

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
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CITY OF ROSEVILLE EMPLOYEES'
RETIREMENT SYSTEM,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-02033-YGR (JCS)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONSIDER WHETHER ANOTHER
PARTY'S MATERIAL SHOULD BE
SEALED**

Re: Dkt. No. 234

Plaintiff filed an administrative motion (“Motion to Seal”) to consider whether its reply on the motion to compel and supporting materials designated by Defendants as confidential under the protective order in this case should be sealed. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5, the party that designates material as confidential must, within 7 days of the filing of such a motion, file a response establishing that the material at issue should be sealed. Civ.L.R. 79-5(c), (f). Defendants filed a declaration (dkt. no. 235) establishing good cause to seal Exhibits 7 and 8 to the Black Declaration (dkt. nos. 234-5 and 234-6) and therefore the Motion to Seal is GRANTED as to those documents. Defendants’ response did not address or seek to seal the Reply or the Black Declaration filed in support of the Reply and Defendants stipulated at the April 15, 2022 hearing on the motion to compel that they only seek to seal Exhibits 7 and 8. Therefore, the Motion to Seal is DENIED as to the Reply brief and the supporting Black Declaration. Plaintiff shall file those documents in the public record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 7, 2022



JOSEPH C. SPERO
Chief Magistrate Judge

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
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California