

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 PROGRESSIVE INTERNATIONAL  
11 CORPORATION,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 AMGTM LLC and CUC  
15 DISTRIBUTORS LLC,

16 Defendants.  
17

CASE NO. C17-448 RAJ

ORDER

18 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Seal. Dkt. # 47.  
19 Plaintiff seeks to file under seal certain documents produced by Defendant, AMGTM  
20 LLC and designated as "CONFIDENTIAL." Dkt. # 47 at 1. Plaintiff attaches these  
21 documents as exhibits to its summary judgment motion. Dkt. ## 46, 48.

22 "There is a strong presumption of public access to the court's files." Western  
23 District of Washington Local Civil Rule ("LCR") 5(g). "Only in rare circumstances  
24 should a party file a motion, opposition, or reply under seal." LCR 5(g)(5). Normally the  
25 moving party must include "a specific statement of the applicable legal standard and the  
26  
27

1 reasons for keeping a document under seal, with evidentiary support from declarations  
2 where necessary.” LCR 5(g)(3)(B).

3           However, where parties have entered a stipulated protective order governing the  
4 exchange in discovery of documents that a party deems confidential, “a party wishing to  
5 file a confidential document it obtained from another party in discovery may file a motion  
6 to seal but need not satisfy subpart (3)(B) above. Instead, the party who designated the  
7 document confidential must satisfy subpart (3)(B) in its response to the motion to seal or  
8 in a stipulated motion.” LCR 5(g)(3). A “good cause” showing under Rule 26(c) will  
9 suffice to keep sealed records attached to non-dispositive motions. *Kamakana v. City &*  
10 *County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal citations omitted).  
11 For dispositive motions, the presumption may be overcome by demonstrating  
12 “compelling reasons.” *Id.*; *Foltz v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1135-36  
13 (9th Cir. 2003).

14           Plaintiff takes no position on the appropriateness of keeping these documents  
15 under seal, other than to observe that Defendant designated these documents  
16 “CONFIDENTIAL” during discovery. Dkt. # 47. Despite this Court’s Order to obtain  
17 substitute counsel two months ago (Dkt. # 45), Defendant apparently has not done so, and  
18 has not filed any response to Plaintiff’s Motion to Seal. The Court has reviewed the  
19 documents Plaintiff seeks to file under seal, and cannot readily determine the basis for  
20 keeping this information out of the public record. Dkt. # 48. Accordingly, Defendant, as  
21 the party designating these documents, has not met its burden to provide a “specific  
22 statement” articulating why these documents should be kept under seal. LCR 5(g)(3).  
23 Neither party has provided any compelling reason to depart from the “strong presumption  
24 of public access to the court’s files.” LCR 5(g).

25           The Court accordingly **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion to Seal. Dkt. # 47. **Defendant**  
26 **shall have twenty-one (21) days from the date of this Order to explain to this Court**  
27

1 **why these documents should be kept under seal.** If Defendants fail to make such a  
2 showing, the Clerk is directed to unseal Dkt. # 48.

3         Additionally, the Court directs Plaintiff to ensure that Defendant is in receipt of  
4 this Order.

5  
6  
7         Dated this 14th day of August, 2018.

8  
9  
10         

11         The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
12         United States District Judge