

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

DANITA COHEN-BREEN,
Plaintiff,

v.

GRAY TELEVISION GROUP, INC.,
Defendant.

3:08-CV-00244-LRH-VPC

ORDER

Before the court is Plaintiff’s Application to File Pleading Under Seal (#44¹). No opposition has been filed.

On December 19, 2008, Plaintiff filed the instant motion asking permission to file under seal her opposition to Defendant’s motion for summary judgment. On December 22, 2008, however, Plaintiff filed her opposition without a sealing designation but with certain information redacted. Thus, it would appear that Plaintiff’s motion to file under seal may be moot. Nonetheless, the court has considered Plaintiff’s motion and will deny it without prejudice.

A party seeking a sealing order bears the burden of showing why a filing warrants such an order. *See Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 504 F.3d 792, 801 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[A] party seeking to seal judicial records must show that ‘compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings . . .

¹Refers to the court’s docket

1 outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.”). Here, Plaintiff
2 offers no reason for this court to issue a sealing order as to any of the information (redacted or not)
3 in her opposition; thus, she has not met her burden. Moreover, Plaintiff’s motion fails to comply
4 with Local Rule 7-2(a), which requires any motion to be supported by points and authorities.

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff’s application to File Pleading Under Seal
6 (#44) is DENIED.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED this 5th day of February, 2009.



10
11

LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26