

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**

SHEEMA KOLOFF,)	Case No.: 1:13-cv-02060 AWI JLT
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART DEFENDANT’S
)	REQUEST TO SEAL DOCUMENTS
v.)	
)	
METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY dba MetLife, INC., et al.,)	(Doc. 25)
)	
Defendants.)	

Before Court is the request of Defendants to seal 197 pages of the Administrative Record developed in this case. For the reasons set forth below, the request is **GRANTED IN PART.**

I. Legal Authority

The request to seal documents is controlled by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). The Rule permits the Court to issue orders to “protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense, including . . . requiring that a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information not be revealed or be revealed only in a specified way.” Only if good cause exists may the Court seal the information from public view after balancing “the needs for discovery against the need for confidentiality.” Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. Cal. 2010) (quoting Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1213 (9th Cir. 2002)).

1 Generally, documents filed in civil cases are presumed to be available to the public. EEOC v.
2 Erection Co., 900 F.2d 168, 170 (9th Cir. 1990); see also Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu,
3 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir.2006); Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1134 (9th
4 Cir.2003). Documents may be sealed only when the compelling reasons for doing so outweigh the
5 public’s right of access. EEOC at 170. In evaluating the request, the Court considers the “public
6 interest in understanding the judicial process” against the private interests of the litigants. Valley
7 Broadcasting Co. v. United States District Court, 798 F.2d 1289, 1294 (9th Cir. 1986).

8 Here, Met Life asserts it seeks to seal information related to Plaintiff’s medical condition as
9 well as her social security number and other personal information. This information is properly
10 sealed. Id.; In re Spalding Sports Worldwide, Inc., 203 F.3d 805, 806 (Fed. Cir. 2000); China Intl
11 Travel Servs. (USA) v. China & Asia Travel Serv., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106622 at *29 (N.D. Cal.
12 Dec. 18, 2008); Mine O’Mine, Inc. v. Calmese, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53077 at *10 (D. Nev. Apr. 16,
13 2012).

14 However, as to many of the documents lodged, Defendant fails to explain why they should be
15 sealed. Moreover, the redacted versions of these documents fail to show that any redaction occurred.
16 Thus, the Court cannot speculate as to why Defendant sought to have these documents sealed. Thus,
17 Defendant’s motion is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**.¹

18 ORDER

19 Based upon the foregoing, the Court **ORDERS**:

20 1. The motion is **GRANTED** as to the following pages and the Clerk of the Court is
21 **DIRECTED** to file the unredacted versions of these documents **under seal**:

22 a. Documents numbered 004-024, 026, 028-036, 038, 040-043, 045-068, 070, 073,
23 077-083, 085-087, 089, 092-109, 111-156, 158, 160-165, 167-182, 184-190, 192-193;

24 2. The motion is **DENIED** as to the following pages:

25 a. Documents numbered 001-003, 025, 027, 037, 039, 044, 069, 071-072, 074-

26
27 ¹ Notably, Plaintiff has failed to lodge an objection to the request to seal or to support the request. Thus, in light of the
28 comprehensive discussion of her medical condition in Plaintiff’s motion for attorney’s fees (Doc.17) and the more
abbreviated discussion of her medical condition in her reply (Doc. 26), the Court concludes she is indifferent to the sealing
of these records.

1 076, 084, 088, 090-091, 110, 157, 159, 166, 183, 191, 194-197;

2 3. The motion is **DENIED** as to the declaration of James Hazlehurst and Defendant is
3 **ORDERED** to file it on the public docket within one court day;

4 4. As to the Documents set forth in paragraph 1.a. above, Defendant is **ORDERED** to file
5 the **redacted** versions of these documents on the public docket within one court day;

6 5. As to the Documents set forth in paragraph 1.b. above, Defendant is **ORDERED** to file
7 the **unredacted** versions of these documents on the public docket within one court day.

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: July 9, 2014

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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