1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ANTONIO A. LOPEZ, No. 2:16-cv-02205-TLN-KJN 12 Plaintiff. 13 ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND v. **DENYING IN PART DEFENDANT'S** 14 PRE-EMPLOY.COM, INC., SECOND REQUEST TO SEAL **DOCUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF ITS** 15 Defendant. MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT 16 17 18 This matter in before the Court pursuant to Defendant Pre-Employ.Com., Inc.'s 19 ("Defendant") Second Notice of Request to Seal Documents in support of Defendant's Motion for 20 Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 27.) Plaintiff Antonio A. Lopez ("Plaintiff") has not responded. 21 Defendant asks the Court to redact and file under seal three Exhibits, U, Z, and II, affixed to 22 Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 24 at 1–2.) The Exhibits contain three types of information: personally identifying information such as social security numbers, 23 24 sensitive information such as birth dates, and public records. (ECF No. 24 at 1–2.) There is a "strong presumption in favor of access" to judicial records. Kamakana v. City 25 26 & Cty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Foltz v. State Farm Mutual 27 Auto. Insurance Company, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). The party seeking to seal 28 records attached to dispositive pleadings "must articulate compelling reasons to seal supported by 1

specific factual findings" sufficient to "outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure." *Id.* at 1178–79 (citing *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1135; *San Jose Mercury* News, Inc. v. U.S. Dist. Ct., 187 F.3d 1096, 1102–03 (9th Cir.1999)). "The mere fact that the production of records may lead to a litigant's embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not, without more, compel the court to seal its records." *Id.* at 1179.

Defendant requests the Court seal documents which contain personally identifying and sensitive information. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2 requires a party to redact certain identifying and sensitive information from a filing, such as full social security numbers and birth dates. Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(a). Defendant has shown compelling reasons to redact personally identifying and sensitive information and to file the exhibits under seal.

Defendant also requests the Court seal documents which contain information from public records. Defendant has not argued the information should be redacted or the documents sealed. Rather, Defendant has described the information as "public records" and stated it believes Plaintiff put these records at issue by filing this suit. (ECF No. 27 at 1.) Further, Defendant referred the Court to Plaintiff for any further briefing on this issue, arguing Plaintiff bears the burden in this matter. (Def. Second Request to Seal Documents at 2.) Plaintiff has not filed any response or argument on this issue. Defendant has not shown compelling reasons to redact or seal documents related to the public records attached to its motion for summary judgment.

Accordingly, the Court hereby GRANTS Defendant's Second Notice of Request to Seal Documents as to personally identifying or sensitive information in the documents and DENIES the Request as to public records information in the documents, (ECF No. 27). Defendant shall file new versions of these documents that have been redacted in conformity with this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 7, 2018

Documents at 2.)

Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge

25

23

24

26

27

28

the burden to demonstrate the Court should seal information about public records. As such, Pre-employ requests that

the Court direct any order regarding further briefing, if needed, towards the Plaintiff." (Def. Second Request to Seal

"To the extent the Court requests any further argument on the matter, Pre-employ submits that Plaintiff has