

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

RONALD MOORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHASE, INC., d/b/a SLATER SHELL; and  
DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:14-cv-01178-SKO

**ORDER DENYING THE PARTIES’  
STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER**

**ORDER THAT THE CLERK OF COURT  
SHALL SEAL DOCUMENTS FILED ON  
THE DOCKET**

**ORDER THAT DEFENDANT SHALL  
REFILE REDACTED VERSIONS OF  
SEALED DOCUMENTS**

On December 2, 2015, Plaintiff Ronald Moore (“Plaintiff”) filed his motion for sanctions against defense counsel. (Doc. 82.) On January 5, 2016, Defendant Chase, Inc. (“Defendant”) filed its opposition to Plaintiff’s motion as well as several declarations and accompanying exhibits. (Docs. 86; 87; 88.) On January 12, 2015, defense counsel filed a declaration informing the Court that he erroneously filed unredacted versions of Exhibits 6 and 7 to Defendant’s opposition to the motion for sanctions at Dockets 86-6 and 86-7. (Doc. 90.)

Upon learning that the unredacted versions had been filed to the publicly accessible docket, the parties stipulated to a “protective order to seal” the exhibits. (Doc. 89.) However, as there is no mechanism for the parties to “stipulate” to seal exhibits already filed to the publicly accessible docket, the parties’ stipulated “protective order to seal” the exhibits must be DENIED.

1 The Court recognizes, however, that Plaintiff has an articulable privacy interest in his  
2 personal, private, identifying information, including his birthdate. *See, e.g., Foltz v. State Farm*  
3 *Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1137 (9th Cir. 2003) (acknowledging privacy interests  
4 implicated by sensitive, personal identifying information). Because Plaintiff’s privacy interest in  
5 protecting this information is the type of “good cause” that outweighs the general history of access  
6 and the public policies favoring disclosure, *Kamakana v. Cty. and Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d  
7 1172m 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006), the Court will on its own motion order that these documents be  
8 SEALED. Local Rule 141; Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2, 26.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 10 1. The parties’ stipulated protective order to seal the docket is DENIED;
- 11 2. The Clerk of Court is ORDERED to SEAL Exhibit 6, Docket 86-6, and Exhibit 7,  
12 Docket 86-7, of Defendant’s opposition to the motion for sanctions; and
- 13 3. Defendant is ORDERED to RE-FILE and RE-SERVE redacted versions of Exhibit  
14 6, Docket 86-6, and Exhibit 7, Docket 86-7, of Defendant’s opposition to the  
15 motion for sanctions within 2 days of the filing of this order.

16  
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: January 14, 2016

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28