## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 AGNES XIE, No. 1: 16-cv-01518-DAD-SKO 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO RE AND DIRECTING DEFENDANT 14 DE YOUNG PROPERTIES 5418, LP, REDACTED DOCUMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 140 AND THIS ORDER 15 Defendant. (Doc. No. 109) 16 Plaintiff Agnes Xie ("plaintiff") filed a complaint against defendant De Young Properties 17 5418, LP ("defendant") on October 7, 2016. (Doc. No. 1.) On June 26, 2018, defendant filed a 18 19 motion for summary judgment, supported by four exhibits, and noticed the motion for hearing on 20 August 7, 2018. (Doc. No. 70.) 21 On June 28, 2018, after receiving an email from plaintiff, the court issued a minute order 22 directing the Clerk of the Court to temporarily seal exhibit 4 to defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 70-4) and directing defendant's counsel to immediately file an appropriately 23 24 redacted exhibit because the exhibit as originally filed included confidential information that should have been redacted pursuant to Local Rule 140. (Doc. No. 71.) On June 29, 2018, 25 26 defendant filed a notice of request to seal documents, or alternatively, to allow redactions. (Doc. 27 No. 72.) On July 2, 2018, the court issued an order directing defendant to file redacted 28 documents, with redactions of financial account numbers, social security numbers, dates of birth,

and plaintiff's current and previous addresses. (Doc. No. 73.)

On July 24, 2018, plaintiff filed a motion to seal documents and to direct defendant to refile with redactions. (Doc. No. 83.) Plaintiff alleged that defendant did not properly seal the exhibits containing plaintiff's confidential information, and moved for sanctions to be imposed on defendant. (Doc. Nos. 82–83.) The court denied plaintiff's motion to sanction defendant but struck the prior exhibits and directed defendant to replace them with a version including additional redactions. (Doc. No. 92.)

On August 14, 2018, plaintiff filed yet another motion to seal documents and to direct defendant to refile with redactions. (Doc. No. 109.) Plaintiff requests further redactions of numbers that she claims can be used to determine her social security number, date of birth, and passport numbers. (*Id.*) Defendant does not oppose this motion.

The legal standards regarding requests to seal and redact have been set forth in this court's prior orders and will not be repeated at length here. (*See* Doc. No. 73 at 2–3.) Plaintiff now argues that additional documents include personally identifiable numbers that could result in identity theft and should be sealed. (Doc. No. 109.) The court will grant plaintiff's unopposed motion as to the following documents: MSJ-0044, MSJ-0051, MSJ-0054, MSJ-0055, MSJ-0056, MSJ-0057. Accordingly, defendant is ordered to file a redacted version of Doc. No. 96 that reflects the redactions as described by plaintiff. (*See* Doc. No. 109.)

For these reasons:

- 1. Plaintiff's unopposed motion to redact (Doc. No. 109) is granted;
- 2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to strike from the docket Doc. No. 96 and defense counsel shall file an appropriately redacted replacement in keeping with this order as soon as possible.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **August 30, 2018** 

INITED STATES DISTRICT