

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

MICHELLE LOU, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MA LABORATORIES, INC. et al.,

Defendants.

No. C 12-05409 WHA


**ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANTS'
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER
SEAL (DKT. NO. 383)**

For three of defendants' exhibits filed with its reply brief, redactions with a black marker were applied to plaintiff's home address, date of birth, social security number, passport number, and bank account number (Dkt. No. 378). Plaintiffs informed defendants that the redactions were insufficiently dark. The exhibits were locked and are not currently available to the public. On November 21, defendants filed an administrative motion to seal the entirety of exhibits A, B, and C and provided revised exhibits with darker redactions.

This order finds that the parties' declarations in support of sealing the entirety of exhibits A, B, and C (rather than just the redacted portions) in sufficient under *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006). The redactions are ordered sealed, however, the revised redacted exhibits should be publicly available.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 4, 2013.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE