

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

|                 |   |                                   |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| DAVID ESTRADA,  | ) | Case No.: 1:13cv00919 DLB (PC)    |
|                 | ) |                                   |
| Plaintiff,      | ) | ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’        |
|                 | ) | REQUEST TO SEAL REPLY TO FINDINGS |
| v.              | ) | AND RECOMMENDATIONS               |
|                 | ) |                                   |
| GIPSON, et al., | ) |                                   |
|                 | ) | (Document 191)                    |
| Defendants.     | ) |                                   |
|                 | ) |                                   |
|                 | ) |                                   |
|                 | ) |                                   |

---

Plaintiff David Estrada (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action. Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint on August 7, 2013. Pursuant to the Court’s screening order and Plaintiff’s notice of willingness to proceed on the cognizable claims, this action is proceeding against (1) Defendants Gipson and Espinosa for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment; and (2) Defendants Gipson, Espinosa, Lambert and Cavazos for violation of the Eighth Amendment. The First Amended Complaint is sealed.

On September 2, 2015, the Court issued Findings and Recommendations regarding Defendants’ February 13, 2015, motion for summary judgment. Both the motion and Findings and Recommendations are sealed.

On October 7, 2015, Defendants filed a request to seal their reply to the Findings and Recommendations.

1 Filings in cases such as this are a matter of public record absent compelling justification.  
2 United States v. Stoterau, 524 F.3d 988, 1012 (9th Cir. 2008). However, as Defendants' motion, the  
3 pending Findings and Recommendations and Plaintiff's objections are filed under seal, the Court finds  
4 justification to seal Defendants' reply.

5 Accordingly, Defendants' motion is GRANTED and their reply shall be filed under seal.

6  
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: October 8, 2015

/s/ Dennis L. Beck  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE