

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEVON D. GRAHAM,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-07-2291 GGH P

vs.

D.L. RUNNELS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

By Order, filed on April 8, 2012, defendants Kopec and Martin were directed to submit, within fourteen days, for in camera review a proposed redacted version of the documents, for the entirety of which they sought a sealing order by a request filed on March 29, 2012. In the April 8th order, the court, inter alia, informed the parties that the undersigned was contemplating the filing of the unredacted motion/opposition under seal along with a public filing of the redacted motion/opposition.

Defendants have timely submitted a proposed redacted version of the defendants' dispositive motion and exhibits. The court's review demonstrates that defendants have appropriately limited the proposed redacted material to information that could well implicate institutional safety and security; there is also a limited amount of suggested redaction that encompasses material, i.e., medical information, that legitimately implicates private and highly personal concerns. The court finds there are compelling reasons for the very limited information

1 not to be subject to public scrutiny which defendants have now shown some restraint in  
2 identifying. Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass'n., 605 F.3d 665, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2010).

3 Accordingly, IT IS SO ORDERED that:

4 1. Defendants' motion, filed on March 29, 2012 (docket # 96), for an order sealing  
5 their entire pending dispositive motion is denied; however, construed more narrowly as a request  
6 to seal only those portions for which defendants have timely submitted, on April 23, 2012, a  
7 proposed redacted version (pursuant to this court's order), the motion, as modified, is granted;

8 2. Defendants are directed to file in the case docket open to public viewing the  
9 April 23, 2012, proposed redacted version of their motion for summary judgment and supporting  
10 exhibits, submitted to the court for in camera review; and

11 3. The unredacted version of defendants' March 29, 2012, motion for summary  
12 judgment and supporting exhibits, submitted for in camera review, shall be filed and maintained  
13 under seal until further order of the court.

14 DATED: April 25, 2012

15 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows  
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17 GGH:009  
18 grah2291.ord2  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26