

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
GAVIN NEWSOM, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. CIV 2:90-0520 KJM DB P

ORDER

Good cause appearing, the Special Master’s request to file his response to the court’s October 18, 2022 minute order, ECF No. 7631, under seal in GRANTED.


“Every court has supervisory power over its own records and files, and access has been denied where court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes.” *Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978). When a party moves to seal a record, the Court looks to the underlying motion and determines whether it is “more than tangentially related to the merits of the case. *Ctr. For Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied sub nom. FCA U.S. LLC v. Ctr. For Auto Safety*, 137 S. Ct. 38 (2016). When a motion is unrelated or only tangentially related to the merits of the case, the good cause standard applies. *Id.* at 1097-98. To establish good cause, a party must show “specific prejudice or harm will result” absent sealing, *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003), which may include the need “to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment,

1 oppression, or undue burden or expense.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). Here, the court finds that the  
2 good cause standard is met.

3 The Court’s clerk is directed to file the previously conditionally lodged copy of Special  
4 Master Matthew A. Lopes, Jr.’s response to the court’s October 18, 2022 minute order in the  
5 record, under seal until further order of the court.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: October 24, 2022.

8  
9   
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28