

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

LINDA MIDDLETON,)
Plaintiff,) 8:12CV19
vs.) ORDER
DOUGLAS COUNTY, NEBRASKA,)
Defendant.)

This matter is before the Court on the defendant's Motion to Seal ([Filing No. 37](#)). The defendant states it seeks to seal the case because it "has been resolved and no other matters remain that would prevent this Court from sealing this case." The defendant did not file a brief or provide other justification for sealing the case. The plaintiff opposes the motion. **See** [Filing No. 38](#).

A motion to seal “must state why sealing is required and whether redaction could eliminate or reduce the need for sealing.” [NECivR 7.5\(a\)\(i\)](#); **see also** [NECivR 5.3\(c\)\(A\)](#) (requiring movant to state need for restriction). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, “[f]or good cause, the court may . . . limit or prohibit a nonparty’s remote electronic access to a document filed with the court.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2; **see also** Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). The defendant fails to describe why it is necessary to seal or restrict access to this case or any part of it. Additionally, the defendant fails to state from whom the matter should be sealed. The defendant fails to provide good cause for sealing the case. Upon consideration,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The defendant's Motion to Seal ([Filing No. 37](#)) is denied.
2. The plaintiff's Objection ([Filing No. 38](#)) is sustained.

DATED this 21st day of February, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Thomas D. Thalken
United States Magistrate Judge