

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO

Finn Corporation, et al. v. Precision Machine & Manufacturing, Inc.

Finn Corporation v. Precision Machine & Manufacturing, Inc., No. 1:25-cv-418 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 24, 2025) · No. 1:25-cv-418 · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio grants Plaintiffs’ unopposed motion to file under seal a four-page Memorandum of Understanding attached as Exhibit 1 to the Amended Complaint. The Court finds that the exhibit contains sensitive business and pricing information, that sealing is narrowly tailored and justified by a compelling interest, and denies as moot Plaintiffs’ earlier sealing motion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeffery P. Hopkins
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio
DECIDED	November 24, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-418
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for leave to file Exhibit 1 to their amended complaint under seal. The defendant did not oppose the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A party seeking to seal court records bears a heavy burden to overcome the strong presumption in favor of openness. The movant must demonstrate a compelling interest in sealing, that the interest outweighs the public's interest in access, and that the request is narrowly tailored. The court must make specific findings and conclusions justifying nondisclosure.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- commercial litigation
- commercial
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs demonstrated a compelling interest sufficient to overcome the presumption of public access to court records.
2. Whether sealing the entirety of Exhibit 1 was narrowly tailored and outweighed the public interest in access.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs established a compelling interest in sealing Exhibit 1 because it contained sensitive business information, including confidential pricing data, whose disclosure could provide competitors with access to plaintiffs' business strategy.
2. The request to seal the entirety of Exhibit 1 was no greater than necessary because the exhibit contained highly confidential business information, the public could understand the dispute and the document's relevance from plaintiffs' description, and the remainder of the amended complaint and exhibits would remain public.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A party seeking to seal court records bears the heavy burden of overcoming the “strong presumption in favor of openness” as to court records.” (Standard of Review)

“Plaintiffs’ Motion (Doc. 10) is GRANTED. Plaintiff is ORDERED to file Exhibit 1 under seal within 7 days of the date of this Order.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs sought to seal a four-page Memorandum of Understanding between themselves and Precision Machine & Manufacturing, Inc. The document contained sensitive business information, including confidential pricing data for parts purchased by plaintiffs for their products. Plaintiffs asserted that disclosure would reveal aspects of their business strategy and provide competitors with an advantage.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and moved to seal a four-page Memorandum of Understanding attached as Exhibit 1. The court construed the motion as unopposed, granted the motion, ordered plaintiffs to file the exhibit under seal within seven days, and denied as moot plaintiffs' earlier motion to seal an exhibit to the original complaint.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Shane Grp., Inc. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield*, 825 F.3d 299, 305-06 (6th Cir. 2016)
- *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. FTC*, 710 F.2d 1165, 1176, 1179-81 (6th Cir. 1983)
- *Lipman v. Budish*, 974 F.3d 726, 753 (6th Cir. 2020)
- *In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co., Inc.*, 723 F.2d 470, 476 (6th Cir. 1983)
- *Kondash v. Kia Motors America, Inc.*, 767 F. App'x 635, 638 (6th Cir. 2019)
- *Baxter Int'l, Inc. v. Abbott Labs*, 297 F.3d 544, 548 (7th Cir. 2002)
- *Exec. Jet Mgmt. Inc. v. Longbow Enters. LLC*, No. 1:21-cv-74, 2021 WL 4952705, at *2 (S.D. Ohio Apr. 1, 2021)
- *Veritas Independent Partners, LLC v. Ohio Nat'l Life Ins., Co.*, No. 1:18-cv-769, 2024 WL 986280, at *13-14 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 7, 2024)
- *Total Quality Logistics v. Riffe*, No. 1:19-cv-23, 2020 WL 5849408, at *2 (S.D. Ohio Sept. 30, 2020)
- *Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien, Inc.*, No. 1:11-cv-871, 2017 WL 4168290, at *2 (S.D. Ohio Sept. 20, 2017)
- *London Comput. Sys. Inc. v. Zillow, Inc.*, No. 1:18-cv-696, 2019 WL 4110516, at *4 (S.D. Ohio Aug. 29, 2019)