1 ||

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	MACARIO BELEN DAGDAGAN,	) ) 2:08-cv-00922-GEB-KJN
11	Plaintiff,	)
12	V .	) <u>ORDER</u>
13	CITY OF VALLEJO, VALLEJO OFFICER JOHN BOYD (ID# 589), VALLEJO	)
14	OFFICER J. WENTZ (ID# 524), VALLEJO OFFICER JAMES MELVILLE,	) )
15	Defendants.	) )
16		)
17	Plaintiff submitted to ch	ambers via an email to the Cou
18	Deputy, for an <i>in camera</i> considera	ation, a four page "Request to

Plaintiff submitted to chambers via an email to the Courtroom Deputy, for an *in camera* consideration, a four page "Request to File Documents Under Seal" and the documents Plaintiff seeks to have sealed. Plaintiff states this sealing request is made because he will use the subject documents in support of his opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion.

Since it is evident that Plaintiff's "Request to File Documents Under Seal" should have been filed on the public docket, the Clerk of the Court shall file Plaintiff's "Request to File Documents Under Seal" on the public docket.

27 Plaintiff, as the movant to have documents sealed in 28 connection with a dispositive motion, must show "compelling reasons"

Dockets.Justia.com

1

1 exist to seal the documents." <u>Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n</u>, 504 F.3d 2 792, 803 (9th Cir. 2007). This showing must be "supported by specific 3 factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the 4 public policies favoring disclosure, such as the public interest in 5 understanding the judicial process." <u>Kamakana v. City and County of</u> 6 <u>Honolulu</u>, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006) (citations and internal 7 quotation marks omitted).

8 Plaintiff's conclusory arguments in his request do not satisfy9 this burden. Therefore, Plaintiff's request is DENIED.

In light of this ruling, the referenced documents are not part of the court docketing system, because when a movant seeks a sealing order which is not shown justified under the applicable sealing standard, the documents are returned to the movant so that the movant can decide what, if any, action should be taken to have the documents included in the court's docketing system. <u>See United States v. Baez-</u> <u>Alcaino</u>, 718 F. Supp. 1503, 1507 (M.D. Fla. 1989)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 7, 2011

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

GARLAND E. BURE

United States District Judge