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| STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ COUNTY | IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE  SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION  \_\_ CVS \_\_ |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_,  Plaintiff,  v.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_,  Defendants. | **ORDER ON PROPOSED REDACTIONS OF DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPTS** |

1. THIS MATTER is before the Court, following resolution of this litigation and filing of dismissals by the parties, on the Motion for Limited Redaction of Deposition Transcripts (the “Motion”) filed on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_, by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
2. Prior to the filing of the Motion, the Court advised counsel for all parties that, in its view, and based on its review of certain deposition transcripts filed under seal by the parties, much of the testimony filed under seal did not warrant protection from public view. The Court, by Order entered \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_, provided counsel for the parties an opportunity to submit to the Court a proposal for more limited redactions consistent with the Court’s obligation under controlling legal precedent.
3. In the Motion, [NAME PARTIES] seek[s] to maintain under seal limited portions of the deposition transcripts in question. All parties consent to the relief sought in the Motion and specifically agree that the redactions, as proposed, are appropriate.
4. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ seek to redact and keep under seal the following categories of information contained in the deposition transcripts (i.e., Exhibits \_\_\_, \_\_\_, \_\_\_, and \_\_\_ to the Motion):
   1. References to, and by, executives of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Plaintiff’s supplier/manufacturer;
   2. References to the personal lives or conduct of Plaintiff and the Individual Defendants;
   3. References to salary, bonus, payment, and stock valuation amounts for Plaintiff and the Individual Defendants; and
   4. References to the financial performance, valuation, and status of the Corporate Defendant.
5. Documents filed in the courts of this State are “open to the inspection of the public,” except as prohibited by law. N.C.G.S. § 7A-109(a); *Virmani v. Presbyterian Health Servs. Corp.*, 350 N.C. 449, 463, 515 S.E.2d 675, 685 (1999). Nevertheless, “the trial court may limit [the public’s right to access to civil court proceedings and records] when there is a compelling countervailing public interest and . . . sealing of documents is required to protect such countervailing public interest.” *Doe v. Doe*, 823 S.E.2d 583, 591 (N.C. Ct. App. 2018) (quoting *Virmani*, 350 N.C. at 476, 515 S.E.2d at 693). Such limitations should be applied only when they are “required in the interest of the proper and fair administration of justice[.]” *Virmani*, 350 N.C. at 463, 515 S.E.2d at 685.
6. The Court has reviewed Exhibits \_\_\_, \_\_\_, \_\_\_, and \_\_\_ in their unredacted form and has compared them to the transcripts with proposed redactions. Based on its review, the Court concludes that many of the proposed redactions for these exhibits are broader than necessary to protect information properly filed under seal. Furthermore, much of the information redacted in the proposed redactions has already been made public by its inclusion in prior public filings in this case, or other filings on the public record, which no party has otherwise requested be maintained under seal.
7. Accordingly, the Court concludes that the Motion should be granted in part and denied in part to the extent it seeks to keep under seal the information redacted in Exhibits \_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_. Defendants shall file revised redactions of Exhibits \_\_\_, \_\_\_, \_\_\_, and \_\_\_ eliminating the redactions referenced in the list the Court has attached to this Order as “Exhibit 1.” The Court concludes that, except as provided in Exhibit 1 to this Order, the information contained in the Proposed Redactions is properly under seal.
8. Further, the parties shall file the following briefs, previously filed under seal, eliminating the redactions referenced in the list the Court has attached to this Order as “Exhibit 1.” The Court concludes that, except as provided in Exhibit 1 to this Order, the information redacted from Plaintiff’s Supplemental Memorandum is properly under seal. [LIST OF BRIEFS TO BE REVISED]
9. THEREFORE, the Court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part the Motion and ORDERS as follows:
   1. No later than [ORDER PLUS 34 DAYS], Defendants shall file revised redactions of Exhibits \_\_\_, \_\_\_, \_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_. The revised redactions shall eliminate the current redactions identified by page and line number and listed in Exhibit 1 to this Order, except as specifically noted therein. Except as noted in Exhibit 1 to this Order, the information redacted from Exhibits \_\_\_, \_\_\_, \_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_ is properly redacted and shall remain under seal; and
   2. No later than [ORDER PLUS 34 DAYS], the parties shall file revised redactions of the briefs identified in paragraph 8 above. The revised redactions shall be in conformity with this Order and specifically the redactions identified and listed in Exhibit 1 to this Order shall be removed from those briefs as revised and filed.
10. Except as expressly granted herein, the Motion is DENIED.

SO ORDERED, this the \_\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.
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