

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 17, 2021. (*See* Dkts. 736, 737.) 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 filed a redacted version of their Reply on the public docket. (Dkt. 740.) 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 6, 7, and 8 thereto. Plaintiffs’ Reply contains the parties’ confidential and proprietary business information that is also protected under the parties’ stipulated protective order. Further, the exhibits consist of the parties’ discovery responses. Public disclosure of this information could bring competitive harm to Plaintiffs, Defendants, and third parties.

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ motion to seal (Dkt. 736) is **GRANTED**. Docket number 738 shall remain permanently under seal.

ENTERED this 25th day of June, 2021.


~~Theresa Carroll Buchanan
United States Magistrate Judge~~
THERESA CARROLL BUCHANAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Alexandria, Virginia