

Exhibit F

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 MEDIMPACT HEALTHCARE
11 SYSTEMS, INC., A CALIFORNIA
12 CORPORATION; MEDIMPACT
13 INTERNATIONAL LLC, A
14 CALIFORNIA LIMITED
15 LIABILITY COMPANY; AND
16 MEDIMPACT INTERNATIONAL
17 HONG KONG LTD., A HONG
18 KONG COMPANY,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 IQVIA INC., a Delaware corporation;
22 IQVIA LTD., a UK company; IQVIA
23 AG, a Swiss company; OMAR
24 GHOSHEH, individually; and AMIT
25 SADANA, individually, and DOES 1-
26 20,

27 Defendants.

Case No. 3:19-cv-01865-GPC-DEB

**ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL**

Judge: The Hon. Gonzalo P. Curiel

[ECF No. 795]

28 EXHIBIT F

1 Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motions to Seal Documents in Support of
2 Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Rule 72(a) Objection and Motion to Set Aside
3 Magistrate Judge's Order Denying Defendants' Motion for Sanctions (the
4 "Motion"). (ECF No. 796.)

5 The Motion seeks to seal Exhibits 6 and 7 to the Declaration of Jennifer
6 Bennett in support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Rule 72(a) Objection
7 and Motion to Set Aside Magistrate Judge's Order Denying Defendants' Motion for
8 Sanctions. Exhibit 6 exhibit is an excerpted copy a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition
9 transcript. The witness was Dale Brown on behalf of Plaintiff MedImpact. Exhibit 7
10 is an excerpted copy a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition transcript. The witness was Krishna
11 Guttikonda on behalf of Plaintiff MedImpact. Both exhibits have been designated
12 as highly confidential under the protective order governing this case. Both exhibits
13 discuss Plaintiffs' confidential policies and procedures regarding the preservation of
14 electronic information. Plaintiffs do business in an industry where the preservation
15 and confidentiality of information is highly regulated. Thus, Plaintiffs practices
16 with respect to preservation and confidentiality are both proprietary and sensitive.

17 Accordingly, the disclosure of this information would subject Plaintiffs and
18 Defendants to a risk of substantial harm or prejudice. *See McArdle v. AT&T*
19 *Mobility LLC*, No. 09-cv-1117, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 218070, at *13–14 (N.D.
20 Cal. Aug. 13, 2018).

21 Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that there are compelling reasons to
22 GRANT the Motion. It is ORDERED that Exhibits shall be SEALED until further
23 order of this Court.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: January 10, 2023


26 
27 Hon. Gonzalo P. Curiel
28 United States District Judge

EXHIBIT F