

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  
OAKLAND DIVISION**

No. C 08-1171 SBA

SIAUPIA VAOVASA; ELISAPETA  
VAOVASA; and LEALOFI PENITITO,  
individually and on behalf of all others similarly  
situated,

**ORDER**

[Docket No. 45]

Plaintiffs,

v.

SFO GOOD-NITE INN LLC,

Defendant.

---

The Court DENIES without prejudice Defendant's Administrative Motion to File Documents Under Seal (the "Motion") [Docket No. 45], because movant has failed to advance any legal argument that the Court has the authority, under the "compelling reasons" standard to seal any of the documents proposed for sealing. *See Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006) (" 'compelling reasons' must be shown to seal judicial records attached to a dispositive motion"). Defendant also fails to establish why redaction alone is insufficient to protect confidential business information. See Local Rule 79-5(c).

Pursuant to Local Rule 79-5(e), the Clerk of the Court is directed to notify the submitting party to retrieve the documents; in the alternative, the submitting party may request the Clerk to return them by United States mail.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

December 11, 2008

  
Saundra Brown Armstrong  
United States District Judge