

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

7

8

Carlos A. Cifuentes,

9

Plaintiff,

10

vs.

11

Southwest Airlines Co.,

12

Defendant.

13

14

) No. CV-10-1979-PHX-GMS

) **ORDER**

)

)

)

)

15

The parties have submitted a Stipulated Request for Entry of Protective Order regarding confidentiality that calls for discovery materials to be kept confidential by the parties. (Doc. 17.) The proposed order, particularly paragraph 8, fails to take into account Ninth Circuit law restricting the circumstances under which confidentiality orders may be entered and documents in the Court’s file may be sealed.

20

Two standards are relevant. “First, a ‘compelling reasons’ standard applies to [the sealing of] most judicial records.” *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 565 F.3d 1106, 1115 (9th Cir. 2009) (citing *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006); *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135-36 (9th Cir. 2003)). “This standard derives from the common law right ‘to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’ To limit this common law right of access, a party seeking to seal judicial records must show that ‘compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.’” *Id.* (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178) (alteration and internal

28

1 citations omitted).


2 The second standard applies to discovery materials. “Private materials unearthed  
3 during discovery’ are not part of the judicial record.” *Id.* (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at  
4 1180) (alteration omitted). The “good cause” standard set forth in Rule 26(c) of the Federal  
5 Rules of Civil Procedure applies to orders rendering this category of documents confidential.  
6 *See id.*; *San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 187 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir. 1999)  
7 (“It is well-established that the fruits of pretrial discovery are, in the absence of a court order  
8 to the contrary, presumptively public. Rule 26(c) authorizes a district court to override this  
9 presumption where ‘good cause’ is shown.”) (citations omitted).

10 The good cause standard also applies to the sealed filing of documents attached to  
11 non-dispositive motions because those documents are often “unrelated, or only tangentially  
12 related, to the underlying cause of action.” *Phillips v. G.M. Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1213 (9th  
13 Cir. 2002); *see Pintos*, 565 F.3d at 1115. Documents attached to dispositive motions such  
14 as motions for summary judgment, however, are governed by the compelling reasons  
15 standard. *See San Jose Mercury News*, 187 F.3d at 1102; *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1136. The  
16 parties do not establish good cause or compelling reasons merely by stipulating that  
17 documents may be filed under seal.

18 The parties may submit a revised proposed order that takes into account these  
19 standards. The stipulation or motion seeking entry of the order should show good cause for  
20 a confidentiality order governing discovery materials. The proposed order should also reflect  
21 the fact that any party seeking to file documents under seal must show good cause for  
22 documents attached to non-dispositive motions or compelling reasons for documents attached  
23 to dispositive motions. Therefore,

24 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** denying the Stipulated Request for Entry of Protective  
25 Order (Doc. 17) without prejudice.

26 DATED this 10th day of January, 2011.

27   
28 \_\_\_\_\_  
G. Murray Snow  
United States District Judge