

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

SEATTLE PACIFIC INDUSTRIES,
INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

S3 HOLDING LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C18-0224RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
SEAL

This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiff’s Motion to Seal.” Dkt. # 24. Pursuant to the procedure set forth in LCR 5(g)(3), plaintiff filed the motion to seal only because defendant had designated the information confidential under the protective order entered in this case. Plaintiff does not believe the information is confidential, and defendant has not provided the necessary statement of applicable law and fact that would justify a seal.

“There is a strong presumption of public access to the court’s files.” LCR 5(g). In order to override the common law right to inspect and copy public documents, “a party seeking to seal judicial records must show that compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring

1 disclosure.” Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010) (internal
2 quotation marks and alterations omitted). Neither party has attempted to make such a
3 showing, and the Court finds that a party’s unilateral designation of a document as
4 “confidential” during discovery does not, in and of itself, justify a seal. The motion (Dkt.
5 # 24) is therefore DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to unseal Dkt. # 28 and # 29.

6 Dated this 12th day of December, 2018.

7
8 

9
10 Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge