defendants to be filed within seven days thereafter.

9 Order Granting Defendants' Conditional Motion to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. 75)  
10 ("March 8 Order") at 2.

11 As this Court knows, the documents were placed under seal only because they were  
12 designated "Confidential Attorneys' Eyes Only" by Stephens Media LLC ("Stephens Media")  
13 under the Stipulated Protective Order. On March 9, 2011, Defendants asked Counterdefendants  
14 Stephens Media and Righthaven LLC ("Righthaven") to withdraw the designation or modify it to  
15 limited portions of the document or advise that they refused to do so. *See* Declaration of Clifford  
16 Webb in Support of Defendants' Request to Unseal ("Webb Decl.") ¶ 3. Defendants also notified  
17 Counterdefendants' counsel that they were willing to attempt to stipulate to redaction of any  
18 appropriately limited portion. *Id.* Later that day, counsel for Stephens Media and Righthaven  
19 refused to lift the designation on Exhibit A. *Id.* ¶ 4. Since then, neither Righthaven nor Stephens  
20 Media have proposed redactions or sought a stipulated resolution. *Id.* Accordingly, Defendants  
21 hereby notify the Court that no stipulation was reached by the parties.

22 Therefore, pursuant to this Court's March 8, 2011 Order, Righthaven and Stephens Media  
23 were required to "file with the Court their justification for retaining Exhibit A under seal" within  
24 fourteen days of the March 8 Order. Dkt. 75. As of March 29, 2011, 21 days from the date of  
25 this Court's order, the due date for Defendants' reply, neither Stephens Media nor Righthaven  
26 have filed with the Court any justification for retaining any documents under seal.

27 Accordingly, by failing to oppose the unsealing, Stephens Media and Righthaven have  
28 failed to provide the specific, articulable facts necessary to meet their burden of showing

1 compelling reasons for overriding the general right to inspect and copy judicial records and  
2 documents.<sup>1</sup> See also Local Rule 7-2(d) (“The failure of an opposing party to file points and  
3 authorities in response to any motion shall constitute a consent to the granting of the motion.”).

4 **CONCLUSION**

5 For the reasons stated above, Defendants respectfully request that this Court unseal  
6 (i) Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Memorandum Addressing Recently  
7 Produced Evidence Relevant to Pending Motions (Dkt. 74); (ii) Defendants’ Supplemental  
8 Memorandum Addressing Recently Produced Evidence Relevant To Pending Motions  
9 (Dkts. 74 & 79); (iii) Declaration of Laurence Pulgram (Dkts. 74 & 79); and (iv) Exhibit A to  
10 Declaration of Laurence Pulgram (Dkts. 74 & 79).

11 Dated: March 29, 2010

FENWICK & WEST LLP

12  
13 By: /s/ Laurence F. Pulgram  
14 LAURENCE F. PULGRAM, ESQ

15 Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaimant  
16 DEMOCRATIC UNDERGROUND, LLC, and  
17 Defendant DAVID ALLEN

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 <sup>1</sup> There is a strong presumption of public access to court records, and “compelling reasons” are required to override  
24 that presumption, particularly in the case of dispositive motions and their related attachments. *Kamakana v. City and*  
25 *County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006) (citing *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d  
26 1122, 1136 (9th Cir. 2003). Of course, the presumptive right to access is not absolute, but it can only be overridden  
27 given “sufficiently compelling reasons” for doing so. *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1135. These compelling reasons must be  
28 supported by “specific factual findings.” *Id.* (citing *San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. United States District Court*, 187  
F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir. 1999)); see also *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1182 (the court’s findings must be based on the  
specific, articulable facts provided to it). There is no room here for “hypothesis or conjecture.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d  
at 1179 (quoting *Hagestad v. Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995)). Conclusory or categorical statements  
that might satisfy the lesser “good cause” standard will therefore not suffice. *Id.* at 1184. Moreover, as the Ninth  
Circuit has explained, “the mere fact that the production of records may lead to a litigant’s embarrassment,  
incrimination, or exposure to further litigation” is insufficient to support sealing. *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178  
(quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1136).