

1 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

2 Courts have recognized the “general right to inspect and copy public records and
3 documents, including judicial records and documents.” Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc., 435
4 U.S. 589, 597 n.7 (1978). The Ninth Circuit has noted there is a “strong presumption in favor of
5 access” to judicial documents. Kamakana v. City of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir.
6 2006). However, the Ninth Circuit has held that “[t]he public policies that support the right of
7 access to dispositive motions, and related materials, do not apply with equal force to non-
8 dispositive materials.” Id. at 1179. Plaintiffs need only show “good cause” under FRCP 26(c) to
9 keep records attached to non-dispositive motions sealed. Id. at 1180. Rule 26(c) states the court
10 may issue an order to protect a party from “annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue
11 burden or expense.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1).
12
13

14
15 **III. ANALYSIS**

16 In support of their motion, Plaintiffs argue that the affidavit contains confidential and
17 proprietary information regarding details of Plaintiffs’ business model as well as the valuation of
18 the HOA liens at issue in the case. ECF No. 18. Plaintiffs argue that they believe good cause
19 exists to warrant sealing the affidavit, but do not present further details about the content of the
20 document.
21

22 In opposing Plaintiffs’ motion, Defendants argue that Plaintiffs fail to provide any basis
23 that overcomes the “strong presumption” of public access. ECF No. 33. Further, Defendants
24 argue that sealing the affidavit would prevent the public from gaining access to information
25 related to assets that will be subject to a foreclosure sale, cutting against the transparency of the
26 foreclosure sale. Finally, Defendants argue that sealing the affidavit would lead to “unnecessary
27 logistical complications” that should be avoided.
28

1 The Court finds that Plaintiffs’ motion should be granted. While Plaintiffs have not
2 articulated with specificity what harm could come from the motion being made public,
3 Defendants mischaracterize this as a situation in which compelling reasons must be shown.
4 Because the affidavit is related to a non-dispositive preliminary injunction motion, Plaintiffs only
5 need to show “good cause” for sealing the affidavit. Protecting proprietary information from
6 public knowledge is sufficient under the stricter “compelling reasons” standard, and is therefore
7 sufficient in this instance in which the lower “good cause” standard applies. See, e.g.,
8 Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179 (noting that “‘compelling reasons’ sufficient to outweigh the
9 public’s interest in disclosure and justify sealing court records exist when such ‘court files might
10 have become a vehicle for improper purposes,’ such as the use of records to . . . release trade
11 secrets.””).
12
13

14
15 **IV. CONCLUSION**

16 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiffs’ Ex Parte Motion to Seal Affidavit of Jay
17 Bloom (ECF No. 18) is GRANTED.
18

19 **DATED:** September 29, 2016.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE