

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

EUGENE VIRGIL HALL,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-09-2552 WBS DAD P

vs.

M.D. McDONALD, Warden,

Respondent.

ORDER

_____ /

On June 14, 2010, counsel for respondent in this habeas action filed a notice of lodging reflecting respondent’s lodging of nine documents with this court making up the underlying state court record including the Clerk’s Transcript, the Reporter’s Transcript, the parties’ briefing in connection with the appeal in state court, the state appellate court’s decision, the petition for review and the order denying review. On that same day counsel for respondent filed a three-line motion requesting that all the lodged documents be sealed because they contain “frequent references to various home addresses and the frequent references to a witness who is a juvenile.” (Mot. at 1.) Respondent’s counsel perfunctorily asserts that redaction of the lodged documents “is not feasible.” (Id.)

The documents lodged with the court, including the state appellate court’s opinion affirming the judgment of conviction were presumably all matters of public record, having been

1 filed in the state court. Counsel for respondent does not explain why matters of public record in
2 the state court files should, in their entirety, be filed under seal in this court. If counsel can
3 identify specific portions of the state court record that should be filed under seal in this court, the
4 undersigned will consider his request. However, the pending motion for sealing across the board
5 is clearly overbroad.

6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that respondent's June 14, 2010 motion
7 to seal (Doc. No. 22) is denied without prejudice.

8 DATED: June 22, 2010.

9
10 
11 _____
12 DALE A. DROZD
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 DAD:sj
12 hall2552.seal