

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
6

7 **A.A. and L.A. on behalf of A.A., Jr.,**

8 **Plaintiffs,**

9 **v.**

10 **CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,**  
11 **CLOVIS SELPA, MARY BASS in her**  
12 **personal and official capacities as SELPA**  
13 **ADMINISTRATOR and DIRECTOR of**  
14 **SPECIAL EDUCATION for CLOVIS USD**  
**and DOES 1-10,**

**Defendants.**

**CASE NO. 1:13-CV-1043 AWI MJS**

**ORDER GRANTING REQUEST TO**  
**FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

**(Doc. 103)**

15 The parties have come to settlement after mediation. As the case involves the claims of a  
16 minor, the court is required by Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 17(c) to conduct an independent inquiry to  
17 determine whether the settlement serves the minor's best interests. Robidoux v. Rosengren, 638  
18 F.3d 1177, 1181 (9th Cir. 2011). Plaintiffs are in the process of filing a petition seeking that court  
19 approval. However, given the subject matter, Plaintiffs are requesting permission to file the  
20 relevant documents under seal. Doc. 103. No party has filed an opposition to this request.

21 For requests to file under seal "a 'compelling reasons' standard applies to most judicial  
22 records. This standard derives from the common law right to inspect and copy public records and  
23 documents, including judicial records and documents. To limit this common law right of access, a  
24 party seeking to seal judicial records must show that compelling reasons supported by specific  
25 factual findings outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring  
26 disclosure." Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n, 565 F.3d 1106, 1115 (9th Cir. 2009), citations and  
27 quotations omitted. The "compelling reasons" standard applies to sealing documents associated  
28 with requests to approve settlement agreements. Sharp v. Sepracor Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS

1 97791, \*3 (D. Ariz. Oct. 7, 2009); Kennedy v. R.M.L.V., LLC, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11430, \*2  
2 (D. Nev. Jan. 29, 2014).

3 In this case, the materials submitted identifies the school the minor attends, the specific  
4 classes the minor will be taking, and the cost of outside educational services. In general, there is a  
5 “very strong privacy interest” in protecting the personal information of a minor. Jenkins v. Wash.  
6 Metro. Area Transit Auth., 960 F. Supp. 2d 2, 16 (D.D.C. 2013). Sealing is appropriate to prevent  
7 the general publication of their “sensitive information.” JSB v. Wheeler, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
8 158650, \*9 (D. Nev. Nov. 24, 2015). There is a “legitimate expectation of privacy” regarding  
9 information about “the educational expenses of a disabled minor.” A.S. v. Harrison Twp. Bd. of  
10 Educ., 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69689, \*4 (D.N.J. May 8, 2017). Similarly, it may be important to  
11 hide the specific the school the minor attends to avoid revealing their identity. See M.M. v.  
12 Lafayette Sch. Dist., 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50759, \*4 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2017). As the sensitive  
13 information is at the heart of the lawsuit and the documents to be filed, sealing is permissible.

14 Plaintiffs’ request to file the (1) Mediated Settlement Agreement, (2) Petition for Approval  
15 of Mediated Settlement Agreement, and (3) Affidavit of Plaintiffs under seal is GRANTED.

16  
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: August 4, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
19 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE