



1 (quotation omitted). However, avoiding a litigant’s embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to  
2 further litigation will not, without more, compel the court to seal its records. *Id.*

3 A lower “good cause” standard applies to “private materials unearthed during discovery”  
4 as well as to “previously sealed discovery attached to a nondispositive motion.” *Pintos*, 605 F.3d  
5 at 678. This standard asks “whether good cause’ exists to protect th[e] information from being  
6 disclosed to the public by balancing the needs for discovery against the need for confidentiality.”  
7 *Id.* (quotation omitted). Nondispositive motions and discovery “are often unrelated, or only  
8 tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action, and, as a result, the public’s interest in  
9 accessing dispositive materials does not apply with equal force to non-dispositive materials.” *Id.*  
10 (quotation omitted).

11 The plaintiffs have not shown good cause for sealing the documents in their entirety.  
12 Most of the information the plaintiffs seek to seal has already been disclosed on the public record.  
13 Additionally, the second amended complaint is not tangentially related to the claims in this case.  
14 The public has an interest in understanding what claims are asserted in this case and the factual  
15 allegations supporting those claims. I therefore deny the motion to seal the documents in their  
16 entirety.

17 I grant the motion to redact John’s birthdate from the second amended complaint, both as  
18 attached to ECF No. 75 and as separately filed at ECF No. 101. I also grant the motion to redact  
19 the names of minors, John Doe, Parent Doe, and others who would make identification possible  
20 in the exhibits attached to ECF No. 92. In addition to the missed redaction identified by the  
21 defendants in ECF No. 102 at page 24, line 20, I also direct the plaintiffs to ECF No. 102-2 at  
22 page 14, line 15 and at page 25, line 18, where other names should be redacted.

23 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the plaintiffs’ motion to seal **(ECF No. 102) is**  
24 **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.**

25 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that within 20 days of the date of this order, the plaintiffs  
26 shall file redacted, publicly accessible versions of ECF Nos. 75 and 92 consistent with this order.

27 ////

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

Because ECF No. 101 has already been filed on the public record with the permitted redaction of John Doe's birthdate, the plaintiffs need not file another version of that document.

DATED this 1st day of June, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE