1

2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 10 RAHINAH IBRAHIM. 11 Plaintiff, 12 v. 13 DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 In December 2013, the parties submitted proposed findings of fact and conclusions of 17 law without proposed redactions. A December 2013 order stated: 18 19 20 unredacted version must be filed under seal. 21 22 23 24 25 26 (Dkt. No. 312). The parties have yet to file public versions of their proposed findings and 27 28

No. C 06-00545 WHA

ORDER RE FILING PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Any proposal or response that relies on SSI or any evidence for which privilege was actually sustained on the record as to that evidence must be redacted in the public record but a full and

(Dkt. No. 652). A January 2010 protective order regarding sensitive security information stated:

Any Party who wishes to use a Restricted Use Document or the Sensitive Security Information contained therein in connection with a motion or other submission to this Court must file the Restricted Use Document and any pleadings, motions or other papers containing Sensitive Security Information under seal. Where possible, only the portions of the filings that contain Sensitive Security Information shall be filed under seal.

responses. Accordingly, the parties shall file (1) public versions of their December 13 proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law with redactions, if any; (2) public versions of their December 20 responses with redactions, if any; and (3) full and unredacted versions of their

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

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	

proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and responses under seal by ${\bf Noon}$	N OI
January 24.	

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 15, 2014.

