

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
TIMBERLY E. HUGHES,  
Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-05931-JCS

**ORDER SEALING EXHIBITS AND  
ATTACHING STANDING ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 68

**I. EX PARTE REQUEST TO SEAL**

Defendant Timberly Hughes, pro se, filed a number of motions on September 4, 2020. In an order issued the same day denying those motions, the Court noted that Hughes waived the protection of Rule 5.2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by filing personal information included in exhibits in the public record. *See* dkt. 75 at 1 n.2. After that order was issued, Hughes sent an ex parte request via email to the Courtroom Deputy requesting that the exhibits to docket entry 68 be placed under seal.

Sealing documents in a federal court docket is the exception rather than the rule, and generally must be supported by “compelling reasons.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016).<sup>1</sup> Requests to file under seal must be made by administrative motion filed in the public record at the time the document at issue is filed, following the procedure set by Civil Local Rule 79-5. Such requests must be narrowly tailored, and even where the Court grants a motion to seal, parties often must also file versions of the documents at issue in the public record with only the sensitive portions of them redacted.

---

<sup>1</sup> A lower standard of “good cause” can suffice for sealing documents filed in connection with a motion only tangentially related to the merits of the case. *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097–1103.

