

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	
PETER J. HANSON, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Case No. C16-1085RSL

ORDER REGARDING MOTION  
TO SEAL

This matter comes before the Court on “Defendants’ Motion to File Certain Exhibits Under Seal.” Dkt. # 67. Having reviewed the memoranda and exhibits submitted by the parties, the Court finds that the medical records and information regarding the non-party patients whose treatment is at issue in this litigation should remain confidential to protect the privacy of those patients. In addition, plaintiffs have shown that certain claims handling documents are entitled to protection from public viewing because they contain unique information, were developed and maintained in confidence at substantial cost, and would put plaintiffs at a competitive disadvantage if disclosed.

Docket # 70 shall remain under seal. The public, however, has a significant interest in the opinions and analysis of the experts in this litigation in that they are important to an understanding of the issues and the Court’s resolution thereof. A balance between the private and public interests can be achieved by redacting all patient names and other personal identifying information from Exhibits E, F, G, and H (Dkt. # 70-3 through # 70-6) and filing redacted copies

ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO SEAL

1 of those exhibits in the record. Defendants shall do so within fourteen days of the date of this  
2 Order. Defendants shall also file for public view the portions of Exhibit C (Dkt. # 70-1) that  
3 plaintiffs agree are not confidential, namely SF0000104PROD, SF0000080PROD, and  
4 SF0000081PROD.<sup>1</sup>

5  
6 Dated this 13th day of November, 2017.

7 

8 Robert S. Lasnik  
9 United States District Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 

---

<sup>1</sup> LCR 5(g)(1) requires parties to meet and confer regarding whether a designating party will  
26 Defendants' email notice to plaintiffs that they intended to file a thousand pages of documents within a  
few hours and would like plaintiffs' input on the confidentiality designations is not a meaningful attempt  
to explore alternatives to filing the documents under seal.