

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

9 POINT RUSTON, LLC, et al.,

10 Plaintiffs,

11 v.

12 PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGIONAL
13 COUNCIL OF THE UNITED
14 BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS
15 AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, et al.,

16 Defendants.

CASE NO. C09-5232BHS

ORDER ON MOTIONS
TO SEAL

17 This matter comes before the Court on the Defendant's ("the Carpenters")
18 unopposed motions to seal (Dkts. 214, 222). The Court has considered the pleadings filed
19 in support of the motions and the remainder of the file and hereby denies the motions to
20 seal as discussed herein.

21 **I. DISCUSSION**

22 On January 8, 2010, the parties entered into a stipulated protective agreement that
23 permits them to designate documents as "confidential," subject to court approval. *See*
24 Declaration of Daniel M. Shanely (Dkt. 215), Ex. 1 (copy of stipulated protective
25 agreement). The parties agreed that the documents pertaining to the instant motions to
26 seal (Dkts. 214, 222) should be sealed. The parties argued that these documents presented
27 sensitive information, the production of which would result in harm by revealing "critical
28

1 confidential research, development and commercial information regarding [Point
2 Ruston's] finances, loans, marketing, sales, and potential and actual customers including
3 confidential financial data and confidential data regarding Plaintiff's business
4 operations." Further, they argued that "redaction of the documents is *not feasible* as an
5 alternative to sealing the documents given the substantive information in the documents."
6 Dkts. 222, 214 at 2.

7 On June 8, 2010, the Court ordered the parties to show cause why these motions
8 should not be denied because, in the Court's view, the documents were not appropriate
9 for sealing. On June 15, 2010, the parties filed their responses to the show cause order.
10 Dkts. 301, 302. These responses confirm the Court's conclusion that the documents at
11 issue should not be sealed. The parties are reminded that this is a public court. The Court
12 will not seal documents simply because the parties stipulate or do not oppose the sealing
13 of certain documents. Counsel for the parties should make a thorough review of
14 documents before moving the Court to seal the same.
15

16 Because the parties have not expressed adequate reasons for sealing the documents
17 subject to the instant motions, the Court denies the motions to seal. The Court further
18 orders the parties to reevaluate their other pending motions to seal and determine whether
19 client and judicial resources would be better served by removing those motions from the
20 Court's docket. *See, e.g.*, Dkts. 254, 266, 271, 275. Should the parties remain steadfast in
21 their position to seal these other documents, they are further instructed to file
22 supplemental briefing to provide adequate reasons for sealing such documents on a
23 document-by-document basis, as opposed to the boilerplate language used in the instant
24 and pending motions.
25
26
27
28

1 **II. ORDER**

2 The Court hereby **ORDERS** that the parties' motions to seal (Dkts. 214, 222) are
3 **DENIED** for failure to articulate an appropriate reason to seal the documents at issue.

4 DATED this 21st day of June, 2010.

5 

6
7 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28