

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

LAL DEV,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:11-cv-2950-JAM-EFB PS

vs.

PATRICK R. DONAHOE,

Defendant.

ORDER

Plaintiff proceeds *pro se* in this action, which was referred to the undersigned pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 302(c)(21). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On February 27, 2013, defendant filed a request to seal Exhibit A to the declaration of Sandra Schmidt, which was filed in support of defendant’s motion for summary judgment. Dckt. No. 56; *see also* Dckt. No. 55. Upon review of that exhibit, it appears that the basis for the request to seal is the inclusion of plaintiff’s social security number on the exhibit. Dckt. No. 55-9 at 8.

Local Rule 140(a) provides that “pursuant to the Judicial Conference Policy on Privacy and Electronic Access to Case Files, and the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, effective April 16, 2003, when filing documents, counsel and the Court shall omit or, where reference is necessary, partially redact the following personal data identifiers from all pleadings, documents, and exhibits, whether filed electronically or on paper, unless the Court orders

1 otherwise: . . . Social Security numbers: Use only the last four numbers . . .” E.D. Cal. L.R.
2 140(a). Because the issue can be resolved via redaction, the clerk’s office will be directed to
3 redact plaintiff’s social security number on the exhibit and the motion to seal will be denied.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. The Clerk is directed to redact plaintiff’s social security number from Exhibit A to the
6 declaration of Sandra Schmidt, Dckt. No. 55-9 at 8, and include only the last four numbers; and
7 2. Defendant’s request to seal, Dckt. No. 56, is denied.

8 SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: March 4, 2013.


EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26