28

1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7 DAVID MCDONALD, Case No. <u>17-cv-04915-HSG</u> 8 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE 9 v. MOTION TO SEAL 10 CP OPCO, LLC, et al., Re: Dkt. No. 88 11 Defendants. Pending before the Court is Plaintiff David McDonald's administrative motion to file 12 under seal portions of his opposition to Insperity PEO Services, L.P.'s motion for judgment on the 13 pleadings. See Dkt. No. 88. Plaintiff originally asserted that the portions of the opposition he 14 wished to seal "contain information received through third-party discovery and designated as 15 confidential by non-party Bright Event Rentals, LLC." See id. at 1. However, Bright Event 16 Rentals, LLC later informed Plaintiff that it did "not intend to file a declaration establishing that 17 the designated material is sealable." See Dkt. No. 91 at 1. Consequently, Plaintiff filed an 18 unredacted version of his opposition, see Dkt. No. 92, and requested that the Court deny as moot 19 his administrative motion to file under seal, see Dkt. No. 91 at 1. 20 Based on Plaintiff's representations and his filing of an unreducted version of his 21 opposition on the public docket, the Court **DENIES** as moot the administrative motion to file 22 under seal. This order terminates Dkt. No. 88. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 Dated: 3/22/2019 25 26 United States District Judge 27