

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,
Defendants.

MASTER CASE FILE
NO. C00-4599 TEH

ORDER OF REFERRAL RE:
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL

11
12
13
14
15
16
17

On October 4, 2012, Plaintiffs filed a motion to file under seal portions of their motion to appoint a receiver and supporting exhibits. It appears from the Court's comparison of the redacted and unredacted versions of Plaintiffs' motion to appoint a receiver¹ that Plaintiffs' request to file documents under seal does not meet the narrow requirements of Civil Local Rule 79-5(a). The parties are reminded that documents identified by a party as "confidential" and produced pursuant to a protective order are not necessarily entitled to sealing from the public.

18
19
20
21
22

Plaintiffs' motion to file under seal (Docket No. 751) is HEREBY REFERRED to Magistrate Judge Nathanael M. Cousins for resolution. Plaintiffs need not provide additional chambers copies of the documents in question; this Court will make its chambers copies of the redacted and unredacted filings available to Judge Cousins.

23
24

IT IS SO ORDERED.

25
26
27

Dated: 10/11/12



THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

28

¹This comparison was necessary because Plaintiffs' motion to file under seal failed to identify proposed redactions with specificity.