

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

TP Link Systems Inc. v. Shenzhen Cudy Technology Co., Ltd.

No. 2:25-cv-00057-JCM-BNW (D. Nev. Dec. 2, 2025) · No. 2:25-cv-00057-JCM-BNW · Decided December 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada granted Plaintiff TP Link Systems Inc.'s motions to seal exhibits filed in connection with a motion to compel and an opposition to a motion to strike. Applying the good-cause standard for nondispositive materials, the court found that the exhibits contained proprietary information concerning product design, testing, development, sales, marketing, and promotional strategies.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brenda Weksler
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00057-JCM-BNW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to seal exhibits attached to its motion to compel and exhibits attached to its opposition to Defendant's motion to strike. The court granted both motions to seal.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the good-cause standard to documents attached to nondispositive motions that were only tangentially related to the merits, balancing the needs of discovery against the need for confidentiality.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- commercial litigation
- commercial

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- trademark litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether exhibits attached to nondispositive motions and only tangentially related to the underlying cause of action should be sealed under the good-cause standard.
2. Whether the information in the exhibits established good cause to overcome the presumption of public access.

HOLDINGS

1. The good-cause standard applies to documents attached to a nondispositive motion when those documents are only tangentially related to the underlying cause of action.
2. Good cause existed to maintain ECF Nos. 81 and 96 under seal because the exhibits contained proprietary business, product-development, testing, marketing, and promotional information whose disclosure could harm Cudy's business.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Generally, the public has a right to inspect and copy judicial records.” (at 1)

“Stipulated protective orders alone do not justify sealing court records.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The sealed exhibits at ECF No. 81 concerned Cudy's design processes, product testing and development, sales, and other proprietary business information. The sealed exhibits at ECF No. 96 concerned product testing and development and sensitive marketing and promotional strategy information. The court found that disclosure could harm Cudy's business.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed two motions to seal, relying on the parties' stipulated protective order. Defendant responded, providing the good-cause showing the court found sufficient to keep the documents under seal. The court granted the motions and directed the Clerk's Office to maintain the identified exhibits under seal.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79, 1183 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2016)
- *Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Association*, 605 F.3d 665, 678-79 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Foltz v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th Cir. 2003)
- *Beckman Industries, Inc. v. International Insurance Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 475-76 (9th Cir. 1992)

OPINION

TP Link Systems Inc. v. Shenzhen Cudy Technology Co., Ltd.

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 * * * 4 TP Link Systems Inc., Case No. 2:25-cv-00057-JCM-BNW 5 Plaintiff,

ORDER

6 v. 7 Shenzhen Cudy Technology Co., Ltd., 8 Defendant. 9 10 Before this Court are two motions
to seal filed by Plaintiff, which rely on the protective 11 order entered into by the parties. ECF
Nos. 82 and 97. Defendant's responses provide the good 12 cause needed for the documents in
question to remain under seal. ECF Nos. 104 and 105. As a 13 result, the Court grants Plaintiff's
motions.

14 I. DISCUSSION

15 Generally, the public has a right to inspect and copy judicial records. *Kamakana v. City & 16*
Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). Such records are presumptively publicly
17 accessible. *Id.* Consequently, a party seeking to seal a judicial record bears the burden of 18
overcoming this strong presumption. *Id.* In the case of dispositive motions, the party seeking to 19
seal the record must articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that 20
outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure, such as the 21
public interest in understanding the judicial process. *Id.* at 1178–79 (alteration and internal 22
quotation marks and citations omitted). The Ninth Circuit has further held that the full 23
presumption of public access applies to technically non-dispositive motions and attached 24
documents as well if the motion is “more than tangentially related to the merits of the case.” *Ctr.*
25 *for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2016). 26 “[A] different
standard applies to ‘private materials unearthed during discovery,’ as such 27 documents are not
part of the judicial record.” *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 1 protective order “to
protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or 2 undue burden or
expense.” “The relevant standard for purposes of Rule 26(c) is whether good 3 cause exists to
protect the information from being disclosed to the public by balancing the needs 4 for discovery
against the need for confidentiality.” *Pintos*, 605 F.3d at 678 (quotation omitted). 5 Given the
“weaker public interest in nondispositive materials,” the court applies the good cause 6 standard in
evaluating whether to seal documents attached to a nondispositive motion. *Id.* 7 “Nondispositive
motions ‘are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause 8 of action,’ and,
as a result, the public’s interest in accessing dispositive materials does ‘not apply 9 with equal
force’ to non-dispositive materials.” *Id.* (citing *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179). It is 10 within the
court’s discretion whether to seal documents. *Id.* at 679. 11 Stipulated protective orders alone do
not justify sealing court records. *Kamakana*, 447 12 F.3d at 1183; see also *Foltz v. State Farm Mut.*
Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th Cir. 13 2003) (noting that reliance on a blanket protective

order, without more, will not make a showing 14 of good cause). Stipulated protective orders “often contain provisions that purport to put the entire 15 litigation under lock and key without regard to the actual requirements of Rule 26(c).” 16 Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1183. Because judges sign off on these protective orders without making 17 individualized findings, they do not provide a finding that any specific documents are secret or 18 confidential to overcome the presumption of public access. Id.; see also Beckman Indus., Inc. v. 19 Int’l Ins. Co., 966 F.2d 470, 475–76 (9th Cir. 1992) (explaining that blanket stipulated protective 20 orders are over inclusive by nature and do not include a finding of “good cause”). 21 Plaintiff’s first motion seeks to seal certain exhibits attached to its motion to compel at 22 ECF No. 82. The sealed documents are at ECF No. 81. Next is Plaintiff’s motion to seal certain 23 exhibits attached to its opposition to Defendant’s motion to strike at ECF No. 95. The sealed 24 exhibits are at ECF No. 96. 25 The exhibits in question are attached to a nondispositive motion and an opposition to such 26 a motion. In addition, these documents are only tangentially related to the underlying cause of 27 action. As a result, the good cause standard applies.] The exhibits at ECF No. 81 contain information regarding Cudy’s design processes, 2 || product testing and development, as well as sales and other proprietary business information. 3 || Disclosure of this proprietary information would be harmful to Cudy’s business. Good cause 4 || therefore exists to keep these documents under seal. 5 The exhibits at ECF No. 96 contain information involving Cudy’s product testing and 6 || development as well as sensitive marketing and promotional strategy information. Disclosure of 7 || these documents could be harmful to Cudy’s business. Good cause therefore exists to keep these 8 || documents under seal.

9 II. CONCLUSION

10 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motions to seal (ECF Nos. 82 and 97) 11 || are GRANTED. The Clerk’s Office is directed to maintain ECF Nos. 81 and 96 under seal. 12 13 DATED: December 2, 2025 14 15 Lig line ban

BRENDA WEKSLER □

16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28