

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 KURT SINGLETON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 INTELLISIST, INC., d/b/a Spoken  
Communications,

13 Defendants.  
14

Case No. C17-1712RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
TO SEAL

15 On November 13, 2017, the parties filed a “Stipulated Motion to File Complaint and  
16 Exhibits Under Seal.” Dkt. # 3. Pursuant to the procedure set forth in LCR 5(g), plaintiff filed  
17 the motion to seal only because the contracts between the parties designated certain information  
18 confidential. Plaintiff does not argue that the information is confidential or that a seal is  
19 appropriate.

20 “There is a strong presumption of public access to the court’s files.” LCR 5(g). In order to  
21 override the common law right to inspect and copy public documents, “a party seeking to seal  
22 judicial records must show that compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings  
23 outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.” Pintos v.  
24 Pac. Creditors Ass’n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010) (internal quotation marks and alterations  
25 omitted). The existence of a contractual confidentiality provision does not, in and of itself,  
26 justify a seal, and defendant has made no effort to support its contention that sections of the  
complaint and exhibits should be redacted and kept confidential.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO SEAL

1 For all of the foregoing reasons, the “stipulated” motion to file the complaint and exhibits  
2 under seal is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to unseal Dkt. # 6.

3  
4 Dated this 6th day of December, 2017.

5 

6 Robert S. Lasnik

7 United States District Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26