

**McDONALD • CARANO • WILSON LLP**  
2300 WEST SAHARA AVENUE • NO. 10, SUITE 1000 • LAS VEGAS, NEVADA  
PHONE (702)873-4100 • FAX (702) 873-9966

1 JEFFREY A. SILVESTRI, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 5779  
2 JOSEPHINE BINETTI McPEAK, ESQ.  
Nevada Bar No. 7994  
3 McDONALD CARANO WILSON LLP  
2300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 1000  
4 Las Vegas, NV 89102  
Telephone: (702) 873-4100  
5 Facsimile: (702) 873-9966  
Email: [jsilvestri@mcdonaldcarano.com](mailto:jsilvestri@mcdonaldcarano.com)  
6 [jmcpeak@mcdonaldcarano.com](mailto:jmcpeak@mcdonaldcarano.com)

7 DAVID S. BLOCH (appearing *pro hac vice*)  
JENNIFER A. GOLINVEAUX (appearing *pro hac vice*)  
8 K. JOON OH (appearing *pro hac vice*)  
ELISABETH A. DERBY (appearing *pro hac vice*)  
9 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
10 101 California Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-5894  
Telephone: (415) 591-1000  
11 Facsimile: (415) 591-1400  
Email: [dbloch@winston.com](mailto:dbloch@winston.com)  
12 [jgolinveaux@winston.com](mailto:jgolinveaux@winston.com)  
[koh@winston.com](mailto:koh@winston.com)  
13 [bderby@winston.com](mailto:bderby@winston.com)

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff AEVOE CORP.*

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
16 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

18 AEVOE CORP., a California corporation,  
19 Plaintiff,  
20 vs.  
21 AE TECH CO., LTD., a Taiwan corporation,  
S & F Corporation dba SF PLANET  
22 COMPANY and SF PLANET  
CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation, and  
23 GREATSHIELD INC., a Minnesota  
corporation,  
24 Defendants.  
25

**Case No. 2:12-cv-00053-GMN -RJJ**

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO  
FILE CERTAIN DOCUMENT  
EXCERPTS UNDER SEAL**

1 Plaintiff Aevoe Corp. hereby submits its Motion for Leave to File Certain Document  
2 Excerpts under Seal. Aevoe requests that the Court enter an order sealing portions of its Reply in  
3 Support of Its Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery Requests.

4 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

5 **I. INTRODUCTION**

6 Aevoe seeks to file its Reply in Support of its Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery  
7 Requests (“Reply”). Portions of the Reply contain confidential and proprietary information,  
8 including trade secrets, which should be protected under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26. After extensive  
9 discussions, Aevoe and Defendants reached agreement on all but one provision of a proposed  
10 protective order to maintain the confidentiality of confidential and proprietary information, including  
11 trade secrets, of parties and non-parties. Aevoe and Defendants ultimately submitted their respective  
12 proposed protective orders for the Court’s consideration, and they are pending before the Court.  
13 Accordingly, Aevoe requests that the Court enter an order sealing portions of its Reply that contain  
14 confidential and proprietary information.

15 **II. ARGUMENT**

16 **A. Legal Standard**

17 “The court may, for good cause, issue an order . . . requiring that a trade secret or other  
18 confidential research, development, or commercial information not be revealed or be revealed only  
19 in a specified way.” FRCP 26(c). Yet, the courts recognize a “strong presumption in favor of  
20 access” to judicial records. *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9<sup>th</sup>  
21 Cir. 2006). Accordingly, “[a] party seeking to seal a judicial record then bears the burden of  
22 overcoming this strong presumption by meeting the ‘compelling reasons’ standard . . . . That is, the  
23 party must articulate the compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the  
24 general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure, such as the public interest in  
25 understanding the judicial process.” *Id.* at 1178-79 (citation and internal punctuation omitted).

26 However, the “compelling reasons” standard applies only to documents attached to  
27 dispositive motions.<sup>1</sup> *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179. In cases where a sealed discovery document is

28 <sup>1</sup> The sealing of dispositive filings is also appropriate to protect the parties’ proprietary  
business operations and trade secrets. *See generally Kamakana*, 557 F.3d at 1179. In such

1 attached to a non-dispositive motion, “the usual presumption of the public’s right of access is  
2 rebutted.” *Id.* (citations omitted). Regarding those documents, “the public has less of a need for  
3 access to court records attached only to non-dispositive motions because those documents are often  
4 unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action.” *Id.* (citations and internal  
5 punctuation omitted).

6 A motion to compel is not a dispositive motion. Portions of Aevoe’s Reply contain  
7 confidential, proprietary information sales information. Accordingly, the “public’s right of access is  
8 rebutted,” and the Court has the authority to enter an order sealing or redacting those documents.  
9 *See Kamakana*, 557 F.3d at 1178. Further, courts have recognized the need to maintain the  
10 confidentiality of pricing and sales information to preserve a party’s competitive standing. *See, e.g.,*  
11 *Triquint Semiconductor, Inc. v. Avago Technologies Ltd.*, No. cv. 09-1531-PHX-JAT, 2011 WL  
12 6182346, \*4 (D. Ariz. Dec. 13, 2011).

13 **B. Good Cause Exists to Seal Excerpts of Aevoe’s Reply In Support of Its Motion to**  
14 **Compel Responses to Discovery Requests**

15 Aevoe’s Reply contains confidential and proprietary information, including trade secrets,  
16 relating to Defendants’ confidential and proprietary sales information. Accordingly, the Court  
17 should grant Aevoe leave to redact its Reply and file it under seal. *See Triquint Semiconductor*,  
18 2011 WL 6182346 at \*4.

19 ...

20 ...

21 ...

22 ...

23 ...

24 ...

25 ...

26  
27 circumstances as here, even under the “compelling reasons” standard, the need to prevent Aevoe’s  
28 sensitive material from disclosure and improper use will, in general, “be sufficient to outweigh the  
public’s interest in disclosure.” *Id.*

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, Aevoe requests that the Court permit it to redact portions of its  
3 Reply in Support of Its Motion to Compel Responses to Discovery Requests and file the Reply under  
4 seal.

5 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 27<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2012.

6 McDONALD CARANO WILSON LLP

7  
8 By: 

9 JEFFREY A. SILVESTRI (#5779)  
10 JOSEPHINE BINETTI McPEAK (#7994)  
11 2300 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 1000  
12 Las Vegas, NV 89102  
13 [jsilvestri@mcdonalddcarano.com](mailto:jsilvestri@mcdonalddcarano.com)  
14 [jmcpeak@mcdonalddcarano.com](mailto:jmcpeak@mcdonalddcarano.com)

15 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
16 David S. Bloch (*pro hac vice*)  
17 Jennifer A. Golinveaux (*pro hac vice*)  
18 K. Joon Oh (*pro hac vice*)  
19 Elisabeth A. Derby (*pro hac vice*)  
20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff AEVOE CORP.*

21 LVDOCS-#262683

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 

24 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

25 **DATED:** October 2, 2012