

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
7

8 JANE DOE,

No. C 07-05596 SI

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE  
APPLICATION TO SEAL AND  
DEFENDANTS' EX PARTE  
APPLICATION TO FILE MOTION  
UNDER SEAL**

10 v.

11 CITY OF SAN MATEO, et al.

12 Defendants.  
13 \_\_\_\_\_/

14 On December 12, 2010, plaintiff filed an ex parte application to seal her deposition. Doc. 391.  
15 On December 15, 2010, defendants City of San Mateo, Shandon Murphy, Sgt. Perucci, and Joseph  
16 Yansuka ("City defendants") filed an ex parte application to file a motion for summary judgment under  
17 seal. Doc. 392. The City defendants explained that they did not believe that plaintiff's deposition  
18 needed to be sealed, since it does not contain plaintiff's true name and address, but agree that one of the  
19 exhibits supporting their motion did need to be filed under seal. Also on December 15, the City  
20 defendants filed a redacted motion for summary judgment that did not contain the exhibit and did not  
21 contain any citations to plaintiff's deposition testimony. Doc. 393. Other defendants in this case,  
22 Suzanne Blick, the County of San Mateo, and the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office ("County  
23 defendants"), filed a motion for summary judgment the same day, which was not redacted. Doc. 395.

24 Because of the sensitive nature of this case, and because the deposition (which the Court does  
25 not have possession of) may contain certain identifying information other than plaintiff's true name and  
26 address, the Court GRANTS plaintiff's ex parte application. (Doc. 391.) The Court also GRANTS the  
27 City defendants' ex parte application. (Doc. 392.) Because it contains references to the deposition  
28 transcript the Court ORDERS that the County defendants' summary judgment motion, doc. 395, be

1 sealed.

2 This order is issued out of an abundance of caution. The parties should be aware that the Court  
3 intends to rule on the motions for summary judgment in an order that will be publically available.  
4 Additionally, if a trial is held, that trial will be conducted in open court.

5 Finally, **the Court reminds all defendants to be vigilant about filing any document**  
6 **containing plaintiff's name or address under seal.** Two documents have been filed so far in what the  
7 Court assumes was an inadvertent violation of the Court's order, one by each set of defendants. See  
8 docs. 189, 390. The Court expects that no more violations will occur.

9

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11

12 Dated: December 23, 2010

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



---

SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge