

findings supporting its decision to seal the documents and for rejecting the alternatives.” *Id.*

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

First, Plaintiffs have provided public notice of their request to seal and interested parties have been given a reasonable opportunity to object. Plaintiffs filed their motion to seal and public notice on June 2, 2021. (*See* Dkts. 684, 685.) Because over seven days have elapsed since Plaintiffs filed the motion to seal and public notice, 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, Plaintiffs have satisfied this requirement under *Ashcraft* and the Local Civil Rules.

Second, this Court has considered less drastic alternatives. Plaintiffs submitted a redacted version of their Brief. (Dkt. 690.) 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 redacted portions of Plaintiffs’ Brief and Exhibits B, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, and S. The redacted portions contain the parties’ confidential and proprietary information. Additionally, the Exhibits contain expert reports, interrogatories, and testimony concerning the parties’ confidential technical documents. This information is protected under the parties’ stipulated protective order and its public disclosure could bring competitive harm to Plaintiffs, Defendants, and third parties.

~~United States Magistrate Judge
Theresa Carroll Buchanan~~