## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

-----

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ex rel. Harry Barko, : CASE NO. 1:05-CV-01276

Plaintiff,

vs. : OPINION & ORDER (AMENDED)

[Resolving Doc. No. 138]

HALLIBURTON COMPANY, et al.,

:

Defendants.

·

## JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

In this *qui tam* action, Defendants Kellogg Brown & Root Services, Inc., KBR Technical Services, Inc., Kellogg, Brown & Root Engineering Corporation, Kellogg, Brown & Root International, Inc., and Halliburton Company (collectively, "KBR") move this Court to file Exhibit 3 to their Opposition to Relator's Motion to Compel under seal.

While the Court has discretion to seal filings where appropriate, "the general presumption [is] that court documents are to be available to the public." [1]

The Court's earlier order allowed the parties to designate as "confidential" documents they deem confidential. After reviewing Exhibit 3 and weighing the factors, the Court finds the Defendants' interest does not outweigh the strong presumption in favor of public access to judicial

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>In re Pepco Employment Litig., No. 86–0603, 1992 WL 115611, at \*5–7 (D.D.C. May, 8 1992).

Case No. 1:05-CV-01276 Gwin, J.

proceedings.<sup>2/</sup> The Court notes Defendants admit that they do not consider the information to be confidential.

Thus, the Court thus **DENIES** the Defendants' motion to file Exhibit 3 to their Opposition to Relator's Motion to Compel under seal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 21, 2014

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>/"These factors include: (1) the need for public access to the documents at issue; (2) the extent to which the public had access to the documents prior to the sealing order; (3) the fact that a party has objected to disclosure and the identity of that party; (4) the strength of the property and privacy interests involved; (5) the possibility of prejudice to those opposing disclosure; and (6) the purposes for which the documents were introduced." *See Johnson v. Greater Se. Cmty. Hosp. Corp.*, 951 F.2d 1268, 1277–78 (D.C.Cir.1991).