



1 counters that the references to sealed documents are incorporated throughout the entire  
2 petition. (Doc. 36 at 5–7.)

3 The Court finds that Roseberry has not shown sufficiently compelling reasons to  
4 seal either his habeas petition or his response to the motion for reconsideration.  
5 Roseberry does not cite any harm that would result from unsealing the petition. In fact, he  
6 “does not desire the concealing of the documents at issue” and moved twice in state  
7 court, unsuccessfully, for the documents to be unsealed. (Doc. 36 at 9.)

8 In addition, as Respondents argues, it is not clear that Roseberry’s filings in this  
9 Court violate the state court’s order sealing the documents. Roseberry’s citations to the  
10 sealed material in his habeas petition do not reveal the contents of the documents. (*See*  
11 Doc. 32 at 25, 67–68, 69, 78, 151, 183.) References to the material in Roseberry’s  
12 response outline but do not detail the contents of the sealed documents or reveal  
13 confidential or privileged matters. (Doc. 36 at 3–6.)

14 Accordingly, because Roseberry has not met his burden of showing compelling  
15 reasons for his sealing requests,

16 **IT IS ORDERED** granting Respondents’ motion for reconsideration. (Doc. 33.)

17 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** vacating the Court’s order granting Roseberry’s  
18 motion to file his amended habeas petition under seal. (Doc. 31.) The Clerk of Court is  
19 directed to unseal Roseberry’s amended petition. (Doc. 32.)

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** denying Roseberry’s motion to seal his response  
21 to Respondents’ motion for reconsideration. (Doc. 35.)

22 Dated this 15th day of September, 2016.

23  
24   
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 Neil V. Wake  
27 Senior United States District  
28 Judge