

portions and interested parties have been given a reasonable opportunity to object. Defendants filed their request to redact the transcript on April 16, 2021. (*See* Dkts. 575.) Because over seven days have elapsed since Defendants filed the motion and no interested party has objected, the Court may treat this motion as uncontested under Local Civil Rule 5(C). *See* L. Civ. R. 5(C). Accordingly, Defendants have satisfied this requirement under *Ashcraft* and the Local Civil Rules.

Second, this Court has considered less drastic alternatives. Defendants request to seal only a few lines in an eleven-page transcript. This selective protection of information constitutes the least drastic measure of sealing confidential material. *See 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 [the document], constitutes the least drastic method of shielding the information at issue.”), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2012 WL 135428 (E.D. Va. Jan. 17, 2012).

Finally, the Court finds reason to redact the requested lines. These portions contain Defendants’ confidential business information, which is also protected by the protective order in this case. Release of this information to the public could lead to competitive harm to the parties in this lawsuit and to third parties.

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that Defendant’s motion (Dkt. 575) is **GRANTED**; and it is further

ORDERED that lines 5:23-6:1, 6:6-7, 6:8-9, 6:16, 6:25, 7:17-18, 7:24-8:2, 8:4, 8:12, and 10:1-2 of the March 19, 2021 hearing transcript (Dkt. 531) shall be **REDACTED**.

