

1 *L.L.C.*, 2009 WL 2224596 at *7 (citing *Pintos*, 565 F.3d at 1116); *see also Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at
2 1179–80. “Under the ‘compelling reasons’ standard, a district court must weigh relevant factors, base
3 its decision on a compelling reason, and articulate a factual basis for its ruling without relying on
4 hypothesis or conjecture.” *Id.* “Relevant factors include the public interest in understanding the
5 judicial process and whether disclosure of the material could result in improper use of the material for
6 scandalous or libelous purposes or infringement upon trade secrets.” *Id.*

7 The Court finds that Plaintiff has not met her burden here. Plaintiff seeks to file Exhibit 2 to
8 her opposition to Defendant’s motion for summary judgment under seal pursuant to the stipulated
9 protective order entered between the parties. *See* ECF No. 12. Plaintiff represents that Exhibit 2
10 contains “documents pertaining to Defendant’s internal policies and procedures that arguably fell
11 under the parties’ stipulated protective order.” *Motion for Leave* (ECF No. 25), 3:24–26. However,
12 this bare bones explanation as to why Exhibit 2 is confidential does not justify an order from the
13 Court sealing Exhibit 2 to Plaintiff’s opposition to Defendant’s motion for summary judgment.

14 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File Documents Under Seal
15 (ECF No. 25) is **denied without prejudice**. Plaintiff may file a revised motion that provides the
16 Court with sufficient “compelling reasons” to justify her request.

17 DATED this 24th day of October, 2016.

18
19 
20 _____
21 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
22 United States Magistrate Judge
23
24
25
26
27
28