

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

E. BERTITA TRABERT GRAEBNER, *et al.*,

No. C 12-01694 WHA

Plaintiffs,

v.

ORDER RE SEALING

MICHAEL E. JAMES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

It appears that plaintiffs have filed a number of redacted exhibits in connection with their opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment; however, no motion to seal has been filed. Pursuant to Local Rules 79-5 and 7-11, plaintiffs must file an administrative motion to seal that clearly identifies the exhibits or portions of exhibits they seek to file under seal and provides specific reasons establishing that they are properly sealable. As stated in Local Rule 79-5, "the request must be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material, and must conform with Civil L.R. 79-5(b) or (c)." Additionally, it appears that the redacted portions in the exhibits currently e-filed on the public docket are not identified, e.g., by noting each sealed portion as "redacted." Plaintiffs must file an administrative motion to seal by **NOON ON JULY 15**. The documents will remain provisionally sealed until further order of the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 12, 2013.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE