

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

----oo0oo----

JOANNE BLIGHT,
 Plaintiff,

 v.

CITY OF MANTECA, a municipal
corporation; Manteca Police
Department Detectives ARMANDO
GARCIA and IAN OSBORN; and
Manteca Police Department
Sergeants PAUL CARMONA and
CHRIS MRAZ;

 Defendants.

CIV. NO. 2:15-2513 WBS AC

ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO
SEAL

----oo0oo----

Plaintiff Joanne Blight brought this action against
defendants the City of Manteca, Manteca Police Department
Detectives Armando Garcia and Ian Osborn, and Manteca Police
Department Sergeants Paul Carmona and Chris Mraz, alleging that
defendants violated her Fourth Amendment rights when they engaged
in a "SWAT style raid" and "search" of her home." (Compl. ¶¶ 19,
32 (Docket No. 1.) Defendants claim that the search was
authorized by a state court warrant issued pursuant to a sworn

1 affidavit they had submitted to the state court containing
2 information provided by a confidential informant ("CI"). (See
3 Answer at 12 (Docket No. 5).) Plaintiff claims that defendants
4 misrepresented or omitted material aspects of what the CI told
5 them in their affidavit to the state court. (Feb. 10, 2017 Order
6 at 2 (Docket No. 55).)

7 The court previously granted defendants leave to seal
8 (1) the CI's personally identifying information (name, address,
9 and phone number); and (2) information that could lead to the
10 CI's identity by working backwards (prior interactions with law
11 enforcement, prior criminal history, and date CI last visited the
12 incident-related property). (Docket No. 92.) Plaintiff now
13 requests to seal the same information in connection with
14 plaintiff's response to defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment.
15 (Docket No. 114.)

16 The court's prior findings with respect to defendants'
17 request to seal apply equally to plaintiff's request. The court
18 previously explained:

19 The court is satisfied that the personally
20 identifying information implicates the safety of
21 the CI and thus satisfies the "compelling
22 reasons" standard. The second category of
23 information also implicates the CI's safety
24 because an individual could take this
25 information, work backwards, and potentially make
26 a reasonable guess of the CI's identification if
27 the individual had the CI's prior criminal
28 history and sentencing, the CI's prior
interactions with law enforcement, and the date
the CI last visited the incident-related
property. For example, knowing the last date the
CI visited the incident-related property may
allow individuals with knowledge of the incident,
including plaintiff, to determine the identity of
the CI.

1 In other words, compelling reasons exist to seal this
2 information, and the public policies favoring disclosure do not
3 outweigh the interests in ensuring the safety of a CI by sealing
4 information that does not appear to be dispositive to the case.
5 See Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79
6 (9th Cir. 2006); Mitchell v. Cate, Civ. No. 2:11-1240 JAM AC P,
7 2014 WL 1671589, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2014) (granting
8 request to seal "information [that] cannot be revealed without
9 endangering informants"); United States v. Conner, No. 15-CR-
10 00296 HSG 1, 2015 WL 8482205, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2015)
11 (granting request to seal information "contain[ing] the possible
12 identity of a confidential informant"); cf. United States v. Bus.
13 of Custer Battlefield Museum, 658 F.3d 1188, 1195 n.5 (9th Cir.
14 2011) ("With respect to warrant materials, courts have recognized
15 several concerns that may call for redaction of materials or
16 withholding of disclosure outright. These concerns include . . .
17 the need to protect the identities and safety of confidential
18 informants.") (citations omitted). Thus, the court will grant
19 plaintiff's motion.

20 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's request to
21 seal certain information in her response to defendants' Motion
22 for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 114) be, and the same hereby is,
23 GRANTED. Plaintiff is permitted to submit the requested
24 information under seal. The court will address the sealing of
25 this information in connection with future motions at the time
26 those motions are made.

27 Dated: August 18, 2017



WILLIAM B. SHUBB
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE