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

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## BERNARD PAUL PARRISH, HERBERT ANTHONY ADDERLY, and WALTER

ROBERTS III,

No. C 07-00943 WHA

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'** MOTION TO SEAL DOCUMENTS

v.

NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS ASSOCIATION and NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS INCORPORATED d/b/a PLAYERS INC,

Defendant.

Plaintiffs' motion to seal the Third Amended Complaint and exhibits D, F, G, I, J, and O in support thereof is **DENIED**. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c), the Court may seal documents upon a showing of "good cause" by the party seeking to seal the documents. The party asserting good cause "bears the burden, for each particular document it seeks to protect, of showing that specific prejudice or harm will result if no protective order is granted." Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2003). The Ninth Circuit has made clear that there is a strong presumption in favor of public access to court documents. Kamkana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006). It is only after weighing the competing interests of public disclosure and the party who seeks to keep judicial documents secret should a court grant a motion to seal. *Ibid*. Plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden as required by Rule 26(c). No substantive basis has been given by plaintiffs to show

good cause for sealing the documents. In addition, plaintiffs may not meet their burden by

simply designating the documents as confidential under the protective order. Such circumstances would confer upon the parties the power to designate nearly any document as confidential. For the foregoing reasons, plaintiffs' motion is **DENIED**.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 19, 2007.

## WILLIAM ALSUP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE