

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, INC. and  
R.J. REYNOLDS VAPOR COMPANY,

Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants,

v.

ALTRIA CLIENT SERVICES LLC; PHILIP  
MORRIS USA INC.; and PHILIP MORRIS  
PRODUCTS S.A.,

Defendants and Counterclaim Plaintiffs.

Case No. 1:20-cv-00393-LO-TCB

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING REYNOLDS’S MOTION TO SEAL REYNOLDS’S  
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF REYNOLDS’S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 7 AND  
ACCOMPANYING EXHIBIT 2**

This matter is before the Court on the motion filed by RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc. and R.J. Reynolds Vapor Company (collectively, “Reynolds”) to file under seal Reynolds’s Reply In Support of Reynolds’s Motion *In Limine* No. 7 and accompanying Exhibit 2 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2(d) and Local Civil Rule 5(C).

Before this Court may seal documents, it must: “(1) give public notice of the request to seal and allow interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object, (2) consider less drastic alternatives to sealing the documents, and (3) provide specific reasons and factual findings supporting its decision to seal the documents and for rejecting the alternatives.” *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 282, 288 (4th Cir. 2000) (internal citations omitted). Upon consideration of Reynolds’s motion to seal and its memorandum in support thereof, the Court hereby **FINDS** as follows:

1. The public has received notice of the request to seal and has had reasonable opportunity to object. Reynolds's sealing motion was publicly docketed in accordance with Local Civil Rule 5. Altria Client Services LLC, Philip Morris USA Inc., and Philip Morris Products S.A. (collectively, PM/Altria) has had an opportunity to respond. The "public has had ample opportunity to object" to Reynolds's motion and, because "the Court has received no objections," the first requirement under *Ashcraft*, 218 F.3d at 288, has been satisfied. *GTSI Corp. v. Wildflower Int'l, Inc.*, No. 1:09CV123 (JCC), 2009 WL 1248114, at \*9 (E.D. Va. Apr. 30, 2009); *United States ex rel. Carter v. Halliburton Co.*, No. 1:10cv864 (JCC/TCB), 2011 WL 2077799, at \*3 (E.D. Va. May 24, 2011) ("[T]he parties provided public notice of the request to seal that allowed interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object—nearly two weeks.").

2. Reynolds seeks to seal and redact from the public record only information designated by the parties as confidential. Reynolds filed a publicly redacted version of Reynolds's Reply In Support of Reynolds's Motion *In Limine* No. 7 in addition to a sealed version, and has redacted only those limited portions it seeks to seal. Reynolds filed only Exhibit 2 wholly under seal. This selective and narrow protection of confidential material constitutes the least drastic method of shielding the information at issue. *Adams v. Object Innovation, Inc.*, No. 3:11cv272-REP-DWD, 2011 WL 7042224, at \*4 (E.D. Va. Dec. 5, 2011) (The "proposal to redact only the proprietary and confidential information, rather than seal the entirety of his declaration, constitutes the least drastic method of shielding the information at issue."). The public has no legitimate interest in information that is confidential to Reynolds, PM/Altria, or third parties. The information that Reynolds seeks to seal includes confidential, proprietary, and competitively sensitive business information of Reynolds, PM/Altria, or third parties, each of which could face harm if such information were to be released publicly. Specifically, the sensitive information that

Reynolds moves for leave to file under seal and to redact from the public version relates to proprietary and commercially sensitive materials from that PM/Altria contends is confidential business information.

3. There is support for filing Reynolds's Reply In Support of Reynolds's Motion *In Limine* No. 7 and accompanying Exhibit 2 under seal. Reynolds's Reply In Support of Reynolds's Motion *In Limine* No. 7 and accompanying Exhibit 2 contain material that falls within the scope of the stipulated protective order. Placing these materials under seal is proper because the public's interest in access is outweighed by a party's interest in "preserving confidentiality" of the limited amount of confidential information that is "normally unavailable to the public." *Flexible Benefits Council v. Feltman*, No. 1:08cv371 (JCC), 2008 WL 4924711, at \*1 (E.D. Va. Nov. 13, 2008); *United States ex rel. Carter*, 2011 WL 2077799, at \*3.

Therefore, based on the findings above, for good cause shown, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that the motion is **GRANTED**, and Reynolds is granted leave to file a **REDACTED** version of Reynolds's Reply In Support of Reynolds's Motion *In Limine* No. 7.

And to file **UNDER SEAL** an un-redacted version of Reynolds's Reply In Support of Reynolds's Motion *In Limine* No. 7 and accompanying Exhibit 2.

And **FURTHER ORDERED** that the un-redacted version of Reynolds's Reply In Support of Reynolds's Motion *In Limine* No. 7 and accompanying Exhibit 2 shall remain **SEALED** until further order of the Court.

ENTERED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2022.

Alexandria, Virginia

---

THERESA CARROLL BUCHANAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE