

Case No. 1:12-CV-2288
Gwin, J.

Moreover, the fact that the protective order is unopposed does not overcome this presumption. See [Proctor & Gamble Co., 78 F.3d at 227](#) (warning district courts against “abdicat[ing their] responsibility to oversee the discovery process and to determine whether filings should be made available to the public” and against “turn[ing] this function over to the parties,” which would be “a violation not only of Rule 26(c) but of the principles so painstakingly discussed in *Brown & Williamson*”).

A successful protective order motion must show specifically that disclosure of particular information would cause serious harm. See, e.g., [Brown & Williamson, 710 F.2d at 1179-80](#). Here, the movant fails to meet this standard. Instead, it provides a non-exhaustive list of documents that it claims “carr[y] the potential to harm Intellicorp both commercially and competitively by providing confidential information to Intellicorp’s competitors as well as to competing customers.” [Doc. 70, at 3.] Further, the movant asks for blanket authority to designate documents as confidential that they themselves deem warrant such status. [*Id.*] However, Intellicorp has failed to show that public disclosure of any information might cause serious harm or is otherwise warranted.

The movant may move to seal individual documents provided that the requisite particularized showing is made. For example, upon a proper motion, the Court will consider limiting public disclosure of information that is highly sensitive or considered a trade secret. However, the Court will not simply grant the movant blanket authorization to cloak the entire case under a veil. The

Case No. 1:12-CV-2288
Gwin, J.

Court thus **DENIES** the motion for a protective order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 12, 2012

s/ James S. Gwin _____

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE