

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

URIEL PHARMACY HEALTH AND
WELFARE PLAN; AND URIEL PHARMACY,
INC., on their own behalf and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

ADVOCATE AURORA HEALTH, INC. and
AURORA HEALTH CARE, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00610

PATRICK SHAW, DEBRA SHAW, and HALEY
SHAW, on their own behalf and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

ADVOCATE AURORA HEALTH, INC. and
AURORA HEALTH CARE, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-00157

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO FILE UNDER RESTRICTED ACCESS

Defendants Advocate Aurora Health, Inc. and Aurora Health Care, Inc. ("Defendants"), pursuant to General L.R. 79(d), respectfully move to file following documents such that access to those documents will be restricted to the Court and counsel for the Parties: the Declaration of Anne Johnson Palmer in Support of Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification and Defendants' Motions to Exclude Opinions Offered by Jonathan Orszag ("Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration"), Exhibits 1-23, 25-26, 28-31, 33-34, 36-43, 45, 47-48, 50-53, 64-69, 71-73, and 81-86 to the Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Defendants'

Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification in *Uriel*, Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification in *Shaw*, Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Opinions Offered by Mr. Jonathan Orszag in *Uriel*, and Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Portions of Mr. Orszag's Opinions in *Shaw*.

Pursuant to General L.R. 79(d)(2), public copies of the documents are being filed concurrent with this motion. The basis for this motion are set forth in the brief being filed concurrent with this motion.

Date: August 3, 2026

/s/ Nathan Oesch
Daniel E. Conley
Nathan J. Oesch
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 2400
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone: 414.277.5000
Fax: 414.271.3552
daniel.conley@quarles.com
nathan.oesch@quarles.com

Matthew Splitek
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
33 E Main St, Suite 900
Madison, WI 53703
Telephone: 608.251.5000
Fax: 608.251.9166
matthew.splitek@quarles.com

Jane E. Willis
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Prudential Tower, 800 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02199-3600
Telephone: 617.951.7000
Fax: 617.951.7050
jane.willis@ropesgray.com

Rocky C. Tsai
Anne Johnson Palmer
ROPES & GRAY LLP
One Maritime Plaza, Suite 1800
300 Clay Street

San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415.315.6300
Fax: 415.315.6350
rocky.tsai@ropesgray.com
anne.johnsonpalmer@ropesgray.com

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

URIEL PHARMACY HEALTH AND
WELFARE PLAN; AND URIEL PHARMACY,
INC., on their own behalf and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

ADVOCATE AURORA HEALTH, INC. and
AURORA HEALTH CARE, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00610

PATRICK SHAW, DEBRA SHAW, and HALEY
SHAW, on their own behalf and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

ADVOCATE AURORA HEALTH, INC. and
AURORA HEALTH CARE, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-00157

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
FILE UNDER RESTRICTED ACCESS**

Defendants Advocate Aurora Health, Inc. and Aurora Health Care, Inc. ("Defendants"), pursuant to General L.R. 79(d), respectfully move to file the documents listed below such that access to those documents will be restricted to the Court and counsel for the parties. Pursuant to General L.R. 79(d)(2), public redacted copies of the documents are being filed concurrent with this motion.

Section I below sets forth the basis for restricting access to the identified documents. In

Section II, Defendants propose a procedure to assist the Court in preparing public versions of any restricted-access documents filed under restricted access that the Court deems essential to its decision.

I. Defendants’ proposed procedure to address documents that may form the basis of the Court’s forthcoming decisions.

Defendants ask that the Court adopt Defendants’ previously-proposed procedure to address information filed under restricted access similar to the procedure utilized in *Methodist Health Servs. Corp. v. OSF Healthcare Sys.*, No. 113CV01054SLDJEH, 2016 WL 5817176 (C.D. Ill. Sept. 30, 2016), *aff’d*, 859 F.3d 408 (7th Cir. 2017): when the Court issues its decision on the parties’ pending *Daubert* motions and class certification motions, Defendants ask that they be permitted fourteen days to prepare and propose public versions of documents that would disclose information that underpins the Court’s decision and is not subject to a countervailing interest requiring long-term confidentiality. ECF No. 206 at 7-8 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 104 at 7-8 (*Shaw*). Both the *Uriel* and *Shaw* Plaintiffs support utilizing this approach. ECF No. 228 at 14 (*Uriel*) (“Plaintiffs do not oppose the procedural framework proposed by AAH Nor do Plaintiffs dispute AAH’s proposed framework that only the documents that underpin the Court’s decision should be disclosed absent a showing of good cause.”); ECF No. 133 at 14 (*Shaw*) (same). Adopting this procedure would properly balance the need for public disclosure of materials that underpin the Court’s analysis with the recognition that information “that does not ‘influence or underpin’ a judicial decision need not be made public.” *Strasser v. City of Milwaukee*, No. 14-CV-1456, 2017 WL 10544079, at *1 (E.D. Wis. Feb. 25, 2017) (quoting *Baxter Int’l, Inc. v. Abbott Lab’ys*, 297 F.3d 544, 545, 548 (7th Cir. 2002)). Therefore, Defendants respectfully request that the Court adopt this proposed procedure that all parties support that will also avoid burdening the Court and promote judicial economy.

II. Access should be restricted to the Court and counsel for the parties for the following categories of documents.

“[T]he antitrust context presents its own particular challenges for courts weighing the public release of information.” *Methodist Health Servs. Corp.*, No. 113CV01054SLDJEH, 2016 WL 5817176, at *18 (C.D. Ill. Sept. 30, 2016), *aff’d*, 859 F.3d 408 (7th Cir. 2017). Discovery “in antitrust litigation, by its broad nature, requires the production of sensitive information regarding business strategy, financials, and operations.” *Id.* (citing *AlliedSignal, Inc. v. B.F. Goodrich Co.*, 183 F.3d 568, 577 (7th Cir. 1999)). Such information often must be shielded from public view, including to eliminate the risk of pricing information being “used by other parties as ‘the basis of effective collusion’ in future negotiations,” and to avoid giving “an unfair advantage” to parties in such negotiations. *Id.* (quoting *Ball Mem’l Hosp., Inc.*, 784 F.2d at 1346). This antitrust litigation is no different. The sensitive information listed below in Sections II.A–E should be accessible only to the Court and counsel for the parties.

While Plaintiffs have asserted that Defendants’ approach to categorizing documents and providing descriptions of the type of information contained within the documents in a certain category of documents is inappropriate, Defendants have utilized this method throughout this case without objection by Plaintiffs (until recently). *See, e.g.*, ECF Nos. 175, 186, 187 (*Uriel*), ECF Nos. 73, 82 (*Shaw*).

A. Documents previously filed under restricted access.

Defendants ask that the following documents that are being filed remain under restricted access:

- Declaration of Anne Johnson Palmer in Support of Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification and Defendants’ Motions to Exclude Opinions Offered by Jonathan Orszag (“Johnson Palmer Opposition

Declaration”), Ex. 1, previously filed as ECF No. 209-10 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-10 (*Shaw*);

- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 3, previously filed as ECF No. 209-11 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-11 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 6, previously filed as ECF No. 209-2 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-2 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 7, previously filed as ECF No. 209-3 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-3 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 8, previously filed as ECF No. 209-8 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-8 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 10, previously filed as ECF No. 209-9 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-9 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 15, previously filed as ECF No. 209-4 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-4 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 16, previously filed as ECF No. 209-5 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-5 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 17, previously filed as ECF No. 209-6 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-6 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 18, previously filed as ECF No. 209-7 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-7 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 19, previously filed as ECF No. 209-14 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-14 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 20, previously filed as ECF No. 209-

15 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-15 (*Shaw*);

- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 22, previously filed as ECF No. 209-19 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-19 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 23, previously filed as ECF No. 209-20 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-20 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 26, previously filed as ECF No. 209-18 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-18 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 37; previously filed as ECF No. 209-23 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-23 (*Shaw*)
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 42, previously filed as ECF No. 209-35 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-35 (*Shaw*);
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 43, previously filed as ECF No. 209-59 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 118-59 (*Shaw*); and
- Those portions of the Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification in *Uriel*, Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification in *Shaw*, Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Opinions Offered by Mr. Jonathan Orszag in *Uriel*, and Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Portions of Mr. Orszag's Opinions in *Shaw* that cite to these exhibits.

The justification for these documents being filed under restricted access was previously set forth when they were initially filed. ECF No. 206 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 104 (*Shaw*).

B. Excerpts from deposition transcripts of Defendants' witnesses and confidential documents produced by Defendants

Defendants ask that the following documents be filed under restricted access:

- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 25;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 39;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 47;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 48;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 50;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 51;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 52;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 53;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 81;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 82;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 83;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 84;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 85;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 86; and
- Those portions of the Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification in *Uriel*, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification in *Shaw*, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude Opinions Offered by Mr. Jonathan Orszag in *Uriel*, and Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude Portions of Mr. Orszag’s Opinions in *Shaw* that cite to these exhibits.

These documents are deposition transcript excerpts of Defendants’ witnesses or internal, confidential documents produced by Defendants. The excerpts and documents contain sensitive information regarding Defendants’ business practices, market analyses, proprietary business

intelligence, and other information that is kept confidential or not regularly shared. Public disclosure of this information would cause Defendants harm because it would disclose Defendants' internal analyses relating to Defendants' competitors and third parties with whom Defendants contract, thereby giving such parties a competitive advantage.

Good cause exists to restrict access to this information. *See Patriot Universal Holdings, LLC v. Formax, Inc.*, 24 F. Supp. 3d 802, 808 (E.D. Wis. 2014) (granting motion to seal where “the materials contained therein [were] confidential business records”); *see also Wisconsin Alumni Rsch. Found. v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 14-CV-062-WMC, 2015 WL 6453837, at *2 (W.D. Wis. Oct. 26, 2015) (granting motion to seal “manufacturing agreements” with third parties and others as well as “related documents” where such documents are not disclosed or otherwise made public); *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Pentech Pharm., Inc.*, 261 F. Supp. 2d 1002, 1008 (N.D. Ill. 2003) (holding that information about terms and conditions of contracts “that might give other firms an unearned competitive advantage” is legitimately confidential information that competitors should not have); *Methodist Health Servs. Corp. v. OSF Healthcare Sys.*, 2016 WL 5817176, at *18 (“Specific to the healthcare industry, the Seventh Circuit has acknowledged that the release of provider-payer rate negotiations could result in an unfair advantage to providers.”) (citing *Ball Mem'l Hosp., Inc. v. Mut. Hosp. Ins., Inc.*, 784 F.2d 1325, 1345 (7th Cir. 1986)).

C. Deposition transcripts and other documents that third parties designated confidential under the Protective Orders

The following transcripts and other documents should be filed under restricted access in accordance with the Protective Orders in these cases (ECF No. 66 (*Uriel*), ECF No. 25 (*Shaw*)), because they were designated confidential by the third-party subpoena recipients who testified or produced documents in reliance on the Protective Orders:

- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 31;

- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 33;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 34;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 36;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 38;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 40;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 41;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 69;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 71;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 72;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 73; and
- Those portions of the Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification in *Uriel*, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification in *Shaw*, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude Opinions Offered by Mr. Jonathan Orszag in *Uriel*, and Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude Portions of Mr. Orszag’s Opinions in *Shaw* that cite to these exhibits.

Defendants certify pursuant to General Local Rule 79(d)(4) that they have met and conferred with third parties in a good faith attempt to limit the scope of the documents and materials listed in this Section II.C, and that Defendants’ efforts resulted in some documents being de-designated and filed publicly. For all documents listed above, the corresponding third party’s counsel has requested that any reference to the third party’s information be redacted and treated consistent with its designation under the Protective Order. Defendants informed each such third party of its obligation under General Local Rule 79(d)(3) to provide “sufficient factual

basis demonstrating good cause sufficient to seal the documents” as the party that designated the information under the Protective Orders.

The third-party materials listed above generally contain references to, and discussions of, confidential business information such as sensitive, non-public, contracting terms and details of contract negotiations. The release of such confidential business information may cause unnecessary harm to third parties as “public disclosure of the information would effectively afford other [medical providers] an unearned competitive advantage—unearned because the issue of public disclosure arises from the adventitious circumstances of the [documents] having become caught up in litigation and as a result having become filed in court.” *Formax Inc.*, 2014 WL 792086, at *3 (citation omitted).

Defendants support the continued restricted access of these materials.

