

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

J & J SPORTS PRODUCTIONS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
ANDREW JOHN COLEMAN, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-0851 TLN DB

ORDER

On January 4, 2017, plaintiff filed a request to file “the Declaration of Affiant” under seal in connection with plaintiff’s motion for default judgment. (ECF No. 15 at 1.) Local Rule 141(b) requires, in relevant part, that a “Request to Seal Documents” shall set forth the statutory or other authority for sealing, the requested duration, the identity, by name or category, of persons permitted access to the documents, and all other relevant information.” Here, plaintiff’s request to seal fails to address any of these requirements.


Moreover, in evaluating requests to seal, the court starts “with a strong presumption in favor of access to court records.” Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). “The presumption of access is ‘based on the need for federal courts, although independent – indeed, particularly because they are independent – to have a measure of accountability and for the public to have confidence in the administration of justice.’” Id.

1 (quoting United States v. Amodeo, 71 F.3d 1044, 1048 (2d Cir. 1995)). A request to seal material
2 must normally meet the high threshold of showing that “compelling reasons” support secrecy. Id.
3 (citing Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)).
4 However, where the material is, at most, “tangentially related to the merits of a case,” the request
5 to seal may be granted on a showing of “good cause.” Id. at 1097-1101.

6 Here, plaintiff’s request does not make a showing of ‘good cause,’ let alone that
7 ‘compelling reasons’ exist, to file the Declaration of Affiant under seal. In this regard, plaintiff
8 asserts simply that the document should be filed under seal as it “contains the Auditor’s
9 confidential information.” (ECF No. 15 at 1.) Although it appears that the original document
10 does contain some personal information, plaintiff has already redacted that personal information.¹
11 “[R]edactions have the virtue of being limited and clear” Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1183.

12 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s January 4, 2017 request to seal
13 (ECF No. 15) is denied.

14 Dated: January 10, 2017

15
16
17 
18 DEBORAH BARNES
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20

21 DLB:6
22 DB\orders\orders.civil\j&jsports0851.req.seal.denc
23
24

25
26 ¹ Although the document does reflect the Auditor’s address and phone number, it is not clear to
27 the undersigned that such information, of a person holding themselves out as an Auditor, is
28 necessarily personal. Especially when the address provided is for a P.O. Box. As noted above,
plaintiff’s filing fails to address this issue or why this information could not simply be redacted as
opposed to filing the entire document under seal.