

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILSON GORRELL,
Plaintiff,
v.
THOMAS C. SNEATH et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:12-cv-00554 AWI JLT
**ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
REMOVAL OF CASE RECORD FROM
LEXIS NEXIS**
(Doc. 14)

On June 27, 2012, Plaintiff filed a request seeking to have the filings and the Court’s orders removed from the public view.¹ Plaintiff is concerned that his lawsuit relates to personal medical matters and, as a result, should not be within the public view.

Though the Court understands Plaintiff’s concerns, the public is entitled to know the matters under consideration by the Court. Generally, documents filed in civil cases are presumed to be available to the public. EEOC v. Erection Co., 900 F.2d 168, 170 (9th Cir. 1990); see also Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir.2006); Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1134 (9th Cir.2003); Local Rule 141.1 (“All information provided to the Court in a specific action is presumptively public.”) Documents may be sealed only when the compelling reasons for doing so outweigh the public’s right of access.

¹ Plaintiff is advised that the Court has no jurisdiction over Lexis Nexis to order it to remove matter that is within the public domain.

1 EEOC at 170. To determine whether particular material within particular documents should be
2 sealed, the Court is required to evaluate factors including, the “public interest in understanding
3 the judicial process and whether disclosure of the material could result in improper use of the
4 material for scandalous or libelous purposes or infringement upon trade secrets.” Valley
5 Broadcasting Co. v. United States District Court, 798 F.2d 1289, 1294 (9th Cir. 1986).

6 Here, it appears that Plaintiff seeks a blanket order sealing all filings in this case.
7 Unfortunately, the Court is not permitted to issue such an order and, indeed, such an order would
8 not be consistent with the law or its own Local Rules. L. R. 141, 141.1. Therefore, Plaintiff’s
9 request is **DENIED**.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 29, 2012

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE