

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----

DANIEL BRUNO, individually and
on behalf of others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES,
LLC; GENEVA FINANCIAL SERVICES,
INC.; MARK HASSAN; GENEVA
MOTORS, INC. d/b/a GENEVA
FINANCIAL SERVICES; ROBERT
MCGINLEY; KAMIES ELHOUTY; JOHN
MCGINLEY; ANDY MITCHELL; and
REBS SUPPLY, INC. d/b/a REBS
MARKETING, INC.;

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-00327 WBS EFB

ORDER RE: MOTION FOR ORDER
RE-OPENING CASE FOR PURPOSE
OF GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST TO SEAL DOCUMENTS

----oo0oo----


On March 10, 2020, plaintiff filed a Motion for Order
Re-opening Case for Purpose of Granting Plaintiff's Request to
Seal Documents. (Docket No. 327.) The documents at issue here
were filed in connection with plaintiff's motion for class
certification but were subject to a protective order and

1 designated as "attorney's eyes only" in a related case in the
2 U.S. District Court of the Western District of Texas, Bruno v.
3 Equifax Information Services, 1:18-cv-00774-LY. Plaintiff
4 requests that this case be reopened and one exhibit be sealed and
5 two lines of his brief in support of his motion for class
6 certification be redacted. (Docket Nos. 292-60 and 291).
7 Plaintiff represents that the exhibit was inadvertently attached
8 to the class certification motion, and the information which he
9 now seeks to redact was inadvertently included in his memorandum
10 in support of his class certification motion.

11 Pursuant to Local Rule 141(a), "[d]ocuments may be
12 sealed only by written order of the Court, upon the showing
13 required by applicable law." E.D. Cal. L.R. 141(a). Given that
14 the document and information plaintiffs seeks to be sealed or
15 redacted were inadvertently disclosed by plaintiff, and appear to
16 be subject to a protective order in a related case, the court
17 concludes that plaintiff has presented "good cause" to rebut the
18 presumption in favor of public access. See Kamakana v. City &
19 County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1189 (9th Cir. 2006).

20 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's Motion to seal
21 Exhibit HHH (Docket No. 292-60) and redact lines 12-13 of page 21
22 of plaintiff's memorandum in support of class certification
23 (Docket No. 291) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED. There is no
24 need to formally "reopen" this case in order to grant such
25 request.

26 Dated: March 20, 2020


27 WILLIAM B. SHUBB
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE