

1 LAURENCE F. PULGRAM (CA State Bar No. 115163) (*pro hac vice*)
lpulgram@fenwick.com
 2 CLIFFORD C. WEBB (CA State Bar No. 260885) (*pro hac vice*)
cwebb@fenwick.com
 3 FENWICK & WEST LLP
 555 California Street, 12th Floor
 4 San Francisco, California 94104
 Telephone: (415) 875-2300
 5 Facsimile: (415) 281-1350

6 KURT OPSAHL (CA State Bar No. 191303) (*pro hac vice*)
kurt@eff.org
 7 CORYNNE MCSHERRY (CA State Bar No. 221504) (*pro hac vice*)
corynne@eff.org
 8 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
 454 Shotwell Street
 9 San Francisco, California 94110
 Telephone: (415) 436-9333
 10 Facsimile: (415) 436-9993

11 CHAD BOWERS (NV State Bar No. 7283)
bowers@lawyer.com
 12 CHAD A. BOWERS, LTD
 3202 West Charleston Boulevard
 13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
 Telephone: (702) 457-1001
 14 Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant
 15 DEMOCRATIC UNDERGROUND, LLC, and
 Defendant DAVID ALLEN

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 17 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

18 RIGHTHAVEN LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,
 Plaintiff,
 19 v.
 20 DEMOCRATIC UNDERGROUND, LLC, a District of
 Columbia limited-liability company; and DAVID ALLEN,
 21 an individual,
 22 Defendants.

23 DEMOCRATIC UNDERGROUND, LLC, a District of
 Columbia limited-liability company,
 24 Counterclaimant,
 25 v.
 26 RIGHTHAVEN LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,
 and STEPHENS MEDIA LLC, a Nevada limited-liability
 27 company,
 28 Counterdefendants.

Case No. 10-01356-RLH (GWF)

**DEFENDANTS' REQUEST
 TO UNSEAL EXHIBIT A TO
 PULGRAM DECLARATION
 AND RELATED FILINGS
 [DKT NOS. 74, 79]**

REQUEST TO UNSEAL

1
2 On March 8, 2011, this Court ordered that Defendants’ Supplemental Memorandum
3 Addressing Recently Produced Evidence Relevant to Pending Motions (Dkt. 74) and
4 accompanying documents be temporarily placed under seal, but also provided that:

5 within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Order, (i) the parties
6 shall file a stipulation as to which portions of said Exhibit A and the
7 Supplemental Memorandum shall remain under seal or, (ii) if no
8 stipulation is reached by the parties, Counterdefendants Stephens
Media, LLC and Righthaven, LLC shall file with the Court their
justification for retaining Exhibit A under seal, with any Reply
thereto by Defendants to be filed within seven days thereafter.

9 Order Granting Defendants’ Conditional Motion to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. 75)
10 (“March 8 Order”) at 2.

11 As this Court knows, the documents were placed under seal only because they were
12 designated “Confidential Attorneys’ Eyes Only” by Stephens Media LLC (“Stephens Media”)
13 under the Stipulated Protective Order. On March 9, 2011, Defendants asked Counterdefendants
14 Stephens Media and Righthaven LLC (“Righthaven”) to withdraw the designation or modify it to
15 limited portions of the document or advise that they refused to do so. *See* Declaration of Clifford
16 Webb in Support of Defendants’ Request to Unseal (“Webb Decl.”) ¶ 3. Defendants also notified
17 Counterdefendants’ counsel that they were willing to attempt to stipulate to redaction of any
18 appropriately limited portion. *Id.* Later that day, counsel for Stephens Media and Righthaven
19 refused to lift the designation on Exhibit A. *Id.* ¶ 4. Since then, neither Righthaven nor Stephens
20 Media have proposed redactions or sought a stipulated resolution. *Id.* Accordingly, Defendants
21 hereby notify the Court that no stipulation was reached by the parties.

22 Therefore, pursuant to this Court’s March 8, 2011 Order, Righthaven and Stephens Media
23 were required to “file with the Court their justification for retaining Exhibit A under seal” within
24 fourteen days of the March 8 Order. Dkt. 75. As of March 29, 2011, 21 days from the date of
25 this Court’s order, the due date for Defendants’ reply, neither Stephens Media nor Righthaven
26 have filed with the Court any justification for retaining any documents under seal.

27 Accordingly, by failing to oppose the unsealing, Stephens Media and Righthaven have
28 failed to provide the specific, articulable facts necessary to meet their burden of showing

1 compelling reasons for overriding the general right to inspect and copy judicial records and
2 documents.¹ See also Local Rule 7-2(d) (“The failure of an opposing party to file points and
3 authorities in response to any motion shall constitute a consent to the granting of the motion.”).

4 **CONCLUSION**

5 For the reasons stated above, Defendants respectfully request that this Court unseal
6 (i) Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Memorandum Addressing Recently
7 Produced Evidence Relevant to Pending Motions (Dkt. 74); (ii) Defendants’ Supplemental
8 Memorandum Addressing Recently Produced Evidence Relevant To Pending Motions
9 (Dkts. 74 & 79); (iii) Declaration of Laurence Pulgram (Dkts. 74 & 79); and (iv) Exhibit A to
10 Declaration of Laurence Pulgram (Dkts. 74 & 79).

11 Dated: March 29, 2010

FENWICK & WEST LLP

12
13 By: /s/ Laurence F. Pulgram
14 LAURENCE F. PULGRAM, ESQ

15 Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaimant
16 DEMOCRATIC UNDERGROUND, LLC, and
17 Defendant DAVID ALLEN

18
19
20
21
22
23 ¹ There is a strong presumption of public access to court records, and “compelling reasons” are required to override
24 that presumption, particularly in the case of dispositive motions and their related attachments. *Kamakana v. City and*
25 *County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006) (citing *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d
26 1122, 1136 (9th Cir. 2003). Of course, the presumptive right to access is not absolute, but it can only be overridden
27 given “sufficiently compelling reasons” for doing so. *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1135. These compelling reasons must be
28 supported by “specific factual findings.” *Id.* (citing *San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. United States District Court*, 187
F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir. 1999)); see also *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1182 (the court’s findings must be based on the
specific, articulable facts provided to it). There is no room here for “hypothesis or conjecture.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d
at 1179 (quoting *Hagestad v. Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995)). Conclusory or categorical statements
that might satisfy the lesser “good cause” standard will therefore not suffice. *Id.* at 1184. Moreover, as the Ninth
Circuit has explained, “the mere fact that the production of records may lead to a litigant’s embarrassment,
incrimination, or exposure to further litigation” is insufficient to support sealing. *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178
(quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1136).