

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

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

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

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

19 For these reasons:

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

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: August 30, 2018

26 
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE