UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUZETTE TIPPITT,

Plaintiff,

v.

TESORO REFINING & MARKETING COMPANY LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 14-cv-03893-RS

ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL

The parties in this case have filed an administrative motion to file certain documents under seal in connection with their summary judgment briefing. As the designating party of the putatively confidential information, Tesoro bears the burden of pointing to compelling reasons justifying sealing and narrowly tailoring its request to target only sealable information. Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006); Civil Local Rule 79-5(b). Its submission does not satisfy the second of these requirements. While the need to protect the privacy of a defendant's non-party employee may justify sealing, Tesoro's request does not merely seek to redact sensitive information pertaining to the individual at issue here. Instead, Tesoro proposes to excise roughly half of the exhibits submitted in support of plaintiff's opposition from the public record. This overbroad request is denied.

Because certain information targeted by Tesoro's request is sealable, the administrative motion is denied without prejudice. Tesoro is directed to file a renewed sealing request, minimizing proposed redactions, no later than **one week** from the date of this order. The renewed request shall include a redacted version of each of the documents at issue. This order does not address the merits of Tesoro's motion for summary judgment.

United States District Court Northern District of California

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 20, 2015

RICHARD SEEBORG United States District Judge