

**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 Plaintiffs RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc. and R.J. Reynolds Vapor Company’s (“Plaintiffs”) Motion to Seal (Dkt. 726) and supporting memorandum (Dkt. 730). Plaintiffs request to file under seal unredacted versions of Exhibits L, M, P, Q, S, T, U, and W to their Brief in Opposition to Counterclaim Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment. (Dkt. 728.) Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5(C), Defendants Altria Client Services LLC, Philip Morris USA Inc., and Philip Morris Products S.A. (“Defendants”) replied (Dkt. 753) in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion. *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.*

