

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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
SAN JOSE DIVISION

JEFFREY SCHULKEN, et al.,)	Case No.: 09-CV-02708-LHK
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	ORDER REGARDING VARIOUS
)	ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS
WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK,)	
HENDERSON, NV, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiffs filed an administrative motion to seal various documents related to their class certification motion. ECF No. 145. The motion to file under seal is unopposed. After reviewing the motion, the supporting declaration and the documents, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' motion to seal. The Court has already determined that many of the documents are properly sealable. *See* ECF Nos. 94, 99. Moreover, those documents that Plaintiffs seek to file entirely under seal contain information regarding Chase's business policies, procedures and strategies with respect to the 4506-T program, as well as statistics regarding the program. Those documents that Plaintiffs seek to file partially under seal also contain information regarding the same internal policies, procedures, and business practices referenced above. The sealing request is narrowly tailored to protect only the properly sealable information. Civil L.R. 79-5. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' motion to seal Exhibits C, D, E, F, G, I, L, M, and O of the Woodrow Declaration is GRANTED. Plaintiffs'

1 motion to partially seal Exhibits A, B, J, K, and N of the Woodrow Declaration, and to partially
2 seal portions of the motion for class certification is also GRANTED.

3 Plaintiffs have also filed an administrative motion to file under seal various documents
4 related to their reply in support of the class certification motion. ECF No. 160. Plaintiffs already
5 sought to seal Exhibits I, J, D, and F of the Woodrow Reply Declaration in the motion for class
6 certification. These documents are properly sealable for the reasons stated above. Exhibit G and
7 portions of Exhibit H are also properly sealable because they contain details regarding the business
8 policies, procedures, strategies and statistics associated with the 4506-T program. Accordingly, the
9 motion to seal Exhibits G, I, and J is GRANTED. The motion to partially seal exhibits D, F, and H
10 is also GRANTED.

11 Defendant has also filed a motion to permanently block the e-filed Exhibit 1 of the Collado
12 Declaration, which is a redacted copy of Plaintiffs' motion for class certification. ECF No. 151.
13 This motion is DENIED. Because the document is already redacted, and nothing that is sealable
14 has been revealed, there is no need to permanently block the ECF filing, or to seal the entire
15 document. If Defendant believes an unredacted copy of Exhibit 1 was erroneously filed, Defendant
16 shall identify the docket number for the Court by December 28, 2011, so the Court may reconsider
17 its ruling.

18 Finally, Plaintiff filed an administrative motion to file a response to Defendant's statement
19 of recent decision. ECF No. 166. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-3(d)(2) the parties are permitted
20 to bring to the Court's attention a relevant judicial opinion, "*without argument.*" Accordingly,
21 Plaintiffs' request is DENIED.

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 Dated: December 21, 2011

24 
25 LUCY H. KOH
26 United States District Judge