D. Expert reports, deposition transcripts, and declarations

Defendants ask that the following expert witness reports and deposition transcripts be filed under restricted access:

- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declarations, Ex. 2;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declarations, Ex. 4;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 5;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 9;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 11;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 12;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 13;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 14;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 21; and

- Those portions of the Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification in *Uriel*, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification in *Shaw*, Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude Opinions Offered by Mr. Jonathan Orszag in *Uriel*, and Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude Portions of Mr. Orszag’s Opinions in *Shaw* that cite to these exhibits.

These documents are expert reports or deposition transcripts of experts in these cases or briefs that cite to these documents or the documents identified in Sections II.A through II.C. The reports, the opinions therein, and the deposition transcripts relate to Defendants’ contract terms with third parties, business practices, market analyses, proprietary business intelligence, financials, and other information Defendants keep confidential or do not regularly share. In addition, the reports and transcripts contain information deemed confidential by third parties that relate to these third parties’ contract terms, business practices, market analyses, proprietary business intelligence, and other information these third parties keep confidential or do not regularly share. The briefs and declaration cite to these reports and deposition transcripts, as well as the documents identified in Sections II.A through II.C.

The same reasons set forth earlier support that this information be restricted, particularly in the context of this antitrust class action. *See supra*, §§ I.A-B; *see also Formax Inc.*, 2014 WL 792086, at *4 (“Documents containing highly sensitive pricing information, sales figures, sales dollar amounts, profit and loss data, and other financial records not normally made known to the public may be properly filed under seal.”); *Grove US LLC v. Sany Am. Inc.*, No. 13-C-677, 2019 WL 969814, at *9 (E.D. Wis. Feb. 28, 2019) (“The sealed exhibits and filings in this case reference confidential, non-public, proprietary, and competitive information regarding the

parties' business operations. This information is worthy of confidentiality under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1)(G).”).

E. Excerpts from deposition transcripts of Plaintiffs' witnesses and confidential documents produced by Plaintiffs

Defendants ask that the following documents be filed under restricted access:

- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 28;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 29;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 30;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 45;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 64;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 65;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 66;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 67;
- Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Ex. 68; and
- Those portions of the Johnson Palmer Opposition Declaration, Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification in *Uriel*, Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification in *Shaw*, Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Opinions Offered by Mr. Jonathan Orszag in *Uriel*, and Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude Portions of Mr. Orszag's Opinions in *Shaw* that cite to these exhibits.

Defendants certify pursuant to General Local Rule 79(d)(4) that they have met and conferred with Plaintiffs in a good faith attempt to limit the scope of the documents and materials listed in this Section II.E and that Defendants' efforts resulted in some documents being de-designated and filed publicly. For all documents listed above, counsel for the *Shaw* Plaintiffs

requested that the information be filed under restricted access and treated consistent with its designation under the Protective Order. As Plaintiffs are the party that designated the information under the Protective Order, it is their burden to provide “sufficient factual basis demonstrating good cause sufficient to seal the documents.” General Local Rule 79(d)(3).

Defendants take no position regarding the continued restricted access of these materials.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Defendants respectfully request that the Court enter an order granting the filing of the documents identified above such that access to those documents is limited to the Court and counsel for the parties. Defendants also respectfully request that they be permitted fourteen days after the Court issues its decision to prepare any necessary public versions of documents such that those portions essential to the Court’s decision are disclosed.

Date: August 3, 2026

/s/ Nathan Oesch
Daniel E. Conley
Nathan J. Oesch
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 2400
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone: 414.277.5000
Fax: 414.271.3552
daniel.conley@quarles.com
nathan.oesch@quarles.com

Matthew Splitek
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
33 E Main St, Suite 900
Madison, WI 53703
Telephone: 608.251.5000
Fax: 608.251.9166
matthew.splitek@quarles.com

Jane E. Willis
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Prudential Tower, 800 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02199-3600
Telephone: 617.951.7000

Fax: 617.951.7050
jane.willis@ropesgray.com

Rocky C. Tsai
Anne Johnson Palmer
ROPES & GRAY LLP
One Maritime Plaza, Suite 1800
300 Clay Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415.315.6300
Fax: 415.315.6350
rocky.tsai@ropesgray.com
anne.johnsonpalmer@ropesgray.com