IIA				
ΊΑ				
<u>xr-00258-EJD-1</u>				
ER RE DOW JONES'S INSEAL				
In connection with Intervenor Dow Jones and Company, Inc.'s ("Dow Jones") motion to				
unseal (Dkt. No. 881), the Court issued an order to unseal certain documents on August 28, 2021.				
Dkt. No. 965. Having received and considered the parties' proposed redactions to documents				
related to the United States' Motion to Rejoin the Trials of Defendants (Dkt. No. 591), the Court				
documents listed below, and				
ort of USA Omnibus Reply filed in error]				

The Court further finds it appropriate to partially unseal the following documents, with minimal redactions¹:

Docket No.	Document
645-1	Exhibit 2 to Baehr-Jones Declaration in Support of USA Omnibus Reply
645-2	Exhibit 2 to Baehr-Jones Declaration in Support of USA Omnibus Reply

The following documents contain information related to Holmes's Rule 12.2 defense. For the reasons described in the Court's previous order, they will remain provisionally partially sealed unless and until Holmes introduces evidence of her Rule 12.2 defense at trial:

INOTURETI DISUTICI OL CALILOTTIA	12	Docket No.	Document
	13	591	USA's Motion to Rejoin the Trials of Defendants
	14 15	624	Balwani's Opposition to USA's Motion to Rejoin Trials of Defendants
	16	627	Holmes' Opposition to USA's Motion to Rejoin Trials of Defendants
	17	644-1	USA's Omnibus Reply in Support of USA's Motion to Rejoin the Trials of Defendants and Motion to Exclude Testimony from Dr. Mechanic
	18 19 20	796	Order Denying Government's Motion to Exclude Expert Testimony or, in the Alternative, for a <i>Daubert</i> Hearing and for Discovery; Denying Defendant's Motion to Exclude Testimony of Dr. Renee Binder and Granting Request for <i>Daubert</i> Hearing; Denying Government's Motion to Rejoin
	21 22 23		ourt continues to monitor and assess the appropriateness of maintaining the sealed
	24	status of certain documents.	

25

Case No.: <u>5:18-cr-00258-EJD-1</u> 2D ORDER RE DOW JONES'S MOT. TO UNSEAL 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

2

¹ The Court finds that maintaining these minimal redactions are necessary to protect the personal 26 identifying information and privacy interests of third-party witnesses. The Court finds that there are no less restrictive means available to protect those interests. 27



United States District Court Northern District of California

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 27, 2021

EDWARD J. DAVILA United States District Judge

28 Case No.: <u>5:18-cr-00258-EJD-1</u> 2D ORDER RE DOW JONES'S MOT. TO UNSEAL