1		
1 2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	DELIA WILSON, on behalf of herself and	Case No. 1:14-cv-00894-WBS-SAB
12	others similarly situated,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
13	Plaintiffs,	REQUEST TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL
14		(ECF No. 42)
15	CONAIR CORPORATION,	
16	Defendant.	
17		
18	On June 11, 2014, Plaintiff Delia Wilson filed this action on behalf of herself and others	
19	similarly situated. On April 7, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel further responses to	
20	discovery requests. On April 22, 2015, the parties filed a joint statement and Plaintiff filed a	
21	request to file documents under seal.	
22	Pursuant to the Local Rule of the United States Court, Eastern District of California	
23	("L.R."), documents may only be sealed by written order of the Court upon the showing required	
24	by applicable law. L.R. 141(a). Plaintiff seeks to seal the documents as the parties have	
25	stipulated that they are covered by a protective order. The stipulated protective order in this	
26	action allows the parties to identify documents as confidential without any criteria to show that	
27	the document would be entitled to confidentiality. (ECF No. 28.)	

28

"Historically, courts have recognized a 'general right to inspect and copy public records

and documents, including judicial records and documents.' " Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of 1 2 Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc., 435 3 U.S. 589, 597 & n. 7 (1978)). Since nondispositive motions are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action, the public's interest in access to 4 5 documents attached to them is not as strong as those attached to dispositive motions. Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore, where a document is 6 7 attached to a nondispositive motion the usual presumption of the public's right to access in rebutted; and the party merely needs to show good cause to preserve the secrecy of the 8 9 document. Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179-80.

10 Here, Plaintiff did not identify the documents which are to be sealed. The Court does not seal case documents or exhibits from public view without good cause. The fact that the parties 11 12 designate the documents confidential under the protective order is insufficient by itself show that 13 good cause exists to file documents under seal. The Local Rule provides that in making a 14 request to file documents under seal, the party must generally identify the documents to be sealed. L.R. 141(b). Plaintiff is directed to Local Rule 141 which is available on the Court's 15 website at http://www.caed.uscourts.gov for additional required information to be included in a 16 17 request to seal. Plaintiff has not provided sufficient information for the Court to find good cause 18 to grant the request to seal.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's request to file documents under
seal is DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: April 23, 2015

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE