



1 that have been omitted from the redacted version . . . .” Id. Moreover, the local rules state  
2 that “[d]ocuments which the filer has in an electronic format must be converted to PDF  
3 from the word processing original, not scanned, to permit text searches . . . . Civ. L.R. 5-  
4 1(e)(2).

5 Along with the rules that apply to unredacted versions of documents, parties that  
6 seek to file documents under seal must also attach a proposed order that “lists in table  
7 format each document or portion thereof that is sought to be sealed.” Civ. L.R. 79-  
8 5(d)(1)(B) (emphasis added).

9 Here, while Dell electronically filed a redacted version of its memorandum of  
10 points and authorities in support of its motion to compel, Dkt. No. 1, Dell’s administrative  
11 motion to seal does not include the unredacted version that contains highlights of the  
12 redacted portions. See Dkt. No. 5. Its current motion to seal includes only three attached  
13 documents: a declaration, a proposed order, and a cover page for an exhibit. Dkt. No. 5  
14 (1-3). Dell also failed to file electronically unredacted versions of certain exhibits to the  
15 declaration of Phillip D. Price; it merely included the cover page to those exhibits. Dkt.  
16 No. 5-3. In terms of the proposed orders for both sealing motions, Dell also fails to list  
17 the documents or portions of documents in table format. See Dkt. Nos. 5-2, 22-4.

18 This failure to comply with the local rules will not do.

19 Accordingly, the Court orders Dell to electronically file an amended sealing motion  
20 relating to its initial motion to compel, and attach unredacted versions (with highlights) of  
21 the documents identified above. However, this Court’s order is not limited to only the  
22 documents discussed; Dell must apply the same rules to all other documents it seeks to  
23 file under seal but failed to file on ECF.

24 Additionally, Dell must resubmit an amended sealing motion relating to its reply in  
25 support of its motion to compel. Dkt. No. 22. Specifically, Dell must file electronically  
26 an unredacted version of its reply, Dkt. No. 22-6, with the redacted portions highlighted.

27 In light of the upcoming hearing on Dell’s motion to compel, Dell must file all of  
28 the documents by the end of today, November, 14, 2014.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: November 14, 2014



---

Nathanael M. Cousins  
United States Magistrate Judge