

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

KURT SINGLETON,

Plaintiff,

v.

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

Defendants.

Case No. C17-1712RSL

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

On November 13, 2017, the parties filed a “Stipulated Motion to File Complaint and Exhibits Under Seal.” Dkt. # 3. Pursuant to the procedure set forth in LCR 5(g), plaintiff filed the motion to seal only because the contracts between the parties designated certain information confidential. Because plaintiff did not argue that the information is confidential or that a seal is appropriate, the stipulation was noted on the Court’s calendar to give defendant a chance to “show that compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure” of court records. Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010) (internal quotation marks and alterations omitted). On December 6, 2017, the Court denied the motion for seal on the ground that defendant made no effort to support the contention that sections of the complaint and exhibits should be redacted and kept confidential.

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

1 The Court erred. Three documents were filed under seal on November 22, 2017, that were
2 offered in support of the parties' stipulation. Having now reviewed those documents, defendant's
3 motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 25) is GRANTED. The unredacted copy of the Complaint (Dkt.
4 # 6) shall remain under seal. The Clerk is directed to unseal Exhibit 2 to the Complaint (Dkt.
5 # 6-1).

6
7 Dated this 11th day of December, 2017.

8 

9 Robert S. Lasnik
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26