

1 Second, Defendant submitted more than 100 pages of documents to the Court *in camera*.
2 The Court does not seal documents *en masse*. Instead, the Ninth Circuit has made clear that the
3 sealing of entire documents is improper when any confidential information can be redacted while
4 leaving meaningful information available to the public. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*,
5 331 F.3d 1122, 1137 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also In re Roman Catholic Archbishop of Portland in*
6 *Oregon*, 661 F.3d 417, 425 (9th Cir. 2011). The Court is unclear why entire documents must be
7 sealed rather than being filed publicly with limited redactions.

8 Third, as noted above, Defendant submitted extensive documentation for *in camera* review.
9 It appears that such documents have already been provided to Plaintiffs, however. *See* Docket No.
10 67 at 1 n.1. Given that Plaintiffs already appear to have a copy of the documents, it is not clear to
11 the Court why Defendant is resorting to an *in camera* review rather than following the typical
12 procedures for filing confidential documents on the docket under seal, accompanied by a motion to
13 seal. *See* Local Rule 10-5(b).

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 DATED: September 29, 2014

16 
17 _____
18 NANCY J. KOPPE
19 United States Magistrate Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28