

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

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELLIOT ZIESEL, on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DIAMOND FOODS, INC.,

Defendant.

No. 10-1192 JSW (EDL)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
REGARDING ORDER REGARDING
MOTION TO SEAL TRANSCRIPT OF
JANUARY 25, 2011 DISCOVERY
HEARING**

During a January 25, 2011 hearing on Defendant’s motion to compel, counsel for Plaintiff requested that the transcript of the hearing be sealed to protect her client’s privacy. The Court denied Plaintiff’s initial request to seal the entire hearing transcript, because much of the discussion during the hearing was unrelated to Plaintiff’s private medical information. On February 9, 2011, this Court issued an Order requiring Plaintiff to file a motion in compliance with Local Rule 79-5(a), which requires that sealing requests be “narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material,” and present a narrowly tailored request, declaration and proposed order. To date, Plaintiff has not filed an amended motion in compliance with the Court’s February 9, 2011 Order. Plaintiff is hereby Ordered to Show Cause why the motion to seal should not be denied and the hearing transcript unsealed for failure to file a proper motion by no later than March 15, 2011. Failure to respond to this Order to Show Cause *and* file an amended motion, declaration and proposed order in

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

compliance with Local Rule 79-5 by March 15 will result in the motion being denied and the transcript being unsealed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 1, 2011



ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge