

1
2 Documents that have been traditionally kept secret, including grand jury transcripts and warrant
3 materials in a pre-indictment investigation, come within an exception to the general right of public
4 access. *See Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178. Otherwise, “a strong presumption in favor of access is the
5 starting point.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “The presumption of access is ‘based
6 on the need for federal courts, although independent—indeed, particularly because they are
7 independent—to have a measure of accountability and for the public to have confidence in the
8 administration of justice.’” *Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th
9 Cir. 2016), *cert. denied*, 137 S.Ct. 38 (Oct. 3, 2016) (quoting *United States v. Amodeo (Amodeo II)*,
10 71 F.3d 1044, 1048 (2nd Cir. 1995); *Valley Broad Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court-D. Nev.*, 798 F.2d 1289, 1294
11 (9th Cir. 1986)).

12 There are two possible standards a party must address when it seeks to file a document under
13 seal: the compelling reasons standard or the good cause standard. *See Center for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d
14 at 1096-97. Under the compelling reasons standard, “a court may seal records only when it finds ‘a
15 compelling reason and articulate[s] the factual basis for its ruling, without relying on hypothesis or
16 conjecture.’” *Id.* (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179). “The court must then ‘conscientiously balance
17 [] the competing interests of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records secret.’”
18 *Id.* “What constitutes a ‘compelling reason’ is ‘best left to the sound discretion of the trial court.’” *Id.*
19 (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Comm., Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 599 (1978)). “Examples include when a court
20 record might be used to ‘gratify private spite or promote public scandal,’ to circulate ‘libelous’
21 statements, or ‘as sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.’”
22 *Id.* (quoting *Nixon*, 435 U.S. at 598-99).

23 *Center for Auto Safety* described the good cause standard, on the other hand, as the exception to
24 public access that had been applied to “sealed materials attached to a discovery motion unrelated to the
25 merits of a case.” *Id.* (citing *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1213-
26 14 (9th Cir. 2002)). “The ‘good cause language comes from Rule 26(c)(1), which governs the issuance
27 of protective orders in the discovery process: ‘The court may, for good cause, issue an order to protect
28 a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense.’” *Id.* (citing

1 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)).

2 The Ninth Circuit has clarified that the key in determining which standard to apply in assessing
3 a motion for leave to file a document under seal is whether the documents proposed for sealing
4 accompany a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Center for Auto*
5 *Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1101 (9th Cir. 2016). If that is the case, the compelling reasons standard is applied.
6 If not, the good cause standard is applied.

7 Here, Plaintiffs seek to file under seal the discrete portions of their First Amended Complaint and
8 Exhibits A and F attached thereto. They represent that the exhibits contain the operative agreement
9 between the parties and other information which the parties have deemed confidential pursuant to a
10 protective order. The motion for leave to amend does not go to the merits of the action itself, but to what
11 claims the Plaintiffs will be asserting. Therefore, the “good cause” standard applies.

12 The exhibits attach the agreements and references other confidential information subject to the
13 protective order entered in this case. Rule 26 allows the court to protect “trade secret[s] or other
14 confidential research, development or commercial information[.]” As such, the court finds that good
15 cause exists to seal exhibits A and F. Therefore, Plaintiffs’ motion (ECF No. 83) is **GRANTED**.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 DATED: July 11, 2017.

18
19 

20 WILLIAM G. COBB
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28