

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

WILLIAM KLAMUT,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-02132-MEJ](#)

**ORDER RE: MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 60

On November 17, 2016, Defendants Officer Seth Nibecker and Sergeant Daniel Wheeler (collectively, “CHP Defendants”) filed a motion to file under seal. *See* Mot., Dkt. No. 60. The Motion pertains to Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Stanley Goff, which was filed in Support of Plaintiff William Klamut’s Opposition to the CHP Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. *See* Ex. 1, Stanley Decl., Dkt. No. 59-1. Plaintiff did not file an opposition. For the reasons set forth below, the Court **DENIES** the CHP Defendants’ Motion.

**LEGAL STANDARD**

There is a “strong presumption in favor of access” by the public to judicial records and documents accompanying dispositive motions. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. 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); *see also Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 727 F.3d 1214, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (finding sealing appropriate where companies “filed declarations from employees” that “explained the measures the two companies take to keep their product-specific financial information confidential” and “the harm they would suffer if their product-specific financial information were made public”).

1 Indeed, such showing is required even where “the dispositive motion, or its attachments, were  
2 previously filed under seal or protective order.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179.

3 **DISCUSSION**

4 The “compelling reasons” standard applies to the CHP Defendants’ Motion, as it pertains  
5 to Defendants’ dispositive Motion for Summary Judgment. *See Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*,  
6 605 F.3d 665, 678-79 (9th Cir. 2010); *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179 (“[T]he strong presumption of  
7 access to judicial records applies fully to dispositive pleadings, including motions for summary  
8 judgment and related attachments.”). The CHP Defendants fail to show that compelling reasons  
9 exist to justify sealing.

10 Exhibit 1 purports to be a video that “shows that the plaintiff was not posing any threat or  
11 actively resisting when he was tased by defendant Wheeler several times and shot with a less  
12 lethal shotgun by defendant Nibecker from less than 15 feet away several times.” Goff Decl. ¶ 2.  
13 The CHP Defendants contend Exhibit 1 is subject to the protective order entered on July 18, 2016.  
14 Mot. at 1-2; *see* Protective Order, Dkt. No. 44. The protective order identifies documents subject  
15 to the order, including photographs, CHP mobile video and audio recording system (“MVARs”)  
16 records, and other documents the producing party designates as “confidential.” Protective Order  
17 at 1-2. Paragraph 2 of the protective order provides that

18 [t]he documents and their contents may not be disclosed, copied,  
19 distributed, shown, described, or read to any person or entity  
20 (including, but not limited to, media representatives) by plaintiff or  
21 his counsel, representatives or agents, other than (a) the parties to  
22 this litigation; (b) the parties’ attorneys, paralegals, and legal office  
staff in this litigation; (c) the parties’ expert consultants in this  
litigation for purposes of expert consultation and trial testimony  
preparation; and (d) the Court in this action, filed under seal, for  
purposes of this litigation.

23 *Id.* ¶ 2. Paragraph 8 further requires that

24 [i]f any party intends to file a motion that includes as an exhibit any  
25 writing(s) subject to this Protective Order, that party shall meet and  
26 confer with the opposing party. If the producing party maintains its  
27 position that the documents are confidential, the party intending to  
file the documents must file a motion to file the documents under  
seal pursuant to Local Rule 79-5 of the Northern District of  
California.

28 *Id.* ¶ 8. The CHP Defendants argue these provisions required Plaintiff to file Exhibit 1, an

1 MVARs video, under seal and to notify the CHP Defendants that he intended to file a document  
2 subject to the protective order in connection with his opposition. Mot. at 2.

3 But Exhibit 1 consists only of a photocopied image of the CD-ROM that contains the  
4 video. See Ex. 1. Plaintiff submitted the actual CD-ROM with his chambers copy of his  
5 Opposition, but he did not file the video itself on the public docket. To the extent the CHP  
6 Defendants request the Court seal the above image, the Court **DENIES** the request. Even if the  
7 protective order provides a compelling reason to seal the video, Exhibit 1 does not actually contain  
8 the video and there is nothing about the image itself that warrants redaction. To the extent the  
9 CHP Defendants wish to seal the video itself, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion. Plaintiff's counsel  
10 shall submit the CD-ROM to the Court to be filed under seal.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12

13 Dated: November 28, 2016

14



15

---

MARIA-ELENA JAMES  
United States Magistrate Judge

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28