

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**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
ADIL HIRAMANNEK,  
Defendant.

Case No. [17-cv-03389-BLF](#)  
**ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S  
MOTIONS TO SEAL DOCUMENTS,  
WITHOUT PREJUDICE**  
[Re: ECF 37, 38]

Before the Court is Respondent Adil Hirananeck (“Respondent”)’s motions to file under seal various documents in this case. Respondent has filed two motions: (1) “Respondent’s Rule 5.2, Civil L.R. 7-11, 79-5, Administrative Motion to Seal Documents,” ECF 37, and (2) “Ex Parte Emergency, Expedited & Supplemental Administrative Motion To Seal Certain Documents With An Order That Petitioner Shall File Respondent & Third Parties Private Information Under Seal,” ECF 38. For the reasons discussed below, the Court DENIES Respondent’s motions without prejudice.

**I. LEGAL STANDARD**

There is a “strong presumption in favor of access” to judicial records. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). A party seeking to seal judicial records bears the burden of overcoming this presumption by articulating “compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.” *Id.* at 1178-79. Compelling reasons for sealing court files generally exist when such “‘court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes,’ such as the use of records to gratify private spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release trade

1 secrets.” *Id.* (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc ’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)). However,  
2 “[t]he mere fact that the production of records may lead to a litigant’s embarrassment,  
3 incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not, without more, compel the court to seal its  
4 records.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179. Ultimately, “[w]hat constitutes a ‘compelling reason’ is  
5 ‘best left to the sound discretion of the trial court.’” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*,  
6 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016).

7 “Despite this strong preference for public access, [the Ninth Circuit has] carved out an  
8 exception,” *id.* at 1097, for judicial records attached to motions that are “tangentially related to the  
9 merits of a case,” *id.* at 1101. Parties moving to seal such records need only make a  
10 “particularized showing” under the “good cause” standard of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
11 26(c). *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1180 (quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1138).

12 In this District, parties seeking to seal judicial records must furthermore follow Civil Local  
13 Rule 79-5, which requires, *inter alia*, that a sealing request be “*narrowly tailored* to seek sealing  
14 *only* of sealable material.” Civil L.R. 79-5(b) (emphasis added).

15 **III. DISCUSSION**

16 The Court has reviewed Respondent’s sealing motions and declarations in support thereof.  
17 Respondent requests that the Court seal this entire case and its related case *United States v.*  
18 *Hiramanek*, 5:17-cv-03392 (N.D. Cal. filed June 12, 2017). ECF 37. Respondent does not argue  
19 or establish compelling reasons for the Court to seal these cases entirely. In the alternative,  
20 Respondent requests that the Court seal documents listed “under ¶2” of his administrative motion  
21 to seal documents. *Id.* The documents Respondent seeks to seal include the underlying petition  
22 (ECF 1), “Respondent’s Preliminary Quick Notice & Request for Time To Respond,” (ECF 3),  
23 certificates of service (ECF 15, ECF 16), the order to show cause (ECF 23), and Respondent’s  
24 motion to dismiss, inclusive of all declarations and exhibits (ECF 31). ECF 37. These documents  
25 are related to the merits of the case, and must be resolved under the compelling reasons standard.  
26 *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1101-2 (holding that “public access will turn on whether the  
27 motion is more than tangentially related to the merits of a case”).


28 Respondent’s requests are not narrowly tailored to sealable material. Although

1 Respondent lists the “kind of information contained in the questioned document(s)” and  
2 summarizes the documents into “*high level categories*” that may constitute compelling reasons to  
3 seal, he does not tailor his requests to sealable information but rather requests the Court to seal all  
4 information, including legal arguments, contained in the identified documents. ECF 37.  
5 Respondent’s request is overbroad and does not satisfy the compelling reasons standard or comply  
6 with Civil Local Rule 79-5(b). Respondent’s sealing motions are DENIED WITHOUT  
7 PREJUDICE. No later than 7 days from the filing of this order, Respondent may renew his motion  
8 so as to more narrowly tailor his request to seal. If Respondent does not renew his motion, he  
9 must file the unredacted documents into the public record. Alternatively, Respondent may  
10 withdraw the documents he filed in this case.

11 Moreover, there is no authority for Respondent’s request that the Court seal “Petitioner’s  
12 future filings that contain any private information of the kind listed under section ¶1.” ECF 38.  
13 Such a request is premature. If Petitioner files sealable information in this case, Respondent may  
14 file a narrowly tailored motion to seal such information.

15  
16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17  
18 Dated: July 26, 2017

19   
20 BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28