

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

**URIEL PHARMACY HEALTH
AND WELFARE PLAN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,**

v.

Case No. 22-C-0610

**ADVOCATE AURORA HEALTH, INC., et al.,
Defendants,**

**PATRICK SHAW, et al.,
Plaintiffs,**

v.

Case No. 24-C-0157

**ADVOCATE AURORA HEALTH, INC., et al.,
Defendants.**

ORDER

In two separate cases, a group of employer plaintiffs (“the Uriel plaintiffs”) and a group of employee plaintiffs (“the Shaw plaintiffs”) bring antitrust claims against Advocate Aurora Health, Inc., and Aurora Health Care, Inc. (collectively “AAH”). On October 8, 2025, I held a telephonic status conference regarding a motion for a protective order filed on September 19, 2025, and resolved that motion. On December 2, 2025, I held a telephonic status conference regarding a motion to compel filed on October 20, 2025, and resolved that motion. I now address the outstanding motions to restrict public access to documents filed in connection with those motions.

The motions to restrict the filings are unopposed, but because I have an obligation to the public to ensure that court filings remain open to public review unless good cause for restricting them is shown, I must still decide whether the materials may be restricted.

Cargil Inc. v. Bingenheimer, No. 17-CV-300, 2020 WL 1309970, at *6 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 19, 2020). “Documents that affect the disposition of federal litigation are presumptively open to public view.” *Goesel v. Boley Intern. (H.K.) Ltd.*, 738 F.3d 831, 833 (7th Cir. 2013) (quoting *In re Specht*, 622 F.3d 697, 701 (7th Cir. 2010)). Transparency in the judicial record is imperative so that members of the public can understand judicial decisions and monitor the judiciary. *Id.* However, this presumption “applies only to the materials that formed the basis of the parties’ dispute and the district court resolution.” *Id.* Moreover, the presumption is rebuttable on the basis of a number of compelling reasons for privacy. *Id.*

Some of the documents which the parties have moved to restrict did not inform my decision. As such, these documents may remain restricted. The rest of the documents the parties wish to restrict were relevant to my decision, but I am satisfied with the parties’ arguments that the documents reveal trade secrets or other information that may be properly withheld from the public record. Accordingly, I will grant all of the motions to restrict.

For the reasons stated, **IT IS ORDERED** that the motions to restrict documents (ECF Nos. 175, 186, 187) are **GRANTED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 5th day of December, 2025.

/s/Lynn Adelman
LYNN ADELMAN
United States District Judge