

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

---

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

1 motions ‘are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause 8 of action,’ and,  
2 as a result, the public’s interest in accessing dispositive materials does ‘not apply 9 with equal  
3 force’ to non-dispositive materials.” Id. (citing Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179). It is 10 within the  
4 court’s discretion whether to seal documents. Id. at 679. 11 Stipulated protective orders alone do  
5 not justify sealing court records. Kamakana, 447 12 F.3d at 1183; see also Foltz v. State Farm  
6 Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th Cir. 13 2003) (noting that reliance on a blanket  
7 protective order, without more, will not make a showing 14 of good cause). Stipulated protective  
8 orders “often contain provisions that purport to put the entire 15 litigation under lock and key  
9 without regard to the actual requirements of Rule 26(c).” 16 Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1183.  
10 Because judges sign off on these protective orders without making 17 individualized findings,  
11 they do not provide a finding that any specific documents are secret or 18 confidential to  
12 overcome the presumption of public access. Id.; see also Beckman Indus., Inc. v. 19 Int’l Ins. Co.,  
13 966 F.2d 470, 475–76 (9th Cir. 1992) (explaining that blanket stipulated protective 20 orders are  
14 over inclusive by nature and do not include a finding of “good cause”). 21 Plaintiff’s first motion  
15 seeks to seal certain exhibits attached to its motion to compel at 22 ECF No. 82. The sealed  
16 documents are at ECF No. 81. Next is Plaintiff’s motion to seal certain 23 exhibits attached to its  
17 opposition to Defendant’s motion to strike at ECF No. 95. The sealed 24 exhibits are at ECF No.  
18 96. 25 The exhibits in question are attached to a nondispositive motion and an opposition to such  
19 26 a motion. In addition, these documents are only tangentially related to the underlying cause of  
20 27 action. As a result, the good cause standard applies. ] The exhibits at ECF No. 81 contain  
21 information regarding Cudy’s design processes, 2 || product testing and development, as well as  
22 sales and other proprietary business information. 3 || Disclosure of this proprietary information  
23 would be harmful to Cudy’s business. Good cause 4 || therefore exists to keep these documents  
24 under seal. 5 The exhibits at ECF No. 96 contain information involving Cudy’s product testing  
25 and 6 || development as well as sensitive marketing and promotional strategy information.  
26 Disclosure of 7 || these documents could be harmful to Cudy’s business. Good cause therefore  
27 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  
11 GRANTED. The Clerk’s Office is directed to maintain ECF Nos. 81 and 96 under seal. 12 13  
14 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