1			
2			
2			
3			
4 5			
6			
7			
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	DELIA WILCON on Dehelf of Hercelf and	Case No: 1:14-cv-00894-WBS-SAB	
11	DELIA WILSON, on Behalf of Herself and All Others Similarly Situated,	CLASS ACTION	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO SEAL CERTAIN EXHIBITS FILED IN	
13 14	v.	SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE	
14	CONAIR CORPORATION,	MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION	
15 16	Defendant.	(ECF No. 89)	
10			
18	On December 8, 2015, Plaintiff filed	an ex parte application to modify the scheduling	
10	On December 8, 2015, Plaintiff filed an <u>ex parte</u> application to modify the scheduling order in this action. On December 9, 2015, Plaintiff filed a request to seal documents that		
20	were inadvertently publically filed with the ex parte application.		
21	The protective order entered in this action requires a party who files protected material without the written permission of the opposing party to comply with Local Pule 141. (ECE		
22	without the written permission of the opposing party to comply with Local Rule 141. (ECF		
23	No. 28 at ¶ 11.3.) Rule 141 provides "Documents may be sealed only by written order of the		
24 25	Court, upon the showing required by applicable law.' In order to seal documents attached to a		
25 26	nondispositive motion, the party is required to show good cause to seal the documents. <u>Pintos</u>		
26	<u>v. Pacific Creditors Ass'n</u> , 605 F.3d 665, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2009).		
27	Here, Plaintiff states that she does not believe there is any confidential information		
28	included in the documents, but is making the request because Defendant designated the		

1	documents as confidential. As Plaintiff was informed in the April 23, 2015 order denying a	
2	previous request to seal documents, "[t]he Court does not seal case documents or exhibits from	
3	public view without good cause. The fact that the parties designate the documents confidential	
4	under the protective order is insufficient by itself show that good cause exists to file	
5	documents under seal." (ECF No. 43 at 2:10-14.) Plaintiff has not demonstrated that good	
6	cause exists to seal the documents attached to the application.	
7	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's request to seal documents is	
8	DENIED.	
9		
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
11	Dated: December 9, 2015	
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	1	