

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division**

RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, INC.,	)	
<i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-393 (LO/TCB)
	)	
ALTRIA CLIENT SERVICES LLC,	)	
<i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Altria Client Services, LLC, Philip Morris USA Inc., and Philip Morris Products S.A.’s (“Defendants”) Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. 595) and supporting memorandum (Dkt. 598). Defendants seek leave to file under seal their Reply in Support of their Motion for Leave to Serve Supplemental Expert Reports (“Reply”) and accompanying exhibits 22 and 23. (Dkt. 597.) Plaintiffs RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc. and R.J. Reynolds Vapor Company filed a reply in support of Defendants’ motion (Dkt. 602) pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5(C). *See* L. Civ. R. 5(C).

District courts have authority to seal court documents “if the public’s right of access is outweighed by competing interests.” *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 288, 302 (4th Cir. 2000). Procedurally, a district court may seal court filings if it (1) “provide[s] public notice of the request to seal and allow[s] interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object, (2) consider[s] less drastic alternatives to sealing the documents, and (3) provide[s] specific reasons and factual findings supporting its decision to seal the documents and for rejecting the alternatives.” *Id.*

Upon consideration of Defendants' filings, the Court makes the following findings.

First, Defendants have provided public notice of their request to seal and interested parties have been given a reasonable opportunity to object. Defendants filed their motion and public notice on May 6, 2021. (*See* Dkts. 595, 596.) 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 filed a redacted version of their Reply on the public docket. (Dkt. 594.) 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 seal the Reply and Exhibits 22 and 23. The redacted portions of the Reply and exhibits contain the parties' confidential business information, which is also protected by the protective order in this case. Specifically, this confidential information includes commercially sensitive business, financial, and design information of Defendants, Plaintiffs, and third parties. 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. 595) is **GRANTED**. Docket number 597 shall remain permanently under seal.

ENTERED this 14th day of May, 2021.



/s/

---

THERESA CARROLL BUCHANAN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Alexandria, Virginia