

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

IGT,

 Plaintiff,

vs.

ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

 Defendant.

ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.,

 Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

vs.

IGT,

 Counterclaim Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cv-00473-GMN-GWF
ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff IGT’s Motions for Leave to File Under Seal (ECF Nos. 140 and 141), filed on June 13, 2016.

Plaintiff requests leave to file its Reply to Its Renewed Motion for Preliminary Injunction (ECF No. 141-1) and Exhibits Z (ECF No. 141-3) and EE (ECF No. 141-8) attached thereto under seal pursuant to the stipulated Protective Order entered into by the parties on August 31, 2015. See ECF No. 65. Plaintiff asserts that its Reply cites to and extensively quotes from material that has been designated “Confidential” or “Highly Confidential” pursuant to the terms of the Protective Order. See *Motions for Leave* (ECF Nos. 140 and 141). Furthermore, Plaintiff argues that good cause exists to file the Reply and Exhibits under seal because “[d]isclosure of the information contained in the cited documents, much of which relates to terms of employment with senior executives, may put the parties at a competitive disadvantage in their dealings with third parties.” *Id.* at pg. 2, lns. 15–17.

1 Upon review, the Court finds good cause to allow Plaintiff's Unredacted Reply and Exhibits Z and
2 EE attached thereto under seal. Accordingly,

3 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff IGT's Motions for Leave to File Under Seal
4 (ECF Nos. 140 and 141) are **granted**.

5 DATED this 14th day of June, 2016.

6
7 
8 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28