

1 *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1137 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also In re Roman*
2 *Catholic Archbishop of Portland in Oregon*, 661 F.3d 417, 425 (9th Cir. 2011) (the district court
3 must “keep in mind the possibility of redacting the sensitive material”)

4 Defendant Apexus’ most recent filing agrees to allow the exhibits at issue to be filed
5 publicly, except that it maintains that redaction to Section 10.A of Exhibit B is proper. *See* Docket
6 No. 176 at 2. That section provides for Apexus’ property and commercially sensitive administrative
7 fee calculation, the disclosure of which Apexus argues would impede its ability to negotiate and
8 enter agreements with suppliers. *See* Docket No. 172 at 7. The Court finds compelling reasons exist
9 for redaction of Section 10.A of Exhibit B. Compelling reasons have not been established as to any
10 other part of the relevant exhibits. Accordingly, no later than September 25, 2014, Defendant
11 Apexus shall file publicly on the docket a notice attaching the relevant exhibits, except that it may
12 redact Section 10.A of Exhibit B.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: September 22, 2014

15
16 
17 _____
18 NANCY J. KOPPE
19 United States Magistrate Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28