1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 ----00000----11 12 DELIA WILSON, on behalf of CIV. NO. 1:14-00894 WBS SAB 13 herself and all others similarly situated, ORDER RE: DEFENDANT'S REQUEST TO 14 SEAL Plaintiffs, 15 V. 16 CONAIR CORPORATION, 17 Defendant. 18 19 ----00000----20 2.1 Defendant requests that the court seal Exhibit A filed 22 in support of its motion for sanctions for spoliation of evidence 23 against plaintiff. (Docket No. 131.) Exhibit A is a redacted 24 copy of the retainer agreement between plaintiff and plaintiff's

252627

136), that the exhibit should be sealed because it contains plaintiff's personal and confidential information and the

counsel. Defendant argues, and plaintiff agrees, (Docket No.

28

agreement is protected by the attorney-client privilege.

This court has previously told the parties that just because they agree to have documents sealed does not constitute a compelling reason that outweighs the public interest in access to court records. (See Feb. 5, 2016 Order (Docket No. 120).) The court has an independent obligation to balance the competing interests of the public and the parties seeking to keep records secret. See Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006).

Defendant fails to specifically identify any information in the retainer, that has not already been redacted, that might be protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Defendant has therefore failed to "articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure, such as the public interest in understanding the judicial process." Id. at 1178. Accordingly, defendant's request to seal Exhibit A is DENIED.

Dated: April 12, 2016

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE