

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re Sandisk SSDs Litigation

In re Sandisk SSDs Litigation · No. 23-cv-04152-RFL (LJC) · Decided May 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California ruled on Plaintiffs’ administrative motion to seal documents submitted in support of a discovery letter brief. The court granted Defendants’ request to keep Exhibits G and J under seal based on potential competitive harm, denied the motion as to the remaining exhibits, and ordered Plaintiffs to file unredacted copies by May 15, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lisa J. Cisneros
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	May 8, 2025
DOCKET	23-cv-04152-RFL (LJC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs filed an administrative motion under Civil Local Rule 79-5(f) seeking to determine whether documents submitted in support of a discovery letter brief should be filed under seal based on Defendants' confidentiality designations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not indicated.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Exhibits G and J should remain under seal because good cause supported protecting their technical contents from disclosure.
2. Whether the other exhibits at issue should be filed under seal based solely on Defendants' confidentiality designations.

HOLDINGS

1. Exhibits G and J should remain under seal because good cause was shown to protect their technical details from disclosure and the resulting competitive harm.
2. The administrative motion was denied as to all other exhibits because the record did not support sealing them based solely on Defendants' confidentiality designations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Good cause having been shown, Defendants’ request to maintain those exhibits under seal is GRANTED.”
(1)

“The administrative motion is DENIED as to all other exhibits at issue.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The documents at issue were submitted in support of a discovery letter brief in litigation concerning alleged defects in solid-state drives. Defendants designated the documents as confidential and specifically asserted that Exhibits G and J contained technical details about their investigation of and response to the alleged defect. Defendants argued that disclosure would cause competitive harm.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs moved to seal documents submitted in support of a discovery letter brief. Defendants responded that Exhibits G and J contained technical details concerning their investigation of and response to an alleged solid-state-drive defect and should remain sealed to prevent competitive harm. The court granted sealing as to Exhibits G and J, denied the motion as to the remaining exhibits, and ordered Plaintiffs to file unredacted copies of those exhibits by May 15, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1103 (9th Cir. 2016)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7
In re SANDISK SSDs LITIGATION. Case No. 23-cv-04152-RFL (LJC) 8 ORDER REGARDING
9 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER DOCUMENTS 10 SHOULD BE

FILED UNDER SEAL 11 Re: Dkt. No. 151 12 Plaintiffs filed an administrative motion under Civil Local Rule 79-5(f) to consider 5 13 || whether documents submitted in support of a discovery letter brief should be filed under seal, 14 || based solely on Defendants' designations of confidentiality.

ECF No. 151. Defendants filed a 3 15 || response arguing that Exhibits G and J, which include technical details of Defendants' a 16 || investigation of and response to an alleged defect in solid state drives, should remain under seal to 3 17 || prevent competitive harm. ECF No. 160. Good cause having been shown, Defendants' request to S 18 || maintain those exhibits under seal is GRANTED.

19 The administrative motion is DENIED as to all other exhibits at issue. To complete the 20 || public record, Plaintiffs shall file unredacted copies of those exhibits no later than May 15, 2025. 21 This Order does not reach the question of whether "compelling reasons" would support 22 || sealing Exhibits G and J if they were offered in a context "more than tangentially related to the 23 merits" of the case.

See generally *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 24 |} 1103 (9th Cir. 2016). 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated: May 8, 2025 7 Zr Arty — A J. CISIWEROS 28 ited States Magistrate Judge