

findings supporting its decision to redact. See id.; Morris v. Cumberland Cty. Hosp. Sys., Inc., No. 5:12-CV-629, 2013 WL 6116861, *1 (E.D.N.C. Nov. 13, 2013).

The applicable standards justify redacting WPL's document. The public has received adequate notice of the request to redact because this Motion has been docketed in the public record, and no objection has been raised in the interim. See In re Knight Pub. Co., 743 at 235. Additionally, there is no less drastic alternative to redacting the document. Filing the document in the public record would disclose confidential and commercially sensitive information not generally known to the public. Simply put, WPL's interest in preserving the confidentiality of its financial status outweighs any public interest in its disclosure. Finally, the Court meets the third prong of the Ashcraft analysis by virtue of the findings delineated in this Order.

For these reasons, WPL's Motion to Redact is hereby GRANTED.

It is so ORDERED.



United States District Judge

Date: 3/24/2017