

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

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

CITY OF ROSEVILLE EMPLOYEES'  
RETIREMENT SYSTEM,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC., et al.,

Defendants.

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

**ORDER RE ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER  
ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIAL  
SHOULD BE SEALED**

Re: Dkt. No. 246

In connection with Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Documents Withheld as Privileged, Plaintiffs filed a motion to seal their supplemental brief and certain supporting declarations based on Defendants' confidentiality designations. *See* dkt. no. 246 ("Sealing Motion"). 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). It appears that Defendants did not file a response to the Sealing Motion, which remains pending. The Court requests that within seven (7) days, Defendants file a response to the Sealing Motion addressing whether the material that is the subject of that motion should remain under seal. Even if Defendants do not seek to have the material sealed, the Court requests that they file a response informing the Court that the Sealing Motion can be denied and the materials sought to be sealed may be filed in the public record.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 14, 2023

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOSEPH C. SPERO