"confidential" by the producing party. However, the Court will not grant broad authority to file documents under seal simply because the parties have designated them as confidential in the course of discovery. "There is a strong presumption of public access to the court's files and records which may be overcome only on a compelling showing that the public's right of access is outweighed by the interests of the public and the parties in protecting files, records, or documents from public review." Local Rule CR 5(g)(2). While the parties may agree on confidentiality among themselves, when they ask for the involvement of the Court in sealing documents, they must make the requisite showing as to each document.

Exhibit P comprises an invoice and a copy of some yarn labels. Neither document represents proprietary information nor trade secrets. The motion to seal (Dkt. # 467) is accordingly DENIED. **The**Clerk is directed to UNSEAL the document filed at Dkt. # 470.

(3) Plaintiff's Motion to Seal, Dkt. # 473

This motion relates to Exhibit E to the Declaration of Robert J. Guite, filed at Dkt. # 476. Defendants have responded to assert that this document should remain under seal. Dkt. # 498. They have also pointed out that plaintiff's motion fails to reference this exhibit, but plaintiff has corrected that error by filing a notice of errata. Dkt. # 499. However, the document does not relate to the subject for which it is referenced. Plaintiff's motion asserts that "Documents produced indicate that many more tests exist from Chinese, American, and Italian labs." Cascade's Motion to Compel, Dkt. # 499, p. 6. Exhibit E is an e-mail chain related to ordering, pricing, and supply. The parties, and particularly plaintiff, have been cautioned previously regarding filing documents as exhibits unless the document is actually referenced in the motion. The Court now extends that caution to include documents which do not represent the substance for which they are cited. The Court shall adopt defendants' suggestion that this document should be stricken. Accordingly, the Clerk is directed to MAINTAIN UNDER SEAL the document filed at Dkt. # 476.

(4) Plaintiff's Motion to Seal, Dkt. # 477

This motion relates to Exhibit A to the Declaration of Robert J. Guite, filed at Dkt. # 480.

Defendants contend that this document contains highly sensitive information that should remain under ORDER - 2

seal. The Court agrees. Plaintiff's motion to seal at Dkt. # 477 is accordingly GRANTED. **The Clerk** is directed to MAINTAIN UNDER SEAL the document filed at Dkt. # 480.

(5) Plaintiff's Motion to Seal, Dkt. # 483

This motion relates to Exhibit E to the Declaration of Robert J. Guite, filed at Dkt. # 484. This is the same document as addressed in paragraph (3) above, and the same result shall obtain. The document does not stand for the proposition for which it is cited by plaintiff in the corresponding motion to compel. *See*, Notice of Errata, Dkt. # 500, p. 2. It shall accordingly be stricken. **The Clerk is directed to MAINTAIN UNDER SEAL the document filed at Dkt. # 484**.

DATED this 21 day of February 2012.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ORDER - 3