


1 despite this Court’s previous denial of a cursory motion to seal—Plaintiff has not set
2 forth any legal standard or argument that would justify sealing the documents described
3 in its motion to seal. See Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179
4 (9th Cir. 2006) (explaining that a party must demonstrate “compelling reasons” to seal
5 judicial records attached to a dispositive motion). Because the documents Plaintiff
6 wants sealed pertain to a dispositive motion, the fact that the documents were marked
7 “CONFIDENTIAL-FOR OUTSIDE COUNSEL ONLY” does not, by itself, satisfy the
8 “compelling reasons” standard as to the specific pieces of information that Plaintiff
9 wants sealed. See id. at 1183-84. It is clear that Plaintiff does not want sealed the
10 entirety of every document listed in its motion to seal because Plaintiff has publicly
11 filed redacted versions of several of these documents. Moreover, the Court has not
12 received a proposed order on Plaintiff’s motion to seal as required by section 2(j)(1)(c)
13 of the Court’s ECF Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual.

14 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff’s motion to seal, (ECF No. 228), is **DENIED**
15 **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Plaintiff shall have up to and including **January 20, 2014**,
16 to file a renewed motion to seal that sets forth the compelling reasons for sealing the
17 specific pieces of information that Plaintiff wants sealed. Pursuant to Section 2(j) of
18 this District’s ECF Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual, the documents
19 currently lodged at ECF Nos. 229, 230, 231, 232, and 233 “will remain lodged under
20 seal without further consideration” unless and until Plaintiff files a renewed motion to
21 seal that sets forth the “compelling reasons” for sealing the specific pieces of
22 information that Plaintiff wants sealed.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 DATED: January 14, 2014

25 
26 HON. GONZALO P. CURIEL
27 United States District Judge
28