I

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	THOMAS HUBBARD,	CASE NO. 09CV0735-LAB (KSC)
12	Plaintiff, vs.	ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE MOTION TO FILE
13		DECLARATION UNDER SEAL
14	PHIL'S BBQ OF POINT LOMA, INC., a California corporation; PHILLIP C. PACE	
15	and JEFFREÝ A. LOÝA,	
16	Defendants.	
17 18		
10 19	Defendants Pace and Loya have moved ex parte for an order permitting the	
20	declaration of John Cheng (offered in support of their opposition to Plaintiff's motion for	
20	summary judgment), and the motion is unopposed. The motion does not brief the standard	
22	for sealing of documents submitted in connection with dispositive motions, and the parties'	
23	consent to have it sealed is insufficient. See Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu, 447	
24	F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006).	
25	The Court notes that the declaration contains confidential financial information that	
26	is subject to a protective order. But the mere fact that a protective order is in place does not	
27	mean that the standard for filing documents under seal is met. See Pintos v. Pacific	
28	<i>Creditors Ass'n</i> , 605 F.3d 665, 678–79 (9 th Cir. 2010) (discussing "compelling reasons" standard that applied to motion to seal documents in support of motion for summary	
	standard that applied to motion to sear documents in support of motion for summary	
	-	1 - 09CV0735

judgment, and contrasting this standard with standard for protective order). Before sealing,
the Court "must weigh relevant factors, base its decision on a compelling reason, and
articulate the factual basis for its ruling, without relying on hypothesis or conjecture." *Id.* at
679 (quoting *Hagestad v. Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995)) (quotation marks
omitted).

Because Pace's and Loya's application does not explain in any detail the reason why
sealing is needed, the Court cannot undertake the required analysis. The application is
therefore **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. No later than noon on Friday, October 19, 2012,
Pace and Loya may renew their application, which must be filed in the docket. The Court will
retain the lodged materials, however, and they need not refile those.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: October 16, 2012

and A. Burn

HONORABLE LARRY ALAN BURNS United States District Judge