

1 and documents, including judicial records and documents.’ ” Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of
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
4 tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action, the public’s interest in access to
5 documents attached to them is not as strong as those attached to dispositive motions. Pintos v.
6 Pac. Creditors Ass'n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore, where a document is
7 attached to a nondispositive motion the usual presumption of the public’s right to access in
8 rebutted; and the party merely needs to show good cause to preserve the secrecy of the
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
11 seal case documents or exhibits from public view without good cause. The fact that the parties
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
15 sealed. L.R. 141(b). Plaintiff is directed to Local Rule 141 which is available on the Court’s
16 website at <http://www.caed.uscourts.gov> for additional required information to be included in a
17 request to seal. Plaintiff has not provided sufficient information for the Court to find good cause
18 to grant the request to seal.

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

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: April 23, 2015

23 
24 _____
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26
27
28