UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Google LLC v. Point Financial, Inc.

Google · No. 25-cv-04033-BLF · Decided January 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California granted Google LLC's administrative motion to file under seal portions of its emergency motion to enforce a preliminary injunction and seek contempt sanctions, along with portions of two exhibits. The Court found compelling reasons to seal confidential business information, trade-secret-related information, and confidential contractual or vendor information, and concluded that the request was narrowly tailored.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Labson Freeman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	January 12, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-04033-BLF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Google moved to seal portions of its emergency motion to enforce a preliminary injunction and for contempt sanctions, along with portions of exhibits. Point Financial opposed sealing as to two categories of information.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the compelling-reasons standard to sealing requests concerning materials more than tangentially related to the underlying causes of action and required the proposed sealing to be narrowly tailored.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

civil procedure · commercial litigation · sanctions · injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure · Commercial litigation · Sealing of judicial records

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether portions of Google's emergency motion to enforce a preliminary injunction and seek contempt sanctions and related exhibits should be sealed under the compelling-reasons standard.
2. Whether the requested sealing was narrowly tailored under Civil Local Rule 79-5.

HOLDINGS

1. Because the sealing request concerned an emergency motion to enforce a preliminary injunction and seek contempt sanctions, which was more than tangentially related to the underlying causes of action, Google was required to demonstrate compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of public access.
2. Compelling reasons supported sealing the identified technology term, contractual quotations, vendor identities, and other highlighted portions because they contained trade secrets or confidential business information whose disclosure could harm Google's competitive standing.
3. The sealing request was narrowly tailored because it identified specific highlighted portions rather than seeking to seal entire documents.

KEY QUOTATIONS

> *"Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, "a 'strong presumption in favor of access' is the starting point.""* (at 1)

> *"The Court finds that compelling reasons exist to seal the materials Google identifies."* (at 2)

> *"The Court also finds that the request is narrowly tailored."* (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Google sought to seal a term concerning confidential and proprietary technology, quotations from a Master Purchase Agreement and an amendment to a statement of work, and the identities of vendors involved with the chip at issue. Google argued that disclosure could reveal trade secrets, strategic contracting information, confidential agreements, or other information that could harm its competitive standing. Point Financial opposed sealing of the first two categories but did not oppose the vendor-identity category.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Google filed an administrative motion to file under seal in connection with its emergency motion to enforce a preliminary injunction and seek contempt sanctions. Point Financial opposed the motion in part. The district court applied the compelling-reasons standard and granted the sealing motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178–80 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)
- Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., 809 F.3d 1092, 1099–101 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Skillz Platform Inc. v. AviaGames Inc., No. 21-cv-02436, 2023 WL 7678270, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2023)
- Music Grp. Macao Com. Offshore Ltd. v. Foote, No. 14-cv-03078, 2015 WL 3993147, at *6 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2015)
- Jam Cellars, Inc. v. Wine Grp. LLC, No. 19-cv-01878, 2020 WL 5576346, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2020)
- Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Qualcomm Inc., No. 17-cv-00220, 2019 WL 95922, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2019)
- In re Elec. Arts, Inc., 298 F. App'x 568, 569 (9th Cir. 2008)

OPINION

Google LLC v. Point Financial, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

GOOGLE LLC, Case No. 25-cv-04033-BLF Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING GOOGLE LLC'S

v. ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE

UNDER SEAL

POINT FINANCIAL, INC.,

[Re: ECF No. 142] Defendant. Before the Court is Google LLC’s Administrative Motion to File Under Seal. ECF No. 142 (“Mot.”). Defendant Point Financial, Inc. opposes. ECF No. 147 (“Opp.”). For the reasons that follow, the Court GRANTS the motion.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

“Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)). Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, “a ‘strong presumption in favor of access’ is the starting point.” Id. (quoting Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). Parties seeking to seal judicial records relating to motions that are “more than tangentially related to the underlying cause of action” bear the burden of overcoming the presumption with “compelling reasons” that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure. Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler

Grp., 809 F.3d 1092, 1099–101 (9th Cir. 2016); Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1178–80. In addition, in this district, all parties requesting sealing must comply with Civil Local document under seal, including an explanation of: (i) the legitimate private or public interests that warrant sealing; (ii) the injury that will result if sealing is denied; and (iii) why a less restrictive alternative to sealing is not sufficient.” Civil L.R. 79-5(c)(1). Civil Local Rule 79-5 requires the moving party to provide “evidentiary support from declarations where necessary.” Civil L.R. 79- 5(c)(2). And the proposed order must be “narrowly tailored to seal only the sealable material.” Civil L.R. 79-5(c)(3).

