| | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Plaintiff(s), v. | Case No | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |
| Defendant(s). | - • | | | | | |
| JOINT MOTION REGARDING CONTINUED SEALING | | | | | | |
| Documents have been filed under ten | nporary seal in connection with the following motion: | | | | | |
| (Motion Title) | (Doc. No.) | | | | | |

Pursuant to LR 5.6, the parties submit this Joint Motion Regarding Continued Sealing.

| DKT. NO. | DKT. NO. OF REDACTED VERSION (IF FILED) | DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT | PRECISELY IDENTIFY: a) The information that the parties agree should remain sealed; b) The information the parties agree should be unsealed; and c) The information about which the parties disagree. | NONPARTY THAT DESIGNATED DOC. CONFIDENTIAL (IF ANY) | REASON WHY DOCUMENT SHOULD REMAIN SEALED OR BE UNSEALED [†] |
|-------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 56 | 55 | Unredacted copy of defendant J. Smith's brief in support of motion for summary judgment | Parties agree that information re: minor FJB should remain sealed. | N/A | Redacted portions of brief contain information about FJB. FJB is a minor. |
| 57 | | Plaintiff's bank records from 2012 | Parties agree entire document should remain sealed. | N/A | Confidential financial records. |
| 58 | | Email from K. Nelson to R. Jones dated 04/30/15 | Parties agree that entire third- party document should remain sealed. | Acme Insurance Agency | Email was designated as confidential under a nondisclosure agreement between defendant J. Smith and nonparty Acme. |
| 59 | 40 | Unredacted portions of F. Mendoza's deposition | Parties agree with the court's order to seal portions of the deposition. | N/A | Redacted portions of deposition were ordered sealed by Magistrate Judge O'Malley on 03/01/16 [Docket No. 48]. |
| 60 | | Email from plaintiff to J. Smith | Parties agree entire document should be unsealed. | N/A | Confidential designation withdrawn by defendant J. Smith. |
| 71 | | Record from 2010 divorce action involving plaintiff and her ex-husband | Parties disagree. Defendant asserts entire document should be unsealed. See | N/A | Plaintiff asserts document contains confidential information about her mental |

| | | Plaintiff's proposed | | health; defendant contends that |
|----|---|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|
| | | redactions, at doc. no. 90. | | information is not confidential |
| | | | | because it was disclosed by |
| | | | | plaintiff on Facebook in 2010. |
| 72 | Contract between parties, dated 5.1.2015. | Parties disagree. Plaintiff | N/A | Plaintiff asserts that clauses 3, 7, |
| | | asserts that clauses 3, 7, and | | and 10 reveals trade secrets. |
| | | 10 should remain sealed; | | Defendant asserts that only |
| | | defendant asserts that only | | clause 3 reveals trade secrets. |
| | | clause 3 should remain sealed. | | |

- 1. contains information designated as confidential by a nonparty
- 2. contains information designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between plaintiff and nonparty
- 3. contains information designated as confidential under a protective order issued in this case [Docket No. XX]
- 4. discovery materials filed in connection with a motion under Fed R. Civ. P. 37
- 5. reveals trade secrets of defendant
- 6. reveals proprietary business methods of plaintiff
- 7. confidential financial records

ⁱ This explanation should be very brief. For example:

- 8. confidential medical records
- 9. contains termination information regarding former employees of defendant
- 10. reveals information regarding a minor
- 11. contains information ordered sealed by the court on DATE [Docket No. XX]