1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	00000	
12	THE NATIONAL GRANGE OF THE CIV. NO. 2:14-676 WBS DB	
13	ORDER OF PATRONS OF HUSBANDARY, ORDER RE: REQUEST TO SEAL	
14	Plaintiff,	
15	V.	
16	CALIFORNIA GUILD, formerly	
17	doing business as "California State Grange,"	
18	Defendant.	
19		
20	00000	
21	On September 12, 2016, the court issued an order	
22	requiring defendant, the California Guild, to pay plaintiff, th	е
23	National Grange, \$144,715.70 in attorneys' fees. (Sept. 12, 20	16
24	Order at 23 (Docket No. 154).) Plaintiff seeks to file a motio	n
25	to add Robert McFarland, president of defendant, as a judgment	
26	debtor to the court's fees order. Defendant has designated 15	of
27	the 17 exhibits plaintiff cites in support of its motion	
28	"CONFIDENTIAL" or "CONFIDENTIALATTORNEYS EYES ONLY" pursuant	to
	1	

1 a stipulated protective order signed by the magistrate judge in 2 this case. Plaintiff disputes defendant's designations, but has 3 agreed to file its motion to add judgment debtor, a separate 4 motion to remove defendant's designations, and memoranda and 5 exhibits supporting the two motions, under seal. Plaintiff now, 6 with defendant's support, requests the court to enter an order 7 allowing it to file the aforementioned documents under seal.

8 While the protective order in this case allows the 9 parties to designate documents as confidential, designating a 10 document confidential does not entitle the parties to file the 11 document under seal. See E.D. Cal. L.R. 141(a) ("[S]pecific 12 requests to seal must be made even if an existing protective 13 order . . . permits the sealing of the document." (emphasis 14 added)). Neither does the protective order's 'challenges' 15 provision, which states that confidentiality designations remain 16 in effect while they are being challenged, entitle the parties to 17 play out their designation challenges via sealed documents. See 18 id. To file any document under seal, the parties must obtain 19 "written order of the Court" permitting the sealing after they 20 have made "the showing required by applicable law." Id. That 21 rule applies even where a prior protective order permits the 22 designation of documents as confidential. See id.

The Ninth Circuit has held that a party seeking to seal a judicial record bears the burden of overcoming "a strong presumption in favor of [public] access." <u>Kamakana v. City &</u> <u>County of Honolulu</u>, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). The party must "articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and

2

the public policies favoring disclosure, such as the public interest in understanding the judicial process." <u>Id.</u> at 1178-79 (citation omitted). In deciding a motion to seal, the court "balance[s] the competing interests of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records secret." Id. at 1179.

Neither plaintiff nor defendant has offered any 6 7 "compelling reasons" for sealing the documents at issue here. 8 The exhibits at issue are a deposition transcript, meeting 9 minutes, emails, budget spreadsheets, tax returns, bank 10 statements, and photocopies of checks. Save for intermittent 11 mentions of private bank account numbers, which the parties may 12 redact pursuant to Local Rule 140(a)(ii), the exhibits do not 13 appear to contain any sensitive business information. That 14 defendant designated the exhibits confidential pursuant to a 15 stipulated protective order is not itself a compelling reason to 16 seal the exhibits. See Foster Poultry Farms, Inc. v. Certain 17 Underwriters at Lloyd's, London, No. CIV. 1:14-00953 WBS, 2015 WL 18 5608241, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2015) ("[A] confidentiality 19 agreement between the parties does not per se constitute a 20 compelling reason to seal documents outweighing the interests of 21 public disclosure and access. The fact that the assigned 22 magistrate judge signed the stipulated protective order does not 23 change this principle."); Starbucks Corp. v. Amcor Packaging 24 Distribution, No. CV 2:13-1754 WBS CKD, 2016 WL 1090550, at *2 25 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 21, 2016) (same).

The court is also unable to find anything in plaintiff's motions or their accompanying memoranda that appear to implicate any "compelling" privacy concerns.

3

1	Because the parties have not offered any "compelling
2	reasons" to grant plaintiff's request to seal, the court will
3	deny plaintiff's request. If the parties are concerned about
4	disclosure of bank account numbers, plaintiff may resubmit its
5	request specifically asking that it be allowed to redact such
6	information from its exhibits.
7	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's request to
8	seal be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.
9	Dated: January 24, 2017 Million & Ambter
10	WILLIAM B. SHUBB
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	4