ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'

This matter comes before the Court on defendants' "Motion to File Document Under Seal (Complaint)." Dkt. # 4. Defendants seek to redact thirteen lines of text from the nineteen page complaint in which plaintiff recounts a conversation he had with a third party regarding other third parties. Defendants have filed an unsealed, redacted version of the complaint at Dkt. #9.

Defendants argue that public disclosure of the communications at issue may implicate existing confidentiality agreements, the third parties involved support the proposed redaction, and the redaction is extremely limited. Plaintiff raises procedural objections, but does not make any argument regarding the interests of the persons involved or the public. The Court finds that, at least at the moment, the redacted information is not of particular importance to the

¹ Defendants' efforts to seal the complaint in King County Superior Court have as yet been unsuccessful given the removal of this action. Whether defendants will be able to seal a document in a closed case is unknown, but that does not mean that its efforts here should be rejected.

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO SEAL

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Doc. 32

public's understanding of plaintiff's claim.² The third parties' privacy interests therefore outweigh the public's interest in the unsealed version of the complaint.

The motion to seal is GRANTED. Defendants shall file a redacted version of the complaint consistent with the attachment to Dkt. # 4. The unredacted version of the complaint (Dkt. # 10) will remain sealed.

Dated this 28th day of June, 2017.

MMS (asmik Robert S. Lasnik United States Distri

United States District Judge

² Plaintiff may file a motion to unseal if, as the case progresses, the events and communications recounted in ¶ 3.26 become a significant issue in this litigation.