



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

First, Defendant has provided public notice of its request to seal and interested parties have been given a reasonable opportunity to object. Defendant filed its motion and public notice on May 19, 2021. (*See* Dkts. 625, 626.) Because over seven days have elapsed since Defendant 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, Defendant has satisfied this requirement under *Ashcraft* and the Local Civil Rules.

Second, this Court has considered less drastic alternatives. Defendant filed a redacted version of its Opposition on the public docket. (Dkt. 624.) 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 Opposition and Exhibit 1. The redacted portions of the Opposition contain the parties' confidential business information, which is also protected by the protective order in this case. Exhibit 1 consists of confidential communications between counsel in this matter. This confidential information contains sensitive information about the parties' expert witnesses and testimony. Release of this information to the public could lead to competitive harm to the parties in this lawsuit and to third parties.

