16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 BARRY BROWN, JENNIFER BROWN, Case No. 13-1451 SC JANE DOE 1, and JANE DOE 2, 9 ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART MOTIONS TO Plaintiffs, 10 SEAL v. 11 JON ALEXANDER, DEAN WILSON ED 12 FLESHMAN, JULIE CAIN, CINDY 13 SALATNAY, COUNTY OF DEL NORTE, and DONALD CROCKET, 14 Defendants. 15

Defendants Jon Alexander, Dean Wilson, Ed Fleshman, Julie Cain, Cindy Salatnay, and the County of Del Norte (collectively, the "County Defendants") now move for an order permitting them to file under seal: (1) their motion to dismiss, (2) their request for judicial notice and attached exhibits, and (3) the Declaration of William F. Mitchell re: Submission of State Court Protective Orders. ECF No. 23 ("Cnty's Mot."). Also before the Court is a similar motion by Defendant Donald Crocket ("Crocket") for permission to file under seal: (1) his motion to dismiss, (2) his request for judicial notice, and (3) the declaration of Dohn R. Henion. ECF No. 21 ("Crocket Mot."). Crocket also requests that the Court issue an order sealing the entire case.

The County's Motion is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part, as is Crocket's. The parties may file under seal their request for judicial notice and declarations, as well as the documents attached thereto. However, the parties' request to file under seal their motions to dismiss is DENIED without prejudice. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(a), sealing requests must be narrowly tailored, and not all information contained in the parties' motions is privileged or otherwise entitled to protection. The County Defendants and Crocket may re-file their administrative motions pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(c), which governs requests to file portions of documents under seal. The administrative motions should propose redactions to the parties' respective motions to dismiss and specifically explain why those redactions are necessary.

Crocket's request to seal the entire case is also DENIED.

Crocket has offered no authority that would support such a drastic remedy. Nor has he enunciated compelling reasons for sealing the entire case. His request is conclusory and does not address the fact that almost all of the docket entries in this matter, including the Complaint, have been available to the public since the case was filed in April 2013.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 15, 2013

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE