

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

BELINDA K.,	)	Case No.: 10-CV-05797-LHK
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO SEAL
	)	DOCUMENTS AND ORDERING
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA et al.,	)	DEFENDANTS TO SHOW CAUSE
	)	WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT
Defendants.	)	ISSUE

Defendants the East Bay Children’s Law Offices and Jonna Thomas have attempted for the third time to properly submit documents under seal. The Court denied both of Defendants’ previous motions, ordering Defendants to “replace Plaintiff’s last name in the papers with the first letter of her last name (K.),” and to request to seal Ex. A to the Request for Judicial Notice as it contains sealable information. See Dkt. Nos. 82 and 90. Defendants have now filed another Administrative Motion to Seal. Dkt. No. 96. Contrary to the Court’s Order, Defendants seek to place entire documents under seal which contain little or no sealable information. Specifically, Defendants seek to seal their Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, the Proposed Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, their Request for Judicial Notice, and the declaration of Bryan L. Saalfeld. Because Defendants have replaced the Plaintiff’s last name with the first letter of her last

1 name in the moving papers, most of these documents do not appear to contain any sealable  
2 information. The only sealable information the Court finds in these documents is references to the  
3 allegations made against Plaintiff's boyfriend, on page 1 lines 8 - 10. In addition, it appears that  
4 Defendants have improperly redacted Exhibit A to their Request for Judicial Notice without  
5 indicating the redaction.

6 Defendants' repeated failure to follow the Civil Local Rules regarding sealing leave the  
7 Court with no choice but to issue an Order to Show Cause why sanctions should not issue for  
8 failure to follow the Local Rules and the orders of this Court. Defendants' response is due **14 days**  
9 **from the date of this Order.**

10 Defendants' third request to seal is DENIED.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: April 29, 2011

13   
14 LUCY H. KOH  
United States District Judge