

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

	:	
MERCK & CO., and MERCK SHARP	:	Civil Action No. 16-266 (ES) (MAH)
& DOHME CORP.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
MERCK KGAA,	:	ORDER
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	

This matter comes before the Court by way of Defendant’s motion to redact portions of the transcript from the Court’s November 7, 2016 Scheduling Conference, D.E. 47;

and Plaintiffs consenting to Defendant’s motion to seal;

and the Court considering the submissions before it, and the applicable law;

and Local Civil Rule 5.3(c) requiring that a party seeking an order sealing or otherwise restricting public access to Court proceedings or materials filed with the Court must file a motion that describes:

- (a) the nature of the materials or proceedings at issue, (b) the legitimate private or public interests which warrant the relief sought, (c) the clearly defined and serious injury that would result if the relief sought is not granted, and (d) why a less restrictive alternative to the relief sought is not available.

L. Civ. R. 5.3(c)(2);

and the Court finding that the submission in support of the motion to seal fails to provide sufficient detail and particularity to satisfy the requirements of Local Civil Rule 5.3(c)(2);

and Local Civil Rule 5.3(c)(2) further requiring that the moving party include “Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law . . . **in the proposed order[;]**”

and it appearing that the proposed form of order fails to include sufficient detail and particularity in the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law;

and the Court requiring any and all motions to seal be filed in compliance with Local Civil Rule 5.3;

IT IS on this 28th day of December, 2016,

ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion to seal [D.E. 47] is denied without prejudice to the right of any movant to file a renewed motion to seal that complies fully with all requirements and provisions of Local Civil Rules 5.3(c) and 7.1(d); and it is further

ORDERED that any renewed motion to seal shall be filed no later than **January 13, 2017**, and the motion shall be returnable **February 6, 2017**; and it is further

ORDERED that nothing herein constitutes a ruling as to whether or not the material identified warrants sealing; and it is further

ORDERED that the materials presently under seal shall remain under temporary seal pending the Court's review of any renewed motion to seal.

/s Michael A. Hammer
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE