

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EMIL LAWRENCE,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [14-cv-00820-MEJ](#)
**ORDER RE: ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**
Re: Dkt. No. 107

On March 3, 2017, Defendant the City and County of San Francisco, Christina Peters, and Daniel Bonnel (collectively, “Defendants”) filed an administrative motion to file under seal. Mot., Dkt. No. 107. In support of the motion, Defendants submit a declaration stating that Exhibits J and K to the Declaration of Brian P. Ceballo in support of Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (the “Ceballo MSJ Decl.”) contain Plaintiff Emil Lawrence’s (“Plaintiff”) health information and that Defendants designated these Exhibits as confidential pursuant to the parties’ protective order. *See* Mot. at 3.

There is a “strong presumption in favor of access” by the public to judicial records and documents accompanying dispositive motions. *Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006) (citing *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). To overcome this presumption, a “party must articulate compelling reasons supported by specific fact[s].” *Id.* at 1178 (internal quotation and citation omitted). Such showing is required even where “the dispositive motion, or its attachments, were previously filed under seal or protective order.” *Id.* at 1179.

The Court GRANTS Defendants’ Motion. Compelling reasons exist to seal Exhibits J and K, as these documents contain Plaintiff’s confidential health information. Any interest the public

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

may have in the disclosure of the records in this case is outweighed by Plaintiff’s interest in the privacy of his medical records. *See Van v. Language Line Servs., Inc.*, 2016 WL 3566980, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2016) (“[C]ompelling reasons exist to protect confidential financial and medical records.”); *A.C. v. City of Santa Clara*, 2015 WL 4076364, at *2 (N.D. Cal. July 2, 2015) (compelling reasons justified sealing medical records). Defendants need not re-file the Exhibits.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 3, 2017



MARIA-ELENA JAMES
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Defendants previously filed a Motion to remove Exhibits J and K from the docket. Dkt. No. 106. The Court DENIES that Motion AS MOOT.