


1 materials. *See Phillips v. General Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1214 (9th Cir. 2002). Thus, a
2 ‘good cause’ showing alone will not suffice to fulfill the ‘compelling reasons’ standard that a party
3 must meet to rebut the presumption of access to dispositive pleadings and attachments. *See*
4 *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006); *see also Starlite*
5 *Development (China) Ltd. v. Textron Financial Corp.*, 2008 WL 2705393 at 34, (E.D. Cal. 2008).

6 Here, Plaintiffs indicate that portions of their motion for jurisdictional discovery, response
7 to Defendants’ motion to dismiss, and supporting exhibits for both pleadings contain “highly
8 sensitive trade secret and non-public information such as Plaintiffs’ pricing, purchasing quantities,
9 and internal financial information.” *See Dkt. #46*. Specifically, Plaintiffs seek to seal portions of
10 its pleadings that reveal confidential customer information. Plaintiffs also seek to seal exhibits to
11 those pleadings, which include a promissory note; a company power point presentation detailing
12 business operations, company products, and disclosing pictures of manufacturing facilities; and
13 portions of internal operating emails and financial invoices. *See Dkt. #39, #40, #44, #45*. Having
14 reviewed the documents, the Court finds that Plaintiffs establish compelling reasons to file portions
15 of their aforementioned pleadings and exhibits under seal. Accordingly,

16 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiffs’ Motion to File Portions of Plaintiffs’ Motion
17 for Jurisdictional Discovery, Response to Motion to Dismiss and Supporting Exhibits Under Seal
18 (#46) is **granted**. Sealed documents #39, #40, #44, and #45 shall remain sealed.

19 DATED this 19th day of September, 2014.

20
21 
22 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
23 United States Magistrate Judge
24
25
26
27
28