1 2		The Honorable Catherine Moore Hearing Date: December 22, 2017 Without Oral Argument	
3	3		
4	4		
5	5		
6	6		
7	STATE OF WASHINGTON KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT		
8	STATE OF WASHINGTON, NO. 17-	2-25505-0 SEA	
9 10	Plaintiff, ORDER OF POR	DENYING SEALING / REDACTING RTIONS OF THE STATE'S	
11	v. COMPI	LAINT	
12	PURDUE PHARMA L.P.; PURDUE PHARMA INC.; and THE PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY,		
13	Defendants.		
14			
15	THIS MATTER, having come before the Court on State's Motion Regarding Redactions		
16	in State's Complaint, and the Court having reviewed the foregoing Motion, responses, if any,		
17	and considered the following material:		
18	8 1. The State's Motion Regarding Redaction	ns in State's Complaint;	
19	9 2. The Declaration of Tad Robinson O'Ne	ill and the exhibits thereto;	
20	3. Defendants' Response to State's Mo	tion Regarding Redactions in State's	
21	Complaint;		
22	2 4. Declaration of Ed Mahony In Support of	Defendants' Response to State's Motion	
23	Regarding Redactions in State's Complaint; and		
24	5. State's Reply in Support of Its Motion R	legarding Redactions in the Complaint.	
25	The Court hereby enters the following FINDINGS OF FACT and CONCLUSIONS OF		
26	6 LAW:		

- 1. The Washington State Constitution, Art. 1, §10, states: "Justice in all cases shall be administered openly, and without unnecessary delay." However, only material that is relevant to a decision actually made by the court is presumptively public under this constitutional standard. Because none of the documents excerpted in the Complaint are presently part of the Court's decision-making process, the Art. 1, §10-based presumption does not apply to the State's Motion. Bennett v. Smith Bundy Berman Britton, PS, 176 Wn.2d 303, 310, 291 P.3d 886 (2013).
- 2. GR 15(c)(2) empowers this Court to find that the redactions appearing in the State's Complaint be maintained provided the redactions are justified by identified compelling privacy concerns that outweigh the public interest in access to the redacted information.
- 3. As the party seeking to maintain the redactions, Purdue Pharma carries the burden to identify compelling privacy concerns. Purdue must show "for each particular document . . . [a] specific prejudice or harm will result" from the disclosure of trade secrets, supported by "affidavits and concrete examples."

 **Dreiling v. Jain. 151 Wnd.2d 900, 916, 93 P.3d 861 (2004).
- 4. Purdue Pharma has failed to provide particularized analysis regarding how specific redactions in the complaint would create a competitive advantage, how its processes are novel or different from those of its competitors, how the secrecy of its prior marketing plans remain currently valuable in the changed regulatory and public relations environment of 2017, and how the secrecy of

1	sales calls and notes with identified and publicly disciplined health care			
2		providers have	current economic value.	
3		5. Under GR 15 (c	c) (2) and case law, Purdue has failed to meet its burden to	
4		justify maintain	ning the redactions in the complaint filed by the State in this	
5		matter.		
6 7		6. CR 26(c) is inap	pplicable as it address disclosure outside of pleadings, not	
8		redactions per (GR 15(c) (2). Even so, CR 26(c) requires a showing of good	
9		cause to keep tr	rade secrets undisclosed and, as set forth above, Purdue Pharma	
10		has failed to me	eet its burden of establishing trade secrets and good cause.	
11		Having entered the abo	ove FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, it is	
12	hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that the State's Motion Regarding Redactions			
13 14	in the State's Complaint is GRANTED. The State is hereby directed to file an unredacted copy			
15	Cut. Co. 1 into its at a Charles Office by January 5, 2019, and no newton of the plantings			
16				
17				
18		DATED this 22 nd day of December, 2017.		
19			HONORABLE CATHERINE MOORE	
20			King County Superior Court	
21	Presented by:			
22	ROBERT W. FERGUSON Attorney General			
23	Attorney General			
24	/s/ Tad Robinson O'Neill TAD ROBINSON O'NEILL, WSBA #37153			
25	KATHARINE F. BARACH, WSBA #51766 Assistant Attorneys General			
26	Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington			