

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  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

LYFT, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 21-cv-04653-BLF

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT  
AGIS SOFTWARE’S SEALING  
MOTION; GRANTING PLAINTIFF  
LYFT, INC.’S MOTION TO CONSIDER  
WHETHER ANOTHER PARTY’S  
MATERIAL SHOULD BE SEALED;  
DENYING PLAINTIFF LYFT, INC.’S  
SEALING MOTION**

[Re: ECF Nos. 93, 108, 109]

Before the Court are (1) Defendant AGIS Software Development LLC’s (“AGIS Software”) administrative motion to seal documents filed with its Opposition to Plaintiff Lyft, Inc.’s (“Lyft”) Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 93); (2) Lyft’s administrative motion to consider whether another party’s material should be sealed in connection with its Reply in support of its Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 108); and (3) Lyft’s administrative motion to seal information in its Reply in support of its Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 109). All three motions are unopposed.

Based on the below reasoning, the Court GRANTS AGIS Software’s sealing motion at ECF No. 93 and Lyft’s motion to consider whether another party’s material should be sealed at ECF No. 108. Further, the Court DENIES Lyft’s motion to seal at ECF No. 109.

**I. LEGAL STANDARD**

“Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu*,

1 597 & n.7 (1978)). Consequently, access to motions and their attachments that are “more than  
2 tangentially related to the merits of a case” may be sealed only upon a showing of “compelling  
3 reasons” for sealing. *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101–02 (9th Cir.  
4 2016). Filings that are only tangentially related to the merits may be sealed upon a lesser showing  
5 of “good cause.” *Id.* at 1097.

6 In addition, in this district, all parties requesting sealing must comply with Civil Local  
7 Rule 79-5. That rule requires, inter alia, the moving party to provide “the reasons for keeping a  
8 document under seal, including an explanation of: (i) the legitimate private or public interests that  
9 warrant sealing; (ii) the injury that will result if sealing is denied; and (iii) why a less restrictive  
10 alternative to sealing is not sufficient.” Civ. L.R. 79-5(c)(1)(i). Further, Civil Local Rule 79-5  
11 requires the moving party to provide “evidentiary support from declarations where necessary.”  
12 Civ. L.R. 79-5(c)(1)(ii).

13 Furthermore, when a party (the “Moving Party”) seeks to seal a document that has been  
14 designated as confidential by another party or non-party (the “Designating Party”), the Moving Party  
15 must file a Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Material Should Be Sealed under Local  
16 Rule 79-5(f). The Moving Party must file a motion “identify[ing] each document or portions thereof  
17 for which sealing is sought.” Civ. L.R. 79-5(f)(1). “Within 7 days of the motion’s filing, the  
18 Designating Party must file a statement and/or declaration as described in [Civil Local  
19 Rule 79-5(c)(1)].” Civ. L.R. 79-5(f)(3). “If any party wishes to file a response, it must do so no  
20 later than 4 days after the Designating Party files its statement and/or declaration.”  
21 Civ. L.R. 79-5(f)(4).

## 22 II. DISCUSSION

23 Because the parties’ sealing motions pertain to a motion for leave to file an amended  
24 complaint, the Court finds that the “good cause” standard applies. *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d  
25 at 1097.

26 The Court has reviewed the sealing motions. The Court finds that AGIS Software has shown  
27 good cause to file under seal the documents and portions of documents containing AGIS Software’s

1 *See, e.g., In re Electronic Arts*, 298 Fed.Appx. 568, 569 (9th Cir. 2008) (finding compelling reasons  
 2 for sealing “business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive strategy”); *In re Google*  
 3 *Location Hist. Litig.*, 514 F.Supp.3d 1147, 1162 (N.D. Cal. 2021) (“Compelling reasons may exist  
 4 to seal ‘trade secrets, marketing strategies, product development plans, detailed product-specific  
 5 financial information, customer information, internal reports[.]’”) (quoting *In re Apple Inc. Device*  
 6 *Performance Litig.*, No. 5:19–MD–02827–EJD, 2019 WL 1767158, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Apr.  
 7 22, 2019)); *Krieger v. Atheros Commc’ns, Inc.*, No. 11–CV–00640–LHK, 2011 WL 2550831, at \*1  
 8 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 25, 2011) (granting sealing request of “long-term financial projections, discussions  
 9 of business strategy, and competitive analyses”). However, as outlined below, the Court finds that  
 10 Lyft has failed to show good cause as to its sealing motion related to the amount of attorneys’ fees  
 11 sought in a concurrent action in the Eastern District of Texas. *See* ECF No. 109.

12 The Court rules as follows on the parties’ sealing motions:

Sealing Motion	Document Sought to Be Sealed	Portions Sought to Be Sealed	Decl. ISO Sealing	Ruling
ECF No. 93, AGIS Software’s Motion to Seal	ECF No. 94, AGIS Software’s Response in Opposition to Lyft’s Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint	Highlighted portions at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 5, lines 8–25;</li> <li>Page 6, lines 1–15, 10–12, 14–18, 23–26</li> </ul>	Rubino Decl., ECF No. 93-1 at 1–2	GRANTED, as confidential business, financial, and licensing information of AGIS Software.
ECF No. 93, AGIS Software’s Motion to Seal	ECF No. 94, Ex. 1, 30(b)(6) Deposition Transcript of Thomas Meriam	Entire Document	Rubino Decl., ECF No. 93-1 at 2	GRANTED, as confidential business, financial, and licensing information of AGIS Software.
ECF No. 108, Lyft’s Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Material	ECF No. 107, Lyft’s Reply in Support of its Motion for Leave to File First Amended	Highlighted portions at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 4, lines 15–21, 22–27;</li> <li>Page 5,</li> </ul>	Rubino Decl., ECF No. 87 at 3–4	GRANTED, as confidential business, financial, and licensing information of AGIS Software.

Sealing Motion	Document Sought to Be Sealed	Portions Sought to Be Sealed	Decl. ISO Sealing	Ruling
Sealed		24–27; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 6, lines 2–3;</li> <li>Page 8, lines 1–2, 10–11</li> </ul>		
ECF No. 108, Lyft’s Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Material Should Be Sealed	ECF No. 107, Ex. 13, 30(b)(6) Deposition Transcript of Thomas Meriam	Entire Document	Rubino Decl., ECF No. 87 at 4; Rubino Decl., ECF No. 93-1 at 2; Rubino Decl., ECF No. 86 at 3	GRANTED, as confidential business, financial, and licensing information of AGIS Software.
ECF No. 109, Lyft’s Motion to Seal	ECF No. 107, Lyft’s Reply in Support of its Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint	Highlighted portions at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 5, line 11</li> </ul>	Salpietra Decl., ECF No. 109-1 at 1–2	Lyft moves to seal the amount of attorneys’ fees sought in a concurrent action in the Eastern District of Texas because “[d]isclosure of this information could cause competitive harm to Lyft by providing an incomplete and misleading picture of the nature and magnitude of legal fees expended for the EDTX Action in view of the fact that Lyft is seeking only a limited amount of its overall fees.” <i>See</i> Salpietra Decl., ECF No. 109-1 at 2–3. The Court disagrees with Lyft that disclosing the amount of attorneys’ fees it seeks in the concurrent action could cause it competitive harm sufficient for a showing of good cause. <i>See In</i>

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



# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.