II. DISCUSSION

Google LLC (“Google”) seeks to seal portions of its Emergency Motion to Enforce the Preliminary Injunction and for Contempt Sanctions Against Point Financial, Inc. (“PFI”) and portions of certain exhibits thereto. Mot. at 2. Google separates its sealing requests into three categories. The first category is comprised of “a single term that pertains to Google’s confidential and proprietary technology at issue in this litigation.” Mot. at 3. Google argues the disclosure of this information would reveal Google’s confidential technology and in turn “weaken the competitive advantage Google maintains in the marketplace.” Id. The second category of requests consists of “direct quotes from the Master Purchase Agreement and Amendment 2 to the Statement of Work.” Id. Google argues that the disclosure of this information would expose Google’s “strategic decision-making with respect to the terms offered to its contracting partners” and harm its competitive advantage in the marketplace. Id. The third category of requests is the “identities of the Vendors that manufacture, test, and assemble the chip at issue in this litigation,” and with which Google has confidential agreements. Id. Google asserts that revealing these identities would give its competitors and potential partners “unfair leverage.” Id. PFI opposes Google’s sealing motion only with respect to the first two categories. As to the first category, the single term pertaining to the at-issue technology, PFI argues that absent “underlying specific details of the components and manufacture of these integrated chips, the single term description conveys no greater sensitive information.” Opp. at 2. As to the second is not comprised of sufficiently sensitive business information to justify sealing. Id. at 3. As the sealing request relates to the Emergency Motion to Enforce the Preliminary Injunction and for Contempt Sanctions, which the Court finds is “more than tangentially related to the underlying cause[s] of action,” the Court will apply the “compelling reasons” standard. Ctr. for Auto Safety, 809 F.3d at 1099–101. The Court finds that compelling reasons exist to seal the materials Google identifies. First, compelling reasons exist to seal trade secrets. Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179; Skillz Platform Inc. v. AviaGames Inc., No. 21-cv-02436, 2023 WL 7678270, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2023). Second, the “compelling reasons” standard is met for confidential business information that would harm a party’s competitive standing if publicly disclosed. See Music Grp. Macao Com. Offshore Ltd. v. Foote, No. 14-cv-03078, 2015 WL 3993147, at *6 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2015); Jam Cellars, Inc. v.

Wine Grp. LLC, No. 19-cv-01878, 2020 WL 5576346, at 12 *2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2020) (finding compelling reasons for sealing “confidential business and 13 proprietary information”); Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Qualcomm Inc., No. 17-cv-00220, 2019 WL 14 95922, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2019) (finding compelling reasons for “information that, if 15 published, may harm . . . competitive standing and divulges terms of confidential contracts, 16 contract negotiations, or trade secrets”); In re Elec. Arts, Inc., 298 F. App’x 568, 569 (9th Cir. 17 2008) (finding sealable “business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing”). 18 The Court also finds that the request is narrowly tailored. See Civil L.R. 79-5(c)(3). 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 1 The Court’s ruling is summarized below: 2 Public ECF Document Portion(s) to Seal Ruling No. / 3 Sealed 4 ECF No. ECF Google LLC’s Highlighted portions at GRANTED as containing

5 No. 141/ |Emergency Motion to | 1:11-12; 2:6, 9, 19, 25; confidential business

ECF Enforce the 3:13-14, 19-20, 22, 24; information, the release of

6 No. 142-4 Preliminary 5:12, 22, 27; 6:1, 4, 11, 13- | which could cause Google

Injunction and for 14, 18-19; 7:25; 8:1-2, 4, harm. 7 Contempt Sanctions | 20, 24, 28; 9:1, 3, 5. g against Point Financial, Inc. 9 (“Emergency Motion” 10 ECF Exhibit A to the Highlighted portions at 6:4- | GRANTED as containing No. 141-3 / |Emergency Motion 5, 17, 28; 13:27; 18:8-9, 22, | confidential business 11 ECF 27; 65:6, 8-10; 85:20, 24; information, the release of

2 No. 142-5 86:2, 3; 90:2-3 which could cause Google

harm. & 13 ECF Exhibit D to the Highlighted portions at GRANTED as containing a No. 141-6 |Emergency Motion 1:10, 22-23, 26, 28; 2:33; confidential business v 14 ECF 3:1, 31; 4:5-6, 10, 19. information, the release of No. 142-6 which could cause Google 2 IS harm. 16

I. ORDER

17 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Google LLC’s Administrative 18 Motion to File Under Seal, ECF No. 142, is GRANTED. 19 20 Dated: January 12, 2026

22 TH LABSON FREEMAN

33 United States District Judge 24 25 26 27 28