

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
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

JEFFREY CONCEPCION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JAMES E. TILTON, Secretary, California
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation;
SCOTT KERNAN, Chief Deputy Secretary
Adult Operations, California Department of
Corrections and Rehabilitation; RICK
RIMMER, Correctional Safety Assistant
Secretary, California Department of Corrections
and Rehabilitation; ROBERT HOREL, Warden
of Pelican Bay State Prison,

Defendants.

Case No: C 08-2296 SBA (PR)

ORDER

Docket 24 and 28

Defendants have filed a motion to seal and to have reviewed *in camera* confidential documents identified as Exhibits A and B to the Declaration of Everett Fischer. (Docket 24.) Defendants seek to have these exhibits sealed by the Court for 75 years on the ground that these documents contain the identity of persons whose safety could be jeopardized in the event that their names are made public. However, Defendants have not complied with the requirements to file an entire document under seal. See L.R. 79-5(b). In addition, Defendants fail to cite any authority for the proposition that the Court has the authority to seal a document for 75 years.¹ Accordingly, Defendants’ Motion to File Confidential Documents Under Seal for In Camera Review is DENIED. Said denial is without prejudice to Defendants’ resubmitting their motion in conformance with Local Rule 79-5 within 14 days of this Order.

¹ It is possible for the Court to maintain these documents under seal until the conclusion of the case and any appellate proceedings, after which time Defendants may request that the Clerk return the confidential documents.

1 The exhibits at issue shall remain under seal pending Defendants' submission of a proper
2 motion to seal.

3 Also before the Court is Plaintiff's unopposed request for a one-day extension to file his
4 opposition (Docket 28), which is GRANTED.


5 Finally, the Court notes that there is no indication that the parties met and conferred
6 prior to the filing of either motion, as required by the Court's Standing Orders. The parties are
7 advised that no further motions or requests will be considered unless the submitting party
8 certifies that it has complied with this requirement.

9 This Order terminates Docket Nos. 24 and 28.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11

12 Dated: February 9, 2010


SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
United States District Judge

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28