

1                                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                                    FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3  
4 PAUL BOSCHETTI,

No. C 13-0628 CW

5                                    Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION  
TO SEAL (Docket  
No. 11)

6                                    v.

7 DANIEL O'BLENIS,

8                                    Defendant.  
9  
10 \_\_\_\_\_/

11                                    On April 4, 2013, Defendant Daniel Everett,<sup>1</sup> proceeding pro  
12 se, filed a motion to seal the entire docket in this case. He did  
13 not, however, provide a declaration establishing that every  
14 document in this case is sealable under Civil Local Rule 79-5.<sup>2</sup>  
15 Under that rule, the Court may only order a document to be sealed  
16 if it "is privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise  
17 entitled to protection under the law." Civil Local Rule 79-5(a).  
18 While Defendant alleges that the San Francisco County Superior  
19 Court -- where this action was originally filed -- previously  
20 granted the parties' joint request to seal this case, that order  
21 is not binding on this Court.

22                                    If Defendant wishes to seal documents filed after he removed  
23 this case from state court, then he must file a motion to seal and  
24 accompanying declaration establishing that those documents are  
25

26                                    <sup>1</sup> Although Defendant is named in this action as Daniel O'Blevins,  
27 he has identified himself as Daniel Everett in his motion.

28                                    <sup>2</sup> Defendant filed this motion under section 1161.2 of the  
California Rules of Civil Procedure. However, as noted above, sealing  
motions in this Court are governed by Civil Local Rule 79-5.

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

sealable under Civil Local Rule 79-5(a). Because he has not done  
so here, his motion to seal (Docket No. 11) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/8/2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CLAUDIA WILKEN  
United States District Judge