1		
2		
3		
4	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
6		
7 8 9	MARY LABRADOR, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,) Case No. 08-2270 SC) ORDER RE:) ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
10	Plaintiff,) <u>FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL</u>
11	v.)
12	SEATTLE MORTGAGE COMPANY,)
13	Defendant.	,))
14		

15 Before the Court is an Administrative Motion by Defendant 16 Seattle Mortgage Company ("Defendant") to file documents under 17 ECF No. 89 ("Mot."). Defendant seeks to file under seal seal. 18 portions of its Opposition to Plaintiff Mary Labrador's Motion to 19 Certify the Class, as well as a declaration and an exhibit in 20 support of its Opposition. Id. Plaintiff has not opposed this 21 Motion.¹

The Court finds that Defendant's Motion complies with Civil Local Rule 79-5 and General Order 62. Defendant has supported its Motion with a declaration candidly discussing why these documents

25

¹ This is Defendant's second motion to file these documents under seal. ECF No. 83. The Court denied Defendant's earlier motion, finding that Defendant had failed to establish that the documents were entitled to protection under the law and that Defendant's proposed sealing order was too broad. ECF No. 87. The Court gave Defendant two days to refile the motion. Id.

should be filed under seal. Hassen Decl. ¶¶ 4-5.² The Court also finds the scope of Defendant's proposed sealing order to be narrowly tailored: Defendant seeks to protect some, but not all, of the documents, and it has identified the specific language it seeks to keep confidential by lodging with the Court suggested redacted versions of each document.

For these reasons, the Court GRANTS Defendant's Motion. The following documents shall be filed under seal:

- Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Certify the Class;
- The declaration supporting Defendant's Opposition; and
- Exhibit B attached to the declaration supporting Defendant's Opposition.

Defendant shall publicly e-file versions of the documents with 14 redaction consistent with the redacted versions submitted to the 15 Court. Defendant shall also file under seal unredacted versions of 16 the documents. Due to the nature of the documents, the sealing 17 18 order shall be temporary: documents shall be sealed for ninety (90) 19 days from the date of this Order, at which point they will be 20 unsealed. Defendant may petition the Court for a continuance of this Order if it believes one is required. 21

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 7, 2010

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

28 ² Michael Hassen, counsel for Defendant, filed under seal a declaration in support of the Motion. ECF No. 89-1.

United States District Court For the Northern District of California 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

2.2

23

24

25

26

27