UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

BELINDA K. and J.H., her minor son, Petitioners, v. YOLANDA BALDOVINOS, et al., Respondents.	Case No.: 10-CV-02507-LHK ORDER RE: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

On February 8, 2013, the Court received two CDs filed by Belinda K., entitled "Calico Interview: 12-20-2006" and "Belinda K. Appeals." This Court no longer has jurisdiction over this case, as it is currently pending on appeal. As such, the Court will not review these submissions. Because the Calico Interview is an interview with a minor about confidential allegations, the Court will keep these submissions under seal.

In an Administrative Motion filed on February 26, 2013, ECF No. 280, Respondents County of Alameda and Yolanda Baldovinos requested copies of endorsed-filed, unredacted versions of several documents that the parties had filed with the District Court.

With the exception of the Notice of Appeal, the requested documents were filed under seal. In preparing for the appeal filed by Petitioner/Appellant Belinda K. (Ninth Circuit Appellate #12-

15372), Respondents have discovered that they do not have endorsed-filed, unredacted copies of the above documents, which they intend to submit to the Ninth Circuit as Excerpts of Record per Ninth Circuit Rule 30-1. *See* ECF No. 280. Respondents' counsel submits that these documents are necessary to the above-referenced appeal.

The Court hereby GRANTS Respondents' motion as to the requested documents that were filed on ECF: the Notice of Appeal (Docket #250), and the Summary Judgment Order (Docket #233). [1] The Clerk's office shall provide Respondents with copies of these documents.

The Clerk's office shall also provide Respondents with redacted copies of the Declarations and attached exhibits of the following declarations Respondents filed in support of Respondents' Motion for Summary Judgment: Declaration of James Crawford-Jakubiak, M.D.; Declaration of Jeri Issacson; Declaration of Linda Fuchs; and Declaration of Marry Ellyn Gormley. Because copies of the remaining documents are currently unavailable, the Court DENIES Respondents' motion with respect to these documents.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 6, 2013

LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge

[1] The Court notes that it has previously granted Petitioner's request for a second unredacted copy of the Order Denying Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment and Granting Respondents' Motion for Summary Judgment ("Summary Judgment Order"), after Petitioner had difficulty obtaining the original from her former counsel. *See* ECF No. 271, n.1.