

ORDER granting in part and denying (without prejudice) in part Plaintiff's 21 Motion to Seal. The court finds that good cause exists under Local Rule 5(e) of the District's Local Rules of Civil Procedure to GRANT Plaintiff's request to seal Exhibits A and B, as submitted in support of Plaintiff's 20 Motion for Preliminary Injunction. These Exhibits contain confidential business information, including "anticipated pricing plans." ECF No. 21, at 3. Plaintiff's interest in protecting such information outweighs the public's interest in accessing judicial documents. See, e.g., *CSL Silicones, Inc. v. Midsun Grp. Inc.*, No. 3:14-CV-1897, 2017 WL 4750701, at *3 (D. Conn. July 12, 2017) (recognizing that "confidential 'commercial information' of a business---including trade secrets, confidential research, internal business documents and information about a business's operations---has been recognized repeatedly as a proper subject for sealing"); *Sullivan Mktg., Inc. v. Valassis Commcns, Inc.*, No. 93 CIV. 6350, 1994 WL 177795, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. May 5, 1994) (acknowledging that "pricing and marketing strategies are widely held to be confidential business information"). Plaintiff filed redacted versions of the Exhibits, consistent with Local Rule 5(e), but moves the court to designate them "Confidential-Attorney's Eyes Only," see ECF No. 21-1, at 2-3, as defined in the undersigned's Standing Protective Order, see ECF No. 8, at 1 (permitting such designation for "highly sensitive" information). The court questions whether disclosure of the redacted Exhibits, which reveal only that prices generally will increase in the future, would "result in significant competitive or commercial disadvantage to the designating party." *Id.* Accordingly, the court DENIES without prejudice Plaintiff's request, insofar as the court believes that the redacted Exhibits should be publicly accessible. See ECF No. 8, at 3 (providing that "the parties will use reasonable care to avoid designating as confidential documents or information that does not need to be designated as such"). Plaintiff may renew its designation request in its supplemental brief, in which case it shall explain why the designation is necessary to prevent "significant competitive or commercial disadvantage." See ECF No. 33 (limiting such brief to ten double-spaced pages). It is so ordered. Signed by Judge Omar A. Williams on 12/9/2025. (Karamanakis, K) (Entered: 12/09/2025)